

# The Signs of the Times, Vol. 12 (1886)

January 7, 1886

## "What the Gospel Teaches" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

"And he said unto him, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16:15, 16. These words were spoken by our Saviour after his resurrection, and shortly before his ascension. They are perfectly in harmony with his words recorded in Matt. 24:14, that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." There is no mistaking the extent of territory in which the gospel must be preached—nothing less than the whole world. And how long must it be preached? Read the whole of Matt. 24:14: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Then the gospel is to be preached until the end. The end here referred to is the same that is mentioned in verse 3, "The end of the world." That this "end of the world" is in connection with the coming of the Lord, is shown by the words of the disciples in the verse last mentioned, and by the words of Christ in Matt. 13:40-43; 24:30, 31.

The fact that by divine command the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, proves conclusively that until the Lord comes, a necessity for its being preached will exist in all the world. This needs no further argument, for it is nowhere disputed. We will therefore turn our attention to a consideration of what the gospel is, and what creates the necessity for its being so long and so extensively preached.

The word "gospel" means, literally, "a good message;" Webster's first definition is "glad tidings." According to its derivation, it might be applied to any good news; but in the Bible it is used with exclusive reference to one thing; what that thing is, we may easily learn from the Bible itself.

In Luke 2:10 we find these words, addressed by the angel of the Lord to the shepherds in the field: "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings [a gospel] of great joy, which shall be to all people." The next verse tells what this gospel is: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." Then the gospel which is to be preached to all people is the announcement of a Saviour. It is from this that Webster derives his specific definition of the gospel, as, "especially, the good news concerning Christ and his salvation."

But the simple heralding of Christ, without stating the nature and object of his work, would not be the preaching of the gospel. The "good news" consists in the fact that Christ the Lord is a *Saviour*. That Christ comes as a Saviour, necessarily implies that there are people to be saved, and something from which they must be saved. Turning to Matt. 1:21, we read the angel's declaration before the birth

of Christ: "And thou shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." Paul says (1 Tim. 1:15): "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." So it is manifest that the preaching of the gospel consists in the announcement that Christ will save people from sin.

But while the gospel is the good news that Christ brings salvation from sin, it is evident that that simple announcement would not suffice to produce the desired results, viz., that men should believe and be baptized. For there are millions of people who virtually say that they are "rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," not knowing that they are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." No matter how destitute a man may be, it would be of no use to offer him money if he were ignorant of his necessities, and perfectly satisfied with his condition. So no man can feel any interest in the gospel as a means of salvation from sin, unless he (1) knows what sin is, and (2) is convinced that he is a sinner, and (3) understands the nature and results of sin, so as to realize that it is something to be shunned. Therefore the gospel, with its announcement of salvation from sin, must also make known what sin is. This it does, as we shall see.

John, the evangelist, so called because it is he who more than anyone else dwells on the love of God and Christ in the salvation of man, defines sin. He says: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for *sin is the transgression of the law.*" 1 John 3:4. In harmony with this, Paul says that "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15.

83

And "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 5:12. Volumes could not define sin more clearly than do these three texts. We have found out, then, (1) that "gospel" means good news; (2) that the gospel of the Bible is the good news of a Saviour-Christ the Lord (Luke 2:10, 11); (3) that Jesus saves from sin (Matt. 1:21; 1 Tim. 1:15); and (4) that "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4.

So that, in short, the gospel announces the way by which man may be saved from the transgression of the law, and from the consequences of such transgression. Sin is the disease; the gospel is the remedy. And since the gospel is to be preached in all the world, until the coming of the Lord, it follows that "all the world," yea, "every creature," has sinned. This we read in Rom. 3:23: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

It must also be true that sin will be in the world till the Lord comes. And this we verify by a comparison of Gen. 6:5 and 13:13 with Luke 17:26-30. But since sin is the transgression of the law, it also necessarily follows that "the law" will be in full force in all the world until the coming of the Lord. In other words, sin is the disease, and it cannot exist where there is no law. Rom. 4:15. The disease, sin, does exist in "every creature" in "all the world;" for the remedy, the gospel, is to be thus extensively made known, and the great Physician would not send the remedy where it is not needed. "They that be whole need not a physician; but they that are sick" (Matt. 9:12); and therefore the law, by which alone "is the knowledge of sin"-the disease-is binding upon "every creature" "in all the world." Now since "the wages of sin"-the transgression of the law-"is death" (Rom. 6:23),

it is important that all men know just what that law is, the transgression of which brings death, and just what its nature and requirements. These points will therefore next claim our attention. E. J. W.

### **"Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The letter from Pope Leo XIII., "Concerning the Christian Constitution of States," addressed "To All the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic World," has spent the subject of considerable comment by both the secular and the religious press. So far as we of seen, it has met with quite a general commendation. The New York *Observer* is an honorable exception to those who, like the *Independent*, think it is "an excellent and sensible pastoral." We have delayed making any comments upon it until we could read it has published by authority. We now propose to notice a few points in it, simply to show that the Catholic Church is the same in every particular that was four hundred years ago and that people may see with what insidiousness it is making its way in the world. The first thing that attracts the attention is the following statement in the Introduction:-

"The Church looks essentially, and the very nature of her being, to the salvation of souls and the winning for them of happiness in Heaven; nevertheless, she also secures even in this world advantages so many and so great that she could not do more, even if she had been founded primarily and specially to secure prosperity in this life which is worked out upon earth. In truth, wherever the Church has set her foot, she has at once changed the aspect of affairs, colored the manners of the people as with new virtues and a refinement unknown before-as many people as have accepted this have been distinguished for their gentleness, their justice, and the glory of their deeds."

The above sentences *seem* little involved, but the idea is very clearly expressed, compared with the greater portion of the letter. If we have been correctly informed, Leo XIII. is a close student of the Fathers; and it would seem that he has been an apt student, for his composition very closely resembles the dry platitudes and the circumlocution which abound in the "Fathers" of the Catholic church. The above paragraph, however, is clear enough to convince any who will think, that it is groundless assumption. In proof of its falsity, one has only to think of the natives of Mexico, Central America, Spain, and Italy. These countries have been under Catholic rule for centuries, and may be taken as representative instances of the refining and civilizing influence of the Roman Catholic Church. If the statement of the pope be true, those countries ought to lead the world and everything. On the contrary, however, they are at the bottom of the list. Of some of them it may be said that they have even deteriorated under the papal influence. The Italian Government, since Victor Emmanuel rescued it from papal oppression, has taken a leading position, although not much can yet be said for the great mass of poor, deluded Italians themselves. But this only makes more prominent the evils of Catholic rule. It is true that many Catholics have been distinguished, but not as a consequence of their Catholicism. The

truth is, as appears further on in the letter, the Catholic Church adapts itself to the people. Among civilized people it has all the learning known to the school; but it is content to leave savage races where it finds them. Provided they will acknowledge its power.

The following paragraph sounds very well, and, taken by itself, would not be very objectionable:-

"As it is not lawful for anybody to neglect his duties towards God, and as it is the first duty to embrace, in mind and then conduct, religion-not such as each may choose, but such as God commands-in the same manner States cannot, without a crime, act as though God did not exist, or cast off the care of religion as alien to them or useless, or out of several kinds of religion adopt indifferently which they please; but they are absolutely bound to, in the worship of the Deity, to adopt that use and manner in which God himself shows that he wills to be adored. Therefore among the rulers the name of God must be holy; but it must be reckoned among the first of their duties to favor religion, protect it, and cover it with the authority of the laws, and act

7

to institute or decree anything which is incompatible with its security."

Whether there is anything wrong in this statement or not depends upon the source from whence it proceeds, as will hereafter be seen. When the pope speaks of religion, he means the Catholic Church alone. The following paragraph explains the above, and shows what he desires when he says that rulers must cover religion with the authority of the laws. It is entitled, "What the Church has Done for Civilization":-

"There was once a time when the philosophy of the gospel governed states; then it was that the power and divine virtue of Christian wisdom had penetrated into the laws, institutions, and manners of the people-indeed, into all the ranks and relations of the State; when the religion instituted by Jesus Christ, firmly established in that degree of dignity which was befitting, flourished everywhere, in the favor of rulers and under the due protection of magistrates; when the priesthood and the government were united by concord and a friendly interchange of offices. And the State composed in that fashion produced, in the opinion of all, more excellent fruits, the memory of which still flourishes, and will flourish, attested by innumerable monuments which can neither be destroyed nor obscured by any art of the adversary. If Christian Europe subdued barbarous peoples, and transferred them from a savage to a civilized state, from superstition to the truth; if she victoriously repelled the invasions of the Muhammedans; if civilization retained the chief power, and accustomed herself to afford others a leader and mistress in everything that adorns humanity; if she has granted to the peoples true and manifold liberty; if she has most established many institutions for the solace of wretchedness, beyond controversy is greatly due to religion, under whose auspices great undertakings were commenced and with whose aid they were perfected. Truly the same excellent state of things would have continued if the agreement of the two powers had continued if greater things might rightfully have been expected if there had been obedience to

the authority, the sway, the counsels of the church, characterized by greater faithfulness and perseverance," etc.

Who cannot see that this is a long look backward to the time when the pope ruled kings, and when with a word he released subjects from their allegiance to their rightful rulers? The time when the pope forced an emperor in Germany to stand for three days in the snow, awaiting the papal pleasure: when a legate of the pope used as a foot-ball the crown of a king of England; when designing men waxed rich off from the superstitions and vices of the ignorant, by selling them pretended indulgences; when the pope had such control of the people's consciences that he could keep them in so great a state of degradation that even the ignorant rabble whom he made to be priests, were far above them; the time when thousands of priests had never seen a copy of the Bible, and when, as a consequence, the pure principles of the gospel had almost ceased to be recognized in the world, so that the very name of priest was almost a synonym for libertine; when the few who dared refuse obedience to the vile men who presumed to stand in the place of Christ, were proscribed and hunted from the earth with the most diabolical tortures which demons in human shape could invent; and when the pope publicly gave thanks to God for the massacre of sixty thousand Huguenots, whose only offense was that they believed the Bible;-these are the times for which Leo XIII. longs. These are some of the "excellent fruits" of the union of the Church and the State. And the pope truly says that "greater things might rightfully have been expected," "if the agreement of the two powers had continued." Let the so-called "National Reform Party" make a note of this.

That the above state of things is what the pope desires, is shown by his reference to the Reformation as "that dreadful and deplorable zeal for revolution which was aroused in the sixteenth century, after the Christian religion had been thrown into confusion." And in spite of all this, there are professed Protestants who think that the letter is "an excellent and sensible pastoral." Sensible it may be, from the Catholic standpoint, but we deny its excellence from any standpoint whatever.

Following up the above statements, the pope says of the Reformation and its results:-

"And since the people is said to contain in itself the fountain of all right and of all power, it will follow that the State deems itself bound by no kind of duty towards God; that no religion should be publicly professed; nor ought there to be any inquiry [by the State], but to each equal rights ought to be assigned with the sole end that the social order incurs no injury from them."

The above needs no special comment here. We merely ask the reader to compare it with some of the extracts which follow, and which shows that the Roman Catholic Church holds that no other form of religion ought to be tolerated in the State.

In the following, the Pope shows still more plainly, the design of the Roman Church:-

"Those foundations of the State being admitted, which at this time are in such general favor, it easily appears into how unfavorably a position the church is driven. For when the conduct of affairs is in accordance with the doctrines of this

kind, to the Catholic name is assigned an equal position with, or even an inferior position to, that of alien societies in the State; no regard is paid to each ecclesiastical laws; and the church, which, by the command and mandate of Jesus Christ, ought to teach all nations, finds itself forbidden in any way to interfere in the instructions of the people."

The "Church" finds itself forbidden "to interfere" in the instructions of the people. That is, the Catholic Church has to be content with the same privileges that are granted to other religious bodies. This is truly an "unfavorable position" for a church that has been accustomed to enforce its dogmas by the sword, the rack, and the stake.

Again we quote:-

"Concerning the reasons for the separation of Church and State, the same pontiff [Gregory XVI.] speaks thus: and 'Nor can we hope happier results either for religion or the Government, from the wishes of those who are eagerly desirous that the Church should be separated from a State, and the mutual good understanding of the sovereign secular power and the sacerdotal authority be broken up. It is evident that those lovers of the most shameless liberty dread that concord which has always been fortunate and wholesome, both for sacred and civil interests.' To like the effect Pius IX., as opportunity offered, noted many false opinions, which had begun to be of great strength, and afterwards ordered them to be collected together, in order that in so great a conflux of errors, Catholics might have something which, without stumbling, they might follow."

To a careless reader the above statement might seem to be very innocent; but it can easily be shown that it endorses all of the intolerance which ever disgraced the papacy in the Dark Ages. Read again the reference to Pius IX., and the "false opinions" which he noted and caused to be collected. This refers to the "Syllabus of Errors" which was put forth by Pious IX. This "Syllabus" is a collection of about eighty statements, all of which are declared to be grievous errors. We have space for only a few of these "errors." Number 21 is as follows:-

"The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion."

Remember that the Catholic Church holds just the opposite of this "error." According to this, none of the Roman Catholics have any religion at all. The 23rd "error" which the pope unqualifiedly condemns, is that:-

"The Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals."

On no ground can it be held that Roman pontiffs have *not* usurped the rights of princes, except on the ground that princes have no right which popes are bound to recognize; and this is just what the Roman Church holds. And right here we might note that the papacy finds a parallel in the self-styled "National Reform Association," which, according to its organ, the *Christian Statesman*, holds that "the State and its sphere exists for the sake of, and to serve the interests of the Church." Human meant nature has not changed a particle in the last three or four hundred years, and every principle of reasoning justifies the statement that such sentiments as the above, whether held by popes or by professed Protestants, will

work out the same results in the nineteenth century that they did in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

"Errors" number 24 and 27 are as follows:-

"The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power."

"The ministers of the Church and the Roman pontiff, ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs."

Of course these are errors, if this is true that Roman pontiffs have never exceeded their jurisdiction, nor usurped the rights of princes; and this is what Leo XIII. reiterates in his "excellent and sensible pastoral." And the "National Reform Association," and all who favor it, cannot consistently deny the pope's claim.

One more quotation from the "Syllabus of Errors" must suffice to show that Leo XIII. holds exactly the same views that were held by his predecessor, Pius IX. and, by the amiable Leo X., who placed Luther under ban, and caused the Christians of his time to be slaughtered. Numbers 77 and 78 of the "errors" noted by Pious IX are the following:-

"In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship."

"Whence it has been widely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship."

Which means that Leo XIII., in common with Pius IX. and all the popes who ever reigned, holds that the Roman Catholic religion ought to be held as the only religion of the State, "to the exclusion of all other modes of worship," and that persons coming to reside in countries called Catholic, ought not to be allowed to enjoy the public exercise of their own worship. Let those who will, applaud such sentiments; we will not. E. J. W.

*(Concluded next week.)*

**January 14, 1886**

**"The Law and the Gospel Co-extensive" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Nehemiah 9:13 we find the following words in the Levites' confession to God: "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai; and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments." Here we have reference made to true laws and good statutes. A good and true law would in every case condemn sin; therefore the law here referred to is of the same character as that which, being transgressed, makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached. This law was given upon Mount Sinai; so we examine the law there given to see if it meets the requirements.

In the 19th of Exodus we have a description of the preparation of the people to hear the law from Sinai. We read:-

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai." Ex. 19:10, 11.

"And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." Ex. 19:16-18.

This was the condition of Mount Sinai when from it God spoke "true laws, good statutes and commandments." Chapter 20, verses 3 to 17, contains the words which God spoke at that time. We quote them in full:-

1. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
2. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.
3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.
4. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.
5. "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.
6. "Thou shalt not kill.
7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. "Thou shalt not steal.
9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
10. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbours."

These are the words which the Lord spoke in the hearing of all the people, from the midst of the fire and smoke upon Mount Sinai. Soon afterward he spoke to Moses, as follows:-

"Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." Ex. 24:12.



Accordingly, we find by reading the remaining verses of the chapter, that Moses went up into the mount, and remained there with God forty days and forty nights. While he was there, the Lord gave him minute directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. Then we read:-

"And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." Ex. 31:18.

"And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand; the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 32:15, 16.

Then we are told how Moses, as he drew near the camp, saw the golden calf, and the people dancing around it, "and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath [at the foot of] the mount." But this was not the end of the matter; for very soon we read thus:-

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of

23

stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest." Ex. 34:1.

We will now read the words of Moses, as he rehearses the whole matter to the Israelites, just before his death. We begin with the point last quoted:-

"At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in mine hand. And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me." Deut. 10:1-5.

One more quotation on this point. In the course of Moses' final address to the people, in which he rehearsed all their history in the wilderness, he repeated the substance of the ten commandments, and at the close he said:-

"These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." Deut. 5:22.

The gist of these texts of Scripture may be expressed as follows: The good and true laws which were spoken upon Sinai (Neh. 9:13) were the ten commandments, found in Ex. 20:3-17; these ten commandments were written by God himself on two tables of stone; and there was nothing spoken to the people by the Lord, except that which was placed upon the tables of stone (Deut. 5:22). Therefore the words found in Ex. 20:3-17, *and no others*, form the ten commandments, the perfect law of God.

But what has this to do with the gospel? Just this: We found that the gospel is the remedy for sin, which is the transgression of the law; and that the law must be in force as long and as extensively as the gospel is preached. We were concerned to know what law it is the transgression of which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, and we have now found it. One more step completes the identification. It is this:-

Paul says (Rom. 7:7): "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." The law here referred to must be the same law that is referred to in John 3:4, because it is one that points out sin; it does this because it is "holy, and just, and good." Therefore it is the law to which the gospel relates. And what law is it?-It is the law which condemns unlawful desire by saying, "Thou shalt not covet." But this is the last one of the ten commandments. Therefore we have proved to a demonstration that the ten commandments of Ex. 20:3-17,-those commandments which were spoken by Jehovah, in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the smoke, and of the thick darkness, and which were written on two tables of stone and deposited in the ark,-form the law which points out sin. They are the law which has been universally trodden underfoot, making it necessary that the gospel should be preached in all the world, to every creature; and, therefore, it is as plain as the Scripture can make it, that they are still binding upon every creature in every part of the world. If it were otherwise, there would be no sin, and, consequently, no need of the gospel. Whoever, therefore, says that he is not under the jurisdiction of those ten commandments, virtually says that he has no sin; and whoever says that he has no sin, places himself outside of the gospel plan; for "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," and no others. His salvation has reference only to those who have transgressed the law of God, the ten commandments.

The above argument is, we think, so conclusive as to make it almost unnecessary to notice the assumption that the gospel of Christ is that which points out sin. If this were true, we should have Christ introducing the gospel into the world in order to save men from the rejection of it! That is, the remedy for the disease creates the disease, the remedy being introduced to cure that which without it would never have existed! Such an absurdity is too puerile to be entertained for a moment. The gospel must relate to something outside of and prior to itself. Since the gospel saves from sin, it is evident that sin existed before the gospel, and that it continues to exist so long as the gospel exists; and since sin is the transgression of the law, it is just as evident that the law existed before there was sin, and, consequently, before there was any gospel, or any need of it, and that it exists as long, at least, as the gospel exists.

The testimony of men can never add to the force of the Bible; but to show that the view taken here is not a peculiar one among Christians, we quote from the two men, both eminent for scholarship and piety:-

"The ordinary method of God is to convict sinners by the law, and that only. The gospel is not the means by which God hath ordained, or which our Lord himself used, for this end. We have no authority in Scripture for applying it thus, nor any ground to think it will prove effectual. Nor have we any more ground to

expect this from the nature of the thing. 'They that are whole,' as our Lord himself observed, 'need not a physician, but they that are sick.' It is absurd, therefore, to offer a physician to them that are whole, or that at least imagine themselves so to be. You are first to convince them that they are sick; otherwise they will not thank you for your labor. It is equally absurd to offer Christ to those whose heart is whole, having never yet been broken. It is, in the proper sense, casting pearls before swine. Doubtless they will trample them underfoot; and it is no more than you have reason to expect, if they also turn again and rend you."- *Wesley's Works, Vol. 1, Sermon 85.*

"The law of God, and its great and solemn injunctions, should be distinctly set forth. Our congregations should be gathered as a round the base of Mount Sinai, while from its summit is heard the voice of God in those commandments which from its summit are heard the voice of God in those commandments which are unalterable and the eternal in their character. The effect of these utterances will be, that conscience will be awakened, and hearts will tremble. Some will say, with Moses, 'I do exceedingly fear and quake,' when they behold the majesty of law, the purity of God, and their own impurity. Others may be repelled, and will say, 'Let not God speak to us anymore.' Some will object to the sternness of the law, and will say, 'Prophecy smooth things;' but still that law must be preached. It brings the sinner to recognition of his sins in having transgressed God's holy law, and shows him the fearfulness of the doom which is impending over him.

"The law must be followed by the gospel; the awakened sinner must be pointed to the Saviour, that he may feel that, deep as are the stains of his transgressions, the blood of Christ can wash them all away. There are many preachers who love to dwell on the gospel alone. They talk sweetly and beautifully of the fatherhood of God. This is well. It is more than well. It is essential. But sometimes they go beyond this, and declaim against the preaching of the law-intimate that it belongs to a past age, a less civilized society; that men can best be moved by love alone, and they rely wholly on its attractive power. Such a gospel may rear a beautiful structure, but its foundation is in the sand. No true edifice can be raised without its foundations of being dug deep by repentance toward God, and then shall the rock be reached, and the building shall be strong enough through faith in Jesus Christ. The law without gospel is dark and hopeless; the gospel without law is inefficient and powerless. The one leads to servitude, the other to antinomianism. The two combined to produce 'charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.'" - *Bishop Simpson in "Lectures on Preaching," pp. 188, 189.*

The obligations which rests upon all mankind to keep the law of God, will be considered more at length in future articles. E. J. W.

**"Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XIII. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Concluded.)*

But as the pope proceeds, he grows more bold, and speaks out the popish views so plainly that it would seem that even the most blind Protestant might take the alarm. He says:-

"These, then, are the things taught by the Catholic Church concerning the constitution and government of the State. Concerning these sayings and decrees, if a man will only judge dispassionately, no form of government is, *per se*, condemned if so long as it has nothing repugnant to Catholic doctrine, and is able, if wisely and justly managed, to preserve the State in the best condition. Nor is it, *per se*, to be condemned whether the people have a greater or less share in the government; for at certain times, and with the guarantee of certain laws, such participation may appertain, not only to the usefulness, but even to the duty of the citizens. Moreover, there is no just cause that anyone should condemn the Church as being too restrictive in gentleness, or inimical to that liberty which is natural and legitimate. In truth, the Church judges it not lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the true religion; still it does not condemn those governors of States, who, for the sake of acquiring some great good, or to prevent great ill, patiently bear with manners and customs, so that each kind of religion has its place in the State."

Let no one think that "the Church" would lay out a cast-iron rule for the government of States. Let not patriotic Americans be alarmed. The pope does not condemn a Republican form of government, nor indeed any form of government, *per se*, if it will only work for the interests of the papacy. The Catholic Church is just as well satisfied to control a senate or a legislature as it is to control a king. And let no one, says the crafty Leo, condemn the Church for its leniency in tolerating the other forms of worship than the Catholic, because it does not now, any more than it ever did, judge it lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the Catholic religion; but, owing to its present "unfavorable position," it is not able to "interfere" as much as it would like to. And, moreover, the Roman Church, so great is its kindness, does not condemn those rulers to allow "each kind of religion" to have "its place in the State," since, on account of the existing circumstances, they cannot help themselves. That is, the pope does not condemn rulers for not persecuting Protestants, when they have not the power to do so! what marvelous gentleness!

And then, as if to emphasize the fact that the Catholic Church still cherishes, as a precious legacy, the principles (or, rather, the lack of principles), which caused Huss and Jerome and thousands of others to be burned at the stake, the pope says:-

"Therefore at so critical a juncture of events, Catholic men, if, as it behooves them, they will listen to us, will easily see what are their own and each other's duties in matters of *opinion* as well as of *action*. And the formation of opinion, whatsoever things the Roman pontiffs have handed down, each and every one is it necessary to hold in firm judgment, well understood, and as often as occasion demands, openly to declare."

But how shall these wise and humane recommendations be carried into effect? The pope provides for this as follows:-

"But generally, as we have said, to wish to take no part in public affairs would be in that degree vicious, in which it brought to the common weal neither care nor work; and on this account the more so, because Catholic men are bound by the admonition of the doctrine which they profess, to do what has to be done with integrity and with faith. If, on the contrary, they are idle, those whose opinions do not in truth give any great hope of safety, would easily get possession of the reins of government. This also would be attended with danger to the Christian name, because they would become most powerful who are badly disposed to the Church, and those least powerful who are well disposed. Wherefore it is evident that there is just cause for Catholics to undertake the conduct of public affairs; for they do not assume those responsibilities to approve of what is not lawful and the methods of government at this time; but in order that they may turn these very methods, as far as may be, to the unmixed and true public good, holding this purpose in their minds, to infuse into all the veins of the commonwealth the wisdom and virtue of the Catholic religion."

Is there any one who cannot see the meaning of this? Is it an innocent and harmless recommendation? Read it again carefully. Catholic men ought to take active part in public affairs. Well, is there any reason why they should not? No; a Catholic has as good a right to vote as anybody else has; but we would have professed Protestants alive to the object for which they vote, so that it may be defeated. Why should Catholic men not be idle in public affairs? Because if they are, those were not favorable to popish assumptions will get the reins of government. This must not be allowed. No one need think that a Catholic, but becoming active in the politics of a Government that is non-Catholic, does so because he approves of that form of Government, but because the design is to turn "these very methods" to the support of the "public good." In other words, the pope is anxious to use even this Republican Government for the support of papal pretensions.

In connection with the last quotation, read the following:-

"The means to seek these ends can scarcely be laid down upon one uniformed plan, since they must suit places and times different from each other. Nevertheless, in the first place, let concord of wills be preserved, and a likeness of things to be done be sought for. And each will be attained to the best, if all shall consider the admonitions of the apostolic see a law of conduct, and shall obey the bishops."

What does this mean? It means that whatever methods varying circumstances demand should be employed. Only one object is in view, and that is to secure the advancement of the Roman Catholic religion, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship. It means that whether in Europe or in the United States, the Roman Catholic who engages in politics is to "consider the admonitions of the apostolic see a law of conduct," and to "obey the bishops." It means that a steady and untiring effort is being made to bring the United States, as well as

all other Governments, under the dictation of a foreign, ecclesiastical ruler, the representative of that "man of sin," "who oppose and exalteth himself above all

that is called God, or that is worshiped." We claim that these conclusions are legitimately drawn from the letter of Pope Leo XIII., and not only so, but these things are plainly stated in that letter. Every candid person must testify that we have not wrested the pope's meaning in the slightest degree. His words speak for themselves.

And now someone will ask: Do you really imagine that the pope will ever gain such control as he desires? Not in this country; but the danger is none the less, not withstanding. When Protestants can see nothing but what is perfectly allowable in such a letter as that of the pope's, and can even commend it, it shows that the principles of what is nowadays termed Protestantism are not very different from those of Catholicism. The angel of Revelation, who announced the judgment of the great harlot, Babylon, declared that "all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Rev. 18:3. Fornication, when applied to the church, means connection with the world, which, on the part of the church, is always unlawful; and the position which the majority of professed Protestants take concerning the pope's views on "the Christian Constitution of States," shows that people are fast becoming intoxicated with the pleasing idea that the church, instead of depending alone on the pure words of the gospel, ought to unite with the world, that it may secure support from it. So intoxicated are they that their vision is affected, so that they cannot see anything wrong in the demands of the papacy. Surely it cannot be long before the likeness to the beast will be complete it. And when this unholy union has been consummated, then we may be sure that all the wrath of offend supreme power will be visited upon those who will maintain their allegiance to God alone.

We are willing to be called alarmists, for we are commanded to "sound an alarm." Joel 2:1. God grant that many may heed the alarm, and in keeping "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," may find a safe refuge from the unmingled wrath of God, infinitely greater and more terrible than that of all the nations of earth, which is sure to be visited upon all who worship either the beast or his image. E. J. W.

**January 21, 1886**

**"Nature of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

### **Nature of the Law**

Having found that the law must be in force wherever the gospel is preached, it is very proper that we learn something in regard to its nature. What we have already learned would teach us that it is just the opposite of sin, for "sin is the transgression of the law." But we will see what the Bible has to say further on this subject.

We first quote the words of the psalmist, in Ps. 19:7, 8, 10, 11:-

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." "More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward."

This comprises all that may be said of the law; for nothing can be more than perfect. Nothing can be added to that which is perfect, neither can anything be taken away, without leaving it imperfect. Therefore the testimony of David teaches us that when God spoke his law it was in just the form that he wanted it, and that he never designed that any change should be made in it.

In perfect accord with the above testimony, the apostle Paul says: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12. This being so, we would naturally expect that the keeping of the commandments would make the keeper thereof perfect and holy. This we find is the case. Moses said to the Israelites:-

"And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. 6:25.

Observe how perfectly this agrees with what we find in the New Testament: Moses said that to keep the law is righteousness. Of course the opposite of righteousness is unrighteousness, and John tells us that "all unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5:17. Then we must conclude that sin is just the opposite of obedience to the law; and that brings us to the original definition: "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Unrighteousness means any deviation from that which is right; and since all unrighteousness is sin, we know that the slightest deviation from right is a transgression of the law.

40

To show that this reasoning has solid scriptural foundation, we quote Ps. 119:96:-

"I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding broad." And to show how broad and far-reaching it is, we have only to read Heb. 4:12:-

"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Thus we learn that the law is so broad that it takes cognizance of the very thoughts of the heart, and not alone the outward acts. As illustrating this, we have our Saviour's words in the sermon on the mount:-

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Matt. 5:21, 22.

Again we quote verses 27 and 28 of the same chapter:-

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

Other instances might be given; but these are sufficient to show the breadth of the commandments of God. The sixth commandment may be broken by a single angry thought that may never be expressed; and the seventh may be as effectually broken by a single wrong desire as by the overt act. Surely the law of God is broad; and since in all its prohibitions and requirements it is perfect, we can readily and naturally accept the words of the wise man, in Eccl. 12:13:-

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man."

This statement, we repeat, is a natural consequence of what has preceded; for the keeping of a perfect law will make a man perfect, and nothing more than perfection can be required. There is no sin conceivable that is not forbidden by the ten commandments, and no righteous act or thought that is not commended and enjoined by them. Of course it would be impossible to go through the whole list of possible thoughts and deeds, in order to demonstrate this; but it will be found true in every case. Things may be mentioned which at first sight may seem to many persons to be outside of the ten commandments; but a little careful thought will show that nothing can be done that is beyond or outside of the perfect law of God. We have not the slightest fear of being brought to confusion because of this statement. We repeat, Nothing more than the duties enjoined in the ten commandments can be required of any man.

In this connection it will be well to notice Matt. 5:20, which some may think opposed to the statement last made, but which strongly supports it. We quote: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven." This text would be opposed to the statement made in the preceding paragraph if it could be shown that the scribes and Pharisees kept the law perfectly, but not otherwise. Indeed, this verse could not teach that it is a man's duty to do more than the ten commandments, without contradicting the 19th verse, which says that "whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." It must be, then, that the scribes and Pharisees, while professing to keep the commandments, did not do all that the law requires. This we shall find was the case, if we read Matt. 23:25-28:-

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."

The scribes and Pharisees pretended to keep the law, and so far as their outward acts were concerned, they did keep it; but Christ, who "knew what was in man," saw that in their hearts they despised the law, and that they grievously



transgressed it, but yet in such a way that men could not know their wickedness. Such obedience, Christ taught, will not suffice to gain an entrance into Heaven. Unless your obedience to the law is more thorough than that, you can in no case enter the kingdom of Heaven.

Here we see the difference between obedience only to the letter and obedience to the spirit of the law. The law is spiritual, and therefore the spirit of it must be obeyed; but some people think on this ground to excuse themselves for disobeying the law. Say they, "The Lord reprov'd the scribes and Pharisees for their obedience to the letter of the law, therefore we should not think ourselves bound by the letter; if we keep the spirit, that is sufficient." But mark, the Saviour did not say that our righteousness must be entirely different from that of the scribes and Pharisees, but that it must exceed it. To exceed means, "to pass or go beyond;" and by using that word the Saviour showed that we must keep the law as well as the scribes and Pharisees did, and a great deal better. Not only must the law be kept outwardly, but it must be obeyed from the heart. He did not reprove the Pharisees for refraining from open adultery; but he reprov'd them for the lust with which their hearts were filled, and which nothing but their love for the applause of men kept them from manifesting openly. Christ did not reprove them because they refrained from actual murder, but because they cherished envy, hatred, and enmity, thus as effectually breaking the sixth commandment as though they had actually taken human life. E. J. W.  
(*To be continued.*)

**January 28, 1886**

**"Nature of the Law (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded.*)

A moment's thought will show any one the folly of supposing that the law may be kept in spirit and not in letter. Can a man worship gods of gold, or stone, or brass, and yet have a proper regard for the God that made heaven and earth? Can a man blaspheme the name of God, and at the same time have perfect love and reverence in his heart? Is it possible to wantonly violate the letter of the sixth commandment, by taking human life, and yet have no trace of enmity, but only perfect love in the heart? Will a man deliberately and persistently take the goods of others, if he has no covetous desires in his heart? And does not everybody know that the committing of adultery is only the outward manifestation of the lust that burns within? There can be but one answer to these questions. Even so there can be no spiritual obedience without obedience to the letter as well.

The statement of the wise man, that to keep the commandments is the whole duty of man, and of Christ, that whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven, prepares us for the truth stated by the apostle, in Rom. 2:13-

"For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."

Since to keep the commandments of God is the whole duty of man, of course the one who keeps the law will be justified; a man can never be justly condemned, when he does his whole duty. We will not, at this time, inquire just how comprehensive the term "the doers of the law" is, nor whether or not there are any such. For the present we shall be content with the truth, which allows of no exception, namely, that "the doers of the law shall be justified."

In Rom. 6:23 we read that "the wages of sin is death." But if a man never sins, he will never receive the wages therefor, consequently the doer of the law will live. And this, again, is no more than we find plainly stated in Rom. 10:5: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law. That the man which doeth those things shall live by them." The man whom the law justifies-the one who is really a doer of all its requirements-will certainly live. Now it is a self-evident fact that when God made a perfect, holy, and just law, he designed that all his subjects should obey it. And since the law, when it is kept, gives life, we can see the force of the apostle's statement, that the law "was ordained to life." Rom. 7:10. As we shall hereafter see more fully, the law was given that man might ever keep in harmony with God's will, in which condition he must necessarily have life.

There is just one more point which we wish to bring out concerning the nature of the law. Let the reader mark it closely; for in the future consideration of this subject it will often be referred to, as it really covers the whole ground; upon it everything else depends. David says (Ps. 119:172), "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." This is really nothing more than is brought out in Ps. 19:7, and other texts; but it leads to another text which materially widens the range of our view of the law of God. In Isa. 51:6, we read:-

"Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished."

Abolish the righteousness of God? of course not; but what is the righteousness of God? The very next verse tells us of what the Lord, through his prophet, is here speaking. We proceed: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." The conclusion to be drawn is very evident. The people who know righteousness are they in whose hearts God's law is enshrined; they know righteousness, because the law is itself righteousness (Ps. 119:172); and not only is it righteousness in the abstract, but it is the righteousness of God. This is an expression which the apostle Paul often uses in referring to the law.

What an exalted idea of the law of God does this give us! To say that it is perfect may convey various ideas to different persons, for many would be apt to measure the law by their own standard of perfection; but when we learn that it is "the righteousness of God," we know that it must be infinite in its breadth. The law is a transcript of God's character, a photograph of character which is infinite in its perfection. It is his nature represented in words, for the benefit of his creatures, so that they may know what is required of them if they would be

partakers of the divine nature. God says to man, "Be ye holy, for I am holy." 1 Pet. 1:16. But without some description of the holiness of God, it would be impossible for man to know how he should order his life; for "the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Jer. 10:23.

Since the law is "the righteousness of God"-a brief yet comprehensive description of his character-it may properly be termed the way of the Lord. And so in Isa. 55:8, 9, we have an additional evidence of the exceeding greatness of that law: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." The holiness of God's law is just as much superior to any goodness that man possesses as God is greater than man. The law of God, then, is very justly called his way, and since those who become acquainted with God by walking in the way with him, are at peace (Job 22:21), it follows that a proper term for the law is, "the way of peace." It is the ten commandments, then, to which Paul refers, when, speaking of the universal wickedness of mankind, he says: "Destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. 3:16-18. This idea is still further proved by Isa. 48:18: "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandment! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea."

The law of God is also called the truth. "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." Ps. 119:142. It is the very perfection of truth, since it is the expression of God's character. This point is brought out in Rom. 2:17-20. Paul there says:-

"Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law."

In that justly celebrated work, "The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul," by Conybeare and Howson, the last clause of the above text is thus rendered: "Possessing in the law the perfect pattern of knowledge and of truth." This accurately describes the law, which is such a perfect pattern of truth that whosoever follows it will live a life of perfect truth. It is because it is perfect truth that it enables the one who is instructed in it to "try the things which differ" (see margin of verse 18), or, as Conybeare and Howson render it, to "give judgment upon good or evil."

It is impossible for mortal tongue ever to express, or even for mortal intellect to comprehend the breadth, the beauty, and the perfection of God's law. There is in it abundant food for meditation both day and night; and the more we learn of it, the more we can appreciate the psalmist's glowing descriptions of it, and his exhortations to continually study it. But as man, by searching, can never find out God, so that he can fully comprehend all his attributes, so no man, even when glorified and made immortal, can ever exhaust the law of God. On earth, as we meditate in the law, we can only exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his

ways past finding out!" and in Heaven, even to the countless ages of eternity, as in the glory of his presence we are permitted to look with unvailed eyes upon Him whose character is portrayed in the ten commandments, our wonder will not cease, and we can only join with the angelic beings that support his throne, in saying, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." E. J. W.

**February 4, 1886**

**"Jurisdiction of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have already anticipated this division of the subject, and have shown, by the extent of the gospel commission, that the law of God has been known and transgressed by men in every part of the world; that as the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of Christ, sin will exist just as extensively and just as long; and that, consequently, the law, of which sin is the transgression, will be binding in all the world till the end of time. We wish, however, to carry the subject a little further.

The apostle says that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," and that he has committed the carrying on of this work to his ambassadors-the ministers of the gospel-who, in Christ's stead, pray the world to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 5:19, 20. Now, reconciliation implies a previous condition of enmity; and if the world needed reconciling to God, it was because the world was at enmity with God. And since the work of reconciling is still being carried on, it follows that the rebellion, or enmity, still exists. Then the question arises, In what does that enmity consist? The same apostle tells us: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; *for it is not subject to the law* of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. Men are rebels, because they are in opposition to God's law. And this is the same truth that had been uttered, centuries before, by the inspired prophet: "Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever; that this is *a rebellious people*, lying children, children *that will not hear the law of the Lord.*" Isa. 30:8, 9.

This brings out again the fact previously stated, that the gospel announces, and carries on its forefront, the law. It was the transgression of the law that made it necessary for Christ to come to reconcile men to God. And as men, by continued sin, lost their sense of its heinousness, and of their obligation to God, it became more and more necessary that the gospel, in announcing to men the way of pardon and reconciliation, should make known their need of such reconciliation and pardon by setting forth, in plain terms, the law which they had transgressed. This is what is plainly stated by Peter, when, after quoting Isaiah's tribute to the enduring nature of the law, "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever," he adds, "And *this* is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter 1:24, 25.

The quotations made from John Wesley and Bishop Simpson are in harmony with this conclusion. Indeed, the conclusion is so nearly self-evident that it must

be reached by all thoughtful, candid minds. The very fact that a pardon is granted, attests the authority of the law; and before a pardon can be granted, the individual must know and acknowledge his guilt. If a man thinks himself righteous, he will indignantly spurn any offer of pardon, even though he may really stand in need of it. Human nature would leave such to the fate which their own blindness and stubbornness deserve; but God loves the world, and desires that all men shall accept his pardon, and thus be reconciled to him; and therefore he takes pains to bring men to a sense of their sinful condition, so that the pardon which he offers may be accepted. The same messenger who is commissioned to announce the pardon, proclaims the law of God, which awakens the self-confident sinner, so that he may appreciate his lost condition.

72

Let us look still further into the matter of the extent of the law's jurisdiction. Read Rom. 3:19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." The law speaks only to those who are within the bounds of its jurisdiction; it cannot condemn any who may walk contrary to its provisions, if they are outside of its limits. For example, a man in Russia may commit an act which is forbidden by the laws of the United States; yet he cannot on that account be declared guilty, simply because the United States law has no jurisdiction in his case. He is not amenable to it. But as a consequence of what the law of God says, all the world are found guilty before him. This, again, shows conclusively that all the world are in duty bound to keep God's law.

There are no exceptions to this fact. We have before learned that "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4) and that "where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. 4:15); and therefore we know that wherever we find sin, there must also be the law. To whomsoever sin is imputed, upon him the law has claims; for "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 5:13. Now we find these statements in the third of Romans: "What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;" "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Verses 9, 10, 23. Here the apostle descends to particulars, and shows that not to the Jews alone, but to Gentiles as well, is sin imputed, thus proving beyond all controversy that the Gentiles as well as the Jews are under the jurisdiction of the law of God, and have violated it.

Our investigation of the law began with the time when it was given on Mount Sinai; and we must therefore now examine to see if that was the first of its existence. And here, as in all our study of the law, we find help from our knowledge of the fact that the law is "the righteousness of God." Then it must necessarily have been in existence before the exode. Since it is a transcript of God's character, it necessarily follows that its existence is coeval with the existence of God.

"But," it may be objected, "the law, as a manifestation of God's righteousness, might exist, without being transcribed for the government of mankind." So it might if there were no creatures to whom it could be made known; or if there was any time after creatures had been brought into existence when God did not exercise

government over them. But it is not for us to speculate on the state of affairs when God dwelt alone, inhabiting his own eternity, before the existence even of the "sons of God" that shouted for joy at the creation of this earth; and there certainly has never been a time since intelligent creatures were formed, either in Heaven or on earth, when God was not supreme ruler. No created beings have ever been independent of his control. But if God has always been ruler, he must have had some rule of government, and that could be nothing else than his righteousness-his law. The ten commandments are righteousness; they are perfect, holy, just, and good, and therefore exactly fitted to be the rule of a righteous and just government. Then, from the very nature of the law we would conclude that it was binding on men before it was spoken from Mount Sinai. We shall shortly recur to the argument broached in this paragraph; but first we wish to show from positive evidence that the law of ten commandments was known by men, and was binding on them, before the giving of it on Sinai.

In Rom. 5:12, we read that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Here the apostle shows that death is a consequence of sin; death came into the world because there was sin in the world. If there had been no sin, there would have been no death, and wherever death is found, it is positive evidence that sin exists. With this passage we may well place 1 Cor. 15:56: "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law." Here death is represented as a cruel monster that has brought many people into its power. It has poisonous fangs with which it strikes its victims, and these fangs, this sting, is sin. Let the fangs be drawn,-let sin be obliterated,-and death's power would be gone. But the "strength of sin is the law." "Sin is the transgression of the law," and it is the violated law which provides death with its powerful sting. Were it not for the law, death would have no sting, that is, it would be powerless to destroy. So here, again, we have proof that wherever death is, there is the law also.

We read on: "For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." Rom. 5:13, 14. Here we have the statement that until the law, that is, until the time of Moses, when it was spoken from Sinai, sin and death were in the world; therefore we know that the law was in the world. And hereby we know that the expression, "until the law," does not indicate that the time so specified was the first existence of the law; for both sin and death were in the world before that time, and neither can exist without the law, and the law violated.

Let us go still further into particulars. "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 5:13. But sin was imputed to Cain (Gen. 4:7, 8), and consequently the law was there to condemn. Turn to the commandments, and you will find that the sixth commandment was the one especially transgressed.

Again we read that "the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly." Gen. 13:13. "Sin is not imputed when there is no law," and consequently we know that God judged the Sodomites by his law. If he judged

them by his law, of course they knew of the existence of that law; otherwise their punishment would not have been just; but we may be sure that the "Judge of all the earth" will do right.

Take the case of the sons of Noah (Gen. 9:22-26). Here we have direct evidence that the fifth commandment was known; that it was violated by Ham, the younger son of Noah, and kept by the other two; and that the one was cursed for his sin, while the others were blessed for their observance of the commandment. These things show the existence of that commandment, a knowledge of its existence, and also a knowledge that it was in full force to condemn the guilty and to acquit the innocent.

We find also the violation of the eighth commandment mentioned in Gen. 31:30. It is not necessary to particularize concerning each of the commandments, but we will notice one more. In Gen. 15:15, 16, we read these words of the Lord to Abraham: "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." This shows that in the days of Abraham, the inhabitants of Canaan, the Gentiles, were guilty of iniquity. Iniquity is sin, and "sin is the transgression of the law;" so, therefore, the Amorites had the law of God. Turn now to 1 Kings 21:25, 26, and you will learn of what the Amorites were guilty:-

"But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up. And he did very abominably in following idols, according to all things as did the Amorites, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel."

Here we find that the Amorites were cast out of Canaan because of idolatry,- idolatry, which, in its rites, involved the violation of not only the first and second commandments, but of all the ten. So we find that all the commandments were known and violated hundreds of years before the Jews came to Mount Sinai, and before there ever was a Jew. The point has now been proved, both from the nature of the law and by actual illustrations of the fact. E. J. W.  
(*To be continued.*)

**February 11, 1886**

**"Jurisdiction of the Law. ( Continued )" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

Thus far we have shown the existence of the law of God from the earliest history of mankind. We wish now to carry the argument a step further, as we have already intimated that we should do. We have found the law to be "the righteousness of God," the rule of his government. Since God has always been supreme ruler, and his rule has always been just and righteous, he must have judged only by his own righteous character, which is embodied in the decalogue. Now God has created many worlds besides this one (Heb. 1:2), and since he formed ours that it might be inhabited (Isa. 45:18), the conclusion is legitimate, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that he made the others for the

same purpose. No thinking person can suppose that this little earth, one of the smallest among the innumerable planets of the universe, is the only one that is inhabited. Now of all these vast worlds, God is the King. "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. 103:19. And since he can rule by naught except justice and righteousness, and all righteousness, even the righteousness of God himself, is comprised within the ten commandments, it follows that they, and they alone, form the rule of action in all God's universe. Of the correctness of this conclusion we have direct evidence in Ps. 103:20, where we read that the angels "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." If the commandments are the rule in Heaven, where God himself resides, certainly they are the rule "in all places of his dominion."

This view of the law, and we are confident that it is a just view, lifts the law question far, far above the plane on which its opposers would fain confine it. Instead of being imperfect and not calculated to bring man into proper relation to his Maker, it is the righteousness of God; instead of being confined to a small portion of this earth, the bounds of its jurisdiction are as extensive as the universe; instead of being given to one nation of earth, and to that alone, it is that to which all loyal creatures, even the angels of Heaven, bow in humble allegiance; and instead of being limited to a few centuries of existence, it "stands fast forever and ever," even as long as God exists and his kingdom ruleth over all.

We are aware that at first sight many will think that this is going too far, and will possibly raise objections, and say that when we consider the nature of certain commandments, it is not reasonable to suppose that they could be in Heaven for the restraint of heavenly beings. We will therefore add one or two more points. But first we would remark that when a case is supported by positive evidence, we are not at liberty to reject it because there are points about it which we do not understand. Nothing can be proved so clearly that no one can raise an *objection*, or even frame an argument, against it; and many things that are susceptible of the clearest proof, cannot be fully comprehended even by those who present the proof. Take, for instance, the question of the existence of God. Both nature and revelation plainly teach that there is a God, who has existed from eternity; yet it is impossible to state the case so clearly that no one can cavil or raise objections; and there is no one, no matter how clearly he can demonstrate that there is a God, who can comprehend him, or understand how he could exist from eternity. The argument from ignorance is no argument at all. Truth is truth, however great our ignorance of it may be. The merchant sitting in his office can put a question to his agent a thousand miles distant, and receive a reply the next minute. Tell this well-known fact to a savage, and he will not believe you; he cannot comprehend how such a thing can be done, and will present objections and arguments which, to his mind, show the utter impossibility of such a thing. Yet in spite of his ignorance, the thing is true. So there are many things in connection with God and his government which finite wisdom cannot explain, but which we must accept.

Now to further show the reasonableness, nay, the absolute necessity, of the ten commandments existing as a rule for all creatures of the universe,



1. "The law of the Lord is perfect." Ps. 19:7. Since it is perfect, nothing can be added to it or taken from it without making it imperfect. If, then, any creatures should be governed by more or less than this law, they would be governed by an imperfect law. But that, of course, would result in imperfect characters, and would further show the lawgiver to be imperfect; therefore such an idea cannot be entertained.

2. "The law of the Lord is perfect," because it is a transcript of his will,-his righteousness. Therefore all intelligent creatures must be governed by it. This has already been stated, but it will bear repetition. Too much stress cannot be laid upon it. Wherever God rules, his will must of necessity be law. That the ten commandment law, the law out of which the Jews were instructed, is the will of God, Paul shows in Rom. 2:17, 18: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And *knowest his will*, and approvest the things that are more excellent [margin, triest the things that differ], *being instructed out of the law*." That the ten commandments are here referred to, may be seen from verses 21-23. Paul, therefore, speaking to a Jew, said, You know the will of God, because you are instructed out of the law. No further evidence is needed to show that the ten commandments are the will of God. Now, since all intelligent creatures must be governed by the will of God, it is evident that they are governed by the ten commandments, unless it could be shown that God changes, having one will at one time and toward one people, and another will at another time and for another people. But this cannot be; for "with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James 1:17. There is, then, one law for all.

3. There are none who can have a greater interest than the righteous whether of the redeemed or of those who never sinned, in having the ten commandments maintained as the standard of right. And this for the very reason that it is the standard of right. It is the badge of their loyalty. If there were a place where the ten commandments were not held as the law, the righteous ones would not want to go there; for there would be nothing to show that they were righteous. But enough has been said to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the universality of God's holy law. In all places of God's dominion, rational beings are by this law either justified or condemned. E. J. W.

*(To be continued.)*

### **"Faith Healing" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The question as to the propriety of the praying for the recovery of the sick, and of depending on the prayer of faith for the healing of disease, has of late been discussed very much, by both the secular and religious press. On the one hand, the infidel and the worldling scoff at the idea of expecting the recovery of those whose diseases will not respond to the action of the medicinal agents known to science. To them such a thing seems an impossibility, an absurdity. The cause of this incredulity is found in 1 Cor. 2:14. On the other hand there are those who read James 5:13-15, and declaim that all the remedial agents known

to the medical profession should be thrown aside, and that in every disease the patient should rely on prayer alone for his recovery.

These are the two extremes; the first was well represented by Mr. Tyndall, who several years ago proposed to test the efficacy of prayer by an experiment. He proposed to set apart two wards in a hospital; the patients in one to be treated by the ordinary remedies, and those in the other to be prayed for. This impious and foolish proposal was, for obvious reasons, declined by the Christian world. As an instance of the other extreme, we may cite the case of the young man belonging to the missionary company that Bishop Wm. Taylor recently conducted to Africa. Being taken with one of the fevers incident to that climate, he utterly refused to make use of any means for his recovery, but, as he said, trusted himself entirely in the hands of the Lord, believing that his faith would insure his restoration to health. In vain the Bishop urged him to adopt the simple remedies which proved successful in other cases similarly afflicted, and the young man died.

We most heartily believe in the power of God to heal the sick, that he has often done so in answer to the professor of faith, and that he does so still; but at the same time we believe that those who discard all remedial agents, and establish what they term "faith cures," *i.e.*, places where all the sick who have faith may come to be healed by prayer alone, bring the cause of religion into disrepute. The position of the modern "faith cures" advocates may be summed up to about as follows: 1. Disease of the body corresponds to disease of the soul, and if cured at all, must be cured in the same manner that sins are forgiven, *viz.*, by faith alone; 2. All disease may be cured if we have faith; 3. We must trust the Lord for the healing of all our ailments, without using any material remedies. And therefore, (1) The use of any remedial agency is a manifestation of a lack of faith; and (2) If we call on the Lord in faith, without having first employed remedies, we have a right in every instance to expect, and even to demand a cure. The folly of such a position may be readily seen by a consideration of the Scriptural position, to which we will now proceed.

We will first cite as a parallel the instruction found in the Bible concerning the provision for the nourishment of our bodies when in health. In the sermon on the mount, Christ said: "Take no thought for your life, of what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet the for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall be eaten? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be closed? for heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." Matt. 6:25, 31, 32. Now an extremest might say, "It is wrong for me to work for my living; God knows what I need, and he will see that I am provided for, if I only exercise faith, and do not try to do anything for myself." So he folds his hands in idleness, and perhaps starves to death. What is this? What is there wrong in this interpretation of Scripture? Simply this: He has been too

hasty in his conclusion, and has not taken into the account that other inspired declaration that, "if any would not work, neither should eat." 2 Thess. 3:10.

A proper interpretation of Scripture takes into the account the various texts bearing on a given point, and then draws a legitimate conclusion from the whole. As bearing on the question of living, we quote the following: "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, *working with his hands* the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Eph. 4:28. "We beseech you, brethren, . . . that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you: that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing." 1 Thess. 4:10-12. A very plain intimation that if they do not work they will lack the necessaries of life. Again Paul says: "But if any provide not for his own, and, specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim.5:8.

Now is there any lack of harmony between these texts and Matt. 6:25? Not a particle. Read now Deut. 8:18: "But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God; for is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." Read the context, from the 10th verse onward, and you will see that all the texts which we have quoted are bound together. Men are to work with their hands for their support; but they are still to give the credit to God, because he gives them the power and the opportunity to labor. If God gives a man the ability to work, and then orders circumstances so that he has an opportunity to work, the honor belongs to God. Thus it is that God supports us. And knowing that "the Lord will provide," we are not to worry and fret over the future, as though the Lord had no interest in us.

There are cases, however, in which is beyond the power of man to secure provision by his own labor. In such cases the Lord has worked a direct miracle, as in the case of the Israelites in the wilderness, and Elijah by the brook Chereth and in the desert. What God has done for the support of his people, we may be sure he will do again under similar circumstances, for his promise cannot fail; but from a careful examination of Scripture it certainly appears that we are not warranted in expecting the Lord to work a direct miracle for support, so long as it is possible for us to provide for ourselves by using the means which is ordained. Such an expectation is not in accordance with God's word, and hence is not faith.

Now it seems to us that the same principle that governs the support of the body when in health must be acted upon in seeking a restoration of it to health, when it is diseased. This can best be proved by citing typical instances of healing, as recorded in the Bible. By so doing we shall find that the cases where God has directly interposed to heal people by a miracle, were cases that were beyond the reach of human skill.

In the first place we have a record of many who were raised from the dead. Here, of course, human agency was of no avail.

Entering into particulars, we note the case of the young man who was born blind. John 9. In his case it was not thought worth while even to seek for a cure; for, as the young man said, "Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind if this man [Christ] were not of God, he could do nothing." John 9:32, 33.

Again, we read of a woman with the issue of blood, who was healed by touching the hem of Christ's garment. She had been afflicted for twelve years,

"and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing better, but rather grew worse." Mark 5:26. The "beloved physician" says that she "had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any." Luke 8:43.

Take the case of the nobleman's son he was "at the point of death." The case was very urgent; for when Jesus was testing the man's faith, the father cried out, "Sir, come down ere my child die." John 4:49. He felt that Jesus alone had power to check the fever.

The man at the pool of Bethesda had been unable to walk for thirty-eight years. John 5:2-9. He was unable even to make the attempt to make use of the remedy that was supposed to be able to reach his case. He was healed by the word of the Lord.

Indeed the third of Acts we have the account of the man whom Peter healed at the gate of the temple. He had never walked, and no means known to man could enable him to walk. The healing of this man was admitted, even by the scoffing Jews, to be "a notable miracle."

Take the case of the stilling of the tempest, recorded in Matt. 8:24-26 and Luke 8:22-25. Here, when the men were unable to manage the boat on account of the violence of the sea, and were about to perish, Christ stilled the winds and waves with a word.

When Jesus miraculously fed the 4,000 men, besides the women and children, it was because they had eaten nothing for three days, and were in the wilderness, where it was impossible to find food for such a vast multitude. More than this, they had not sufficient strength to go to the villages to buy food, and doubtless but few of them had money, had they been able to go.

To all these cases might be added the numerous instances of the cleansing of lepers who had been cast out as incurable, the healing of the deaf and dumb, and the casting out of devils. In every case the direct power of Heaven was interposed after the means known to mortals had failed.

The case of Peter's mother-in-law might be cited by some as a case where Jesus healed a curable disease. But no one knows that this fever could be cured. Indeed. The probabilities are, rather, that, as in the case of the nobleman's son, they had been unable to check the fever by ordinary means.

There is another class of cases that may be thought to contradict the position above taken. These are the cases where persons whom God has employed in a special manner in his service, have been healed in answer to prayer when there was urgent need of their immediate attendance upon certain duties connected with the Lord's work. Persons have been healed of ailments that *possibly* might in time have been removed by medical skill, if it had been employed. But these cases are in reality the same as the others; for there was certainly no human skill that could heal them in the brief space of time that the circumstances demanded.

Again we notice that in many cases where miracles of healing were performed, the sufferers were required to do something before their cure was effected. Namaan the Syrian was required to wash seven times in the Jordan. 2 Kings 5:1-14. The blind man of whom John writes, after having his eyes anointed with clay and spittle, was told to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, and then he

received his sight. Now whatever effect these washings had, it is safe to say that if those individuals had not employed the means provided they would not have been healed. Thus we see that God has provided remedies that will with his blessing accomplish the restoration of the sick to health, and he has made it possible for men to obtain a limited knowledge of these remedies. Now when those heaven-ordained remedies are within our reach, for us to expect to get well when we refuse to make use of them, is a manifestation not of faith, but of presumption. The case is exactly parallel to one who, having health and strength, should fold his hands and expect the Lord to feed him.

But the worst presumption comes in when men establish what they call "faith cures," where, as they advertise, all people may come to be prayed for and healed. This is a reversing the true order of things, instead of being content to be instruments in the hands of God, such ones presume to make God an instrument in their hands, and to manipulate him to suit their own interests.

It is entirely a mistake to try to make a strict parallel between sickness, disease of the body, and sin, disease of the soul. Men can do nothing whatever to secure the forgiveness of sin, except to believe in the merits of Christ. There are no means provided, no works, by which a man may cleanse himself from sin. But there are means provided by which he can remove certain forms of disease. Again, God has not promised to instantly heal all cases of disease; but he will at once forgive the sins of any who come to him in faith. But in every case of healing, whether of the body or of the soul, the praise rightfully belongs to God. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed." Lam. 3:22.

Once more: Everything must tend to the glory of God. All things are for his pleasure, and he is worthy to receive all honor, and glory, and blessing. Rev. 4:11. Now it is not always for his glory that even his most devoted servants should be freed from disease. Paul's "thorn in the flesh" was not removed, although he thrice besought the Lord that it might depart from him. Therefore he gloried in infirmities, that the power of Christ might rest upon him. Sometimes Christ is glorified by the patient's suffering, or even by the death, of his faithful followers, and therefore the Christian should pray that he may recover if it will be for the glory of God. "Not has I will, but as thou wilt." We do not always know what will be for the best. We are zealous to work for the Lord; and when we are afflicted we feel like a prisoner of war, who, in his anxiety to be in the battle, beats against his prison bars. We are in danger of imagining that the Lord needs us in the field, forgetting that he knows best, and may require us to serve him in affliction, and that he can get along without any of our service. Milton solved the problem, when, having been smitten with blindness in the midst of his career, he wrote:-

"When I consider how my light is spent  
Ere half my days, in this dark world and wide;  
And that one talent which is death to hide,  
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent  
To serve therewith my Maker, and present  
My true account, lest he returning chide;  
Doth God exact day-labor, light denied?"

I fondly ask. But Patience, to prevent  
That murmur, soon replies, God doth not need  
Either man's work or his own gifts; who best  
Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state  
Is kingly; thousand at his bidding speed,  
And post o'er land and ocean without rest;  
They also serve who only stand and wait."

If the position of many so-called "holiness" people and the modern "faith cure" advocates were true, that we may at once be healed of all disease if we will but exercise faith, then Christians would not all be practically immortal. There would be no death. But immortality is not promised to any one until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection. See Luke 20:35, 36; 1 Cor. 15:51-54, etc. At that time "the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing." Isa. 35:5, 6. Of the new earth it is said, "And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwelt therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Isa. 33:24. And then, when all things shall have been made new, and the people of God have been redeemed from destruction, we will find the complete fulfillment of Ps. 103:2-4: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget

89

not all his benefits; who forgiveth all thine the iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies." Compare this with Isa. 33:24.

It is a favorite saying with a man that "God helps them who help themselves." This is true; but there is something else that is equally true, and that is that God helps those who are not able to help themselves. And while his protecting care is continually over us, blessing the means which we employ for the preservation or the recovery of our strength, it is not till we are brought where the resources which we have at hand utterly fail that God miraculously exhibits his power; and then only when he will be glorified in so doing. As is often said, "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." "He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength." Isa. 40:29. E. J. W.

**February 18, 1886**

**"Jurisdiction of the Law. ( Continued )." *The Signs of the Times* 12, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Continued).*

While we have been making the claim and proving it, that the law of God covers every possible act or thought, and that no responsible being is outside of its jurisdiction, some one has been looking for the verse which says that the Gentiles do not have the law, but are a law unto themselves. Perhaps this is as good a time as any to consider that text. An answer to it will also involve the consideration of the question why the ten commandments, since they have such

universal jurisdiction, were spoken from Mount Sinai only to the Jews. Let us now read the passage above referred to.

"For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.)" Rom. 2:12-15.

A brief examination of Paul's argument in this chapter will be necessary in order to get a proper understanding of this text. It will be noticed that the 13th, 14th, and 15th verses are parenthetical, and are therefore secondary to the main argument. Therefore in stating the argument, we shall omit those three verses. In the first chapter of Romans, Paul has shown the terribly immoral condition of the heathen world; and in the second chapter he proceeds to show that whoever condemns the heathen, condemns himself; for all are guilty. God, he says, "will render *to every man* according to his deeds." To those who patiently persevere in well-doing, he will render eternal life; but to those who are contentious, and do not obey the truth (see Ps. 119:142), he will render indignation and wrath. And these rewards of good or ill will be rendered to every man, whether he be Jew or Gentile. "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel."

In the first two chapters of Romans, the apostle brings out the fact which is plainly stated in the third, that "both Jews and Gentiles" are "under sin," and that "there is none righteous, no, not one." In the passage under consideration, he states that, as a consequence, all who do not repent shall suffer "the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds." This will be done without regard to nationality; "for there is no respect of persons with God;" that is, it is not a man's birth, but his character, that gives him favor with God. It is the *doers of the law* whom he justifies, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, and not those who, as did many of the Jews, hear the law, but do not obey. All who sin, whether with the law or without it, shall perish.

In the 12th and 14th verses, we have the two classes brought to view—those who have the law, and those who have it not. There is no question but that the Jews had the law; they rested in it (Rom. 2:17), and by breaking it dishonored God. Verses 23, 24. And the 14th verse tells us plainly that those not having the law are the Gentiles. Before considering their case, we must not fail to note the fact that both the Jews who had the law, and the Gentiles who had it not, had sinned. They were alike guilty before God. Rom. 3:9, 10. Now "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. Therefore it is beyond controversy that both classes here mentioned had transgressed law, and more than that, had been conscious of the fact; for "sin is not imputed when there is no law." So it is certain that the Gentiles had transgressed the law; yet the text says they had not the law, and

that they "sinned without law." How shall we explain this seeming contradiction? Let us see. Read again verses 14, 15:-

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another."

When God made man in his own image, he made him upright. Eccl. 7:29. Not alone in his physical form, but also in his moral nature, he was in the image of God. While Adam continued in this upright, sinless condition, the law of God was in his heart. We know this from Ps. 40:8, where David, speaking for the Messiah, says, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." The existence of the law of God in the heart is manifested by the willingness to obey that law; and he who, as was the case with Christ, has the law perfectly formed within his heart, will render perfect obedience to the law. This was the case with our first parents in the garden of Eden.

But man fell from his high estate; he sinned against God, and thus marred the perfect copy of the law which had existed in his heart. The tendency of sin is to multiply itself; like the tares sown among the good grain, it will grow without any attention. So the first sin prepared the way for many more, till at last nearly all the world became wholly given up to sin. In Heb. 3:13, the apostle says that men become "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;" that is, the more men sin, the less heinous does sin appear to them, until at last evil appears to be only good, and good evil, and they sin without the slightest compunction of conscience. This principle is something with which everybody is familiar. Now this progressive love of sin, and the indifference to it, is nothing else than the obliterating of the copy of the law which exists in a more or less perfect state in every heart. This work is not done instantaneously; it takes time for men to so completely obliterate the law from their hearts that they will feel no restraint. But when it is entirely gone, then man is in the condition in which he was just prior to the flood, when "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6:5. So long, however, as any portion remains in the heart, the Spirit is enabled to strive with man, and, by means of that law, to convict of sin; and this whether the individual knows anything of the written revelation or not.

Now the Gentiles did not have the law written on stone and in books, as did the Jews; they only had that portion which still remained unobliterated from their hearts. Of course the Jews, having much more light than the Gentiles had, were far more responsible. The former would necessarily be judged by the fullness of the law; for they could not plead ignorance of any portion of it. If they sinned, justice required that the condemnation of the law should be visited upon them in full measure. But the Gentiles could be judged only by the light that they had. Since they had not the written revelation, that, of course, would not be brought up against them. They knew, however, the difference,

in many things, between right and wrong; and by this they are judged. Had they lived fully up to the light which they had by nature, they would have been counted



as doers of the law; but since they did not, since their own conscience condemned them, they must suffer the consequences. The Jews, having the written law, are judged by the law; and the Gentiles, not having the written law, perish without being brought into Judgment by it.

Perhaps this can be made plainer by illustration. The Jews had every one of the ten commandments in such shape that they could constantly be reminded of them, and know the extent of their claims. Now when they came into Judgment, it is no more than justice that the whole law should be held up before them, that the enormity of their guilt may be manifest. But here is a poor, ignorant barbarian, who, we will suppose, knew by the light of nature, only two precepts of the law,- that it is wrong to kill and to commit adultery. His knowledge of the sinfulness of those acts is shown by his trying to conceal the fact when he has done one or the other of them. His own conscience accuses him. Now it is not necessary, in order to convict him of sin, that the whole ten commandments be held up beside the record of his life. In the Judgment let the two precepts with which he was familiar be recalled to his mind. By these alone he stands condemned as a sinner; and since "the wages of sin is death," he justly perishes, without ever having seen the written law. Thus we see that all men, whatever their condition, are amenable to, and are to be judged by, the law of God. When Paul says that the Gentiles have not the law, he means that they had not the written revelation, but not that they did not have some knowledge of right and wrong, as defined by the moral law. E. J. W.

*(To be continued.)*

### **"What Is Faith?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

This question presented itself very forcibly to our mind a few days ago, when we read in a religious paper the following quotation from an eminent minister: "Faith is the true anesthesia of the soul." We do not propose to enter into a fine-spun theological discussion as to the exact definition of faith, but simply to cite a few instances of true faith, that we may see how the possession of it affects people.

Let us first get the meaning of the quotation. An anesthetic is something which is administered to produce insensibility, so that surgical operations may be performed without pain to the patient. Anesthesia is the state of insensibility which is produced by the administration of an anesthetic. The meaning of the quotation, then, is that faith is that condition in which the soul has no sensibility, no consciousness. That is, it is a state in which the individual feels perfectly secure, having no care for surrounding circumstances.

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb. 11:1. Faith is active; it is keenly alive to all the dangers that surround, yet is confident, because it has a clear perception of certain evidence. Take the case of Caleb and Joshua. When the ten spies brought back an evil report, and said, "We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we," these two men said, "Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to

overcome it." Num. 13:26-33. Was it because Caleb and Joshua did not understand the danger, that they were so confident? No; they had seen the walled cities, and the giants, before whom they were as grasshoppers. But they had faith in God. They said; "If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us into this land, and give it us; . . . and the Lord is with us; fear them not." Num. 14:8, 9. This was true faith.

When David went forth to answer the challenge of Goliath, he knew that the giant had for forty days defied the army of Israel. He did not in the least underestimate the giant's strength and skill. But he believed that the One who had delivered him in his encounters with the wild beasts of the forest, would help him now. So the stripling went boldly toward the giant, saying, "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcasses of the host of the Philistines this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel." 1 Sam. 17:45, 46. David knew the power of the giant; but he believed the evidence which he had received, that the Lord is stronger than all, and willing to help those who trust him. This was true faith.

But it is worthy of note, that although David said to Goliath, "This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand," he did not sit down and wait for the Lord to deliver the giant into his hands. He made use of the means which the Lord had provided, believing that the Lord would bless them.

Take the case of Paul on his sea-voyage to Rome. Among the two hundred and seventy-six souls on board the vessel, Paul alone was calm and unmoved amid the terrible tempest. Could it be that he was insensible to the danger? By no means. He had many times been on the sea, and he realized the danger of the situation better than any one else did. When the sailors thought the prospect was favorable, Paul had told them that the voyage would end disastrously. Acts 27:9-11. What was the source of his courage? Hear his words to the passengers and crew: "There shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before CÆsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer; for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me." Acts 27:22-25.

Paul's belief in the promise of God, however, did not keep him from putting forth every possible effort for the safety of himself and his fellow passengers. He exhorted them to eat, that they might retain their strength, and he hindered the sailors from leaving the ship, declaring that if they should leave, the rest could not be saved. The sailors were needed on board the ship, to do all that they could towards managing it. It is worthy of note, also, that because these people were saved in answer to his prayers, Paul did not set up in the life-saving business, and advertise that he would deliver from shipwreck all sailors who would take him along to pray for them.

The definition which we quoted is incorrect, because anesthesia, indifference to danger, leads one to make no effort for self-preservation; and faith which is unaccompanied by works is no faith at all, for "faith without works is dead." That which is dead has no existence.

Sometimes that which is called faith is only blindness or negligence. For instance, there are many professors who, no doubt, pray for their children, and who therefore have, as they think, faith that they will be saved. Yet they do nothing more than pray occasionally for the children, and leave them practically without restraint. Now is it a manifestation of faith for the parents to believe that their children will be saved? Not at all; for the "evidence" is all against such a result. "A child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame," says the Bible. Self-deception and careless security are altogether different from faith.

Thousands have no thought but that they will enter Heaven at last. Under certain circumstances it is proper to have faith that we shall be saved; but if the conditions are not met, there is no ground even for hope. What are the conditions? "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," says the Saviour. Again: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14. We may believe in Christ after a manner, that is, we may believe that he is the Son of God; but unless our belief leads to obedience, it is not true faith in Christ, because Christ suffered for us in order "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us."

"Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." James 2:18. E. J. W.

**February 25, 1886**

**"Jurisdiction of the Law. Why the Law Was Spoken Only to the Jews  
( Concluded )" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

Now why was it that only the Jews had the written law? Did the giving of the law to them indicate partiality on the part of God? Not by any means: "For there is no respect of persons with God." Before the exode, all the world was on a level, so far as written revelation was concerned. When sin separated man from God so that he could no longer talk with him face to face, then God supplemented the light which men had in their own hearts, by communicating with them in visions and dreams given to his prophets (Num. 12:6), and by sending angels to them. Gen. 22:15. Had all men hearkened to the voice of conscience, the communication thus opened between God and man would have been sufficient to bring them at last to the state where the law would be perfectly restored in their hearts. This is that which God is still striving to accomplish. Heb. 8:10.

But men did not care to follow even that portion of the law which they retained in their hearts, and consequently God could not send them more light through his

prophets. Thus "as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a mind void of judgment." Rom. 1:28. In process of time, only one family retained the knowledge of God, and all the rest of the world were destroyed for their abominable wickedness.

Within four hundred years after the flood, men had again corrupted their way on the earth, and only Abraham remained loyal to God. He kept God's commandments (Gen. 26:5), and had the determination to command his children and his household after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment. Gen. 18:19. In order that the descendants of Abraham might retain the knowledge of God, God called Abraham away from his corrupt associates, and gave him the rite of circumcision, in order that the separation might be complete. This rite was not designed to be a mark of birth or nationality, but simply as a means of keeping the observers of God's law from the contaminating influence of those who did not regard it; for whenever one of any other nation became willing to separate from his people and keep the law, he also became circumcised. Gen. 17:12.

This precaution served to keep the descendants of Abraham a distinct people through all their wanderings, and to preserve among them the knowledge of the true God. Some from other tribes, getting the light from them, would occasionally turn to the Lord, to keep his commandments, and, becoming circumcised, would be counted as the descendants of righteous Abraham; but the great mass of the world chose to remain in the darkness of heathenism. Thus it happened that when the Lord brought his people from Egyptian bondage, they alone of all the people in the world had a knowledge of God. All the rest could say with Pharaoh, "I know not the Lord." At that time the Lord chose to give mankind his law in a manner so plain that it could not possibly be mistaken, and so that they could always meditate in it, in its perfection, even though no prophet were at hand. By this means, the Spirit could make greater progress, so to speak, in writing the law in their hearts. But to whom could he speak the law? Only to those who knew him, and would accept the law as coming from him. Therefore he was compelled to give the written law to the Jews, and make them light-bearers to the world. The law, when it entered, came to the Jews, not because it was designed for them alone, but because they alone would receive it.

As a further evidence that God was not moved by race considerations, and did not give the law exclusively to the Jews as a nation, we may notice the fact that when the Jews left Egypt, "a mixed multitude went up also with them." Ex. 12:38; Num. 11:4. This "mixed multitude" was composed of Egyptians, and, no doubt, of people of other nationalities. These went along with the Jews, and with them received the law from God at Mount Sinai.

We cannot close this portion of our subject without giving, from the pen of another, the following graphic portrayal of the condition of a people who should have no regard for the law of God:-

"No error accepted by the Christian world strikes more boldly against the authority of Heaven, none is more directly opposed to the dictates of reason, none is more pernicious in its results, than the modern doctrine, so rapidly gaining ground, that God's law is no longer binding upon men. Every nation has

its laws, which command respect and obedience; no government could exist without them; and can it be conceived that the Creator of the heavens and the earth has no law to govern the beings He has made? Suppose that prominent ministers were publicly to teach that the statutes which govern their land and protect the rights of its citizens were not obligatory—that they restricted the liberties of the people, and therefore ought not to be obeyed; how long would such men be tolerated in the pulpit? But is it a graver offense to disregard the laws of states and nations than to trample upon those divine precepts which are the foundation of all government? It would be far more consistent for nations to abolish their statutes, and permit the people to do as they please, than for the Ruler of the universe to annul His law, and leave the world without a standard to condemn the guilty or justify the obedient. Would we know the result of making void the law of God? The experiment has been tried. Terrible were the scenes enacted in France when atheism became the controlling power. It was then demonstrated to the world that to throw off the restraints which God has imposed is to accept the rule of the cruelest of tyrants. When the standard of righteousness is set aside, the way is open for the prince of evil to establish his power in the earth.

"Wherever the divine precepts are rejected, sin ceases to appear sinful or righteousness desirable. Those who refuse to submit to the government of God are wholly unfitted to govern themselves. Through their pernicious teachings the spirit of insubordination is implanted in the hearts of children and youth, who are naturally impatient of control; and a lawless, licentious state of society results. While scoffing at the credulity of those who obey the requirements of God, the multitudes eagerly accept the delusions of Satan. They give the rein to lust and practice the sins which have called down judgments upon the heathen.

"Let the restraint imposed by the divine law be wholly removed, and human laws would soon be disregarded. Because God forbids dishonest practices,—coveting, lying, and defrauding,—men are ready to trample upon His statutes as a hindrance to their worldly prosperity; but the results of banishing these precepts would be such as they do not anticipate. If the law were not binding, why should any fear to transgress? Property would no longer be safe. Men would obtain their neighbors' possessions by violence, and the strongest would become richest. Life itself would not be respected. Those who disregard the commandments of God sow disobedience to reap disobedience. The marriage vow would no longer stand as a sacred bulwark to protect the family. He who had the power, would, if he desired, take his neighbor's wife by violence. The fifth commandment would be set aside with the fourth. Children would not shrink from taking the life of their parents, if by so doing they could obtain the desire of their corrupt hearts. The civilized world would become a horde of robbers and assassins; and peace, rest and happiness would be banished from the earth."—*Mrs. E. G. White, in "Great Controversy," vol. 4, chap. 51.*

This is just the state of things that would exist, not only in this world, but in all the universe, if the ten commandments were not the universal rule of action. If there be any portion of the universe where the decalogue is not the recognized

law, the above paragraphs accurately describe the condition of its society. E. J. W.

**"The Chinese Question" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is well known by all the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that this paper is purely a religious family journal. On political questions we have ever been strictly non-partisan, not because we have not private opinions on political matters, but because there are thousands of papers in which people can find the news of the day, and because we believe that we have a work to do that is of far greater importance. The matter of high or low tariff is of trifling importance compared with the things which pertain to our eternal destiny.

But the anti-Chinese agitation has assumed such proportions on this coast, that we feel it duty to define our position upon it; and this because it is becoming a question of morals fully as much as one of politics.

In the first place, we will say that there are features of the Chinese question which people in the East, where Chinamen are very scarce, cannot possibly appreciate. One who passes through "Chinatown" in San Francisco will learn more of Chinese character and habits in a single hour than he could by reading books for a month. They are not the most desirable neighbors, by any means. They are of a race that is so entirely different from ours that it is probably impossible that there should be any assimilation between the two, even in a civil capacity. And we do not think that it would be wise to attempt to make American citizens of them. While we believe that God made of one blood all the nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, we also believe that he has "determined the bounds of their habitation." For this reason we think that unlimited Chinese immigration would be an injury to this country, and possibly to the Chinese themselves.

But some of the Chinese are here, and it should be remembered that they came by invitation. They came for the purpose of bettering their condition; and it must also be remembered that if they have bettered their own condition, they have added immensely to the resources of this country. Hundreds of miles of railroad have been built by them, over places where few but Chinamen would be willing to work; and thousands of acres of land on this coast have been cleared by the Chinese, and are now teeming with the fruits of the earth as a result of their labor.

Furthermore, the Chinese evil is not one-hundredth part as bad as it is represented to be. It is said that they degrade labor; but labor and mechanics receive higher wages in California than they do in the East. It is said that they won't become Christianized. Perhaps they will not; we confess we don't see much inducement for them to; but there are many, many thousands of the Caucasian race who show, not indifference to Christianity, as to the Chinese, but open contempt. It is said that they are vicious; but a drunken Chinaman would be a novelty; and the number of brothels and gambling dens that are run by Chinamen can be quadrupled in San Francisco by the same class of places in

which no Chinaman ever set his foot. Therefore we say that the cry that "the heathen Chinese" is corrupting the youth of our land is a point poorly taken.

The question now is, What shall be done with those that are here? The answer comes back, "The Chinese must go!" There is no doubt but that the country could get along without them; so far as we are concerned, it would make no difference; for we do not employ them. But we will say frankly that we have no sympathy with a method that is to be adopted to drive them out. It is proposed to boycott, not only the Chinese, but every man who refuses to boycott them, and also to boycott those who do not boycott those who do not boycott the Chinese.

We cannot think that all who have committed

120

themselves to such a course have fully considered what they are doing. For ourselves, we believe is is condemned by every principle of right. We are American citizens, and we have always had unbounded respect for those brave men who, at the risk of their lives, made the following declaration: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That principle is just as true to-day as it was a hundred and ten years ago; and it is just as applicable to the Chinese as it is to the Americans or Europeans. And that statement of the Declaration of Independence derives its truth from the Golden Rule spoken by our Saviour. We must not infringe upon anybody's rights, but must allow them the same freedom that we would exact for ourselves. Those who are unwilling to grant liberty to others, are not worthy of it themselves.

It is true the Chinese are heathen, and they have some terribly debasing vices. But the fact that the American and European even in this country out number the Chinese ten to one; that for every Chinese gambler, there are doubtless a score of white gamblers; and that among the white population whisky has doubtless a hundred victims where opium has one among the Chinese; is ample evidence that it is not on moral grounds that Chinese expulsion is called for. The Chinese smoke opium in their dens, and stay there till they recover from its effects; but the whites drink whiskey everywhere, and the effects never cease. We are finally convinced that if the Chinese were patrons of the saloons, the outcry against them would be very much more feeble than it now is.

But suppose that the Chinaman is not covered by the Declaration of Independence, it cannot be denied that all native-born Americans have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then to boycott our fellow-citizens is contrary both to the genius of our Government and the law of God. For example, here is my neighbor; he is a good, law-abiding citizen; possibly he is a brother in the church. He does not see fit to resort to mob violence to rid the country of the Chinese, and so I am required to pledge myself to boycott him, to have no dealings with him, to keep others from dealing with him, and to injure his business all I can. is this right? Every honest person must say No. then I will not do it; for though I may not be what many are pleased to call a sentimentalist, I profess to be a Christian.

Whenever evil is done that good may come, the devil gains a victory, and the good never comes. It is as true now as it was three thousand years ago, that the violent dealing of any man is sure to come back upon his own pate. Even though the Chinese were more of a curse than it is claimed that they are, this boycotting business would be a thing to be unqualifiedly condemned. It is a cowardly act, and will fail of the desired result. It is the design of the anti-Chinese League to secure uniformity of action against the Chinese, so that they can say to Congress that the people of California are a unit upon this matter. But do they not see that when their petition goes to Congress the very fact that boycotting has been resorted to will kill it? The men at Washington are wise enough to perceive that there is not unity of sentiment when it is necessary to ruin people's business in order to "convert" them to any course of action.

The best men of the Pacific Coast, the Christian men, the men of steady habits and stability of character, are not in favor of boycotting, which is simply mob rule. While there is a general sentiment against further Chinese immigration, the men just referred to are in favor of letting the matter be settled in a peaceable manner by the legislature. Many have been led against their better judgment to engage in this boycotting for fear of the results to their business. But we believe that "the spirit of '76," to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity, will lead a man to do what is right, and to be just to all men, regardless of the consequences to himself. And the color of a man, the shape of his eyes, the length of his hair, his private opinions, or his personal tastes and habits, have nothing to do with determine whether or not he is to be treated justly.

We have written thus at length because we know that many conscientious persons are troubled as to their duty in this crisis, and we desire to help them to a decision that will not put them to shame in the day of Judgment. E. J. W.

**March 4, 1886**

**"Throwing the Bible Aside" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

A little over a year ago (Jan. 8, 1885) the *Christian at Work* used the following language:-

"The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis, and none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest."

This is not very definite; for the "early Christian church" covers quite a space of time, including the time of Christ and the apostles; and people might be led to think that the *Christian at Work* claimed apostolic authority for Sunday observance. But that is not the case, as the following from the same paper, Feb. 18, 1886, shows:-

"We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted,



that we must go to later than apostolic time for the establishment of Sunday observance."

Very true; and we knew it before the *Christian at Work* said it; for we have read the Bible. But here is a point for consideration. "The Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture," we are told. Now what day is it that is thus identified in the Scriptures as the Sabbath? It is the seventh day, and no other. This the *Christian at Work* admits when it says that "the church" has taken the liberty of discarding the day designated in the fourth commandment, and that this was done this side the time of the apostles. We would ask, then, how it is possible to reconcile Sunday observance with reverence for the Bible. If a man takes the Bible, and that alone, as his guide, he must keep the seventh day of the week; and (according to the above quotations with which we agree), if he accept Sunday he must go directly against the Bible. It ought not to take any candid person long to decide what to do in this matter, for it is evident that "their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges." And, besides, one who was foremost among the apostles has said: "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." E. J. W.

### **"Perpetuity of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is impossible to discuss one branch of this great subject of the law without touching more or less upon every other branch. So in considering the nature of the law and its relation to the gospel, we have necessarily shown that it must endure forever. We shall not take up this branch more in detail.

The law of God is the righteousness of God. It may not be amiss to review the proof on this point. David, in these words, bears witness to the fact that the commandments are themselves righteousness: "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." Ps. 119:172. Since there is no righteousness but that of God, the commandments must be his righteousness; but we have still more direct evidence. The prophet Isaiah thus contrasts the things of earth with the righteousness of God: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever; and my righteousness shall not be abolished." Isa. 51:6. In the next verse he proceeds to tell what this righteousness is: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." Because the law is the righteousness of God, it enables those who are instructed in it to "give judgment upon good or evil."

The text says, "My righteousness shall not be abolished." Since there can be no question but that "righteousness" is here used with reference to the law of God, we may properly substitute "law" for "righteousness," thus: "The earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my law shall not be abolished." This gives the exact meaning, and is no more positive than we shall find stated elsewhere.

God is from everlasting to everlasting. Ps. 90:2. As he cannot exist separate from his nature, or, in other words, separate from himself, and the law is the transcript of his nature, it necessarily follows that the law exists from everlasting to everlasting. And since created beings, who are all subjects of God's Government, cannot obey an abstract principle, but must have that principle clearly defined, we know that at least from the time that God created intelligent beings as subjects of his Government, the law must have existed in written form

135

or must have been expressed in definite language. And from the beginning of his creation to everlasting ages, it must continue so to exist.

This is exactly what we are taught by the words of Christ in the sermon on the mount. Said he: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill (to ratify, establish, or teach). For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18. Here two things are mentioned, the law and the prophets. Christ did not come to destroy either one. He came in fulfillment of prophecy, and also to teach the law, which he did in the sermon on the mount. He did not, however, fulfill all the prophecy; for some of it reaches far beyond his first advent. For instance in Ps. 89:20-29 we read the following prophecy concerning the kingdom of David, over which Christ, as the Son of David:-

"I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him; with whom my hand shall be established; mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him; and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and *his throne as the days of heaven.*"

In verses 35-37 we read further:-

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven."

Here is a prophecy that will be in process of fulfillment as long as the sun and moon endure, even to all the days of Heaven. Now the words of Christ are, that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Till all what be fulfilled? Evidently till all the prophets be fulfilled, for he is speaking of the prophets, in connection with the law. Then, in view of the prophecy that we just read, we know that not the slightest change can be made in the law so long as Christ reigns on the throne of David; and that will be throughout eternity.

Nothing can add to the force of this testimony. We may quote other texts, as, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke 16:17), or, "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth

and uprightness" (Ps. 111:7, 8), but, strong as they are, they do not go beyond what has already been presented. To give all the texts which show the enduring nature of the law, would be to quote a large portion of the Bible. In our consideration of other points connected with this subject, many additional proofs will necessarily be brought in. But right here we wish to introduce a few quotations from eminent authors of different denominations, to show that they have used just as strong language as we have to set forth the holiness and perpetuity of the law. Bishop E. O. Haven said:-

"Not only is every one of the ten commandments binding upon all men, [but] every one is often broken by persons who have received Christian instruction. The decalogue is God's grand compendium of moral philosophy. Whoever obeys it in letter and spirit is a perfect man."-"*Pillars of Truth*," p. 7.

Again the same author says:-

"This decalogue can never become obsolete. It was designed for all men, and, obeyed, would render all men noble, and worthy of immortal blessedness. It is a kind of concentration of the moral teachings of the Bible."-"*Pillars of truth*," p. 235.

The "Speaker's Commentary," on Matt. 12:8 says:-

"On what principle of legislation can it be maintained that, because laws are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards the laws of man, still more so as regards the laws of God."

Rev. S. P. Sprecher, pastor of Calvary Presbyterian Church San Francisco, in a sermon delivered Feb. 18, 1883, and reported in the *Occident* of Feb. 21, 1883, said:-

"When God gave the ten commandments on Sinai, he did not propose that men should obey them if they commended themselves to the natural heart; but that they should obey because they were the voice of God. Truth is not always seen and appreciated at first. It generally requires a certain favorable state of the heart."

On the words of our Lord in Matt. 5:17, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill," we find the following comment by Wesley, in the first volume of his works, sermon 25:-

"Some have conceived our Lord to mean: I am come to fulfill this by my entire and perfect obedience to it. And it cannot be doubted but he did, in this sense, fulfill every part of it. But this does not appear to be what he intends here, being foreign to the scope of his present discourse. Without question, his meaning in that place is (consistently with all that goes before and follows after), I am come to establish it in its fullness, in spite of all the glosses of men; I am come to declare the true and full import of every part of it; to show the length and breadth, the entire extent, of every commandment contained therein, and the height and depth, the inconceivable purity and spirituality of it in all its branches."

Rev. W. A. Jarrel (Baptist), in "Old Testament Ethics Vindicated," pp. 25-27, speaks as follows concerning the law of God:-

"The divine will must be what the divine nature is. That the will must be what the nature is, is one of the fundamental truths of all true moral philosophy. . . .

While the law is not the nature of God, it is the effect and likeness of that nature; it is the perfect reflection of his infinite holiness and wisdom. It must, therefore, be as unchangeable as the infinite holiness of the divine nature. Law is the positive enactment of this nature; it is the expression of God's will."

"Law, then, being the expression of the holiness of the immutable, divine nature, it can never be relaxed or changed. As God's nature must forever will only moral right, his law can never be other than the expression of moral right."

This will suffice for quotations from religious authors. These quotations show that the idea here presented are no new thing, so that no one need fear to accept them, lest he should be straying from the old paths. They help to confirm the argument that the ten commandments are the "old paths," into which God calls all men to turn their steps. They are the way of holiness, the eternal way of peace; and human tongue or human pen can never adequately express their purity and their unchanging nature. E. J. W.

### **"Something about Writing" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is an age when people read; and when everybody reads, somebody must of necessity write. Moreover, if those who read are benefited by their reading, it must be because those who write have written something worth reading, and have written so plainly that the meaning cannot be misunderstood. Now, since reading from which no benefit is gained is a waste of time, it follows that a great responsibility rests upon all who write. We therefore give a few practical hints for the benefit of those who feel it to be their duty to write, but do not know just how to do so to the best advantage.

The first thing necessary, if one would write, is to have something to say. Not only should you have something which you think is worth telling, but you must be fully persuaded that it is very necessary that others should know it. You may be mistaken in your convictions, but that is another matter; the point is, if you wish others to be impressed by what you write, you must yourself first be impressed by it.

Have your subject well in hand before you begin to write. Do not take your pen, dip it in the ink, and then wait for the ideas to come and arrange themselves in the proper order. Thoughts are not so obedient as to do that. They will not arrange themselves; you must do it. Before you begin to write, take a pencil and paper, and jot down the various points which you wish to make, the texts which you wish to use, etc. Then arrange them, and your work is half done. As you write, you can alter your plan, adding or omitting thoughts as seems best.

Express yourself in the simplest and most direct manner possible. The object of language is to convey thought; therefore the more plainly this thought is expressed, the better is the language. Most younger writers do not seem to understand this, and some writers never learn it. Aim to write so plainly that people not only *may* understand, but that they *must* understand.

Do not try to be grand, or to soar. In short, do not try to force yourself to write in some particular style. If you do, your lameness will be apparent. There are

writers whose eloquent passages and well-rounded periods are a constant delight. You may write as they do, if it is natural for you to do so. But do not sacrifice strength for beauty. A thing may be very pretty, and yet be utterly useless.

Of course this means you must not imitate any one style of expression. Be yourself. There is no more reason why you should imitate another's style of writing than there is that you should imitate his manner of conversation. Saul's armor was no doubt first class in every respect, but David could not fight in it. Because your neighbor's coat fits him well, you must not conclude that it will also become you. Your coat may be of an entirely different size and pattern, and yet it may fit you as well as it fits him. So words which are very impressive when uttered by one, may be commonplace when spoken by another. It is just as necessary that the style of expression should fit the individual as it is that his coat should fit him.

Above all, don't plagiarize. This is a word which

136

has much the same meaning as embezzlement, defalcation, etc. In plain English, it means stealing. And don't steal. If somebody has written something which you think is good, don't try to get the credit of it by signing your name to it. If you quote it, give the author the credit. If you do not know the author's name, or do not wish to give it, at least indicate that the quoted passage is not your own. This is the honest way. To do any other way is to be dishonest. The law does not punish a man for appropriating an article that has been written by another, unless the article has been copyrighted; but such an act is no less desirable on that account. "Thou shalt not steal."

Besides the sin of plagiarism, there is another thing about it to be considered, and that is the loss of reputation which it brings. A man steals money because he has none, and does not like to work. It is very natural to imagine that people steal ideas for the same reason. If your ideas are your own, and are expressed in your own style, they may be somewhat crude, but you will get credit for just what you are. But if you take the ideas and expressions of another and pass them off as her own, people will not give you credit for being able to produce anything yourself.

Of course it is understood that there is very little absolute originality. We are all mutually dependent. We know nothing that we have not learned; and we have learned somebody new before we did. But we may have combinations of ideas that no one else has, and we may be able to express ideas in a way that has occurred to no one else. This is originality, in the common acceptance of the term. If one has not this originality, if he cannot say anything that has not already been said, there is no occasion for him to write.

Don't attempt to write poetry if you can possibly keep from it. This rule should be written in capital letters, and kept constantly before every young writer. Hundreds of persons who might have been useful, have resigned themselves by starting in with poetry. Many people seem to think that poetry is the simplest and most natural kind of composition. This is a grave error. Composition is not necessarily poetry because each line begins with a capital letter; neither can all

rhyme be called poetry. There are not so many poets in the world by a great many thousand as is sometimes supposed. Don't imagine that you are one of the few, just because you enjoy reading poetry. But if your thoughts will present themselves in rhyme and meter, and you cannot possibly express herself except in verse, then go ahead. The result may be poetry, and it may not be; but it is more likely to be poetry than is a great part of the matter which is called by that name.

Finally, if you wish your manuscript to receive speedy attention from any editor, observe the following simple items:-

Write on ruled paper.

Write only on one side of the sheet.

Use pen and ink.

Write as legibly as you possibly can. Don't "dash off" your thoughts, and then ask the editor to excuse poor writing, as you were in a hurry. The chances are that if you were in too great a hurry to write legibly, the editor will be in too great a hurry to attempt to read what you have written. Many valuable thoughts have perished in the wastebasket because of a failure to observe this last rule. Remember that to write poorly is solely the editor's prerogative.

These are by no means all the important points that might be noted; yet if only these are kept in mind, and you write, not for fame, nor for any selfish motive, but with the simple purpose to do good, you will be quite likely to write something worth reading. E. J. W.

**March 11, 1886**

**"A Question Concerning the Sanctuary" *The Signs of the Times* 12,  
10.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother sends a letter of inquiries, in which we find the following:-

"In reference to the priests taking the blood of the victim into the sanctuary, it seems to me that in case it was for the sin of a priest or of the whole congregation, then the blood was taken into the first room [the holy place]; but if it was for a ruler or one of the common people, the work was all done in the court, by the altar of burnt offering. And if this is true, how were the sins of *these* lodged in the sanctuary? From Lev. 10:17, I gather that the priests, by eating of this sin offerings whose blood was not taken into the sanctuary, *bore the iniquity* of the people."

The brother is partly right and partly wrong in his conclusions. It is true that the blood of some sin offerings was taken into the holy place, and that the blood of others was not. When the blood was taken into the sanctuary, the body of the victim was burnt without the camp. See Lev. 4:1-26; 6:30. But when the blood of the offering was not taken into the sanctuary, its flesh was taken by the priests into the holy place, and was there eaten by them. See Lev. 6:24, 25. Thus the sin was figuratively taken within the sanctuary,-in one case by the blood, and in the other by the flesh.

The wrong part of the conclusion was in supposing that in the latter case the priests themselves bore the iniquity of the people. Lev. 10:16-18 reads as follows:-

"And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and, behold, it was burnt; and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron which were left alive, saying, Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord? Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the holy place; ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy place, as I commanded."

A careful reading of the above, especially verse 17, plainly shows that *the flesh* of the sin offering, and *not* the priests, was to bear the iniquity of the congregation. What did Moses say God had given to the priests? The flesh. For what purpose had he given it? To bear the iniquity of the congregation. The construction of the sentence absolutely forbids the conclusion that the priests bore the iniquity.

The victim represent Christ. He "bare our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Pet. 2:24. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. In his own person he took them into the true sanctuary in Heaven. And as the lamb or goat typified Christ, the sins that were confessed over it were laid upon it as a whole, so that they might be conveyed into the sanctuary either by the flesh or by the blood. The animal was innocent, and might therefore be a type of Christ; but the priest was a sinful, mortal man, and could not therefore himself represent Christ in the act of bearing our sins. We design ere long to give this subject a more extended consideration in the SIGNS. E. J. W.

## **"The Foundation of God's Government" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is one more argument that we would introduce right here. To do so, we shall have to refer to the tabernacle built by Moses, and we shall try to do so as briefly as is consistent with perfect clearness. In general, only references will be given; the reader can look them up at his leisure.

In Ex. 25:8 we read these words: "And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." These words of the Lord follow a command to Moses to receive offerings of gold, silver, brass, acacia wood, fine linen, goat's hair, etc. Of these the tabernacle was to be built. Chapters 25-30 contain the complete description of this structure, together with all the furniture and vessels connected with it. The framework was composed of boards standing upright. There were twenty on each side, and eight on the west end. These boards were ten cubits fifteen feet long, and a cubit and a half wide, and were entirely covered with gold; each one had at the lower extremity two tenons, which were inserted into the sockets of silver, and this arrangement, together with bars that ran through rings on the sides of the boards, served to keep them in position. Ex. 26:15-30.

The east end was closed by a vail, or hanging, of fine linen of various colors, with figures of cherubim worked on it. This was called the door of the tabernacle. Ex. 26:36, 37. Four curtains, made respectively of linen, goat's hair, rams' skins, and badgers' skins, formed the covering of the tabernacle. Ex. 26:1-14. Besides the door, there was a second vail of the same material, which divided the tabernacle into two rooms; the first was called the "holy place," and the second the "most holy place." Ex. 26:31-33; Heb. 9:1-3. So much for the tabernacle itself.

Within this tabernacle were various articles of furniture. Just within the holy place on the north side, was a table, upon which show-bread was placed. Ex. 27:23-30; 40:22, 23. On the south side there was a candlestick, or lamp-stand, having seven lamps, the whole beaten out of one solid piece of gold. These lamps were to be kept continually burning. Ex. 25:31, 39. In the western extremity of the holy place, just before the second vail, was the golden altar of incense. Upon this the priest offered incense night and morning. Ex. 30:1-9. This is all that was in the holy place. In the most holy place there was but one article of furniture, the ark of the testimony (Ex. 25:10-22), and that is of so much importance in our investigation that we shall examine it more particularly.

By a careful examination of the scripture last referred to, we find that this ark was an oblong box of acacia wood, covered within and without with gold. On its sides were rings of gold, through which staves were passed for use in carrying it, so that it need never be touched by human hands. The cover to this ark was called the mercy-seat, and was of solid gold. Upon the mercy-seat were the cherubim, one on each end, of solid gold, and of the same piece as the mercy-seat itself. The wings of these cherubim were extended so as to form an arch over the ark, and their faces looked toward each other, and downward to the ark. Within the ark was the "testimony" (Ex. 25:16), which was nothing other than the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, wrote on tables of stone, and delivered to Moses for safe deposit in the ark. Deut. 10:1-5. This ark, as stated before, was in the most holy place (Heb. 9:3-5), into which no man could enter save the high priest, and he only once a year. Heb. 9:7. Even then he did not see the ark, because the cloud of incense arising from the censer which he held in his hand, entirely concealed it. Lev. 16:12, 13. Without this precaution, he would have died, and the reason why will presently appear.

Turning to Ex. 25:20-22, we read: "And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Now we know why no one except the high priest could enter the most holy place, and why even he, in his yearly visit, could not behold the mercy-seat and live. It was because the glory of God was there. In that place the priest was in the immediate presence of God.

It is now time to inquire how Moses, after having been commanded to build the sanctuary, happened to light upon the special style that he did. For an



answer, read Ex. 25:9, 40. "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount." Since it was to be God's house, God himself furnished the plan. But by reading a little more, we shall find that this pattern was not something then for the first time conceived. In the 9th of Hebrews, Paul, after telling that Moses purified (in a figure) the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, by sprinkling them with the blood of animals, says, verse 23: "It was therefore necessary that *the patterns of things in the Heavens* should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." This tells us plainly that the tabernacle and its furniture were copied after things in the Heavens. Now read Heb. 8:1, 2: "Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens; a minister of *the* sanctuary, and of *the true tabernacle*, which the Lord pitched, and not man."

Now we know that the tabernacle built by Moses as a dwelling-place for God, was only a temporary representation of God's real, permanent dwelling-place in Heaven. That God does have a tangible structure in Heaven for his occupancy, where, to use a common expression, he holds court, is evident from the scriptures just quoted, and also from Ps. 11:4: "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men." This temple, the place of God's throne, has been seen in Heaven. John says: "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." Rev. 11:19.

If we should ask what portion of the earthly tabernacle especially represented God's throne, the reader would almost at once answer: "The ark, with the cherubim on the mercy-seat above; because it was between these cherubim that his glory was manifested." This would be correct. God's actual dwelling-place is between the cherubim; when he moves from place to place, his throne (a living throne) and the cherubim accompany him. For proof of this read the following texts:-

"Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest

152

Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth." Ps. 80:1.

"The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved." Ps. 90:1. Besides these, read Eze. 1 and 10; Isa. 6:1-3, and Eze. 28:14.

Remember now that everything in the earthly sanctuary was a representation of some corresponding thing in the heavenly sanctuary, as nearly exact as human hands could approach to a likeness of things not made with hands, and we shall of necessity conclude that the throne of God in Heaven is directly above the original law of ten commandments, of which the tables placed in the ark by Moses were only a copy. In other words, the ten commandments form the foundation of God's throne.

In further pursuit of this thought, read Ps. 80:14: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face." Also the following: "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation [establishment] of his throne." Ps. 97:1, 2. We have already learned that the law is holy, just, and good, and that it is righteousness; it is perfect righteousness, and there is no righteousness outside of this law of ten commandments. Therefore when the psalmist says that righteousness is the establishment of God's throne, it is equivalent to saying that God's throne is established upon the ten commandments; that the ten commandments literally form the basis, or foundation, of the throne of God.

This term "throne" is often applied to sovereign authority or royal dignity. The ruler of a country is the representative of that government, and by metonymy the place where the ruler dispenses justice is put for the ruler, and so for the government. We speak of "the throne of the universe," meaning thereby the government of the universe. So, then, the fact that the ten commandments are the foundation of God's throne, shows that they are the rule of his Government; that every act is in accordance with their just sanctions; and that all the creatures of his Government throughout the universe are required to obey them.

This is a conclusion which we are confident cannot be overthrown, nor can any one who holds himself to a strict regard for the plain word of God, contradict it. This being so, what a view it gives us of the perpetuity of God's law! Leaving the eternity that is past, we look forward and ask, How long shall God's moral law endure? And the answer comes, It will endure just as long as God's throne endures, just as long as God rules the universe; for God's throne could not remain firm if its foundations were destroyed.

And this shows the unchanging nature of the law, as well as its perpetuity. The moral law is composed of ten precepts. Since the law is the foundation of God's throne, we may with propriety call the ten precepts the ten stones composing the foundation. Indeed, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, seemed to have a similar idea in his mind, when he wrote the little book, entitled, "The Pillars of Truth." This work contains ten chapters, each chapter being the substance of a lecture before the students of Michigan University, the subject of the lectures being the ten commandments. These commandments, according to the bishop's idea, are the ten pillars that uphold all truth. This being true, how can one of them be exchanged for another? What would support the throne of the universe while the transfer was being made? Such a question needs no answer. When we realize the relation which the moral law sustains to God and his Government, the mind at once sees the absurdity of the idea that one jot or one tittle can pass from the law, or that the slightest change could ever be made in it. We must exclaim with the psalmist: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." Ps. 119:160. E. J. W.

**March 18, 1886**

## **"Doers of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

In previous articles we have laid down some of the fundamental principles of the law. We have found that the moral law of ten commandments, spoken from Sinai, is perfect, holy, and good; that it is the instrument which enables us to judge between good and evil; that it is "the righteousness of God," so that there is no goodness or morality to be found outside of it; that it is also called "the way," "the way of peace," "the truth," "the testimony," the "word of the Lord," etc., and that it is the expression of God's will; that the transgression of it is sin, which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, so that whoever admits the existence of sin, and the necessity for the preaching of the gospel, virtually testifies to the existence of the law; more than this, we have learned that, as the righteousness of God, it is the foundation of his throne, the basis of his government of the universe, and that it was therefore in full force before this world was brought into existence, and that it will continue in force as long as God's throne endures, the delight of all the redeemed, throughout eternity.

These points must be borne in mind as we proceed to their application in the examination of special texts. In this examination the points mentioned above will be strengthened, if it is possible to strengthen a position already so strong.

We have already quoted Rom. 2:13: "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." This statement of the apostle is unqualified, and admits of no qualification. The doers of the law shall be justified. The statement is positive and emphatic. There can be no qualification nor exception. Think a moment. It is the righteousness of God, the perfection of holiness. Must not the keeping of it, then, as Solomon says, be "the whole duty of man"? And if a man does his whole duty, and is a partaker of the righteousness of God, can he be condemned? Not by any means. God himself has declared, through his inspired apostle, that "the doer of the law shall be justified." Wherever in the universe a being is found who is a doer of the law, he is just in the sight of God.

Already I hear some one exclaim, "He thinks that man can save himself by his own works, and leaves no room for Christ." Not so fast; do not pass judgment upon a piece of work until it is completed. Perhaps the proposition will seem clearer if we consider what constitutes one a "doer of the law." Let us illustrate: A father goes from home, leaving his son a certain amount of work to perform. There is a portion of work for each hour,-enough to keep the son constantly employed. Suppose that the son works faithfully for an hour or two, and then consumes the remainder of the time in play; has he done what his father commanded? Certainly not. But suppose that he works faithfully every hour but one, and leaves the work allotted to that hour unperformed; can he now be called a doer of his father's will? He evidently cannot. Unless he can truthfully say, "I have done what my father left for me to do," he cannot be called a doer of his father's will; and he cannot truthfully say that he has done what his father gave him to do, unless he has done all that was enjoined upon him.

This is more than a simple illustration; it is a plain statement of fact. The boy cannot be said to have done what his father told him to do, if he has not done it all; a man cannot be said to have traveled the road from one point to another, if he lacks a mile of it; even so no man can be called a "doer of the law" of God if he has ever violated one of its precepts. If there be a man who has kept every commandment but one, and has violated that one but a single time, he cannot be called a doer of the law, and hence cannot be justified by the law. He would be almost a doer of the law, but there is no promise of justification for those who simply almost do the law.

Right in this connection we must read the words of James: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." James 2:10, 11.

Many people, in their shortsightedness, have thought that this is unjust. There is no injustice in it; it is simply a statement of what exists from the very nature of things. The apostle does not say that the man who breaks only one commandment shall be considered as guilty as he who should violate every one, although he is guilty of all. There are degrees of sin. The law is sometimes likened to a chain having ten links. Now if only one link be broken, the chain is broken, and, until that link is mended, is just as useless as though all the links were broken. So if a man breaks one commandment, he has broken the law, and it is just as impossible for the law to justify him as it would be if he had broken every precept. The following from Dr. Chalmers is direct on this point:-

"In order that you [may] feel the force of the apostle's demonstration, there is one principle which is held to be sound in human law, and which, in all equity, ought to be extended to the law of God. The principle is this,-that however manifold the enactments of the law may be, it is possible, by one act or one kind of disobedience, to incur the guilt of an entire defiance to the authority which framed it; and therefore to bring rightfully down upon the head of the transgressor the whole weight of the severities which it denounces against the children of iniquity. To be worthy of death, it is not necessary to commit all the things which are included in the sad enumeration of human vices, any more than it is necessary for a criminal to add depredation to forgery, or murder to both, ere a capital sentence go out against him from the administrators of the law upon which he has trampled. You may as effectually cut with a friend by one hostile or insolent expression, as if you had employed a thousand; and your disavowal of authority may be as intelligibly announced by one deed of defiance as by many; and your contempt of Heaven's court be as strongly manifested by your willful violation of one of the commandments, as if you had thwarted every requirement. . . .

"The man who has thrown off the allegiance of religion, may neither have the occasion nor the wish to commit all the offenses which it prohibits, or to utter all the blasphemies which may be vented forth in the spirit of defiance against the Almighty's throne. And yet the principle of defiance may have taken full possession of his heart, and irreligion may be the element in which he breathes.

And in every instance, when his will comes into competition with the will of God, may the creature lift himself above the Creator; and though, according to the varieties of natural temperament, these instances may be more manifold and various with one man than with another, yet that which essentially constitutes the character of moral and spiritual guilt may be of equal strength and inveteracy with both. . . . Ungodliness, in short, is not a thing of tale and measure; it is a thing of weight and of quality."-*Chalmers on the Romans, Lecture VI.*

The above is a good exposition of James 2:10, 11. We learn, then, that when a man willfully violates one commandment, it is not respect for the law, nor for the Lawgiver, that restrains him from violating all of them. He has shown his contempt for the authority that gave them, and thus becomes guilty of all. Now when we recall the fact that each one of these commandments reaches the thoughts and intents of the heart, we may have something of a sense of what it takes to be a doer of the law. If it is thought that there is even one human being who merits that title, read the following plain declarations:-

"For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Rom. 3:9-19.

After reading the above, you will have no difficulty in understanding why the apostle immediately adds:-

"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20.

It seems hardly possible that any one should now imagine that there is any disagreement between Rom. 2:13 and Rom. 3:20. It is a fact that all must recognize, that the law will justify all doers of it; and it is just as certain that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, because there is no one of whom it can be said, He is a doer of the law. It is not the fault of the law that it will not justify anybody; it would do so if it were possible; it is the fault of man that it cannot. E. J. W.

### **"Forgiveness; Real, not Figurative" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no one who gives the matter any consideration, who doubts that the offerings for sin, under the Levitical law, represented the real sacrifice made by Christ; although there are very many who fail to notice that the service performed by the priests was only a type of the real service which is conducted by Christ, our great High Priest, in the true sanctuary in Heaven. The Scriptures,

however, give abundant evidence of the fact that the tabernacle built in the wilderness was but a pattern of "the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man;" that the high priest was a type of Christ; and that, in short, the whole service was typical, or figurative.

But here some are liable to make a mistake. Many suppose that because the service of the sanctuary was only figurative, therefore the forgiveness which the sinner is said to have received was also only figurative. The fallacy of this supposition will be apparent if a comprehensive view is taken of the whole subject. It will be remembered that the figurative sanctuary service continued until Christ made the real sacrifice on the cross. Then if the supposition noted were true, it would appear that before the time of Christ no sinner had really been forgiven. But Elijah went to Heaven, and therefore his sins must certainly have been forgiven. David says: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." Ps. 32:5. That is positive proof of sins actually pardoned. Therefore we must conclude that sins were pardoned *in fact*, before the time of Christ.

"But," asks one in astonishment, "do you think that there was any virtue in the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin?" Not at all; neither do we believe that there is any virtue in the mechanical act of baptism; yet we are commanded to be baptized as a condition of securing remission of sins. What is it that secures our forgiveness? It is the death and resurrection of Christ (Rom. 4:25); it is not by the mere act of baptism, but by the faith which is thereby indicated, that we secure pardon for transgressions. So in the case of the man in the Levitical age. He was forgiven, not through any virtue in the blood of the goat or bullock which he offered, but by virtue of his faith in Christ's sacrifice, which he manifested by offering an animal that typified Christ.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the plan of salvation has not varied in the least since the days of Adam. When man first sinned; then Christ was given as a ransom. It was then that Christ voluntarily offered to die in man's stead; it was then that God's love to the world led him to consent to deliver up his only begotten son; it was then that the promise of life through Christ was made to the human race. Now a *promise* on the part of God is just as sure as a thing that is actually performed; for he cannot lie. And for this reason it is that Christ is said to have been "slain from the foundation of the world." It made no difference that the death was not accomplished until four thousand years after the fall; from the time the promise was made, forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ was just as certain to the man who repented as it is to-day.

Notice the exact parallel between the case of men in the days before Christ and that of those after Christ. They had ceremonies by which they manifested their faith in Christ; and because of this faith they were forgiven. We have ceremonies (as baptism and the Lord's Supper) by which we manifest our faith in Christ; and because of our faith we obtain the forgiveness of our sins. They looked forward by faith to the time when Christ, according to the promise, should be offered; we look backward to the cross and we see the promise actually fulfilled.

But while their sins were forgiven in fact, they were blotted out only in figure. Even in this the parallel holds good; for the sins of men now living, although forgiven, have not yet been blotted out. The exhortation to us is, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Acts 3:19. And because the way of salvation is uniform throughout, and God deals with men in the same way in all ages of the world, we do not like the terms "old dispensation" and "new dispensation;" or "Jewish dispensation" and "gospel dispensation." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, lived in the "gospel age" as well as we. See Gal. 3:8. The gospel is the good news of salvation through Christ, and the patriarchs understood that as well as we do. Forgiveness of sins has always been granted immediately upon repentance; and Christ's blood was of just as much efficacy four thousand years ago as it is to-day. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. E. J. W.

### **March 25, 1886**

#### **"Unleavened Bread at Communion" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-"What kind of bread should be used in a celebration of the Lord's Supper? Some say that unleavened bread alone should be used; others argue for leavened bread; and still others say that it makes no difference. Which is right? G. C. I."

ANSWER.-To answer categorically, we should say that only unleavened should be used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The reasons for this answer are as follows:-

1. By using the bread we follow the example of Christ. The Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ in connection with the last Passover (Matt. 26:17-30), and it is certain that only unleavened bread was used on that occasion; because during the whole of the Passover week, no particle of leaven was allowed in the Jewish dwelling. The law on this point was very restrict. See Ex. 12:18-20. This may be said to be only negative testimony; but it is more than can be produced in favor of leavened bread. If in the absence of positive command, we follow the example of Christ, we certainly cannot go wrong. But this is not all that we have.

2. The Lord's Supper is designed to represent the death of Christ. See 1 Cor. 11:26. It is a memorial of that which was foreshadowed by the Passover and by all the sacrifices of the old ceremonial law. There is, therefore, the same reason for using unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper that there was for using it in the passover. When Christ broke the bread, he said: "This is my body, which is broken for you." 1 Cor. 11:14. since the bread of the communion represents Christ's body, it must be without blemish, or else it is not a fit symbol; for Peter says: "Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1

Pet. 1:18, 19. Now leaven is a fermentation, and fermentation is decomposition and decay. Then certainly leavened bread cannot officially represent the spotless body of Christ, any more than leavened or fermented wine can properly represent his precious blood. Therefore we hold that it was no accident which led to the use of unleavened bread at the institution of the Lord's Supper.

3. This conclusion is verified by Ex. 23:18, which reads thus: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread." This is a positive commandment, and leaves us no choice in the matter. It cannot be said that this applies only to the sacrifices under the old ceremonial law; for they were no more the blood of the Lord's sacrifice than is the cup of the Lord's Supper. Indeed, the Bible speaks more plainly of this than it does of those; for Christ himself said, when he took the cup: "*This is my blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26:28. It is plain enough that Ex. 23:18 does not refer to the literal blood of Christ; for no man ever offered, or could offer that with anything; and it is equally plain that it does not refer to anything that was or used to represent Christ's blood, whether before or after his death.

In view of the reasons here given, and especially of the explicit commandment in Ex. 23:18, we think we are justified in saying not only that it is right to use unleavened bread at communion, but that it is wrong to use any other. It may seem to some a trifling matter, but nothing can be a trifling matter upon which the Lord has seen fit to give the commandment. E. J. W.

### **"Justified by Faith" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

Before going further, let us have some definitions to keep in our mind. *Justification* is "a showing to be just, or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety." *Condemnation* is "the judicial act of declaring guilty, and dooming to punishment." The two words are directly opposite in meaning; and we have the inspired declaration that all the world are guilty (condemned) before God, and that by the deeds of the law none can be justified.

That there may be no possibility of a mistake, we will compare Rom. 2:13 and 3:20 a little further. Both are true, but they do not both apply to the same classes. The first is a universal truth. The *doers* of the law, wherever or whenever they are found, are justified. It cannot be otherwise. But in this world there are no doers of the law. There may be many who are trying to do it; but whatever degree of success they may have, they cannot be called *doers* of the law, for they have repeatedly broken it. Suppose now that it were possible for a man to turn squarely around and keep the law perfectly, would he be justified? By no means. The law requires that *all there is of us* shall be devoted to it *all the time*. Then if a man gets behind, he can never catch up. Since all our strength is required for each hour, it is plain that the perfect performance of duty during any hour will not in the least degree make up for the non-performance of duty during any other hour. There can be no such thing as works of supererogation. While the law justifies us in the performance of good deeds, it cannot, as a matter of fact, justify us for a single moment, no matter how good our present actions may be, since



on its very first application to us, it must detect the past sin, and consequently must at once condemn us. Justification and condemnation have reference to our whole lives; and since, however good we may be, for a portion of our lives, at the end, it will be seen that we have not done *all* our duty, we must therefore stand condemned. The law is just and good, and therefore it can never declare a guilty man innocent.

Is there, then, no hope for any? Since all have sinned, must all receive the wages-death? Will the law with its unrelenting grasp forever hold all the world in the bondage of death? Such would be the case, and there would be no hope for any, had not "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. All the world are guilty before God, because all have sinned; but they may be "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:24. There is "hope in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption." Ps. 130:7. Let us read Paul's brief but wonderfully clear statement of how we may be justified:-

"Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:24-26.

Take notice that this is not indulgence for sin, nor remission of the law, but *remission of sins*. The sins are remitted-sent away. By this process, the sins are taken from the individual, so that he may be counted as though he had never committed them. Note also the fact that it is by the grace of God that we are justified, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There is no antagonism between the Father and the Son; both are concerned in the great work of man's redemption. The death of Christ, inasmuch as the Lord "laid upon him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6), made it possible for God to justify those who have faith in his blood.

"To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." Christ's righteousness was perfect. He delighted to do the will of God, because the law-God's will-was within his heart. Ps. 40:8. He "did no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2:22. He alone, of all the people who ever trod this earth, could challenge even his enemies to find in his life one trace of sin. John 8:46. We have learned that righteousness is obedience to the law. Now it is because of unrighteousness-disobedience to the law-that man is condemned. If by any means a man's whole life could be made to appear in perfect harmony with the law, it is evident that that man would be justified. It is also evident that if the sins of his life could be removed, his life would appear in harmony with the law of God. Now this is just what is done. Christ's righteousness is declared for the remission-taking away-of those sins. As Christ's life is worth infinitely more than the lives of all the world, so through his death his righteousness may be made to take the place of the disobedience of all those who will have faith in him. We may say that an exchange is made; Christ takes upon himself the sins of all our past life, and in return lets his righteousness be counted as ours. When this is done

for a man, the law can do no other than justify him. It demands perfect obedience in the life, and that is what it finds. It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the man's life is not really his own; it is counted as his own; and since the obedience is perfect, the law cannot condemn. Christ suffered the penalty for the sins which the man actually committed (Isa. 53:6, 10; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Peter 2:24), and thus God can be perfectly just and at the same time may justify a man who has sinned. But this can be done only for those who have faith in Christ's blood.

It must not be forgotten that we are now speaking only of the sins that are *past*. It is impossible that *remission* of sins could have reference to anything else, for that which does not exist cannot be

184

taken away; and to justify a man for sins not yet committed, in other words, to grant indulgence for sins, would throw contempt on the law, and bring in anarchy and ruin. And no sins are remitted, except of those who believe in Jesus. If any are Christ's, they are Abraham's seed (Gal. 3:29), and therefore, with him, their faith is imputed unto them for righteousness. James 2:23.

"Therefore," says Paul, "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3:28. This does not mean that the law is ignored, and that a man who disregards the law can be justified. Nothing of the kind. There could be no justification in such a case; for justification has no connection with injustice, and to clear a guilty man—a violator of the law—is an act of injustice. The Lord says that he "will not at all acquit the wicked" (Nahum 1:3), and he does not; for the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin (1 John 1:17), and when this is applied to an individual, as it is to all who have faith in it, it frees him from guilt, and then he must necessarily stand justified. But the man could not be justified if the law were left out of the account; for justification, as we have already learned, is "a showing to be just or conformable to law."

But this will not be done for a man who does not acknowledge the justice of the law which condemns his sins, and, repeating of them, promise obedience to the law. No just governor would pardon a man under any other circumstances. Here is a man who has been convicted of theft; he petitions for a pardon, but unless he promises to reform, he will not be likely to get it. If he persists that he has a right to steal, and has no intention of reforming, nothing can secure his pardon. Of course this is not a perfect parallel to the sinner pleading with God for forgiveness; for when a man receives pardon from an earthly ruler, his guilt remains the same as ever; but when he receives a pardon from God, the same blood which secures the pardon, takes away the sin.

The statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law, is only a summing up of Paul's argument, which we have already given. No amount of work will have the slightest effect in securing justification by the remission of past sins. That which is done, we cannot undo.

Nothing that we can do can alter the fact that we have sinned. Your past life has been full of sin, and you want to become free from the guilt of it; what can you do? Though you were able to keep the law without the slightest deviation, that would not remove a single sin. You can do nothing but "believe on the Lord

Jesus Christ." He says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden [with sin], and I will give you rest." Matt. 11:28. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. So we conclude, with Paul, that "a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law."

We have said that no work of ours, however perfect it may be, can atone for past transgressions; that even though we should be able to turn around and keep the law perfectly, that would not remove a single sin. As a matter of fact, however, it is impossible for the sinner to do any good work, even though it would be counted in his justification. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that *ye cannot do the things that ye would.*" Gal. 5:17. This means, of course, while we are serving the flesh, and out of Christ; for Christ says: "Without me ye can do nothing." John 15:5. This was said to those whose sins had been forgiven, and will certainly apply, with all its force, to those who have never known Christ. Christ says that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Matt. 15:19. These are the works of the flesh (see the complete list in Gal. 5:19-21), and are what men do by nature. Men may have good desires, but they cannot do what they would. Gal. 5:17. The law of God is so extensive and perfect in its requirements that the best efforts of fallen man, unassisted, must fall far short of it. And this thought makes us understand still more clearly the statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; for every act that the man performs before he comes to Christ, no matter how good his intentions may be, only sinks him the deeper in condemnation.

"Not all our groans and tears,  
Nor works which we have done,  
Nor vows, nor promises, nor prayers,  
Can e'er for sin atone.  
"Relief alone is found  
In Jesus' precious blood;  
'Tis this that heals the mortal wound  
And reconciles to God."

And so the sinner, appalled at the multitude of his sins, which like a mountain upon his back well-nigh sink him into despair, having lost all confidence in himself, may sing:-

"Just as I am,-without one plea,  
But that thy blood was shed for me,  
And that thou bid'st me come to thee,  
O, Lamb of God, I come.  
"Just as I am-and waiting not  
To rid my soul of one dark blot,  
To thee, whose blood can cleanse each spot,  
O, Lamb of God, I come." E. J. W.

**April 1, 1886**

**"Justification and Sanctification" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

Having explained Rom. 3:28, we are prepared to understand a parallel text that, without the explanation already given, might be considered a difficult one. The text referred to is Rom. 3:21: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." The righteousness of God, as we have already learned, is a term applied to the ten commandments, or rather to that righteousness which the ten commandments enjoin. But the question arises, "If the righteousness of God is the perfect righteousness which the law demands, how can it be manifested "without the law?" Let Paul explain for himself, as he does in the following verses: "*Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.*" Rom. 3:22-25.

200

By this we see that the righteousness of God which is manifested without the law, is simply the remission of sins that are past, for which no works of obedience on our part could make any satisfaction. Paul, speaking of Abraham, describes it as follows: "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. 4:20-25.

"Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." The same thing, says Paul, will be done to us also, if we also believe. The case, then, stands thus: The law demands perfect and unvarying obedience, but it speaks to all the world and finds none righteous; all have violated it, and all are condemned by it. (Rom. 3:9, 19.) Present or future obedience will not take away past transgression, therefore the law cannot help us. But Christ is perfect righteousness, for in him dwells "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Now God says that he will impute the righteousness of Christ to every one who will fully believe on him. Impute means, "to set to the account of." Therefore we are to understand that whenever we accept Christ, his righteousness is set to our account. Thus "the righteousness of God" is manifested in our past lives, even though we ourselves have never done a single act of righteousness. So we have the wonder of perfect obedience to the law, without a single righteous act on our part. The righteousness of God without the law—Christ's righteousness imputed to us.

But what is the law doing all this time? Has it relaxed its claims? Not at all. Paul says, "The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, *being witnessed by the law.*" The law stands by, and witnesses to the righteousness that is thus manifested in our past life. Whereas it before condemned us, now it justifies us, for in the righteousness that is imputed to us it can detect no flaw. It makes no difference to the law that the righteousness to which it witnesses is not the result of our own works; the righteousness is accounted as ours, and that satisfies the law.

Right here we may profitably note the force of Rom. 5:20: "Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." The "entering" of the law refers to the formal giving of it from Sinai. This will be readily seen from Rom. 5:13, 14, and has already been noted in our comments on that passage. Before the giving of the law, from Sinai, it did not exist in written form in the world. The remains of the law "written in their hearts," and the instruction of men who, like Enoch, and Noah, walked with God were what the people had to depend on for their knowledge of right and wrong. The law existed before that time, for sin was imputed to the people, and "sin is not imputed where there is no law." But the law was given "that the offense might abound." The apostle does not mean that the law was given so that there might be more sin, but that it was given so that the sin which already existed *might abound*, that is, might appear greater than it did before. Paul expresses the exact meaning in another place when he says that sin, by the commandment, became "exceeding sinful."

To illustrate: Here stands a glass of water; it does not look perfectly pure, yet it does not seem very impure. Now a rod is thrust down to the bottom of the glass and given a few vigorous turns, when, behold, the water at once becomes exceedingly foul. Did the rod make the water impure? No; the impurity was there all the time; the rod simply made it appear. So there was sin in the world; but the law, when it was written on tables of stone, and copies could be multiplied in books, and scattered among the people, made the extreme hideousness of sin to appear. And why was this necessary? The answer is implied in the last clause of the verse: "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Men could not be saved while defiled by sin, even though they did not realize its heinousness. So the law was brought close to them, to show them their deformity, and make them feel their need of help from some source outside of themselves. And this effect it had; for no matter how much their sins were made to abound, "grace did much more abound." Christ's righteousness was seen to be sufficient to cover all the sins of the past. With Wesley, the repentant sinner may sing:-

"Plenteous grace with Thee is found,  
Grace to cover all my sin;"

and with David he can realize the blessedness of the man "whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered," and unto whom the Lord will not impute iniquity.

We have seen that the law stands as a witness to the sinner's justification. This shows that no act of Christ has in any way robbed the law of its force. Indeed,

without the existence of the law there could be no such thing as justification. Now what about the man's future relation to the law? It is evident that unless he keeps it he will again fall into condemnation. The man's faith secured his justification; but that justification was simply the "showing to be just, or conformable to law." His justification was simply pardon for having violated the law; it was an act by which another's righteousness was put in place of his unrighteousness. Now since "faith without works is dead," it follows as a necessary conclusion, that if the man's faith was genuine (and if it were not he could not have been pardoned), it will now be proved by works of obedience. And therefore the characteristic of the justified man is that he keeps the law.

Of Abraham it is said that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. But James takes the same subject up and says, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" James 2:21. This is no contradiction of Paul's statement in Rom. 3:28; for James immediately adds: "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Verses 22, 23.

By this we see that Abraham's faith could not have been imputed to him for righteousness but for the disposition to work. And since justification has reference to the law of God, it is evident that the works that make perfect the faith that secures justification, must be the works which the law requires. But this continued obedience is sanctification; for Christ prayed for his disciples: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." John 17:17.

Paul says that God has chosen us to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:17); but that by which the Spirit acts is the word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit. Eph. 6:17.

Again Paul says: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Phil. 2:12. But no one can accuse Paul of inconsistency; for he adds: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This is exactly in accord with our Saviour's words: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing." John 15:4, 5.

Peter also bears the same testimony. He says: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." 1 Peter 1:22. God's law is the truth (Ps. 119:142), and to purify is to cleanse from guilt or defilement, to sanctify. So Peter's sentence is that we are sanctified by obeying the truth; but he adds that this is done "through the Spirit." Sanctification, then, is the result of obedience; but as obedience is not simply a momentary act, but the work of a lifetime, it follows that sanctification is not an instantaneous, but a progressive work. A man is justified as soon as he exercises true faith in Christ; but the work of sanctification goes on as long as there is any truth for him to obey. And since a man, after he has been justified by faith, would fall into condemnation if he should refuse to do any duty that was presented to him, and can only retain his

state of justification by continuing in obedience to the law, it may be said that sanctification is but continued justification. Each new duty only makes the performance of others possible, and so "the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

"Faith without works is dead;" and on the other hand, obedience without faith is impossible, as is shown by our Saviour's words in John 15:4, 5; also by the words of Paul. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 8:8. The man who is destitute of faith in Christ cannot keep the law, or do any act that is really good. In our best efforts there is so much imperfection, that but for the continual imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies, we should be lost. The best that we alone can do is bad. Without faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. 11:6. And thus we see the force of the words: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John 5:4.

"Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith." Rom. 3:27. The redeemed saint will have no cause for boasting over the lost sinner. True, the law, when applied to their lives, reports perfection in the one case, and only sin in the other; but the saint cannot boast, for without Christ he would have been nothing. If Christ had not put his own righteousness upon him, he would be in as hopeless a condition as the sinner. And to all eternity the redeemed host will join with the heavenly choir in saying, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." Rev. 5:12.

"That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." 1 Cor. 1:29, 30.

"And this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Jer. 23:6. E. J. W.

**April 8, 1886**

**"Punishment and Torment" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS sends the following:-

"Your number of March 11, in 'Notes on the International Lessons,' says the doctrine of the eternal torment is contrary to the word of God. Will you please explain Matt. 25:41, Christ's own words? I have had faith in your papers; its teachings compared in many respects to my belief. But without satisfactory explanations in this doctrine, my faith will have some doubts on other subjects."

The last verse of the 25th of Matthew reach thus: "And the [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." We believe that this verse will be literally fulfilled. We know, also, that the words "everlasting" and "eternal" in this verse from the same in the Greek, and have the same meaning in the English; and therefore the text teaches that the punishment of the wicked will last just as long as the reward of the righteous. Our friend must certainly agree with us thus far.

Now what will be the punishment of the wicked? "The wages of sin is death." Rom.6:23. Then since the punishment of the wicked is everlasting, it must be everlasting death-a death from which there is no awaking. Paul also in another place says that they "shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*." 2 Thess. 1:9.

Our friend has confused the words "punishment" and "torment." They are not synonymous terms. Whatever torment the wicked may suffer, they cannot be said to have *been punished* until they have suffered death; for the wages of sin is death. The "tribulation and anguish" which will be rendered to them may be a very long continuance; but their *punishment* consists in death. And this punishment-will be everlasting. To all eternity the wicked will "be as though they had not been." Obadiah 16.

The 41st person of Matt.25 reads as follows: "Then shall he say also wanted them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, and everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." This does not in the least contradict the explanation just given. Everlasting or eternal fire does not necessarily imply that its victims must exist eternally. How was it with Sodom and Gomorrah? The Lord rained fire and brimstone upon them, and they were consumed from off the face of the earth. Nothing marks where they once stood, and is supposed that the waters of the Dead Sea roll over it. They have no existence, yet the apostle says: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*." Jude 7. If "eternal fire" resulted in the complete destruction of the cities of the plain, it must have a like edict on those who are finally impenitent. Indeed, the connection shows that the destruction of those cities was an example of the final fate of the wicked. On this passage Dr. Barnes says:-

"The phrase 'eternal fire,' is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity and intensity of the suffering. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires that consumed Sodom and Gomorrah were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) That the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual as *if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities were for ever rendered desolate; and (2) That in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly."

One word concerning the position taken by one correspondent. He says that he has had faith in the SIGNS, because its teachings corresponded to his belief. While we are pleased to have people favor the SIGNS, we do not like to have the favor rest on that foundation. If a man accept only what he already believes, he will make no advancement, and may only be confirmed in error; but if he accepts whatever is demonstrated to be truth, whether it accords with his previous belief not, he will always be in the right. This is in accordance with the apostolic injunction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. 5:21. E. J. W.



## **"Christ the End of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles we have considered the fundamental principles of the law, and all its bearings. We have by no means exhausted the subject; for that would be impossible; neither have we referred to all the texts relating to it; but we have given an outline of the nature of the law, its origin, perpetuity, extent of jurisdiction, and the relation to it of both righteous and wicked. By the principles of the law, which have already been enunciated, every text in the Bible that mentions the law may be explained; and bearing those principles in mind, we shall now proceed to consider the application of some texts that are too often regarded as antagonistic to the law. Without a knowledge of the principles of the law, these texts may justly be considered as difficult; but with such knowledge, we find not only that they are in perfect harmony with those principles, but that they greatly strengthen the argument already made. Right here, we will say that the task of "harmonizing" different portions of the Bible, is one which no man has to perform. The different portions of the Bible were harmonized by inspiration; all that the expositor has to do is to point out the harmony that already exists.

In Rom. 10:4 we read as follows: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Before showing what this text means, it may be well to briefly show what it does not mean. It does not mean that Christ has put an end to the law because (1) Christ himself said concerning the law: "I am not come to destroy," Matt. 5:17. (2) The prophet said that instead of destroying it, the Lord would "magnify the law, and make it honorable." Isa. 42:21. (3) The law was in Christ's own heart. "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:7, 8. And (4) since the law is the righteousness of God, the foundation of his Government, it could not by any possibility be abolished. See Luke 16:17.

A reading of the verses preceding the one quoted should suggest its meaning. "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they

216

might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Rom. 10:1-3. Bear in mind that "the righteousness of God" is his law. Isa. 51:6, 7. We can see that Paul uses the term in this sense; for, without any break for explanation, he adds, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," etc.

From these verses we learn that Paul, instead of teaching that the law has come to an end, is showing that Israel, through ignorance, had failed to realize the design of the law in securing righteousness. What had caused this failure? Paul says it was because they were ignorant of God's righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness. They had such low views of the righteousness of God, as required by his law, that they thought they could make themselves righteous. But, as we have already seen, all men are sinful, and while in the flesh cannot please God. Rom. 8:8. The only way in which men can

appear as righteous, is to have that "righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ." When their faith is imputed to them for righteousness, they become, in Christ, new creatures (2 Cor. 5:17), and thenceforth it is possible that with them all things shall be of God. But the Jews rejected Christ, and therefore failed to secure that righteousness which the law was designed to perfect in man. A comparison of Scripture texts will show that the view here outlined is the correct one.

The reader must know that the word "end" does not necessarily mean "termination." It is often used in the sense of design, object, or purpose. For instances where it is so used, see James 5:11; John 18:37; Rom. 14:9; Amos 5:18; Luke 18:1; Heb. 13:7; 1 Peter 1:9. In reading these texts no one would get the idea that faith is ended, or that the Lord had ceased to exist. So in reading Rom. 10:4, even without an explanation, one need not suppose that "end" means cessation of existence.

Now for a more detailed exposition of the text. In 1 Tim. 1:5, the same writer says: "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." The word here rendered "charity" is often rendered "love," and is so rendered in this place in the New Version. In John 5:3, we read: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;" and Paul himself says that "love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:10. In both these texts, the same word (*agape*) is used that occurs in 1 Tim. 1:5. Therefore we say that this text means, Now the design of the commandment (or law) is that it should be kept. Everybody will recognize this as a self-evident fact.

But this is not the ultimate design of the law. In the verse following the one under consideration Paul quotes Moses as saying of the law that "the man that doeth those things shall live by them." Christ said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19:17. Now since the design of the law was that it should be kept, or, in other words, that it should produce righteous characters, and the promise is that those who are obedient shall live, we may say that the ultimate design of the law was to give life. And in harmony with this thought are the words of Paul, that the law "was ordained to life." Rom. 7:10.

But "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and "the wages of sin is death." Thus it is impossible for the law to accomplish its design in making perfect characters and consequently giving life. When a man has once broken the law, no subsequent obedience can ever make his character perfect. And therefore the law which was ordained unto life, is found to be unto death. Rom. 7:10.

If we were to stop right here, with the law unable to accomplish its purpose, we should leave all the world under condemnation, and sentence of death. Now we shall see that Christ enables man to secure both righteousness and life. We read that we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:24. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5:1. More than this, he enables us to keep the law. "For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:21. In

Christ, therefore, it is possible for us to made perfect,-the righteousness of God,- and that is just what we would have been by constant and unvarying obedience to the law.

Again we read: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. . . . For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:1-4.

What could not the law do? It could not free a single guilty soul from condemnation. Why not? Because it was "weak through the flesh." There is no element of weakness in the law; the weakness is in the flesh. It is not the fault of a good tool that it cannot make a sound pillar out of a rotten stick. The law could not cleanse a man's past record, and make him sinless; and poor, fallen man had no strength resting in his flesh to enable him to keep the law. And so God imputes to believers the righteousness of Christ, who was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, so that "the righteousness of the law" might be fulfilled in their lives. And thus Christ is the end of the law.

But life is promised to the obedient, and as Christ enables his people to obey the law, he thus secures to them eternal life. Paul says that Christ has "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1:10. Christ himself says: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10:10. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. And because Christ meets the end or design of the law which was ordained to life, he is called our life, as Paul says: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3:4.

To conclude, then, we have found that the design of the law was that it should give life because of obedience. All men have sinned, and been sentenced to death. But Christ took upon himself man's nature, and will impart of his own righteousness to those who accept his sacrifice, and finally, when they stand, through him, as doers of the law, he will fulfill to them its ultimate object, by crowning them with eternal life. And so we repeat, what we cannot too fully appreciate, that Christ is made unto us "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." E. J. W.

**April 15, 1886**

**"Abolishing the Enmity" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

Although we have shown by repeated arguments and texts of Scripture, that the law endures forever, and have shown that Christ did not come to relax any of its claims, but that he is the "end of the law," in that he enables sinners to keep it, and thus to secure the life to which the law was ordained, there is a text which to some may seem to be a contradiction, or which may at least cause confusion in

their minds. That text, therefore, shall be our next study; it reads thus: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Eph. 2:14, 15.

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." 2 Tim. 3:16. Therefore there can be no contradiction in the Bible, and the text just quoted cannot contradict those texts which say that the law cannot be abolished. Although a certain "law of commandments contained in ordinances" is spoken of as having been "abolished," even before we study it, our faith in the integrity of the Scriptures forces us to conclude that in this text a law is referred to, different from that of which Christ said, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

Let us contrast certain expressions. That which is abolished is said to have been "enmity;" but Paul says: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:10. And John says: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3. Certainly the same thing cannot be both love and enmity. Again Paul says: "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12. Surely then it is not the law of God to which he applies the term "enmity." He also says: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Rom. 7:22. But he would not delight in that which was enmity; therefore we *know* that Eph. 2:15 has no reference to the law of God, or ten commandments.

Go back now to the time when the law was given from Sinai. The record says that after God had spoken the ten commandments, "he added no more" (Deut. 5:22); and we have seen that all that God spoke from the mount on the day of the assembly, was written by him on the two tables of stone, and that nothing but the ten commandments was so written. The people, however, could not know that God intended to speak no more than his own holy law, and they said to Moses: "Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die." "Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee." Ex. 20:19; Deut. 5:27.

Accordingly God told Moses to say to the people, "Get you into your tents again." "And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was." Deut. 5:30; Ex. 20:21. Moses was in the mount with God forty days, receiving instruction for the people; and the fact that the people received instruction through Moses, besides

232

that which the Lord spoke to them directly, is thus noted in Nehemiah's prayer: "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." Neh. 9:13, 14.

Those things which were given by the hand of Moses are recorded chiefly in Exodus, chapters 25-30, and in Leviticus. Among them were many burdensome

ceremonies,-the requirement that every male should go up to Jerusalem three times in every year, circumcision, "diverse washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Heb. 9:10. We say that these ceremonies were burdensome, for Peter himself said that they were a yoke, "which neither *our* fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts 15:10.

Moreover, some of them, at least, were an "enmity," or a cause of enmity, between the Jews and Gentiles. The ceremony of circumcision, which was designed to serve as a line of demarcation between the Jews and the Gentiles, was especially the cause of much enmity. The Jews regarded it as a sure proof of their superior sanctity, and therefore looked with contempt upon the uncircumcised Gentiles; while the Gentiles in turn hated the Jews, and despised their circumcision, looking upon it as little different from a badge of slavery. Acts 11:2, 3 indicates how the Jews regarded those who were uncircumcised.

This rite of circumcision was done away in Christ. It was given to Abraham as a sign or "seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Rom. 4:11. Thus we see it was designed to mark a *real* separation, the separation which always exists between the righteous and the wicked. But when a Jew departed from God, his circumcision and separation from the Gentiles was only an outward form, a mockery. Paul assures us that real circumcision is "of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. 2:20. God looks upon the heart, and demands that righteousness shall be from within, and not merely from without, as an outward sign. The man who is pure in heart is really separated from the world more completely than he could possibly be by any mere outward mark. And so "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Gal. 6:15.

Thus this source of enmity, which really served as a barrier to the Gentiles, was taken away. We say it served as a barrier to the Gentiles, because, being uncircumcised, they were held to be rejected of God, and would naturally make less effort to become his followers. The Jews, also, in their sectional pride and vain confidence, were really separated from the true Israel. But when this cause of enmity was removed, both could be united in one body by the cross, and so find peace. But after circumcision as an outward sign lost its force, the keeping of God's holy law still remained as a primary obligation. Said Paul: "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." 1 Cor. 7:19. And the keeping of the commandments from the heart constitutes the true circumcision, whose praise is of God.

Among the "ordinances" there were also various sacrifices. In the fourth chapter of Leviticus we find an account of the sin-offerings. We cannot take time to go over the ground in detail, but simply refer the reader to that chapter, also Lev. 6:25-30; 10:16-18, and chapter 16. In the service for sin, an innocent animal was substituted for the sinner, whose sins were confessed over it, and it was slain. Either the flesh or the blood was carried within the sanctuary, and the sinner was forgiven. On the last day of the year, a goat was slain as a sin-offering for all the people; its blood was taken within the sanctuary, and its body was

burned. In every sacrifice for sin, the sin was considered as laid upon the substitute as a whole, and it was entirely consumed.

But these sacrifices did not atone for a single sin: "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Heb. 10:4. The only one who can remove sin is the Lamb of God. John 1:29. He "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9:26. On him was laid "the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6), and he "bare our sins *in his own body* on the tree." 1 Pet. 2:24. After Christ's sacrifice, those typical sacrifices that could not take away sin, were no longer required, as we read: "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me." Heb. 10:5. And so it is literally true that "in his flesh" Christ abolished "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." So it is that we are required to eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, if we would have eternal life. John 6:53-56.

One thought more. Where these ordinances were abolished "in the flesh," it was "to make in himself of twain one new man, *so making peace*." And what alone can make peace? Let inspiration answer: "Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend them." Ps. 119:165. "O that thou hadst hearkened unto my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isa. 48:18. Paul, also, speaking of those who have sinned (*i.e.*, transgressed the law), says, "And the way of peace have they not known." Rom. 3:17. Therefore we see that instead of the ten commandments of God being abolished "in his flesh," they "stand fast forever and ever," and are the bond of union of the "one new man;" they are the basis of the peace which both Jews and Gentiles who believe may have with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

And so both those who are near, and those who were afar off, become together members of "the household of God," not settled on a new basis, but "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Eph. 2:20. E. J. W.

### **"Is It a Whimsey?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

A noted California clergyman says that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is "a whimsey," and a prominent religious journal of the coast indorses the statement. A whimsey is, "a whim; a freak; a capricious notion." Let us see about this. About four thousand years ago a mountain in Arabia "was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as a spoken of a furnace, and all whole mount quaked greatly." Ex. 19:18. "He came with ten thousands of his holy ones; from his right hand went forth a fiery law for them." Deut. 33:2. This law was spoken by God himself "out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice (Deut. 5:22); and was written upon tables of stone. "The tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 32:16. Of this law the psalmist says: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every

*one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.*" Ps. 119:160. And again: "And his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111:7, 8. Christ himself said that "one jot or one tittle" should in no wise pass from the law (Matt. 5:18), and that "it is it easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

And now we find that the commandments which were spoken by God's own terrible voice, amid scenes of the most awful grandeur, and which were written with his own finger in the imperishable stone, to indicate that every letter was to be as enduring as his own eternity, the fourth one reads as follows:-

"Remember the Sabbath day [literally, *the day of the Sabbath*], to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days *the Lord* made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and *rested the seventh day*; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

What do you say, friend? Is the keeping of the seventh day a capricious notion, a whim? If so, do you know of any thing that is reasonable, and which rests on a solid foundation? Read the book of Malachi, and see what the prophet says of those who say, "It is vain to serve God." E. J. W.

**April 22, 1886**

**"The Handwriting of Ordinances" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2:13-17.

The text, like Eph. 2:15, 16, is often misapplied; it cannot, however, be applied to those things contained in the ten commandments, unless the texts which show the enduring nature of that law are either forgotten or ignored. The ten commandments were graven on tables of stone, by the finger of God. See Ex. 32:15, 16; Deut. 4:12, 13. Now the Bible is a consistent book, and has respect to the fitness of things; but it is evident enough that there would be no fitness in speaking of "blotting out" something that was chiseled in the rock. Neither is it an appropriate figure to speak of nailing tables of stone to a cross. Therefore even if the Bible did not assure us that the commandments of God "stand fast forever and ever," we should know that the apostle has in this text no reference whatever to the law of God. The things which God gave through Moses were written in a book, and only in a book; consequently it is perfectly

appropriate to speak of blotting them out. If it be objected that the ten commandments were also written by Moses in a book, we reply that that makes no difference; since the ten commandments were engraved in stone, they could not be blotted out even though all the books in the world were destroyed.

The fact that the thing here spoken of came to an end by the cross of Christ, should cause us to conclude that the same thing is here spoken of that is spoken of in Eph. 2:15, 16 as having been abolished "in his flesh." In this text it is said to have been "contrary;" in the other it is called "enmity;" and Peter called it a burdensome yoke. This, Paul says, was "against us." But the law of God is holy, and just, and good in its requirements. We conclude, therefore, that the "handwriting of ordinances," which was nailed to the cross of Christ, was the Levitical law. The ceremonies were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, and when that sacrifice was actually made on the cross, the types at the same time ceased.

We notice that because these ordinances have been blotted out, therefore we are not to be judged concerning certain things. This indicates that those things were part of the ordinances. Paul enumerates them as meats and drinks, feast days, new moons, and sabbaths; "which are a shadow of things to come." The very enumeration of these things shows us that the law of God is not here under discussion, for none of these things formed a part of it. It is true that the fourth commandment is concerning the Sabbath; but the Sabbath of the fourth commandment dates from creation (compare Ex. 20:8-11; Gen. 2:2, 3), before the fall of man made the coming of Christ a necessity; while the sabbaths mentioned in Colossians were shadows of things in the work of Christ. These sabbaths are given in Levi. 23, in the ceremonial law. They occurred only once a year, and were the first and seventh days of unleavened bread (Lev. 23:5-8); the day of Pentecost (verses 15-21); the first day of the seventh month, being the memorial of blowing of trumpets (verses 24, 25); the tenth day of the seventh month, or the day of atonement (verses 27-32); and the first and eighth days of the feast of tabernacles. Verses 34-36.

All these days, as is seen at once in the case of the passover and the day of atonement, were feast days typifying certain parts of Christ's mediatorial work for sinners. Of them the Lord said: "These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day." Lev. 23:37. Notice: The Lord said to Moses, "These are the feast days. . . which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations." These are some of the things which God gave by the hand of Moses (Neh. 9:14); but the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was proclaimed by God's own voice. This distinction is plainly marked, for after enumerating the ceremonial sabbaths which were to be observed by the people, the Lord added: "Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." Lev. 23:38. This shows beyond all question that the sabbaths which ceased when the "handwriting of ordinances" was blotted out, were the ceremonial sabbaths, and consequently that it was not the moral law, but the ceremonial law, which constituted that "handwriting of ordinances."



In addition to these proofs, it may not be amiss to cite the following statements of learned commentators, to show that the same proofs were conclusive to their minds also. Says Dr. Clark:-

"The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holy days or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity. . . . There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was suspended, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,' is a command of perpetual obligation."

Dr. Barnes also says on the same point:-

"There is no evidence, from this passage, that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe any holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to declare that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number-'the Sabbath,' it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to affirm that that commandment ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not on the moral law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law, no one of the ten commandments, could be spoken of as 'a shadow of things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation."

A few words now concerning the different relations which the people sustained toward the moral law and toward the ceremonial law. The moral law was of primary obligation, and it was binding upon all men alike. The Gentile as well as the Jew was under obligation to worship God, to keep his Sabbath, and to abstain from murder, adultery, and theft. It was the moral law which convicted men of sin (Rom. 7:7), and which showed all the world to be guilty before God. Rom. 3:9.

The ceremonial law, on the other hand, was not of primary obligation. Having reference only to the mediatorial work of Christ, it had no existence before man fell. Moreover it was not of universal obligation. It would have been thought sacrilegious for an uncircumcised person, an idolator, or an atheist, to attempt to engage in the Jewish ceremonies. Yet whenever a Gentile accepted the true religion, he was, through circumcision, admitted on an equal footing with the Jew. Where, then, in

248

individual experience, did the ceremonial law come in? Read what Paul says of Abraham, in this connection:-

"We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a

seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Rom. 4:9-11.

From this we learn, what none will deny, that circumcision and its kindred ceremonies, while they pointed forward to the real work of Christ, did not precede faith in Christ. They were the means by which the people signified that faith which was necessary before they could participate in them. To the man who had never heard of Christ, those ceremonies were meaningless; but to the one who had faith in Christ and his promised work for man, they were a beautiful means of expressing that faith.

The moral law, being of primary and universal obligation, would be impressed by the Holy Spirit on the heart of a heathen. By it he would see himself to be a sinner. Earnestly seeking freedom from condemnation, he would find that the Messiah for whose coming the pious Jews looked with longing hearts, was the only one who could take away his sin. Joyfully seizing upon this hope, he would separate himself from his heathen associates; by circumcision he would signify the putting off of his own sinful habits; and henceforth, so long as he retained his faith in Christ, he would gladly manifest that faith, and with each manifestation thereof quicken it into renewed activity, by celebrating the ordinances which prefigured the promised sacrifice and atonement of Christ.

But when the reality came, the types ceased. Not so the moral law, the ten commandments of God. Being the foundation of God's Government, there was nothing in them of a fleeting or shadowy nature. They still remain of primary, universal, and eternal obligation. They still convict of sin; and he who by them is convinced of his need of One who can save from sin, may still come to a Saviour who has suffered for sin, and may obtain pardon. Through the ordinances of the Lord's house,-baptism and the Lord's Supper,-he may show his faith in a sacrifice already made, until his promised redemption is consummated by the return of his Lord; and then from Sabbath to Sabbath he may worship before the Lord, and see his face; and the law, which stands fast forever and ever, will witness to his loyalty to the Creator. E. J. W.

**May 6, 1886**

**"Under the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

One of the peculiarities of the human mind is that while it readily grasps a pleasing story or a fable, it refuses to accept truth until it is compelled to. So strong is this tendency toward error, that mental philosophers are obliged to take it into account. One of Bacon's rules for avoiding erroneous conclusions is the following: "In general, let the student of nature take this as a rule, that whatever the mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion." The converse would teach that truth will naturally be repelled and rejected. And this is just what the Bible says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." 1 Cor. 2:14. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. "For out

of the heart proceed naturally evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Matt. 15:19. These things are directly opposed to the law of God; and therefore, as a general thing, before men will accept the truth of the Bible concerning the law, every feature must be made perfectly clear. It is not enough that the principles be unfolded, but the harmony of all the texts bearing on the subject must be shown.

Accordingly we find it necessary to devote special explanation to Rom. 6:14 and kindred texts. That text reads thus: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." So strong is the natural tendency to reject truth, that in spite of the overwhelming evidence already produced to show that the law is to all eternity binding upon every created rational being, many people will seize upon the expression, "Ye are not under the law," and claim that there are some, at least, who have no duty to keep it. The readiness with which this view is seized and dwelt upon, should alone arouse suspicion as to its justice. But that there may be no chance for an honest doubt, we propose to examine not only this text, but every text which contains the phrase, "under the law."

In Rom. 6:12 the apostle gives this exhortation: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." We have already learned that "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Therefore when the apostle tells us not to sin, he virtually tells us not to transgress the law. But this is an evidence that the law is binding upon us; and therefore we are assured that the statement in verse 14 cannot mean that the law has no claims upon us.

Again: The apostle continues: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Rom. 6:13. This is but a repetition of the argument presented in the preceding paragraph. For he says we must not sin, that is, must not transgress the law; and again, that we must yield our members as instruments of righteousness. Now righteousness is obedience to the commandments of God. See Deut. 6:25; Ps. 119:172; Isa. 51:6, 7, which have already been explained. So the 13th verse is an exhortation not to transgress the law, and another exhortation to keep the law, both of which amount to the same thing, and show that the apostle recognizes the fact that the law is in existence and is to be obeyed.

Then comes the conclusion: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Verse 14. Notice a few facts and necessary conclusions. 1. Since "sin is the transgression of the law," the absence of sin must indicate obedience to the law. Therefore when the apostle says to any persons, "Sin shall not have dominion over you," it is an evidence that they are keeping the law. 2. Those over whom sin has no dominion are those who are not under the law. "Sin shall not have dominion over you; *for ye are not under the law.*" The fact that sin has no dominion over them is *an evidence* that they are "not under the law." Therefore, to be "*not* under the law" is equivalent to being free from the dominion of sin. 2. But we have already seen that to be free from

the dominion of sin represents a state of obedience to the law; therefore, to say that one is "*not* under the law" is equivalent to saying that he is keeping the law.

These propositions will stand the test of any criticism, and they demonstrate that the apostle's argument is based on the fact that the law is in full force, binding upon all, and that there are but two classes of people; those who keep the law, and those who transgress it. Those who keep the law are *not* under it, and of course those who transgress it *are* under it. In other words, those over whom sin has dominion are under the law; and those over whom sin has not dominion, are *not* under the law.

In harmony with this, the apostle continued "When then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Verse 15. That is, Shall we transgress the law because we are not under it? By no means. Keep from under it, by refraining from sin.

Thus far we have not shown the full force of the terms "under the law," and "not under the law," but have simply shown that they do not indicate that any persons are outside the jurisdiction of the law; that those "under the law" are violating it, while those "*not* under the law" are obeying it. The next two verses give us a clew to the real force of the terms. They read thus: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." Verses 16, 17. "Whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Sin, the transgression of the law, brings death. "For the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. Every one who sins is under condemnation of death; and since, as has been abundantly proved, those who sin are "under the law," it follows that "under the law" is an expression meaning, Under the condemnation of the law. Now see how aptly this meaning fits verses 14 and 15. Ye are not under the condemnation of the law, but under the grace of God. Shall we sin, then, because we are not by the law condemned to death? No, indeed; for that would at once bring us again under condemnation. Let us keep from sinning, and then we shall be no more condemned. How are we freed from the condemnation which the law brings? "Being justified freely by his [God's] grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the commission of sins that are past." Rom. 3:24, 25. Having accepted Christ, his righteousness is imputed to us, which makes us clear before the law, and we are then subjects of the grace, or forbearance of God.

Take an illustration from human affairs. Here is a man that has been convicted of murder. The law of the State forbids murder, and therefore it condemns the man. The murderer is then "under the law," because the hand of the law is upon him.

Nothing that he can do will avert the threatened punishment. He may be sorry for his crime, and may resolve never to break the law again; but that will make no difference. He has already broken the law, and must suffer the penalty. But now, through the intercession of powerful friends, and because of his repentance and

his promises of future obedience, the Governor is induced to pardon the criminal. Now he is no longer under the law,-a condemned prisoner,-but a free man. He is free by virtue of the grace or favor of the Governor. Therefore he may be said to be "under grace." The question now arises. Is he at liberty to commit murder, because he is not under the law, but under the grace of the Governor? Everybody says, No, indeed. He is now under even greater obligation to keep the law than he was before, because he is the subject of the Governor's special favor; and that favor would not have been extended to him, but for his promise to henceforth keep the law.

And as sin brought condemnation and death, so, when we are cleared from sin and condemnation, continued obedience, or righteousness, brings eternal life through Christ. This is indicated by the expression, servants "of obedience unto righteousness" (Rom. 6:16) and, "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23.

In closing this preliminary study of the term, "under the law," the reader can profitably compare with what he has read, the following verses:-

"Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5:18-21. E. J. W.

**May 13, 1886**

**"Logical Antinomianism" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

A writer for a professedly Adventist paper in the East, in an article against Sabbath-keeping, says of the ten commandments: "Paul tells those who keep this law that they are 'fallen from grace,' which is equivalent to saying that there is no salvation in keeping the ten commandments." We never yet came across any such statement in any of Paul's writings, but we know that there are many people who, in their hatred of the Sabbath, teach just such stuff. There are people organized into churches, whose chief article of faith is that the law of God is abolished, although it is seldom that one is found bold enough to declare that all who keep the law of God are worthy of death. But this is the inevitable conclusion; for if God's law has been abolished, then it must now be sin to follow the injunctions of that law.

Let us suppose that we have the records of a church whose foundation (?) is the belief that God's law has been abolished, in which discipline is rigidly enforced. We should read something like this: "Brother A was charged with a crime of not having taken the name of God in vain for three months. A committee was appointed to labor with him, but he acknowledged the truth of the charge,

and stubbornly refused to change his course, stating that he was determined always to hold the name of his Creator in reverence. Accordingly he was disfellowshipped as one irrevocably fallen from grace.

"Deacon B had in early life been well known as a horse jockey. After he joined the church his natural ability was exerted with tenfold diligence for the edifying of the body of Christ. So skillful had he become by long practice in chicanery, that no man could by any means get even with him in a bargain. He could cheat and lie with unblushing countenance. In short, he was an ornament to the church. But in an evil day he fell in with a traveling preacher, who persuaded him that the law of God is binding upon Christians, and from that time he became a different man. He began at once to restore to those whom he had defrauded. This caused suspicion in the minds of his brethren. Finally suspicion became certainty, when Brother X overheard him tell the truth in regard to an old horse which he was selling to one he was no judge of animals. By this unwarranted act, he actually lost the opportunity of cheating the poor man out of fifty dollars! In another instance, he could easily have extorted one hundred per cent interest from a brother who was forced to borrow a sum of money for three months. Instead of doing so, however, he loaned the brother the money without interest. Patient labor was bestowed upon him, but to all entreaties he turned a deaf ear, perversely repeating the words, Thou shalt not steal, and saying that henceforth he should abide by that rule. He even expressed extreme sorrow that he ever violated it. He was decided to be an incorrigible observer of the old ten-commandment law, and was accordingly disfellowshipped by unanimous vote.

"Mr. C had gained a wide notoriety as a 'bruiser' and cut-throat. He had 'killed his man' many times, and was so expert with the pistol that his bullet never failed to reach the heart. It was his delight to lie in wait for unsuspecting and inoffensive persons, and kill them without any warning. He was so adroit with all, that the officers of the law had never been able to detect him in these acts. He had never read the Bible, nor heard of the ten commandments. He was finally arrested for a petty crime, and while lying in jail he was visited by a clergyman, who read the Bible to him. For the first time in his life he heard the obsolete commandment, Thou shalt not kill. When he learned that this was spoken by the great Jehovah, amid the thunders of Sinai, he was struck with terror and remorse, with trembling lips he confessed all his past course, and was assured by the minister that God would pardon. Accordingly, as soon as he was released, he applied for admission to the church; but he was told that he had now fallen from grace,-that the ten commandments are abolished; that no man who professed a desire to keep them could become a member of the church of Belial. After a short talk with the committee, he seemed to see the matter clearly. Drawing a revolver, he shot the chairman through the heart, and with a club he knocked down two of the deacons, all the time using the most violent oaths. Upon this clear evidence of his fitness for church membership, he was at once received into full fellowship.

"Brother D was turned out of the church in disgrace. Cause: A rigid observance of the old seventh commandment. At the same time, Mr. F and Mrs. G. on profession of having lived in open adultery for a year, were admitted into the church."

And thus we might read on for pages. Does it seem irreverent to write in such a strain? It is only what would actually be done if no-law people always lived up to their profession. People have actually been turned out of churches simply because they kept the fourth commandment; and if people are disfellowshipped for keeping the fourth commandment, why not for keeping any other? And when men say that it is sin to keep the ten commandments, who shall say what abominable things they do not do in secret? or that they would not do them openly if fear of their fellow-men did not restrain them?

Why is it that professed Christians speak with such contempt of the law of God? Because they hate the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. Primarily, however, it is because of the hatred of all law and restraint. No doubt they would repudiate the picture which we have portrayed. They would profess abhorrence of murder, adultery, and theft. But if it is a sin to keep the fourth commandment, it is also wrong to keep the sixth, seventh and eight. If they teach that the law of God is not in force, that those who keep it have fallen from grace, they necessarily teach that it is no sin to swear, lie, steal, kill, and commit adultery! Nay, more, they actually teach people that they must do those things in order to secure the favor of God! A more horrible doctrine could not be imagined. To teachers of such doctrines we commend a careful consideration of the following texts, the application of which is obvious:-

"Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and, stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?" Jer. 7:8-10.

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that the darkness to light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" "Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossoms shall go up as dust; because they have cast away law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel." Isa. 5:20, 24. W.

### **"Under the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The next text which we shall notice is Gal. 5:18. "But if ye led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Antinomians very rarely quote this verse, doubtless because it is so very evident from the connection that the law is recognized as being in active existence. Let us give it our attention for a little while, that we may see what beautiful harmony there is in the Bible on the subject of the law.

Since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, it follows that those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law. Again, the preceding verses read as follows: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." Gal. 5:16, 17. These verses state in the plainest terms that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to each other;

that walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit are directly opposite conditions. Then since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, and those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law, it follows that those who are under the law are those who are fulfilling the lusts of the flesh.

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21.

The fruit of the Spirit is, of course, the very opposite, being "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Verses 22, 23. Referring to these fruits of the Spirit, the apostle says: "Against such there is no law." Verse 23. That is, those who are led by the Spirit, and who yield its fruits, are in harmony with the law; while the law is against the works of the flesh; and those who do the works of the flesh are condemned by the law, or are under it. Here we arrive at the same conclusion as in regard to Rom. 6:14, that "under the law" simply represents a state of antagonism to, and violation of, the law; and of course no one could be in such a state if the law were not in full force. Now since all sinners are by the law condemned to death (Rom. 3:19; 6:23), it follows again that "under the law" means condemned by the law-under the sentence of death.

Turning backward, we find the expression "under the law" used twice in Gal. 4:4, 5: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

In the third verse the apostle says that when we were children we were "in bondage under the elements of the world." But (that marks a change) God sent forth his Son to redeem "them that were under the law." We would naturally expect the redemption to be from that under which we were in bondage, which was "the elements of the world." In the fifth verse the redemption is said to be from "under the law," thus showing that "in bondage under the elements of the world," and "under the law," are equivalent terms.

Let us trace further this matter of bondage. In verse 9 Paul says to the Galatians: "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" Here it is implied that they were in danger of returning to a condition in which they had previously been. And what condition was that?

279

Read verse 8: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." That is, they were heathen. So being in bondage to the elements of the world,-the "weak and beggarly elements,"-is equivalent to being in a state of heathenism. Those who do not know God are termed heathen. But no man can know God without being a follower of Christ, as the Saviour said, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6. In the strict Bible sense, therefore, all who are not in Christ are heathen. And therefore although Paul



addressed his epistle to those who had been idolaters in the commonly accepted sense, the argument is of universal application.

We conclude, then, that the "elements of the world" are simply the various forms of sin. This is still further shown by Eph. 2:1-3: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation [manner of life] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Nothing but sin is meant by "the course of this world," the "weak and beggarly elements," and "the elements of the world." And to be "in bondage under the elements of the world," is to be "under the law," in a state of condemnation.

Christ came in the fullness of time (see Mark 1:14, 15; Dan. 9:25) "to redeem them that were under the law." But in order to do this, he himself had to be "made under the law." This is in harmony with Heb. 2:17, which says: "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." The people whom Christ came to redeem were "under the law," therefore he was made like them, "under the law."

Now if there is any lingering doubt as to the meaning of "under the law," compare with the above and Gal. 4:4, 5, Paul's words in 2 Cor. 5:21: "For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Christ was sinless; he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Peter 2:22); the Law of God was in his heart (Ps. 40:8), and his whole life was an exemplification of the law. Yet knowing no sin, he was made to be sin for us. As the prophet said: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:5, 6. We were in bondage to sin, "under the law," and he took upon himself the same bonds, and was made under the law. Moreover, since those "under the law" are condemned, under sentence of death, he, "being found in fashion as a man," having voluntarily placed himself in the same condemnation, "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. 2:7, 8.

And so the innocent suffered for the guilty. Man had been overcome by sin, and by it brought into bondage (2 Peter 2:19), and in order to redeem him from this corruption, and the death that must necessarily follow (James 1:15), the spotless Son of God took upon himself the form of a servant of sin, and consented to be covered with the same degradation into which man had plunged himself. What for? "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:21. In order that we might be made without "spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing" (Eph. 5:27),-perfectly conformable to the holy Law of God; and that thus being enabled, in Christ, to keep the commandments, we might through him have eternal life. Matt. 19:17.

Before leaving this text in Galatians, there is one more point which we wish to place before the reader. We read that Christ was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." It was necessary for Christ to assume the condition of those whom he would redeem. This being the case, we may know that Christ redeems none who occupy a position different from that which he took. This is plainly stated in the Scripture. "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren," etc. Heb. 2:16, 17. Those whom he was made like, he can redeem; others he cannot. We read also that Christ "died for all." 2 Cor. 5:15. What, then, is the necessary conclusion? Just this: Since he was made "under the law," and was made like those whom he came to redeem, and he came to redeem all men, then all men were "under the law." Further, the text indicates that he came for the sole purpose of redeeming them that were under the law; their being under the law made necessary some act for their redemption. If they had not been under the law, they would have needed no redemption. Now when we recall Paul's words to the effect that Christ "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14), the conclusion is unavoidable that "under the law" indicates the state of sin which characterizes every human being, and from which none can be rescued but by Christ.

But notice the dilemma in which they place themselves, who claim that Gentiles are not "under the law," and that the law was only for the Jews. If that position were true, it would necessarily follow that since Christ came to redeem only those who are under the law, he came to redeem only the Jews! For certain it is, that no person who is not in the position which Christ took upon himself when he came to redeem man, can have any part in that redemption. We think that none, when they consider this point, will place themselves outside of God's scheme of redemption, by refusing to admit that they are by nature and by practice "under the law."

Let us rather acknowledge our guilt, that it may be washed away in the blood of the Lamb. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Prov. 28:13. W.

### **"Cleansing of the Sanctuary" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-"Was the cleansing of the sanctuary finished at the end of the twenty-three hundred days? or is the work of cleansing still going on? If it is still going on, when will it be finished? "W. L. K."

ANSWER.-It is very evident from the reading of Dan.8:13, 14 that the end of the twenty-three hundred (years), the cleansing of the sanctuary was begun, and not then finished. The angels words, "Unto two thousand and three hundred years; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," were in reply to the following questions: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the post to be trodden underfoot?" The reply showed that the sanctuary and the host were to be *trodden*

*underfoot* "unto two thousand and three hundred days;" consequently the cleansing *began* at the close of the days.

The cleansing of the sanctuary is the blotting out of the sins of God's people. When that work is finished, the names of those who have not overcome will have been blotted out of the Lamb's book of life, and that shows that probation ends when the work of cleansing the sanctuary is completed. But the gospel still reaches the hearts of sinners; therefore probation is not ended, and the work of cleansing the sanctuary is still going on. When this work will be finished, no man can tell. We cannot know that it will be soon. To the close of this work the following words apply: "Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not."

**May 20, 1886**

**"Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

We had the pleasure one day last week of listening to a "Bible-reading" on the Sabbath question, given by Dr. L. Munhall, the evangelist who has been holding revival services in San Francisco for several weeks. It was advertised to be a Bible-reading, but was, in fact, a short sermon, with a few more Scripture quotations that are usually heard in the popular modern sermon. The "reading," however, was more pointed and interesting than any other Sabbath study we ever heard from a first-day preacher.

The Doctor began by saying that the law of the Sabbath was given long before Mount Sinai. He quoted Ex 16:25, 26: "And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." "These words," said the speaker, "indicate that the Sabbath was not first given at Sinai, but was kept before. The law of the Sabbath is as old as creation. The Fourth Commandment found in Ex. 20:8-11, connects itself with what was said at the first, recorded in Gen. 2:1-3, and makes good the law that obtained among God's people even before the thunders of Sinai. The Sabbath was the seventh day of creation."

In the above paragraph we have given the exact expressions of Mr. Munhall. No one could have made a better statement on the case, for it is the exact truth. The speaker then read the following texts:

"Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing [plowing] time and in harvest thou shalt rest." Ex. 34:21.

"Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death." Ex. 35:2.

"These," said Mr. Munhall, "are explicit statements with reference to the Sabbath law. We are to cease on the Sabbath from our usual daily employments. The Sabbath is to be a day of rest. It is not to be spent in idleness, sleeping half the forenoon, eating a big dinner, and taking a buggy ride in the afternoon. Rest

don't mean idleness. But the Sabbath is to be spent in work for God, because it was hallowed by him."

The Doctor then read Neh. 10:31; 13:15, as another point on the way the Sabbaths should be kept. They read thus: "And if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath, or on the holy day; and that we would leave the seventh year, and the exaction of every debt." "In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals."

On these texts the following strange comments were made: "This touches a point that needs to be noted by Christian people. Some of you will send your children to market on Sunday morning for meat. Or you will step into a cigar store, or stop and get a glass of soda on your way home from church on Sunday. But you will say, 'Suppose I should forget to get my beefsteak on Saturday night; but not be necessary to get it on Sunday morning?' You have no business to forget. If you do forget, you must go without. Every desire of a heart and stomach is not to be gratified at the expense of God's law. If your grain will spoil if you don't work on Sunday, then lose your grain. If you are a produce dealer, and your provisions will spoil if you don't work on Sunday, then use your provisions. Obey God."

To the last sentence in the above paragraph we can hardly subscribe. So we could to all the rest, if the speaker had used the word Sabbath instead of Sunday. He had previously said that the seventh day was set apart at creation, and that was kept by the people of God before the commandment for its observance was given upon Mount Sinai. Of course the seventh day must have been kept by God's people after the specific law for its observance had been given amid the thunders of Sinai; and this is allowed by Mr. Munhall, for later in his discourse he said that no day but the seventh day is the Sabbath. How then can he learn from Ex. 34:21; 35:2; Neh. 10:31, and 13:15 how Sunday should be kept? We agreed that the things of which he speaks ought not to be done on the *Sabbath*, because God has forbidden them. "Obey God," says Mr. Munhall. So we say; and therefore we refrain from labor on the seventh day of the week, as God as commanded. But how can a man obey God by doing something which God never commanded? Impossible. Mr. Munhall exhorts the people to obey God by refraining from labor on Sunday, and in the same discourse tells them that "there is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for the observe of Sunday," and that "the Sabbath has never been transferred from the seventh to the first day."

But a still more wonderful exposition followed. The Doctor said: "I may be called a Puritan, because of my rigid observance of Sunday. Very well, I am willing. There are specific reasons in God's word why this they should be kept. Ex. 20: He says: 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' God has hallowed this day. Because he has hallowed it, we must keep it holy."

God has hallowed the seventh day, and therefore we must keep the first day holy! If the Doctor had designed to give us an example of a *non sequitur*, he could not have done better. Yet he was in sober earnest. God commands us to do a certain thing, and we obey him by doing something directly contrary! People never reason that way in regard to the laws of men.

Eze. 20:12: "Moreover all so I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they may know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." On this text, the Doctor made the following true statement: "Unless we observe the Sabbath as God has directed, we shall forget God. There was never a nation that ignored the Sabbath that did not forget God. France is an example, and the same thing is coming upon this country. [The speaker then quoted Ex. 31:15, 16; Neh. 13:18; and Eze. 20:20, 21.] These also have direct reference to God's ancient people, and to the troubles that came upon them because they violated the Sabbath. Their land was filled with mourning. The Sabbath was made for men (Mark 2:27), for the welfare of society. The violation of the Sabbath always brings trouble. Look at the riots in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. In the cities the Sabbath is almost universally trampled under foot. There will also be riot and bloodshed in San Francisco if the Sabbath is not observed better. Show me a city where there is riot and bloodshed, and I will show you one where the Sabbath is disregarded."

It is true if that the violation of the Sabbath is always accompanied by forgetfulness of God. If all people kept the Sabbath, there would be no heathenism, and prosperity might be expected. But Sabbath-keeping is not a national, but an individual affair. That is, a nation, in its national capacity, cannot keep the Sabbath. A nation can be said to keep the Sabbath only when all the individuals composing a nation are Sabbath keepers. And when any considerable number of people in a nation do not observe the Sabbath, any number of legislative acts in favor of Sabbath-keeping will not make that nation a Sabbath-keeping nation. The same is true with regard to any other which God requires.

But it is the keeping of *the Sabbath* that makes people know the true God. Now Doctor Munhall himself declares that the seventh day, and that only, is the Sabbath. It alone was rested upon by the Creator; the seventh day alone was blessed by him; and the seventh day, and no other, was by the Creator appointed to be kept holy. No other day could be *kept* holy, because no other day was ever *made* holy. How then is it possible for Dr. Munhall, while acknowledging all these facts, to say that the disregard of Sunday is responsible for the prevailing godlessness? Further: Since the keeping of the Sabbath is the only evidence given to indicate that people know God, must we not conclude that the keeping of the day which is not the Sabbath, and the consequent profanation of the only day which God ever appointed as the Sabbath, is evidence that people have largely forgotten God? It cannot be otherwise. And when a nation goes so far as to enjoin the observance of Sunday, then we may know that God is practically ignored. And still further: When we find legislators and ministers of the gospel combining to enact laws devoting the Sabbath of God's appointment to pleasure, in order that men may rest on Sunday, concerning which God has said nothing except to command us to work upon it, we have overwhelming evidence that

men are not only ignoring God, but that they have so forgotten him that they can heap insult upon him without the slightest fear of his power. "For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." Most true it is that terrible judgments are coming upon this land because of the insults which the people have offered to the one great Lawgiver; and we cannot help trembling for the fate of men who use their influence as ministers of the gospel to induce people to disregard the true Sabbath of the Lord for a day which they acknowledge has no "Thus saith the Lord" in its behalf. W.  
(Concluded next week.)

### **"The Bible vs. Mythology" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among Christian people of modern times nothing is more common than to speak of death as a river. It is spoken of as "the dark river," "death's river," "the dismal flood," etc. people have died are said to have "crossed the river," or "passed over to the other side." Of course these terms can be used only by those who believe the paradox at death men still continue to live. They believe that death is but the entrance to life, and therefore they sing, "Death is the gate to endless joy," and, "'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms." In harmony with this idea, also, they sing, "Shall we meet beyond the river?" meaning, shall we meet after death?

Now every Bible student ought to know that these expressions are entirely unscriptural. Death is not the gate to endless joy, but an enemy. See 1 Cor. 15:26. It is not the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms, but something that is under the control of the devil. Heb. 2:14. Christ gained the power and the right to call his children to his arms

295

only by gaining the victory over death. Heb. 2:14, 15; Rev. 3:18. Death is not a river across which the righteous are ferried to the realms of bliss, but a voracious monster by which they are held until the last trump releases them from its cruel grasp. 1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:51, 52; Hosea 13:14. And then this last enemy shall be destroyed. Nowhere in the Bible is death likened to a river.

Whence then did these expressions arise. Some, no doubt, think that the figure comes from the Israelites crossing the river Jordan into the land of Canaan. But that is a mistaken idea. 1. Although the entering of the Israelites into Canaan was a type of the entering of the saints into their final inheritance, we have seen that death is not the gate to that inheritance, and that some will receive their inheritance without seeing death. See 1 Cor. 15:51, 52; 1 Thess. 4:15-17. Therefore the river Jordan cannot be a type of death. 2. Even if it were a type of death, the popular idea would not hold, because the river was cut off, so that the Israelites went over dry shod. 3. There was no change whatever of the condition of the Israelites after they crossed the river. The entire absence of any Bible comparison of death to a river, and the fact that death is emphatically stated to be an enemy, and that it is not in any sense the boundary of our eternal inheritance, show that the popular expressions for death have no Bible foundation.

If we study heathen mythology, however we find the origin of these terms. Among the heathen, the river Styx encircled the abode of the dead. In order to get to this abode, the departed had to be towed over the Styx in a ferry managed by Charon who, demanded an *obolus*, about three cents, as his fee. To provide the soul with the necessary means to defray his expenses to *hades*, an *obolus* was always placed in the mouth of the dead person. From this heathen custom arose the modern practice of calling death a river, and of speaking of the dead as having passed to the other shore, or as having been watted over the river.

Now we have no objection to this. Indeed, we think that it is eminently fitting that those who hold to the heathen doctrine of natural immortality should use heathen terms in speaking of it. Nevertheless, the users of such language sometimes get mixed in their metaphors, as is evident from the following extract from a communication written by Dr. William Dean to the *Watchman*:-

"Yesterday I stood on the banks of the dark river to help a young man of twenty-nine years, a New York broker, into the ferry-boat to take him over to the other side. As he was moving out, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, exclaiming, in her anguish, '-, don't go! I cannot let you go. If you must go, take me with you.' This departure reminded me that I was sent to cross the same river, and gave rise to a train a serious reflections."

The mixture of the literal and the figurative in the above paragraph is amusing. For instance, are we to suppose that the Doctor was himself at the point of death? That is what is usually meant when a person is said to be standing on the brink of "the dark river."

Again, when the Doctor says that he was helping the young man into the ferry-boat which was to bear him over the river, are we to understand that he was trying to hasten the young man's death? We have never heard it claimed by even the most enthusiastic believer in the doctrine that "death is the gate to endless joy," that it is allowable to kill a good man in order to get into heaven sooner. The Doctor's conduct ought to be inquired into.

But the next sentence is more wonderful still: "As he was moving off, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, explaining in her anguish, '-- don't go! I cannot let you go!'" How was this? Was the young man about to cross the river bodily? We never supposed that Charon's craft was staunch enough to carry anything more substantial than an immaterial spirit. The language would indicate that his body was about to make the attempt to accompany the spirit to the "other side." Or are we to infer that the young wife caught her husband's immaterial spirit in her arms? If so, it was a remarkable case of materialization. We hope that in a future letter the Doctor will give us more of the details of this affair. He ought at least to tell us plainly whether he killed the young man or not.

The only moral which we shall draw from this narrative is that professed Christians ought not to mix their faith with heathen doctrines and mythological expressions. Leave such things to the unenlightened heathen, but let Christians follow the doctrines and use the language of the Bible. W.

## **"The Church and Boycotting" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Fresno *Democrat* thinks that Judge Sawyer's decision that boycotting is conspiracy, is not just, and says:-

"A peaceful boycott against them [the Chinese] and those who employ them was commanded by the Sacramento Convention. This is clearly lawful, and even were it not, no number of statutes could prevent it. If this style of boycott is declared against the laws, where will the matter end? Church organizations may be prosecuted for declaring war against theaters, dancing-halls, and the like, and temperance organizations may be held to answer for putting the whiskey-shops under their ban. Such strange construction of law would lead us into foolish and dangerous straits."

The above simply shows how terribly muddled political journals are apt to become when they attempt to enunciate principles of religion. Boycotting the Chinaman, who has as much right to protection from this country as any other person has, and boycotting those who refuse to boycott the Chinese, is no more to be compared with the opposition of the church to theaters, saloons, etc. than Herr Most's incendiary speeches are to the preaching of the gospel.

Any man, or any number of men, may decline to deal with any other person or number of persons. No one has a right to compel them to trade where they do wish to; but by the same rule they have no right to try to compel others not to trade where they may wish to. This last is just what boycotting is; and any candid man must admit that it is not straining a point in the least to say that for a number of men to combine to rule on another's business is conspiracy.

The opposition of the church and the temperance society to theaters, saloons, etc., has no such characteristics. Christians are by their profession pledged to abstain from all evil; and knowing that theaters and saloons are only evil in their nature, they shun such places. They also endeavor to induce others to shun evil places and associates. But no Christian boycotts either the saloon-keeper or his victim. One who follows the teachings of Christ will be as ready to assist a saloon-keeper if he is in distress as he will one who is in a respectable business; and while rendering this assistance, the Christian will try to turn a man from the evil of his ways. Much less does the Christian refuse all intercourse with the man who may patronize the theater or the saloon. His very profession requires him to "do good unto all men;" and the Master has set the example of kindness to the erring. Therefore when a man compares the work of the church with that of boycotting leagues, he shows that he has no knowledge whatever of Christianity.

We have said that no Christian boycotts either the saloon or the theater. Much less will a Christian boycott one who is pursuing a legitimate business, and is doing no injury to anyone. But we are compelled to admit that many people who profess Christianity, and whose names are on some church roll, do advocate the boycott. We have heard the boycott advocated from the pulpit, as the Chinese were not the ones against whom the boycott was to be directed. Neither were the saloons and theaters to be boycotted, unless they kept open on Sunday. In fact, it was urged that all who did any business on Sunday, no matter how legitimate



that business might be, should be boycotted. The lack of Christianity in this proposed boycott was manifest from the fact that the foulest dives were not to be molested if they kept closed on Sunday.

We believe that ere long a large part of the professed church of Christ will go into this business of boycotting. The beloved apostle, looking in prophetic vision to near the end, saw a decree go forth "that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Rev. 13:17. But of one thing we are certain, that no Christian will ever engage in any such business. When the keeping of Sunday is made a test of citizenship, as is desired by the Religious Amendment Party, then hypocrisy will be at a premium; then the church and the world will be identical; and then boycotting and other kindred abominations may be carried on under the name of religion. W.

**May 27, 1886**

**"Under the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The text which next claims our consideration is Gal. 4:21: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" A complete understanding of the force of this verse can be had only by (1) a knowledge of the peculiar danger of the Galatians, which made the writing of this epistle necessary; (2) an examination of the remainder of the chapter, which involves (3) a brief consideration of the two covenants. As this is all in the line of our study of the law, and will be very useful in our further investigation, we will take time right here to examine these points.

In the first chapter of Galatians, Paul speaks of his call to the ministry, and his first connection with the church. His call, he says, was not from men, but from God. It was three years after his conversion before he went to Jerusalem, and then the only apostles whom he saw were Peter and James. Therefore he did not receive his knowledge of the gospel from men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

In the second chapter, Paul states the occasion of his second visit to Jerusalem, which was fourteen years after his first visit. The occasion of this visit was the council which was held in Jerusalem, and which forms the subject of the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Certain men had come down from Judea to Antioch, where Paul was laboring, and had taught the brethren, saying, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Acts 15:1. After much discussion in regard to the matter, the brethren determined that Paul and Barnabas, and a few others, should go up to Jerusalem to lay the matter before the apostles and elders. That the question which came before this council was the one which was troubling the Galatian brethren, in regard to which they were in danger, appears from the second chapter of Galatians. Paul mentions the visit, but assures the brethren that those who "seemed to be somewhat in conference," that is, the leading men in the council, "added nothing" to him. The

gospel had been made known to him by direct revelation from Jesus Christ, and so he knew the whole truth of the matter before the council convened. Further, he states that after the council, he had a controversy on the very same subject which was there discussed, with Peter, who was acting contrary to the decision of the council. These things show that the danger which threatened the Galatian brethren, and which called out Paul's epistle to them, was the same thing into which the men from Judea tried to lead all of Paul's converts. For the Jews constantly followed Paul around, trying to overthrow his work.

Let us now examine the teaching of these men from Judea. "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Of course all the kindred ordinances of the ceremonial law were included with circumcision. Now why did they want to force circumcision upon these converts from among the Gentiles? The reason given was, in order that they might be saved. Circumcision, they taught, was the one thing indispensable, if they would secure salvation. But the only thing which stands in the way of salvation of all men is sin; and therefore since circumcision was put forth as the condition of salvation, we must conclude that it was urged as a means of justification. But this was directly contrary to the gospel which Paul preached, namely, that justification comes only through Christ. This was indeed "another gospel," which was no gospel at all.

That the seditious ones urged circumcision upon the Gentiles as the means of justification, is still further shown by the words of Peter, who said: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Acts 15:7-9. Peter's argument was that God purposed to treat the Gentiles who believed just as he did the believing Jews, giving both the Holy Ghost, and purifying them by faith, and not by circumcision or by any other work which they could do.

Notice particularly the effect which the teaching of these men from Judea must necessarily have had on those who accepted it. It led those who accepted it to reject Christ as the means of justification from sin. If they were justified by circumcision, of course they would have no need of Christ. And this was why that doctrine was taught. These men from Judea did not accept Christ; their sole opposition to the preaching of Paul and the other apostles was that Christ was set forth as the only means of justification and future resurrection. See Acts 4:1, 2. These men from Judea are sometimes styled "Judaizing Christians," but they were not Christians at all. Their sole work was to oppose the gospel of Christ. And in their hatred of it and of Christ, they went about among the churches, trying to induce the new converts to seek pardon and salvation by circumcision, instead of through Christ. These were the men who were "zealously affecting" the Galatians, with the sole purpose of "excluding" them from the faith of Christ." Gal. 4:17.

We have before shown that all who are in sin are "under the law,"-condemned. Then since besides Christ "there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12),-since men are not

justified by any works of their own, but solely by faith in Christ,-it follows that all who accepted the teaching of the men from Judea, and were circumcised for justification, were still "under the law." No amount of work, whether it was circumcision or something else, could clear them from the guilt of past sins. Moreover, those who had accepted Christ, and had been forgiven, if they listened to this teaching fell from grace; for to be circumcised with a view to justification thereby, was simply rejecting Christ and repudiating their former profession. And this is just what Paul told them: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Gal. 5:2. Paul did not mean that there was anything wicked in circumcision of itself, for he himself circumcised Timothy, and that, too, after the council at Jerusalem. Acts 16:1-3. Timothy's father was a Gentile, although his mother was a Jewess, and if Timothy had not been circumcised, he would not have been allowed to labor with Paul among the Jews in their synagogues. Therefore as a matter of expediency, Paul circumcised Timothy, thus showing that whether a man was circumcised or not, was regarded by him as a matter of no vital importance. See 1 Cor. 7:19. But when men submitted to circumcision as a means of gaining salvation, that moment they rejected Christ, man's only hope, and therefore Christ profited them nothing, Christ cannot help those who reject him. So we see that it was a grave heresy which was being preached to these young Christians.

Note again: The heathen religion was a religion of forms and ceremonies. Some of these ceremonies were of the most licentious nature. Now if the converts from among the heathen could only be induced to rest their hope of salvation on Jewish ceremonies, it would be but a step for them to sink back into their old heathen customs. This was actually the effect that it had on the Galatians; for Paul said to them: "Ye observe days, and months, and times [Deut. 18:8-10 tells how the Lord regarded this], and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Gal. 4:10, 11. Their being circumcised did not lead simply to the substitution of Judaism for Christianity, but to a relapse into heathenism. And thus we see that the Galatians were really going back "under the law," or, as stated in verse 9, they were turning to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, to which they were desirous of again being in bondage.

Some may wonder at the expression which Paul uses in verse 21, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law," etc. Why should Paul charge them with desiring death? For if "under the law" means under sentence of death, he did virtually charge them with desiring death. A parallel passage is found in Prov. 8:36: "They that hate me love death." Now while no one would love death itself, so as to deliberately choose it, people do love sin, not realizing that the end thereof is death. So with those to whom Paul speaks. They desired a certain thing which would bring them under the condemnation of the law; and therefore they could be said to desire to be under the law, although they did not realize that such would be the consequences of their choice. W.

*(To be continued.)*

## **"Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

The Doctor seemed nettled because some reporters and doctors had poohed at a statement by him that man is built on a seventh-day plan, so that the Sabbath rest is a demand of his physical nature. We are willing to accept that statement. "The Sabbath was made for man," and we believe that the Lord made no mistake in the amount of time which he allotted to men for rest. But this is not given in the Bible as a reason for Sabbath observance. The Sabbath was given to man that he might remember God; and the fact that God commanded its observance is sufficient reason why we should keep it. Notice this fact: Nobody ever heard a Sabbath-keeper urge man's physical necessity as a reason for Sabbath observance; with a Sabbath-keeper, the commandment of God suffices. But the fact that man needs a rest one day in seven is the most prominent reason given for Sunday observance by the advocates of that day. It is the only thing they can urge; but as a Sunday argument it is useless from the fact that God has said nothing about it, and it is applicable to any other day of the week.

In behalf of Sunday as the Sabbath, the Doctor simply read Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; and Rev. 1:10, without comment. Since the last mentioned text makes no mention of the first day of the week, and since concerning the other two the Doctor said, "The fact that the disciples met to break bread on the first day of the week is no authority for the sanctification of Sunday," we may safely say that he does not believe that the Bible anywhere authorizes Sunday observance. In fact, we know that he does not, for he said: "The resurrection of Jesus Christ had no more to do with sanctification of Sunday than did his crucifixion on Friday. Some people think that it did, but there is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for it." Again he said: "There is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for keeping the first day of the week, and there is no use and saying there is when there isn't. The seventh day was hallowed by the Lord, and there has been no transfer."

We would that Dr. Munhall's hearers

311

remember these words, and then follow his exhortation to "obey God." But someone may be anxious to know why he keeps Sunday, holding the views that he does. Well, here is his "reason:"-

"We find evidence that the disciples did keep the first day, and therefore we keep it; though why they kept it I do not know, for they gave no reason, and there is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for it."

The "evidence" that the disciples kept the first day is all found in Acts 20:7, and 1 Cor. 16:2, which is just no evidence at all. But allowing the Doctor's claim, that the disciples did keep Sunday, what then? Why, we have been doing something for which they have given no reason, and for which no reason could be given. One of the same disciples charges us to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you." How can we do this if we keep Sunday, since the apostles themselves gave no reason for it, and the Lord never commanded it? The fact that the Lord never commanded Sunday observance, and that the apostles, while exhorting

Christians to be able to give a reason for their faith and practice, gave no reason for Sunday observance, should convince anybody that the apostles never kept Sunday.

In closing, the Doctor said: "I know that I can't observe the law of the Sabbath on the seventh day." Well, then, in the name of common sense, how can the law of the Sabbath be observed? That law enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and no other. This law Dr. Munhall proposes to observe by keeping Sunday! And by the same token we propose to celebrate next Fourth of July the first of August. It will be just as easy for us to rest on the Fourth of July on the first of August, as it is for Dr. Munhall to observe the law of the Sabbath on the first day of the week.

But why cannot the Doctor "observe the law of the Sabbath" on the seventh day, the day which the law of the Sabbath designates? Because "as things are in the world," it is *inconvenient*! Is this the same man who half an hour before said: "You have no business to forget; you must not think that every desire is to be gratified at the expense of God's commandment. If your business will suffer if you keep the Sabbath, let it suffer. Obey God. That is all you have to do. The man who lives up to an honest conviction and does right, must expect to suffer inconvenience"? Yes, it is a very same man who now says that "as things are in this world" he cannot keep the Sabbath. And then in the next breath he urges his hearers "to have a conscience in this matter"!

In Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," we read of one Mr. By-ends, one of whose kinsmen was Mr. Facing-both-ways, who earned his money as a waterman, "looking one way and rowing another." The Saviour described the same class of men when he said: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not seek after their works; for they say, and do not." It was not by accident that Bunyan made Mr. By-ends a relative of Mr. Facing-both-ways; for when a man acknowledges a certain obligation, and then says that circumstances will not allow him to regard it, he faces both ways, and advertises himself as a man who has ends of his own to serve.

We might sum up Dr. Munhall's discourse as follows:-

1. The law of the Sabbath was given at creation, and simply reaffirmed at Sinai.
2. The seventh day of the week, and no other, is the Sabbath.
3. The Sabbath is a memorial of creation, and was given that men might remember God.
4. Those people and nations that disregard the Sabbath will have to suffer disastrous consequences.
5. No man has any business to forget the Sabbath, or to allow business or pleasure to interfere with his observance of it. God requires us to obey him whether it is convenient or not.
6. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath, and there is no use in saying that it is. God rested upon and sanctified only the seventh day, and no transfer has ever been made. There is no "Thus saith the Lord" for the observance of Sunday. God never required it.

This is good Bible doctrine: whenever the Doctor preaches such doctrine, we shall be glad to assist him in his work by giving it wide circulation. And in connection with the above, we hope no one will fail to remember Dr. Munhall's only "reason" for keeping Sunday. It is this:-

"I believe that the apostles kept Sunday, though I don't know of any reason why they did so. The seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, but it isn't convenient to keep it."

In conclusion, we would urge our readers to heed the Doctor's exhortation to "have a conscience in this matter." W.

**June 3, 1886**

**"Under the Law. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Concluded.)*

We have now learned the danger which threatened the Galatian brethren, and can understand Paul's fear for them, and his statement that they desired to be "under the law,"-in bondage to the elements of the world. It will therefore be a short task to examine the remaining portion of this fourth chapter of Galatians, and note what bearing it has on the law. The apostle continues:-

"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." Gal. 4:21-26.

It will be seen at once that in these verses three things are placed in contrast with three other things: Hagar, ancient Jerusalem, and the old covenant are placed in opposition to Sarah, the new Jerusalem, and the new covenant. Ishmael and Isaac stand respectively as representatives of those under the old covenant, and those under the new. It will also be noticed that those who are free are the children of the New Jerusalem, the new covenant, while those in bondage, "under the law," are children of the old Jerusalem, the old covenant. The explanation of this chapter, then, involves an explanation of the two covenants. This we can do only in the briefest manner.

The first covenant was made with the children of Israel when they left Egypt. See Heb. 8:8, 9. The terms of that covenant are found in Ex. 19:3-8; 24:3-8. They were simply as follows: God promised to make of the Israelites a great nation, a kingdom of priests, if they, in turn, would obey his law. This they promised to do. Thus the covenant, or agreement, was made. The law of God was the basis of the covenant, or that concerning which the covenant was made. See Ex. 24:8.

Now notice what this covenant required of the people. The Lord had first promised to do certain things for them if they would obey his voice. Then they

heard his voice speaking the law in thunder tones from Sinai, and after that they renewed their promise of obedience, saying, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Ex. 24:7. This was nothing less than an agreement to yield perfect obedience to the law. Those who "hear the law," know that it covers every act or thought of man's entire life. Therefore, if the Jews had fulfilled their promise, they would have merited all the blessings which God promised them; but, unfortunately, they did not, neither could they. They had already broken the law many times, and were sinful by nature, so that it was utterly impossible for them, in their own strength, to yield perfect obedience to it. See Rom. 8:7, 8; Gal. 5:17. Now in this covenant there was no provision for the forgiveness of sins either past or future,-no hint of Christ, through whom alone forgiveness and power to keep the law can come. They had virtually made a promise to make themselves righteous before God. But every one who attempts to do this must fail, and therefore it is truly said that that covenant gendered to bondage. Let no one imagine that we mean that that covenant made them under obligation to keep the law. The obligation to keep the law existed before any covenant was made; but we mean that that covenant left them just where it found them,-in condemnation because of violated law.

Had there never been any other covenant than this, the whole world must have been lost. (Rom. 3:19.) Some will ask if God did not know that they could not of themselves keep the law perfectly, and if it was not trifling with them to make such a covenant with them. God did indeed know that they had no power to do as they agreed, but in making the covenant he was not trifling with them. The making of such an agreement was the most forcible way that could be devised to bring home to their minds a sense of their condition. In their vain endeavors to keep the whole law in their own strength, they would learn their need, and that would turn their attention to that other covenant, called the new covenant, but which in reality had been in existence ever since the fall. Here it is:-

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after these days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. 31:31-34.

In what respect does this covenant differ from the other? Is it in regard to the keeping of the law? No; for that is required in both. But in this there is forgiveness of sins, and the blotting out of transgressions. More than this, the law is to be written in the hearts of the people, and that means that they will be enabled to keep it perfectly. See Ps. 40:8. This work is done by Christ. Through him pardon is secured, and he enables us to be made the righteousness of God. It will

readily be seen that, whereas the other covenant found and left the people in bondage to sin, and under condemnation of death, this covenant enabled them to become free from sin and condemnation. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:1.

Now the application of Paul's words is easy. Hagar was a bondwoman, and Ishmael, her son, was begotten according to the flesh. Sarah was a freewoman, and her son, Isaac, was a child of promise, born not according to the flesh, but when humanly speaking, such a thing as the birth of a child was impossible. Since Ishmael "was born after the flesh," he is a fit type of those who are "in the flesh;" and in this condition are all careless sinners, as well as all who attempt to secure salvation by their own unaided efforts. When men have once sinned, it is contrary to anything in nature that they should ever be made to appear perfectly righteous,-as though they had never sinned. But God, by a miracle of grace, which is manifested through Jesus Christ, causes this to be done, so that the sinner may stand before the law uncondemned. And so those who have obtained this freedom may be fitly represented by Isaac, who was born contrary to the order of nature, solely because of the promise of God.

So likewise, the old Jerusalem, which was rejected of God because it had killed the prophets, and stoned them which were sent to it, and had rejected Christ, is very aptly termed the mother of those who are in bondage because of sin. The New Jerusalem, however, is called the Bride, the Lamb's wife (See Rev. 21:2, 9, 10, and onward); and since Christ is the Everlasting Father (Isa. 9:6), and it is he alone that gives freedom (Rom. 8:1; John 8:33-36), the city is very properly called the mother of all those who are saved from sin.

"But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." Gal. 4:20. This is only another form of what we find in Gal. 5:17: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

"Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." Gal. 4:30. Exactly; the works of the flesh must be put away, for "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Gal. 5:24.

The apostle, having shown the bondage in which all sinners are held, and how Christ alone can set men free, and enable them to do the requirements of the law, says: "So, then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." Gal. 5:1. Compare this with Gal. 4:8, 9.

Here we might leave this portion of Scripture, since we have fully explained verse 21, which is all that we set out to do; but the one who has read thus far will scarcely fail to read the verses immediately following the one last quoted, and will doubtless be puzzled over one or two expressions which are there found. A few words will suffice to explain them. We quote:-

"Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every



man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." Gal. 5:2-5.

The reader will recall what has before been said concerning circumcision and other ceremonies. It is evident that Paul did not mean that circumcision was in itself so terrible a thing that the receiving of it would cause a person to fall from grace; for the apostle himself circumcised Timothy as an act of expediency. See Acts 16:1-3. It must be, then, that he refers to circumcision as taught by the men who came down from Judea, and who were trying to turn away Paul's converts from the faith. They urged it as the means of justification. They said: "Except ye be circumcised, . . . ye cannot be saved." Acts 15:1. But since pardon and justification can be secured through Christ alone, those who adopted circumcision for that purpose, necessarily rejected Christ; and if they had previously accepted Christianity, of course their rejection of Christ was a fall from grace. Christ was of no effect in any one who expected to be justified by his own works. But we, on the contrary, says Paul, "wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." This shows that the mode of justification from sin is the subject still under discussion.

But how about the expression, "I testify to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law"? Does that mean that if a man is circumcised he must keep the law, but that if he is not circumcised he may disregard the law? Not by any means. The law is of universal obligation; all men, whatever their condition, are in duty bound to keep it. It is because this duty rests upon every individual, that all the world are guilty before God; for all have transgressed the law. Since all have transgressed the law, they are condemned. Now "the doers of the law shall be justified." None others can be. But "a doer of the law" is one who can present a record of obedience unbroken by a single sin. Thus it follows that, after all have sinned, by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified.

Now suppose a man starts out with the determination to secure righteousness without the aid of Christ. What must he do? Why he must do the whole law. Very well; suppose that it is possible for him to keep the law perfectly for the remainder of his life, will he be lacking in anything? Certainly; for the law demands obedience for that part of his life which he spent in sin, before he attempted to do right. Perfect obedience is required of him who would stand as a doer of the law. So Paul virtually says: If you set out to be justified by circumcision, or by any other work, it will be necessary for you to show a perfectly clean record: you must your own self take away those past sins, so that the law will witness to your perfect righteousness,-so that it may appear that you have never sinned. But this he cannot do, and therefore he is in the fullest sense "a debtor,"-eternally a debtor. He is in the condition of the man who owed his lord ten thousand talents, and had nothing with which to pay, and who was cast into prison till he should pay it all. For him there was no hope. To all eternity he must remain a debtor to his lord.

So with the man who seeks to stand justified before God by any works of his own. There is a depth of meaning to the words, "he is a debtor to do the whole law," which the casual reader does not catch. The hopelessness of the bondage into which the man is cast who goes about to establish his own righteousness can scarcely be conceived. In this bondage we all are, or have been. Let us ever rejoice that "with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption" (Ps. 130:7); and that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin. W.

### **"A Little Confused" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Tennessee Baptist*, having received a copy of Professor Pettengell's book, "The Unspeakable Gift," feels moved to do something to stay the tide of "heresy," and gives the following notice:-

"A RICH TREAT FOR OUR SUBSCRIBERS.-We have engaged our stated contributor, A. J. Frost, D. D., of Sacramento, Cal., to review thoroughly the prevailing theory of Conditional Immortality, or Annihilationism. This is a modern phase of old Universalism and Restorationism, which is extensively prevailing in many parts of the North and West, and is destined, at an early date, to be the most popular delusion of this age."

If Mr. Frost knows no more about the doctrine of conditional immortality than the editor of the *Tennessee Baptist* seems to, his review will indeed be "a rich treat." To say that conditional immortality is a modern phase of Universalism and Restorationism is about as true as it would be to say that Presbyterianism is a modern form of Catholicism or that Luther was special emissary of Pope Leo X. or that Christianity, is a modern form of paganism. Conditional immortality is as much different from Universalism as daylight is from darkness. Indeed it is the only doctrine that can successfully combat Universalism. Universalism teaches that when. . . . their belief and practice; the doctrine of conditional immortality teaches just what the Bible teaches that, "He that believeth on the Son hath life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." The one robs Christ of all his glory, making his sacrifice a useless thing, while the other crowns him "Lord of all." No man can be a Universalist or a Spiritualist so long as he holds to the doctrine of conditional immortality; but the one who believes in natural immortality has no safeguard against either delusion. W.

**June 10, 1886**

### **"The Real Point Involved" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is one strange thing about this Sunday-sabbath, and that is that an argument which is universally used by its advocates, and is relied on as conclusive, is not considered of any force whatever when used in favor of the Sabbath. For instance, an extended Sunday argument is scarcely ever made without reference to the number of times that Christ met with his disciples on Sunday, and the number of religious meetings held on that day. Now the facts are

these: We have a record of just one meeting of Christ and his disciples on the first day of the week, and of but one meeting of people for worship. The first meeting was while the disciples sat at supper in which they were joined by Christ, and the second was an evening meeting just before Paul was to take leave of the brethren at Troas after a week of labor among them.

Concerning Sabbath worship we have the following: It was the "custom" of Jesus to worship in the synagogue on the Sabbath day. Luke 4:16. He also told his disciples that because it was made *for* man, not against him, they would now be violating it by doing a charitable action that day. We also find Sabbath meetings spoken of in Acts 13:11, 42, 44; 17:2, and 18:4. We find also that it was Paul's "manner" to hold meetings on the Sabbath. Now if custom is to be taken as evidence, in favor of the day, certainly the verdict must be in favor of the seventh day.

But this is not all, nor is it the main point at all. The mere fact that meetings were held on a certain day proves nothing, because the disciples were accustomed to meet every day, and Christ and the apostles preached every day. Here is a point: The first day of the week is invariably spoken of as "the first day of the week." No sacred title is ever applied to it. There is absolutely nothing in connection with the mention of it to indicate that any sacredness was attached to it. On the contrary it is spoken of as being devoted to secular employments, and is designated, the same as the other working days, only by its number. The seventh day, however, the Sabbath, is always spoken of as "the Sabbath"-the rest day. This is wherein we find evidence in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath in the New Testament. Christian men, moved by the Spirit of God to write for Christians, writing at periods varying from five to thirty years after Christ's ascension, invariably referred to the particular day enjoined in the fourth commandment as "the Sabbath." Surely, then, there can be no doubt as to what day is the only Sabbath for Christians to keep. The Spirit of God has set its seal on the seventh day, and has declared that is the Sabbath day.

Still further, the inspired apostles have left on record the statement that *only* the seventh day is the Sabbath. There is no question but that the day on which the Jews met for worship was the seventh day of the week. Now Paul, when he was at Antioch, in Pisidia, showed, in the following words, how inconsistent the Jews were in rejecting Christ: "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." Acts 13:27. If the Scriptures were read in the Jewish synagogues on the seventh day, which no one will think of denying, then, according to Paul, they were read *every* Sabbath day, which effectually shuts Sunday out of the claim to be called Sabbath.

The apostle James, also, in an assembly of the apostles and elders, which is generally spoken of as "the first Christian council," and where the Holy Ghost was present to direct, said, "For Moses of old time hath in every city then that preach him, being *read in the synagogues of every Sabbath day.*" Acts 15:21. Here we have, in an assembly of Christians twenty years after the crucifixion, an unmistakably Christian declaration to the fact that the day on which the Jews

read the books of Moses in their synagogues,-the seventh day,-is the Sabbath to the exclusion of every other day.

We cannot see how Christians can ignore such facts these. If the Holy Spirit declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the only Sabbath, why should we not say so too? How can we be Christians if we walk not as Christ and the apostles walked, and talk not as they talked? If holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, why should not their words be an end of all strife? For our part we will maintain before the world that the seventh day of the week is the only Sabbath, and the day which God and Christ demand shall be kept by Christians; and we know that this position cannot be contradicted by the Scriptures. W.

### **"A Feature of Catholicism" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the "decrees" of the Plenary Council held in Baltimore, the following is found:-

"We earnestly appeal to all Catholics, without distinction, not only to take no part in any movement tending toward a relaxation of the observance of Sunday, but to use their influence and power as citizens to persist in the opposite direction. Let them make it not only a day of rest, but also a day of prayer."

The *Congregationalist* prints the above with simply the following comment: "Here is a feature of Catholicism which we most heartily endorse." We doubt if the *Congregationalist* realized the full import of its comment. Sunday observance is indeed a "feature of Catholicism," and is, in fact, its principal feature, as may be seen by the following:

The apostle Paul gave as the chief characteristic of the papacy that he "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4. And the angel told Daniel how the papacy would fulfill the specifications of opposing and exalting himself above God, namely, by thinking to change the law of God. Dan. 7:25. In no other way could the Pope exalt himself above God. Of course no power on earth could really make a change in the law of God; but the papacy was to think itself able to do so. That the Catholic Church fills this specification, putting itself above God, by thinking it has power to change God's law, is evident from its own testimony.

"Ques.-How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?"

"Ans.-By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow all of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church."-*From "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine."*

"Ques.-Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?"

"Ans.-Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her; she could not have substituted the

observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority."-*From the Doctrinal Catechism.*

To the statement that "all modern religionists agree with her" in substituting Sunday for the Sabbath, we must take exceptions. We agree that she has done it, but we do not agree that she had any right to do it. But some one will say that there was no papacy until about the fifth or sixth century, and that as the Sabbath was changed before that time, it could not have been by the papal power. To this we reply that the "mystery of iniquity" was working even in Paul's day, and that before Justinian's decree making the bishop of Rome head over all the churches, the Catholic Church existed just as really as it did afterwards. All the difference lies in the fact that after that decree the papacy was firmly established, as we may say, on a legal basis. An act performed before the beginning of papal supremacy, was just as much an act of the Catholic Church as one performed afterwards.

In writing of the Trinitarian controversies, which took place in the time of Constantine, Gibbon points to the two parties as the Arians and the Catholics. The party which finally became dominant, and which Constantine favored, is invariably termed the Catholic party. Thus we see that it is a recognized fact that the Catholic Church, so-called, had an existence in the time of Constantine. Although Constantine was not baptized till near his death, he favored the nominally Christian party from the year 313. He is called "the first Christian Emperor;" and as the influential "Christians" in her day were the Catholics, it follows that any decree issued by him concerning a matter of religion, would be a Catholic decree. It is well known that in the year 321 A.D. Constantine did issue a Sunday edict, and of that edict Chambers's Encyclopedia, article "Sabbath," says:-

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that day (Sunday) is known to have been ordained is the edict of Constantine, A.D. 321."

More testimony to the same effect might be given, but this is sufficient to show that the Catholic Church is responsible for the change that has been made in the Sabbath, a change which has no Scripture warrant, and that this change of the Sabbath is claimed by the Catholic Church as the mark of its authority. It is not simply a feature of the Catholic Church, but it is *the* feature of that church, as we would say before, the *Congregationalist* probably did not realize the import of its own words; but it is a fact, nevertheless, that in indorsing that "feature of Catholicism," it is simply endorsing Catholicism itself. As a Catholic writer said in a book entitled, "A Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day." "It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the Sabbath [Sunday]-in which, after all, the only Protestant *worship* consists-not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday. . . . Thus the observance of *Sunday* by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] Church."

What do you say, friends? Will you indorse this "feature of Catholicism," and thus indorse Catholicism itself, with all its abominations and horrible deeds of blood? This is a question that will not down. The time has come when it must be answered by each person for himself. It may be passed by once or twice, or even more times, but it will surely come again and call more loudly for an answer. The Lord says, "with a loud voice," "If any man worship the beast and his image. . . The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." Would it not be better to serve God by doing just as he says? "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." W.

**June 17, 1886**

**"Religion and Happiness" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

"For a person to live and die happy, he must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." These words we lately saw in a religious journal and have very often heard similar expressions. The utterance of such a sentiment gives evidence of very crude idea of religion and its object. We think that such a view of religion is injurious yes, for the following reasons:-

1. It fosters selfishness, which is directly opposed to true religion. To make happiness the sole or the principle incentive for gaining religion, is to direct the attention of the individual to himself rather than to God. Love should be the mainspring of every act of the Christian. The reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the ungodly are both set before us, to stimulate us both by hope and by fear; yet these are not the main incentives. "Perfect love casteth out fear." It is certain that when one is imbued with the spirit of Christ, who said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish His work," he will not do his work through fear of the consequences if he should neglect it. At the birth of Christ the angels sang, "Glory to God and the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Luke 2:14. And the first commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all my mind," while the second is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In true religion there is no place for thoughts of self; the glory of God, and the welfare of our fellow-men comprise our whole duty. All the thought the Christian has to take of self is to keep himself unspotted from the world.

2. The idea is injurious because it tends to discouragement of those who hold it. If a man thinks that happiness is the sure and invariable result of belief in Christ, he will surely be discouraged when trouble comes, as it certainly will. When the Thessalonians were in distress, Paul wrote to them "that no man should be moved by these afflictions; for yourselves know that we are appointed there unto." 1 Thess. 3:3. It is enough for the disciple if he as his Lord, and he was "a man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief." So he says to

359

his followers: "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." "Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service."

"In the world ye shall have tribulation." True, the Christian will be "joyful in tribulation," yet it will be tribulation still.

3. The idea that happiness is a constant accompaniment of believe in Christ, is injurious, because it tends to produce false hopes. The careless sinner and the professor who is "at ease in Zion," having this idea, a fancy that they are in a good ease. They have no trouble, therefore they think the Lord must be pleased with them. They forget that "whom on the Lord loveth chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Pious Job was afflicted almost beyond conception, while the wicked in whom David saw were not in trouble as other men, neither were they plagued like other men. They were in prosperity, and had more than heart could wish. And this was just because they were wicked. The devil can well afford to let his servants dwell in peace, but "all that will live God in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

A happy death is not in itself any evidence of a person's piety, nor an assurance that he is sure of final happiness. The psalmist says of the wicked, "There are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm." Ps. 73:4. On the other hand, a good man may, like Hezekiah, be in sore distress at the thought that he is near death.

In a word, the honor and glory of God should be placed before our own happiness. Indeed, happiness should never be sought. If we seek for happiness, it will be sure to escape us, although we may be satisfied with a spurious article. If we glorify God, that is of itself true happiness or blessedness, for Christ declares that they that mourn *are* happy. And this should show the folly of trusting to *feeling* in any case. The basis of the Christian's hope and trust is not feeling, but knowledge. In the midst of terrible trial he can say, "I *know* that my redeemer liveth;" and although he may feel that because of poverty and low station, he is despised by men, if he keeps "the commandments of God and faith of Jesus," he may have, not the *feeling*, but the *assurance* that he pleases God. W.

### **"Brief Comments on Romans 7" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

The seventh chapter of Romans may be said to be Rom. 6:14 expanded. It is a masterly argument for the holiness and perpetuity of the law, and is all the stronger because the nature of the perpetuity of the law is not the subject under discussion. The apostle showing, in the sixth and seventh chapters, what true Christian life is, and how one is brought to be a Christian. The reference to the law are, we may say, incidental, and show how impossible it is to ignore law when speaking of Christian experience. We should give this chapter a brief exposition, dwelling only on the portions that are often misunderstood by the casual reader.

We have already shown from Rom. 6:14; Gal. 5:18-23; 4:4, 5; and 4:21-31, that "under the law" indicates a condition of condemnation on account of sin; and that persons are freed from the law, or redeemed from under the law, only through faith in Christ, by which they are thenceforth enabled to comply with its just demands. In this chapter the apostle carries out the figure of life and death,

introduced in the sixth chapter, representing the one still under the condemnation of the law as alive, and the justified one has been dead. The relations of the man to his sins, to the law, and to Christ, are first indicated by an illustration, which we quote:-

"Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man." Rom. 7:1-3.

In this illustration we have four terms, namely, a woman, her first husband, and her second husband, and the law. The law says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and thus defines marriage as the union of one woman and one man. Such a union the law sanctions. Not only does the law sanction such a union, but it binds the parties during life. While her husband lives, the law binds the woman to him; but when the husband dies, then of course the union is at an end. Now, says the apostle, she may be married to another man, and she will be no adulteress, because she is freed from the law that bound her to her first husband. How was she freed from that law? By the death of her husband, which rendered further union impossible. But did the law itself change in any particular? Not in the least: It performs the same office that it did before. The law binds the woman to the second husband just the same as it did to the first; and if while her second husband lives she should be married to a third, the law will condemn her as an adulterous just the same as it would if she had married her second husband while the first husband was living. Thus we see that the law is the one thing that remains unchanged. Now read the application.

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Rom. 7:4-6.

Here, as in the illustration, we have four parties, namely, the man, his sins, Christ, and the law. In the first place, the man is united to his sins. That is when he is "in the flesh," under the law (Gal. 5:17, 18), and unable to please God. Rom. 8:7. Here is a union in which the law holds him fast. "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit and to death." The apostle says that the sins were "by the law." This is the same as "where no law is there is no transgressions." If no law existed, there could be no such thing as sin, and therefore Paul says that the motions of sin were by the law. "The strength of sin is the law." Now we say that the law holds the man fast in this union with sin. That does not mean that the law delights to have the man a sinner; nothing of the kind. The law has no choice in the matter. By his own voluntary action the man has transgressed the law and



thereby become a sinner, and now the law can do nothing else than declare him to be such. If the man, through fear of the consequences of his sins, or for any other reason, wishes to escape from this union, he cannot. The law still reiterates, "You are a sinner." If the law could die, or could be made void, then the man at it once would be free; but that cannot be.

There is, however, a way by which the man may be freed from the galling bondage to sin, if he feels it to be a galling bondage, and that is through faith in the death and resurrection of Christ. He may be "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, to the forbearance of God." Rom. 3:24, 25. When "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ," has been imputed to the man, the law no longer calls him a sinner. He is justified, freed from the body of sin.

But this freedom from sin, and consequent deliverance from the condemnation of the law, has been accomplished only through Christ. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things have become new. And all things are of God." 2 Cor. 5:17, 18. Now the man is united to Christ, and by the same law which before held him to be a sinner. While he was in the flesh, the law could not for a moment allow that he was righteous; now that he is in Christ, the same law witnesses to his righteousness. The law remains the same; the man only has changed.

Notice the parallel between the illustration and the application. The law binds the woman to her husband. She cannot escape from that union, even though it be disagreeable to her. But the husband dies, and she is a free woman, and may legally be married to another man. So a man is united to sin, and the law, true to itself, holds him to that account. But by Christ the body of sin is destroyed; and now the man, being free from sin, is united to Christ, and the law sanctions the union. As a woman cannot legally be united to two husbands at the same time, so no person can be united at the same time both to his sins and to Christ. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matt. 16:24. Union with Christ while we are in sin is impossible; and if, while professing Christianity, a person still clings to sin, he is guilty of spiritual adultery. "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship with the world is enmity with God?" James 4:4. The law sanctions no such union as that.

The reader may, however, think that he detects a flaw in our reasoning, because in the application

the apostle tells us that we have to die in order to become united to Christ. This, he will say, is not an exact parallel to the case of a woman whose husband dies that she may be joined to another. The difficulty is only apparent, not real. The parallel is as close as it is possible for any parallel to be. In the illustration the husband dies, and thus the woman may be united to another. Now if you should suppose a case in which the woman died with her first husband, and then have a resurrection, and was thus united to another, we have an exact parallel to the case of the sinner being freed from sin and united to Christ. The case is of

sufficient importance to warrant a more detailed investigation. The following verses contain the whole argument:-

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."

"The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. The law demands the death of every sinner. But "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. For Christ "bore our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness." 1 Peter 2:24. By baptism we show our belief in the death and resurrection of Christ, and our acceptance of him as a propitiation for our sins. Indeed, by baptism we are joined to Christ: "As many of you as have been baptized in the Christ hath put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. But we are baptized into Christ, by being "baptized into his death." "We are buried with him by baptism into death." And thus it is that we receive the penalty of the law; not in person, but in figure. Christ has suffered for sin; and if we are "in him," we also are accounted as having received the penalty. And since it is by baptism that we become united to him, we become dead to the law and united to Christ at the same time.

"Dead to the law." What does the apostle mean by that expression? Simply that we have (in Christ) received the penalty of the law, and that it now regards us as dead. To illustrate: A man guilty of stealing is by the law sentenced to a term of years in the penitentiary. He serves his sentence, and then is set at liberty. Now he has no fear of the law. He may go boldly into the court-room, and even into the prison; for he knows that, having received the penalty for his crime, the law will not molest him. Now carry the illustration a little further: A man commits murder and is sentenced to death. When he has been executed, the law is satisfied. Suppose now that it were possible for the man to come to life again. Having received the full penalty of the law, he is, so far as his past offense is concerned, thenceforth considered by the law as a dead man. So with the sinner's relation to the law of God. It condemned him to death. In Christ he received the death penalty, and now that he is raised to walk in newness of life, the law considers him to be a dead man. He is now a new man; the man who sinned is dead, and the man who takes his place shuns those things which the former man did, and therefore the law declares him to be righteous. In harmony with the above quotation and explanation are the following words:-

"If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. *For ye are dead*, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Col. 3:1-3.

Read also of the following statement by the same apostle: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20.

Now why was it necessary for us to go through this process of dying and being raised to new life? Because we have upon us a burden of sin from which we could not otherwise be free. Did we get rid of this body of sin by that means? Yes; hear the apostle: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." The body of sin was the first husband. We became disgusted with that union, and desired to become united to Christ, but could not as long as the first husband was living; and in order for that husband to die, we ourselves have to die. For the moment, both are dead; then we are raised to be henceforth joined to Christ in a new life, because the first husband, the old man, the body of sin, remains dead. So long as that body of sin remains dead, we, although alive in Christ, are dead in the eyes of the law. But if at anytime the old man should come to life by our calling back going back to our old sins, that moment the law would condemn us as adulterers. W.  
(*To be continued.*)

**June 24, 1886**

**"Brief Comments on Romans 7. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded.*)

The remainder of the seventh chapter of Romans is a graphic account of the steps which lead the sinner to hate the sin in which he was bound, and to his freedom therefrom. It is not, as some have supposed, a Christian experience; it is simply an account of the experience of a man passing from a state of sin, through conviction, to a new creature in Christ. It will be worth our while to give it a little study, that we may learn more of the law's dealings with the sinner.

The apostle first declares (verse 7) that the law is not sin; this is proved by the fact that it points out sin. But for the law he could not have known what sin is. "But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead." Verse 8. Here sin is regarded as a person, producing all manner of evil in the heart. And since without the law there would be no sin he says that sin took occasion by the commandment. In the next verse he embodies this idea and carries it farther. He says:-

"For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Verse 9.

The first clause of this verse presents to us a picture of carnal security. It is the confidence of the man who is insensible to danger. "Without the law" means that the law had not been driven by the Spirit into his heart. Many a man who has read the ten commandments scores of times, has never felt them searching his

heart. Therefore his way is right in his own eyes, and he feels secure. An easy mind is by no means a sure test of acceptance with God. It was forgetfulness or ignorance of this fact that caused David so much trouble. Ps. 73. He saw the wicked wholly at ease, and that there were no bands even in their death. But when he learned their end, he found that such a condition is not an enviable one.

But as soon as a personal application of the law is made to one's heart, the sin stands out in bold relief. "When the commandment came, sin revived." The law did not create the sin; it simply brought to his view that which already existed. A room may be very dusty and dirty, yet if it is dark, the filth will not appear. But let a bright light be brought in, and the foulness becomes all too noticeable. So the law of God lights up the dark corners of the heart and reveals the depravity within.

When this had been done, says Paul, "I died." He does not here mean death to sin; for the next verse says: "And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." The law had shown him that he was a sinner, and "the wages of sin is death;" therefore he felt himself to be virtually a dead man. He did not actually die, but he speaks as though that which was inevitable had already come. In like manner the Lord said to Abimelech, who had taken Abraham's wife, "Thou art but a dead man." Ex. 20:3. "For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Rom. 7:11. Sin is deceitful; it arrays itself in a pleasing garb so that to the unsuspecting one it appears to be good. But underneath its pleasing exterior it carries a weapon that wounds to the death all who come in contact with it.

Notwithstanding all that the law had revealed to Paul, he could say, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Verse 12. He would uphold the dignity of the law, and shield it from all blame for his present deplorable condition. Although he had before said that the law, which was ordained to life, he found to be unto death, he insists that it was not the law,—"that which is good" (verse 13),—that was made death to him, but that it was sin that condemned him to death, and that the commandment had simply made sin "become exceeding sinful." Happy is the awakened sinner who views the law in this light. Such a one is "not far from the kingdom of Heaven." Unfortunately too many rail at the law, as though it were the cause of their lost condition, and then, as if they could avert the danger by shutting their eyes, they turn away from the law, and relapse into their old state of false security.

"For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." Rom. 7:14, 15.

Again we must caution the reader against supposing that in these verses Paul is relating a Christian experience. Up to this point he has shown how any a person is convicted of sin. He has related the experience of one who, when the law convicts him of sin, does not turn from the light, but honestly desires to obey. Now he proceeds to give the experience of one under conviction, until he is made a free man in Christ. He uses the first person and the present tense in order to make the narrative more vivid, as he portrays the sinner's struggle for freedom. It was once a present matter with him, and is the experience that all

pass through, though with various modifications, before they find peace with God.

"Sold under sin." This idea is carried out in many places. Peter says that the sinner is "in bondage." 2 Peter 2:19. Paul says that he is in bondage "to the weak and beggarly elements of the world." Gal. 4:3, 9. He is a slave to sin. Rom. 6:16, 17. In a future article we shall see the case stated in even stronger terms. The idea is that the sinner is helpless. He may "consent unto the law that it is good" (verse 16), and may with his mind serve the law of God (verse 25); that is, he may desire to obey it, yet sin has dominion over him, and he is forced to serve the law of sin, namely his natural, sinful habits. As Paul elsewhere says, "They that are in the flesh *cannot* do the things that ye would." Gal. 5:17.

This is the condition of the awakened sinner. He would do good, but evil is present with him, so that he does the very thing that he has resolved not to do. The flesh is depraved, having no good thing in it, so that although he may determine to do good, he will not find any power in him to carry out his determination. The trouble is, sin *dwells* in him; it has never been killed.

Let the reader imagine a man bound with fetters and having a dead carcass fastened to him by a strong chain. He is fully conscious of the seriousness of the situation, and knows that death must be the inevitable result. Every day the load which hangs to him becomes more noxious, and the whole air becomes putrid. Imagine the terror of the man as he contemplates the steady and sure approach of a horrible death, and imagine his despair when he finds that all his frantic efforts to escape from the disgusting cause of that death are in vain. It would be impossible for the imagination to overdraw the feelings of horror and despair that would fill the soul of the unfortunate man. This was the condition in which Paul found himself. Sin was upon him as a terrible burden; he knew that unless he could get rid of it and lead a life of righteousness it would sink him into perdition; and he found that his most desperate efforts to get rid of it, and to do the good that he longed to do, were unavailing. It was the law that revealed his condition to him. As he continues to look into that holy law, his sin becomes more and more disgusting to him, and yet the more he looks, the larger and more revolting does the burden of sin become. What shall he do? Must he sink into perdition? In the agony of his despair he cries out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Even as he utters this wail for help, the help appears, and he immediately answers his own question, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." He has found peace and rest in Christ. His condition now is presented in the following words,-a Christian experience:-

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:1-4.

"No condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," because they are new creatures. They are not the ones against whom the law had such a terrible

indictment. The condemned ones have died, have been crucified with Christ, and now although they live, it is no more they, but Christ dwelling in them. Once sin dwelt in them; now Christ has taken its place.

Verse 2 is a parallel to Rom. 3:21, 22. The righteousness of Christ being imputed to the sinner, frees him from sin and the fear of death. For a long time he may have tried to make himself righteous, but he found his best deeds so far below what the law requires that they alone would have been sufficient to ruin him. Even if he could have fulfilled the requirements of the law, that would not have removed past transgression. What the law cannot do is to make a sinner righteous. This is not on account of any defect of the law, but is solely owing to the weakness of the flesh. The law points out the disease and shows what a condition of health would be; then the man begins an ineffectual struggle to reach that high condition; the law goads him on until he finds that he has not power to accomplish his desire; and when he has lost all confidence in himself, he accepts Christ as the only source of help, and at once becomes free. Thus the law drives the sinner to Christ that Christ may free him from his past sins and enable him to keep the law. W.

### **"Little Religion" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

The word "sermon" seems to grate harshly on the ears of many people. Listening to a sermon is considered as sort of penance, which they are constrained to undergo once a week as an expiation for their "shortcomings;" for "shortcomings" also sounds less harsh than "sins." And so the word "sermonizing" is used to characterize any talk which, being of a serious cast, is consequently disagreeable. This is doubtless why "sermonettes" have become so popular lately. They are ostensibly for children, but we learn that they are preferred by older people. A "sermonette" is supposed to be a diluted sermon-easier to take. And now they have the "churchette." This, the *Sunday School Times* aptly defines as a place "where they have

375

sermonettes, and prayerettes, and hymnettes, and creedettes, and commandmentettes, and all the other 'ettes.'" All of this is in harmony with the mistaken idea that religion must be belittled in order to adapt it to children.

**July 1, 1886**

### **"When Is It Sunset?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

A Colorado correspondent sends us the following statement of fact and question:-

"I live a mile from the base of the mountain which is three to five thousand feet higher than where I live. As the mountain is west of us it hides the sun from our view and casts a shadow over us long before it is sunset east of us. Is it *sunset* when the shadow comes on us while the sun is shining *east* of us?"

No; it is not sunset until the sun has gone down. When we say that the sun has gone down, we do not mean that it has gone behind a cloud, or that some intervening obstruction keeps its rays from coming direct to our eyes; but we mean that the sun is below the horizon and no longer sheds light upon the part of the earth where we live. If a man should spend the entire day on the east side of a barn, he would not think of calling it sunset at two o'clock in the afternoon, just because he could not see the body of the sun, but he would have as good reason to do so as he would under the circumstances indicated by our correspondent.

If we were to go on the principle that the sun has set when we no longer receive its direct rays, a man living in a deep canon would have a very short day. As a matter of fact, the sun sets to such a man at exactly the same time that it does to his neighbor who lives on the plain. He can tell when the sun sets, just the same as the man on the plain can when the day is so cloudy that he cannot see the sun at all. The sun sets when it sinks below the horizon, and not when it passes behind a barn or a mountain.

### **"The Second Commandment" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

"I wish to know how you understand the second commandment. Does not 'graven image' include statues and busts? and are not all pictures, photographs, or paintings, 'likenesses'? and does not the commandment say *in plain words*, 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of the any thing'? If you believe in taking the fourth commandment as it reads, why not the second?"

We understand the second commandment just "as it reads." In this respect we make no difference between it and the fourth. But our correspondent has not quoted it just as it reads. He has omitted an essential part of the commandment. The prohibitory part of the commandment reads thus:-

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bowed down thyself to them, nor serve them." Ex. 20:4, 5.

If the commandment said, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing," and said no more, it would certainly prohibit paintings, photographs, etc. not only so, but would prohibit also the hewing of timbers for houses or ships, the cutting of garments, the coining of money, the drawing of plans by architects, or the printing of books and papers from types. In fact it would prohibit nearly everything that is done for the support of civilized life. But the commandment does not prohibit these things. On the contrary, immediately after the command was given, God instructed Moses to build a tabernacle according to a *pattern*, and on the walls and curtains of the tabernacle were made, by God's order, figures of cherubim, and two images of cherubim were placed upon the ark. If the second commandment had been designed to

prohibit the making of any image or likeness, God would not have immediately charged the people to do that very thing.

The commandment concerning images is not complete without these words: "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." This shows under what circumstances it is wrong to make images and likenesses. It is wrong to make them for the purpose of offering them even the slightest measure of worship or reverence. It is wrong to show reverence to images that others have made. It is wrong to bow down to any image, even though the worship of the heart is directed to the true God. This the commandment plainly teaches; and no one has a right to make it teach something different, by quoting only a portion of it.

### **"Practical Thoughts on Psalm 63" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

"O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary." Verses 1, 2. David had correct ideas of his relation to God. He says: "Thou art *my* God." Too many imagine that God is far off from them, and that they have to make some great exertions to arouse his interest in them. They forget that God is "not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being." They forget that God has sought us, and is anxiously waiting for us to seek him. They imagine that God is like a man, -holding off those who have done him a wrong, and refusing to be reconciled. They forget that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8), and that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world of himself," and that to his ministers he has committed the word of reconciliation, who in Christ's stead beg of sinners, "be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. 5:19, 20.

Many people remain at a distance from God, because they forget, or have never heard, that he has proclaimed himself "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin." Ex. 34:6, 7. "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy." Ps. 103:8. He is "long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Peter 3:9. So willing is he to forgive, that when men seek him, turning him from their wicked thoughts and actions, "he will multiply to pardon." Isa. 55:7, margin. And so abundant and efficient is his mercy toward them that fear him, that though their sins be as scarlet, "they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Isa. 1:18. Why will not men let the goodness of God lead them to repentance. What more could he have done than he has done?

"Early will I seek thee." David knew that that was the time to seek the Lord. "Those that seek me early shall find me." Is not this an indication that, if seeking the Lord is put off, he may not be found? Isaiah says: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found." Then there will be a time when he may not be found. "Now is the



accepted time." True, this refers to the gospel age, but it is literally true. We have known men, in this age when the gospel is preached, who could not find the Lord. They had once felt the strivings of the Spirit, but now they could feel no interest in divine things. They would acknowledge the truth of God's word, but they were indifferent to it. *Now* is the time when the Lord may be found,-just now while you feel that the husks of sin, "the beggarly elements of the world," are unsatisfying food. Do not stifle the slightest conviction: "Quench not the Spirit." Says Jesus: "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." John 6:37.

But it is not sufficient to simply seek early; some start to seek the Lord, but have not a desire sufficiently strong to make them persevere. Said David: "My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee." He felt that he must have God. He could not be satisfied without God. When a man feels that way, he gets what he wants. Says Christ: "Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled." Matt. 5:6. The trouble too often is, that instead of having an intense desire and longing for righteousness, we are simply passively willing to have righteousness. We ask the Lord to help us overcome some sin, with a mental reservation that we may indulge in it once in a while. We don't like to say, "I *hate* the sins that made thee mourn." "Hate" seems too strong a word; we still cherish a secret love for the sin. We want (so we think) to be righteous, and yet we feel loth to part with that darling sin. That is very far from hungering and thirsting after righteousness. Such half-way desire will never result in anything except final defeat. But when the mind is fixed upon Christ; when he is to the soul "the chiefest among ten thousand," the one "altogether lovely;" when to be like him is the one absorbing desire;-then will he be found. To such the promise is.

"They shall be filled." Think of that. How much righteousness does that imply? Here is the definition of "fill." "To make full; to supply with as much as can be held or contained; to put or pour into till no more can be received; to occupy to the whole capacity of." Now that doesn't leave any room for anything else. When a man is "*filled* with the fruits of righteousness," there isn't going to be any wickedness cropping out. Such a one "keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."

But is such a condition possible? Let us see. Paul told the Ephesians that he prayed to God, "that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be *filled with all the fullness of God.*" Eph. 3:16-19.

Do you know anyone who has realized the answer to that prayer? Such a thing must be possible, for Paul prayed for it, and he says that God is able "to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, *according to the power of that worketh in us.*" Ah that's the secret. There is some power working in us that is stronger than we, "That Christ may *dwell* in your hearts." Well, Christ was unsullied by the strongest of Satan's temptations, and if he *dwells* in our hearts, why may not we likewise repel all of Satan's advances?

Says Paul: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20. No man has the strength to resist the devil, but with Christ to strengthen him he can do all things. "This is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith." 1 John 5:4. Not the victory that makes a feeble effort to overcome, and fails; but the victory that does overcome.

What has been done may be done. Zecharias and his wife Elisabeth, "were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord *blameless*." Luke 1:6. Enoch "walked with God;" and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Moreover we have the Lord's own testimony concerning Job that he was

391

"A perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil." It is true that there was "none like him in the earth;" but the fact that there was one such man shows that there might have been more; and if there might have been more there ought to have been more.

Let it be remembered, however, that this is not a gift suddenly bestowed, but is a constant work. Says David: "My soul followeth hard after the." Ps. 63:8. It is not enough simply to seek the Lord early, or even to hunger and thirst after him, unless it is kept up. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed God might be careful to maintain good works." Titus 3:8. Such a state of righteousness is progressive. "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be blameless till the day of Christ." Phil. 1:9, 10. "The path of the just is says the shining light, that shineth more and more on to the perfect day." Prov. 4:18. The Christian can never arrive at a place beyond which there is nothing. Stereotyping is a thing that is done in Christian experience.

As a matter of course, walking with God produces humility. "Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not up right in him." Hab. 2:4. When a man becomes satisfied with his condition, he ceases to hunger and thirst after righteousness; he ceases to follow hard after God, and consequently he becomes empty. Notwithstanding Job's perfectness, when God revealed himself to him in an especial manner, he said: "I had of heard of thee with the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself." Job 42:5, 6. The nearer one gets to God, the greater will seem the contrast between God and himself. If it were not so, there would come a time when he would cease to say, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," and would ascribe worthiness to himself. That time can never come.

"To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary." That is what David longed for. He had been at times wonderfully impressed, during the services in the sanctuary, with the power of the love of God. He had been greatly blessed. Now he wants to see the Lord just as he had seen him in the sanctuary. He believed that a person might enjoy just as much of the blessing of God while about his daily business as when the in church. How was it with Daniel? He was prime minister of the kingdom of Babylon, with all the burden of

the business of that mighty empire upon him, yet while he was in the palace, doing "the king's business," he received a vision from God. See Dan. 8:1, 2, 27. He did not allow business care to separate him from God. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. For what purpose was it told what Daniel was doing when he had that vision, except that we might learn that it is possible to "walk with God," and to have close communion with him, even when burdened with business cares. Daniel had learned to cast his care on the Lord. When a man has learned that, he can say,

"Because thy lovingkindness is better than life, my lips praise thee." He can't help praising the Lord. "Thus will I bless thee while I live; I will lift up my hands in time name." Yes; "they will be still praising thee."

"My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness; and my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips; when I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches. Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice." Verses 5-7.

Continual remembrance of God must result in praise and thanksgiving; and praise to God is a powerful help in overcoming. Says David: "So will I say praise unto thy name for ever, that I may daily perform my vows." Ps. 61:8. Meditation upon God reveals his goodness, and this calls for praise; praise is but an expression of confidence in God, "and this is the victory that overcometh the world, and even our faith." W.

**July 8, 1886**

**"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no portion of Scripture which is more commonly supposed to give "aid and comfort" to the enemies of the law of God, than the third chapter of Galatians. It is true that there are in this chapter, as in other parts of Paul's writings, some things "hard to be understood," but only the unlearned and unstable will wrest them to their own destruction. The student of the Bible may rest assured that the law of God stands fast forever and ever (Ps. 111:8), and cannot be overthrown. And he may also remember another thing: those texts which are the most depended upon by antinomians in their opposition to the law, will be found, after careful study, to be strong bulwarks in its support. No weapon formed against God's law can prosper. "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever." Ps. 119:152.

There is not a point in the third chapter of Galatians that has not been explained in our study of other texts; therefore in our brief study of this chapter we shall only emphasize facts already established. The reader will recall our remarks in a previous article on the particular errors into which the Galatian brethren had fallen, and the object of the epistle to them. It will not be necessary to give more than an outline of the statements there made. Men had come from Judea saying to the young converts, "Except ye be circumcised. . . . ye cannot be

saved." This was teaching them that their salvation depended on their own works, and was directly contrary to Paul's teaching, that works outside of Christ amount to nothing. Paul taught that sinners can obtain justification only by the grace of God, through faith in the blood of Christ; those Jews taught that circumcision was the true means of justification. It can readily be seen that the latter teaching was directly subversive of the former, and that the acceptance of it was equivalent to the rejection of Christ.

In harmony with the above idea are the opening words of the third chapter: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" Christ and him crucified had been set forth among them, and Christ is "the truth." Through faith in him they had begun the Christian life, and now they were in danger of turning from him and endeavoring to be "made perfect" by their own works. For such a proceeding they justly merited the epithet "foolish."

Abraham is next taken as the model for Christians. "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Verse 6. Nothing else but his faith could be counted to him for righteousness, that is, for his past life; for any work that he could do could not take away a single sin. Abraham did works, as it is written, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Gen. 26:5); but these works were done only through his faith. Works are necessary, but they are of no avail outside of Christ. Paul says:-

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:8-10.

The patriarch was justified by faith, and then by works his faith was made perfect, or shown to be genuine. James 2:22. Having shown that even Abraham was not justified before God by his own works, Paul shows that the promise is to none but the children of Abraham; and since the children of Abraham are those only who have the same faith that he had, only those that are of faith can receive the promise. These are his words:-

"Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. 3:7-9.

Following this statement, the apostle emphasizes the fact that we can be justified only by faith, and not by works. He says:-

"For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Verse 10.

This verse is the cause of much stumbling, and is often wrested from its true meaning, but its explanation is simple, and is contained within the verse itself. It is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." These words are quoted from Deut. 27:26,

and Jer. 11:2-4, in both of which places they have unmistakable reference to the ten commandments. The law contains the whole duty of man, and the transgression of it brings death, and therefore the man who fails to obey it comes under the curse of God. But there is no man who has kept the law perfectly. Consequently if any are saved they must have recourse to something outside of the law; for the law cannot justify the sinner. Or, to use the words of Paul, "As many as are of the works of the law [that is, as many as depend upon the law], are under the curse." They are "under the law;" condemned to death.

"But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." Verses 11, 12.

This is a repetition of the thought already presented, showing that no man can be just except through faith. It is parallel to Rom. 10:4, 5. W.

### **"The Doctors Disagree" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Baptist Flag* has been publishing some articles by one Dr. Dobbs, who claims that the ten commandments are not moral, and are not to be obeyed by Christians. This has called out an emphatic protest from Rev. W. A. Jarrell, author of "Old Testament Ethics Vindicated," who writes to the editor of the *Flag* as follows:-

"Permit me to enter my emphatic protest against the position of Dr. C. E. W. Dobbs that the ten Commandments are not the moral law, and that the Sabbath of to-day, is not the same Sabbath which was ordained in Eden, but now put upon the first day.

"Dr. Dobbs' position, while intended to meet Seventh Dayists, only plays into their hands. Besides, it positively contradicts the Baptist position, and is Campbellism. Campbellites argue as he does, while Baptists say of the Sabbath: it "is a positive, moral and perpetual commandment binding on all men. . . . to be kept holy unto him, which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection was changed into the first day of the week," etc.-*London Conference of 1689, chapter 22*. The Scriptures are fearfully tortured into the support of Brothers Dobbs' and Smith's position. Had it not been to refute Seventh Dayists, no one would ever have dreamed of sawing off the limb we are all sitting on.

"Whenever I cannot refute heresy without destroying the Ten Commandments, I will, as the lesser of two evils, become the heretic. I have had much to do with debating with Seventh Dayists, and well know they are successfully met only by the old Baptist position, in the above quoted confession. I have not now time to give my reason. But if, when I get some work off my hands, the *Flag* will give the room for a series of articles, I will do so."

Good! We hope Mr. Jarrell will cling to his determination never to attempt to refuse heresy by the ten commandments, and to accept any "heresy" that cannot be overthrown except by destroying them. We heartily thank him for his noble stand for the commandments of God, and for rebuking his brethren in the church

who would treat them with contempt. But we are anxious to know how he reconciles this acceptance of the ten commandments with his observance of Sunday. We know him to be a gentleman and a scholar, one who does not believe in "torturing" Scripture into the support of any theory, and is too wise to saw off the limb on which he sits. He is, moreover, a direct and forcible writer, and therefore whenever his work will allow him to write an article showing how first-day observance can be reconciled with the belief that the fourth commandment is a "Moral and perpetual commandment, binding on all men," we will gladly give it a place in the SIGNS. We hope to hear from him soon. Meanwhile let it be noted that scarcely any two leading first-day writers are agreed as to the authority for Sunday-keeping.

**July 15, 1886**

**"Peter's Vision" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we answered a question concerning the use of swine as food, promising to consider Peter's vision of the net full of beasts if, as we expected, somebody should offer that as Bible authority for pork-eating. It was but a few days before we received a request for an explanation of that vision, with which we cheerfully comply. We will first state the circumstances under which the vision was given; the entire narrative may be found in the tenth chapter of Acts.

A Roman by the name of Cornelius, a centurion, was stationed at Cæsarea. This man, although a Gentile, was very devout and benevolent, serving God to the best of his knowledge. To him an angel of God came one day, telling him that his prayers and all had gone up for a memorial before God, and directing him to send men to Joppa to call for Simon Peter, who would tell him what further he ought to do. Accordingly Cornelius sent two of his household servants and a devout soldier to Joppa, with instructions to bring Simon Peter back with them. But Peter was a Jew, with all the natural Jewish prejudices against associating with Gentiles, and therefore he would have refused to follow the Heaven-directed messengers if the Lord had not prepared him for their visit. This was done by means of a vision, which we quote:-

"On the morrow, as they went on their journey, and drew nigh unto the city, Peter went up upon the housetop to pray about the sixth hour; and he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven." Acts 10:9-16.

Was taught by this? Pork-lovers claim that the Lord meant by this vision to teach that Peter might eat pork, and that everybody else may do likewise. Indeed, many people seem to think that the vision teaches that we ought to eat pork. But why stop at the hog. That sheet contained "all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air." Then besides the hog, there must be in it dogs, cats, rats, hyenas, jackals, monkeys, porcupines, weasels, buzzards, vultures, crows, bats, lizards, snails, centipedes, scorpions, toads, etc. Now if that vision meant that we should eat the hog, it meant that we should also eat all other scavengers and reptiles. We say this: If the vision has the slightest thing to do with the hog, which we deny, it teaches: (1) That it is a Christian duty for us to eat him; and (2) That it is equally our duty to eat every beast, fowl, or creeping thing, however filthy it may be. No one can dissent from this; and certainly swine-lovers should not shudder at the thought of eating anything filthy. There is nothing in creation more filthy than the hog; and we cannot see why it should be preferred to crow, bat, buzzard, vulture, hyena, jackal, or any other scavenger.

But now to show what the vision does mean. When the three men that were sent by Cornelius reached Peter's lodging-place, while he was wondering what the vision could mean, the Spirit said to him: "Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and give thee down and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them." Verses 19, 20. Notice that Peter did not understand the vision to teach that he might eat hogs, hyenas, buzzards, etc.: he knew that God meant by it to convey to him some important truth. What that truth was he learned before he reached the house of Cornelius the next day, for when he entered and found a company of Gentiles assembled, he said to them: "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." Verse 28. Still later he stated more particularly what he learned: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Verses 34, 35.

That this is what the vision was designed to teach, no one who reads the chapter can deny. And if it teaches this it cannot teach something else entirely different. It was designed to show that God's love to man is not confined to one race, and that, partaking of the divine love, we should as readily preach the gospel or give other aid to the meanest specimen of the most despised heathen race as to the most refined citizens of an enlightened land. By this vision Peter was taught what Paul teaches in Eph. 2:11-21, and what David teaches in Psalm 68:13, "Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold." The gospel brings all men to the same level, whatever their position or condition in this life. And it seems to us one of the clearest evidences of the perverseness of human nature, that so many can see in this illustration of the divine love to man, nothing more than a divine permission to eat pork. It certainly is a magnificent display of the divine mercy and pity that he forbids the regarding of even *such* persons as unclean. W.

## **"Something To Be Followed" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to some queries an exchange has a column of replies, among which is the following categorical answer: "We should *not* follow Christ's example in washing one another's feet." And this notwithstanding Christ's emphatic statement: "If I then, [your] Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet. For *I have given you an example*, that ye should do as I have done to you." John 13:14, 15. An "example" is something "which is to followed or imitated;" and Christ said that he designed that his disciples should follow his example. He wished them to do *as* he had done to them. More than this, "ought" implies duty; it is the old form of the past tense of the word "owe" and therefore indicates obligation. If we say a person *ought* to do a certain thing, we indicate that to do that thing is a debt that he owes. So when Christ says, "Ye *ought* to wash one another's feet," he means that to do so is a duty; it is a debt that Christians owe.

Again Christ says: "If ye know these things, happy are ye are if ye do them." John 13:17. "Happy" is equivalent to "blessed." A blessing is pronounced on those who *do* according to Christ's example in this respect. And what if, knowing these things, we do not do them? Certainly the blessings will be withheld.

The matter is as plain as words can make it. True, there is only one mention of it in the Bible; but if those who plead this fact as against the adoption of the ordinance, mean to imply that Christ never did and said the things recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John? We believe not, for we never heard any doubt expressed as to the truthfulness of the account. Then if it is a fact that Christ washed his disciples' feet, and said "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example," isn't it just as valid as though the account were repeated fifty times? It certainly is.

We are morally certain that if such evidence could be found in favor of Sunday-keeping, or of infant "baptism," those who believe in these practices would not ask for any stronger testimony in their support. We also know that there are hundreds of men who would shout for exultation if they could find as strong an argument for Sunday-keeping as the thirteenth of John contains for foot-washing. The trouble is, it is too humiliating an ordinance to be generally adopted; and a strong tendency nowadays is to reject all the Bible except Christ's own words, and to reject all of his words that are unpalatable.

## **"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

The next verse that we come to the 13th, is another "stone of stumbling" to many, but with an understanding of the 10th verse, it is impossible to go wrong on this. We quote it with the 14th:—"For Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."



What is the curse of the law? Is it obedience to the law? No; for it is written, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3.

The psalmist also says: "Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord." Ps. 19:1. Now if the keeping of the law is a blessing, disobedience, with its consequences, must be the curse. And so Paul, after warning the Ephesians against whoredom, covetousness, and idolatry, says: "For because of these things the wrath of God. . . curse of God cometh upon the children of disobedience." Eph. 5:6. And "the wages of sin is death." So "the curse of the law" is, in a word, death.

That death is the curse from which Christ has redeemed us, is evident from the latter part of the ninth verse. He redeemed us from the curse by being made a curse for us, and the curse which he suffered was his death,-being hanged on a tree, which was absolutely necessary that Christ should be made in all respects like those whom he would redeem. Heb. 2:17. He came to save sinners, therefore he was counted as a sinner. Isa. 53:12; 2 Cor. 5:21. And being found in fashion as a man, he suffered the curse which hung over guilty man. He died that we might live. And because he was made a curse for us, we may all through faith share in the blessing of Abraham.

"Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promise made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3:15, 16.

Here the apostle introduces a new point, the conclusion of the argument being, as stated in verse 21. That the law is not against the promises of God. He makes the positive and unquestionable statement that if a covenant be once confirmed it cannot afterwards be altered. Now the covenant was confirmed

423

to Abraham by "two immutable things [God's promise and his oath] in which it was impossible for God to lie" (Heb. 6:15-18); therefore, as is stated in verse 17, the law given from Sinai four hundred and thirty years after, cannot make the promise void, nor destroy the fact that the inheritance is solely by promise. Thus the main idea of the chapter, that God's grace as manifested in Christ is man's sole hope, is kept prominent.

But there is still another point which we should not fail to consider in connection with the fifteenth verse. 1. Although the law "was four hundred and thirty years after" the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect." Ex. 17:1. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was "because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Ex. 26:5. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise. 2. Although the covenant was confirmed in Christ to Abraham, it was only in anticipation. As the first covenant was confirmed by blood,-the blood of beasts,-so the second covenant was also ratified by blood,-the blood of Christ. Christ

himself "confirmed the covenant with many for one week," in the midst of which he shed his blood on the cross, thus affixing the final seal to the covenant of God's grace. 3. As the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as "the second covenant," which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10. None can deny that in his earthly ministry Christ taught the necessity of obedience to the law of God. See Matt. 5:17-19; 19:17; Luke 16:17, etc. Always, in the strongest terms, he proclaimed the enduring nature and obligation of God's law. Now since the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one tittle could pass from it. The fact that God's law cannot be changed, we have learned before; but it is well to emphasize it in connection with the death of Christ. That which some suppose marked the abolition of the law, was that which emphasized its perpetuity. It is admitted, even by antinomians, that the law of God was in full force until the death of Christ, and therefore Gal. 3:15 should convince them that it is in full force now. Says Paul, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

Verse 16 also shows that the promise is made only to Christ and to those who are his. In the verses following, 17-26, the apostle shows the relation of the law to the promise of God. "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that is should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Verses 17, 18.

What covenant was it that "was confirmed before of God in Christ"? Manifestly it was the covenant with Abraham, quoted in verse 8 from Gen. 12:1-3; 13:14, 15; 17:7, 8, and 22:18. The promise was that Abraham should be "heir of the world" (Rom. 4:11), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. Gen. 17:1-8. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed "in Christ" (Gal. 3:17) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare Rom. 4:11 with 3:22-25. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as "the second covenant," which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called "the first covenant," although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant.

Now the apostle says that the law, which was formally announced from Sinai four hundred thirty years after the covenant with Abraham, cannot disannul that covenant, that it should make the promise of none effect. "For if the inheritance

be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith.

The reader can readily see the force of the apostle's argument. He is trying to convince the Galatians, and with them all men, that out of Christ, there is no salvation. The man who hopes to gain an inheritance in the kingdom of God through his own works, no matter how high his aim may be, will fail. The promise is not for works, lest any man should boast; but it is through faith in Jesus Christ, that he may be "Lord of all." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. W.

### Extracts

Galatians 3:21 That the law is not against the promises of God.

". . .the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect." Ex. 17:1. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was "because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Ex. 26:5. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise."

". . .the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as "the second covenant," which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See Jer. 31:33; Heb 8:10."

Galatians 3:15 ". . . the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one tittle could pass from it."

"The promise was that Abraham should be "heir of the world" (Rom. 4:11), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. Gen. 17:1-8. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed "in Christ" (Gal. 3:17) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare Rom. 4:11 with 3:22-25. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as "the second covenant," which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called "the first covenant," although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant."

"For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith."

**July 22, 1886**

**"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Wherefore then serveth the law?" This is a very pertinent question, and several points need to be borne in mind in reading it. First, the word "serveth" seems to convey to many minds the idea that the law was subservient, or secondary, to something else. There was really no necessity for the insertion of the word by the translators, for it is not expressed in the original. The text reads, *Ti oun ho nomos?* "Why then the law?" This conveys the exact meaning. It may also be more freely rendered, "O, what use, then, is the law?" Second, it must be remembered that questions of this sort are very common in Paul's writings. After having stated a proposition, he puts himself in the place of a supposed objector, in order that, by answering the question, he may bring out an additional thought. By so doing he anticipates every objection that might be brought against his argument.

Now recall the argument of verses 16-18, and you will readily see the force of this question. He has shown that the works of the law will not suffice to gain the promised inheritance for anybody. Faith in Christ is the only condition of salvation. Then the objector speaks up, and says, "Then what is the use of the law? If the inheritance is only by promise, what do men gain by having the law? Is it not rather a detriment to them?" There was need of asking and answering this question; for, notwithstanding Paul's answer, thousands are to-day asking the same question, and in so doing they imagine that they are making an unanswerable objection against the law. They say, "If we are saved by grace, what need have we of the law?" And what is the answer?-"It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Verse 19.

This is a very short answer, but it is full of meaning. Let us examine it candidly and carefully, giving due weight to every word. "It was added." Here the casual reader is liable to be misled into supposing that some mathematical process is referred to. It is true that the word (*prostithami*) is most commonly used in the sense of "add," but every word must be rendered in accordance with its connection. When used in connection with the law, it does not have the sense of "add." The only other instance in the New Testament where this word is used with reference to the law is Heb. 12:19, where it is rendered "spoken." Paul says that when the people heard the voice of God proclaiming the law from Sinai, "they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken unto them any more." This makes the meaning more clear than if it had been rendered, "They that

heard entreated that the word might not be added to them any more." In fact, that rendering would not bring out any idea at all. The "Emphatic Diaglott" uses "added" in this place, thus: "The hearers of which entreated that not another word should be added to them;" but by the change of construction the expression is equivalent to that in the regular version. So if in Gal. 3:19 it were rendered "spoken," the meaning would be brought out more clearly. "It was spoken because of transgression." Now when the antinomian asks: "What was the use of the law, if the inheritance was only by promise?" Paul answers, "It was spoken because of transgressions."

"Because of transgressions." Again the casual reader will say: "You have told us that there can be no transgression when there is no law; yet here you have the law spoken because of transgressions already existing; how is this?" It is all right. There can indeed be no transgression when there is no law; but it must be remembered that the law existed in full force long before it was spoken from Sinai, yes, long before the creation of man. In the temple of God in Heaven the law of God was beneath the throne of God, the basis of his Government. This we have clearly demonstrated. And when it was spoken from Sinai, and a copy of it was given to Moses to place within the ark, there was no more law in existence than there was before. The people of the world were under just as much obligation to keep the law before that time as they were afterward. And that was just why it was then given. The people being under obligation to keep the law perfectly, it was necessary that they should have it in such a form that they could study it carefully. Before the giving of the law upon Sinai, God had conveyed a knowledge of his will to the people by his prophets, as Enoch and Noah. The people also had in their hearts more or less trace of the law originally written in the heart of man. But the only people who cared to remember God had been in long and cruel bondage to the heathen, and their knowledge of right and wrong had become blunted. Consequently the law was given that wrong might be known to be wrong. If this point be kept in mind, the reader will not become confused by the text, even though he retains the rendering "added" instead of "spoken." Thus the law was already in existence, and known to man, although only by tradition; but now the Lord added it in written form. But however it is rendered, there is no more reason for supposing that it teaches that the law was here first introduced than there is of supposing that by the "entering" of the law, in Rom. 5:20, or the "speaking" of it, in Heb. 12:19, the first introduction of the law is indicated.

A parallel to the expression, "It was added [or spoken] because of transgressions," is found in Rom. 5:20: "Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound." The "entering" of the law was at Sinai. Why did it enter?—That the offense (sin) which previously existed might abound. The previous existence of sin implies the previous existence of the law; but it was then formally given that the enormity of sin might be seen. And why was it necessary that the enormity of sin might be seen? Says Paul, "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." That is, it was necessary for men to see the real nature of sin, in order that they might seek

the grace that is in Christ, which alone can take away sin. And the more enormous sin appeared, the more comprehensive views could they have of grace; for no matter how greatly sin abounded, grace super-abounded. This will be made more clear further on. W.

### **"Rome Never Changes" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Sabbath Recorder*, after noting the position of the Catholic Church in regard to secret societies, and its *quasi*-support of temperance principles, asks: "May we not hope that the time is not far distant when the dominion of the church over the fate and practice of her communicants will be broken, and the era of freedom of conscience shall come again to this priest-ridden church?" No; the Bible forbids us to hope for any change. It is a truth that "Rome never changes." The prophet, speaking of the papal power, says: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the Saints possessed the kingdom." Dan. 7:21, 22. Freedom of conscience and Roman Catholicism are incompatible.

**July 29, 1886**

### **"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." There is no question of course but that the "seed" is Christ. The sixteenth verse plainly says so. Then what is the coming of the seed? Some have supposed it to be Christ's first advent, but a little study will show that the second advent is here spoken of. The "seed" is never mentioned except in connection with the promise, and the promise is fulfilled only at the second coming of Christ. The following texts and argument will make this appear:-

In Gen. 3:15, the Lord, in pronouncing the curse upon the serpent (Satan), said, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it [the seed] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Paul, in his letter to the Romans, many years after Christ had come and had ascended to Heaven, said, "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Rom. 16:20. The bruising of a serpent's head is its destruction; but this was not accomplished at Christ's first advent, but was something still future. The destruction of Satan begins only at Christ's second coming. See Rev. 20.

Again, in the promise to Abraham it was said, "And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22:17. This was not fulfilled at the first advent of Christ. On the contrary he was then delivered into the hands of his enemies, and they did to him whatsoever they would. He will possess the gate of his enemies only when the following promise is fulfilled: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in

pieces like a potter's vessel." Ps. 2:7, 8. And this is fulfilled at Christ's second advent, when he takes vengeance "on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel," as is described by the revelator:-

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in Heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and *he shall rule them with a rod of iron*; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. . . . And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. 19:11-21. Thus he possesses the gate of his enemies.

Again, another part of the promise to the seed was that he should possess the whole earth. See Ps. 2:7, 8, where the uttermost parts of the earth are promised to Christ for a possession; also see Gen. 13:14-17, and Rom. 4:13. But when Christ was on earth, he possessed not so much as a place where he could lay his head. Matt. 8:20. When, however, the seventh angel sounds (when the mystery of God is to be finished, Rev. 10:7), then it will be said: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." Rev. 11:15. The eighteenth verse says that this is at "the time of the dead, that they should be judged," showing conclusively that it is at the second coming of Christ. Compare 2 Tim. 4:1.

Still further, in the prophecy of Ezekiel the promise of the earth to Christ is directly associated with his second coming. The prophet foretells the captivity of the Jews, the succession of the four universal monarchies, and the setting up of the kingdom of God, as follows:-

"And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Eze. 21:25-27.

The diadem was taken from the king of Israel when he and his people were carried away to Babylon. At that time Babylon was a universal monarchy. Then three "overturnings" are mentioned, which reach to the second coming of Christ. Thus: The first overturning made Medo-Persia a universal dominion; the second gave the dominion of the world to Grecia; and the third overturning made the empire of Rome fill the world. This was the state of things at Christ's first advent,

and for four hundred years later, and the prophet declared that there should be no more general revolution "until He come whose right it is." Note the parallel between this and the clause in Gal. 3:19, which says, "Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." In the light of Eze. 21:25-27 we think there can be no question but that in the latter passage the second coming of Christ is referred to.

Once more: The promise to the seed was that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed. This of course could not be fulfilled as long as any wicked are in existence. But when Christ comes, sitting on the throne of his glory, to destroy sinners out of the earth, "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matthew 25:34.

From the above quotations and references it will be seen that the promises to "the seed" are not fulfilled until the second coming of Christ; they all culminate at his second advent. It was willful forgetfulness of this fact that caused the Jews to reject Christ. They read the promises to the seed,-promises of glorious triumph,-and applied them to the coming of the Messiah; and when they saw none of those promises fulfilled in him, they rejected him. Let us not, like them, fall into grievous error by referring to his first advent those promises to be fulfilled only at his second glorious coming. That was the time of his humiliation, not of his triumph. Christ then came as an offering for sin, and not as the seed to whom the promise was made. When he comes the second time he comes as King of kings and Lord of lords; he comes to take possession of the gates of his enemies, whom he will dash in pieces as a potter's vessel; he comes to take possession of his inheritance, even "the uttermost parts of the earth," and to receive as his own a great multitude whom no man can number. Compare Rev. 7:9 and Gen. 13:16. In short, he comes as "the seed to whom the promise was made." W.

### **"Plain Facts on the Sunday Question" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among the letters on the Sunday question, published in the St. Louis *Republican* of July 4, is one from a Catholic priest, D. S. Phelan, of the St. Louis, which states the facts relative to the Sunday in such a plain language that we reproduce it entire. We earnestly invite all Protestants to give it a careful perusal:-

"St. Louis, July 3.-EDITOR REPUBLICAN: I have been asked my view on the question of Sunday observance. I have no views. It is a matter of positive law. Dogmas of faith and canons of discipline are great and stubborn things; views are trifles light as air. The Sunday is an institution of the church. The attempt to identify it with the Jewish Sabbath, or to make it heir to its rights and ceremonies is futile and absurd. The ceremonial law Moses is abrogated-buried in the same grave with the synagogue. The Lord's day is the creation of the church in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in

455

the week would seem to be of divine origin. When the church set apart the first day of the week for public worship, she enacted that all her children who reached the years of discretion should first hear mass, and secondly abstain from servile



works on that day. This is positive law, and any man's views contrary to this enactment are treasonable. The mass is the one great sacrifice of the new law, and all the faithful are obliged to assist at on the Lord's day. Sunday is likewise a day of rest-made so by the church's enactment. She says we may not do any work on that day which is of servile or ordinary wage-earning character.

"But how all about games and amusement on the Lord's day? 'What saith the law?' the Church does not condemn them, although she encourages the faithful to works of piety and prepare. She knows the world too well to impose a burden they cannot bear. She is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for all Christians to spend all of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour.

"Why do our separated brethren place so much stress in observing this Sunday ordinance of the Catholic Church? They are more Catholic than the Catholic Church. But they are Catholic only on Sunday. On Friday they are pagans. Why do they eat meat on the latter day? The church, who presented the method of Sunday observance, forbids the use of flesh meat on Friday. Why, too, do they not observe the laws of the Lenten season? They emanate from the same authority which fixed the time and method of the weekly public worship. The Pharisees were in the habit of higgling about trifles, while they neglected the weightier things of the Mosaic law. Our separated brethren are in the same predicament. They take the Sunday from the church, and they get the scare-crow of Christendom, while they throw away the Friday abstinence, and the Lenten fast, not to speak of the annual confession and communion."

The only thing in the above that we would criticize is the implication that by the abrogation of the ceremonial law the Sabbath was also abolished. The fourth commandment had in it nothing of a ceremonial nature, consequently it was not affected by the blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances. So when "the church" set apart Sunday as a demi-semi-holy day, there were too weekly days of worship claiming man's allegiance: one given by man himself; the other, the original Sabbath which God gave to man. We wish now to call our readers special attention to the following points in the letter of "Father" Phelan:-

1. "The Sunday is an institution of the church." It has no connection with the Sabbath, and derives none of its "authority" from the command enjoining the observance of what is termed the "Jewish Sabbath."

2. "The Lord's day [an erroneous title for Sunday] is the creation of the church, in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in the week would seem to be of divine origin." But why should it "see" that the obligation to observe one day in the week is of divine origin? If the Sabbath commandment be abolished along with the ceremonial law, the obligation to observe one day in the week must also be gone; for the fourth commandment is the only place where such obligation is expressed. But if there is now obligation to observe one day in the week, and that of divine origin, it must be derived from the fourth commandment, which specifies particularly which day of the week shall be observed. Note this point: Our Catholic friend distinguishes between the obligation that is of "divine origin," and the "obligation" which originated in the "church." This is as it should be. The observance of one day in the week is

enjoined by the Creator, in the fourth commandment; the setting apart of the first day, instead of the seventh "according to the commandment," rests solely on the authority of men. There is nothing divine about it.

3. The same power that set apart the Sunday also originated the mass; and the Sunday was set apart so late for the celebration of this mummery. Notice: The church "is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for Christians to spend the whole of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour." Outside of that hour, the people may engage in anything except servile work. Thus the only *essential* thing about Sunday is the mass. If professed Protestants want to know how to keep Sunday, why do they not go to the only source of authority on that subject?

The remainder of the letter speaks for itself. We commend to all Protestants the questions which it contains. If they are determined to follow, and even to exceed, the Catholic ordinance concerning Sunday, why not be consistent, and attend mass on that day, abstain from meat on Friday, and go to confession? But if they are determined to be Protestants indeed, the way is plain. We do not acknowledge the Pope's authority, and the only treason that we know of in matters pertaining to morals, is disobedience to the commandments of God. W.

**August 5, 1886**

**"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 5" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

In last week's article, texts were quoted to show that the expression, "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made" (verse 19), has reference to the second coming of Christ. This is an important point, and we wish to have it well fixed in the mind of the reader. We therefore present a few more thoughts in the same line of argument. Let us first read the eighteenth and nineteenth verses in connection:-

"For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added [spoken] because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."

There can be no question but that the "promise" referred to in verse 19 is the same as that mentioned in verse 18. And what is that promise? It is the promise of "the inheritance." What inheritance was promised to Abraham? In Rom. 4:13 Paul tells us that the promise to Abraham was "that he should be the heir of the world." This promise must be the same as that discussed in the third chapter of Galatians, because, (1) only one inheritance was promised to Abraham, and (2) the same means of securing the inheritance is given, both in Romans and in Galatians. Compare the two texts: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Rom. 4:13, 14. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. . . . And this I say, that the covenant, that

was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Gal. 3:16-18. That the thought in these two texts is identical, there can be no shadow of doubt. It therefore needs no further argument to show that the "promise" is the promise of "the inheritance," and that "the inheritance" is the whole earth, which God gives to Christ, the seed (Ps. 2:7, 8), and to all who, by faith in Christ, become children of faithful Abraham (Gal. 3:7, 29). And this is at the second coming of Christ.

The next point to be emphasized is that in speaking of the seed, "the inheritance" is in the mind of the apostle. His argument, in outline, is this: The inheritance is given solely on account of faith. To the objection that this makes void the law, he replies that the law was spoken (made more plain) to serve an important purpose in connection with faith, and that it will continue to fill this office until the seed shall come to whom the promise was made, and through whom alone the inheritance can be obtained. The coming of the seed brings the fulfillment of the promise, and, of course, the end of faith. 1 Peter 1:9.

And when will this take place? For answer, note two texts that have been previously quoted. Through the prophet, Ezekiel the Lord says of the dominion of this earth: "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." Eze. 21:27. And that this refers to the second coming of Christ, he himself showed when he said: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations. . . . Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 23:31-34.

From the foregoing we think that there can be no doubt in any mind that the apostle has reference in verse 19 to the second coming of Christ. This will appear even more plainly as we develop the argument which he bases on this point. The next thing for consideration will be the relation which the law sustains to the promise and its fulfillment. This is the objective point of the whole argument; but since the limits of this article will not allow the matter to be presented in such shape that it could well be left for a week, we shall defer a discussion of that question until the next number. W.

### **"Ex-parte Evidence" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

In its issue of June 26, 1886, the *Golden Gate* contains the following:-

"Truth is generally determined by the weight of evidence in its favor. Our Adventist friends declare with Job, that there is 'no knowledge nor device in the grave'-that the soul sleeps after death till the literal resurrection of the body. Now we can bring a great 'cloud of witnesses' who were once mortals like us, and who will all declare most positively that they were never more alive nor wide-awake than they are now. Shall we not believe our spirit friends in preference to Job,

who evidently did not know what he was talking about, never having had any experience as a spirit separate from the body? It is hardly fair to insist that a man is dead, when he himself declares to the contrary."

Again, in its issue of July 17, we find the following in an editorial note:-

"Job said that 'the dead know not anything;' while the so-called dead come back to us by thousands, and declare that Job was mistaken. Who shall we believe?"

It is not at all surprising that a paper which has no special use for the Bible should persist in giving Job credit for what Solomon wrote; we never knew an opponent of the Bible to be acquainted with its contents. The mistake is not so bad a one, however, for although Job did not use the language attributed to him, he did speak thus of the dead: "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Job's testimony is directly opposed to Spiritualism, and so the editor of the *Golden Gate* did not go so very far astray. But it is surprising indeed to see a man of his intelligence bring in behalf of Spiritualism a class of evidence that would not be accepted by a Police Judge in a petty larceny case, and then call it "*weight* of evidence." Here the spirits are on trial. The Bible charges them with being spirits of devils. We call them up and put the question, "Guilty, or not guilty?" They reply, "Not guilty," and straightway the editor of the *Golden Gate* claps his hands, and says, "I told you so."

The story is told that in a remote country village, a man of limited capacity was elected Justice of the Peace. The first case that came before him was that of a man charged with stealing chickens. To the usual question, the accused replied, "Not guilty." Immediately the Justice prepared to leave the court room. The prosecuting attorney asked in surprise if he were not going on with the trial. The Justice replied, "What's the use? The prisoner admits that he isn't guilty." We always thought that this story was the creation of somebody's imagination; but now we are prepared to believe it. Surely a country justice should not be laughed at for doing that which is done not only by the learned editor of the *Golden Gate*, but by Spiritualists all over the world.

We don't accept the evidence; and we would warn all unsuspecting persons against being imposed upon by such one-sided testimony. When you are asked to believe that there is no death, on the ground that some wonderful spiritual phenomena have been exhibited, remember that the Bible says, "They are the spirits of devils working miracles;" and remember also that the only defense made is on the testimony of the accused themselves.

But this is not all. Not only is there no evidence in behalf of the accused, except their own testimony, but their own testimony is admitted to be worthless. The *Golden Gate* of May 8, 1886, gave an account of a slate-writing séance, together with a *fac-simile* of the messages that were received. In the course of the account, the editor said:-

"It is not claimed that this writing was done, in all instances, or even in any instance, by the spirit giving the name. Much of it, no doubt, is done by the medium's control, or by spirits skilled in the manipulation of the pencil tips; and such spirits act as mediums for those less proficient in the matter. This explains

the poor grammar and orthography sometimes witnessed in communications from spirits who, in earth life, we know would never have committed such mistakes."

In the face of this admission, we are asked if we shall not believe our "spirit friends" when they testify in their own behalf! No; for the most "advanced" Spiritualists admit just what the editor of the *Golden Gate* does, that there is no means of identifying the spirits. We could give abundance of testimony on this point, but prefer to use the recent matter all from the same source.

The case stands thus: Certain spirits do communicate with men. This we all admit. We claim, on the testimony of the Bible, that they are the spirits of devils. Spiritualists claim that they are our "spirit friends," and offer the testimony of the spirits themselves as proof, at the same time telling us, what we would know without being told, that their statements are not to be relied on. And for the sole testimony of the accused, who are known only as liars, we are asked to throw away the Bible, which, by the exact fulfillment of prophecy is covering the whole of the earth's history, as well as by its general testimony concerning human nature, has been demonstrated to be the embodiment of truth. We shall stick "to the law and to the testimony;" and urge all people who are asked by Spiritualists to "try the spirits," to challenge the testimony that is offered.

Christ said that lying is the characteristic of the devil. "He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in them. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." It has been shown that the only thing known about these communicating spirits is that they are liars. Do they not in the themselves afford proof of the Bible charge that they are the spirits of devils?

Next week, if we have space, and if not, the week following, we shall answer the question that is so often asked, namely, "If the spirits are the spirits of devils, how is it that they sometimes heal the sick, and in other ways render aid to men?" It is not a difficult question to answer, yet thousands have stumbled over it. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

Wednesday, July 28, Elder J. N. Loughborough, Elder E. J. Waggoner, and Professor S. Brownsberger, left San Francisco for Eureka, Cal., to attend the Humboldt camp-meeting. To meet the wants of the cause, the California conference is obliged to hold five camp-meetings the present season. This not only shows what a large scope of territory is embraced within the bounds of the Conference, but is a gratifying evidence of the growth of the cause in this State. For all of which we are thankful to God.

**August 12, 1886**

### **"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 6" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

We now know from the foregoing question, that the answer to the question, "Of what use, then, is the law?" may justly be paraphrased thus: "It was spoken in order that all sin might be perfectly well known to be sin, until the coming of Christ should bring the fulfillment of the promise." And now before the reader hastily jumps to the conclusion that this implies the doing away of the law at the second coming of Christ, let him carefully note the following points:-

1. The law existed in its fullness before it was "spoken" from Sinai. This has been amply demonstrated. It is the foundation of God's throne, and was in existence from the beginning of God's Government. The giving of it from Sinai added no feature that had not existed for ages.

2. It was spoken from Sinai for a special purpose. That purpose, as stated by Paul in Rom. 5:20, was that sin might be made to appear more plainly than it did before. God hated sin just as much before that time as he did afterward. And there were men who understood fully the nature of sin, and that God required "truth in the inward parts;" but the mass of mankind had wandered so far from God that he could not communicate with them as he did with Adam, Enoch, Noah, and such ones; and the only way that they could constantly know his will was to have it in writing. By the law in written form, they could always know God's will, just as well as if they could converse with him; for the law is a likeness of his character.

3. The making of sin to abound by the entering of the law, was necessary to the fulfillment of the promise. The inheritance can be given to none but the righteous; there must be no spot in those who inherit the earth. Matt. 5:5, 8. It is true that righteousness can be obtained only through Christ, but sins must be confessed before they can be pardoned, and that cannot be done till sin is known. If the law had not been "spoken," perfect knowledge of sin could not have been had. The inheritance was not promised through the law, but through faith; but this, instead of making the law unnecessary, called for the clearest statement thereof. The law points out sin; the knowledge of his sinful condition drives the sinner to Christ as the only source of help; Christ imputes to the repentant sinner his own righteousness, which is the righteousness of God, and enables him to live up to the requirements of the law, thus making him "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

4. When Christ comes, this design will have been accomplished. Under the second covenant the law will have been written in the hearts (see Jer. 31:33) of all who have desired the better country, and thus they will "all be righteous," and fit to "inherit the land forever." Isa. 60:21. They will be righteous because the law is written in their hearts. They will then be as pure as was Adam when he was first created, with this advantage, that their characters will have been fully tested. When that time comes, the prophet says: "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Jer. 31:34. It will not be necessary for them to teach one another, (1) because the law will be written in their hearts, and (2) because they can go direct to the great Fountain of truth. The prophet, speaking of the time when the

promise shall be fulfilled, says: "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children." Isa. 54:13.

When "the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them;" when "they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads," there will be no necessity for one man to say to another, "Know the Lord." When men can come in person to that glorious and awful throne of God, whose foundation is the perfect law of God, and can talk face to face with the author of that law, then there will be no need for copies of the ten commandments written in books, or even engraved on rock of man's hewing. The preaching of the gospel will be no more heard, and Bible societies will not be known. The law will have done its work in bringing men to Christ, and thus to perfect obedience to it, and then "They shall all know the Lord," for his law shall be in their hearts, and his name shall be in their foreheads.

5. To say that when that time shall come there will be no less law than there is now, or than there was in the days of Abraham, or of Adam, or before it was spoken from Sinai, is now unnecessary, for all must see it plainly. Indeed, it will then be far better known than it has been at any time since the fall, for men will literally "walk with God," as did Adam and Enoch. This point will be still more fully developed when we consider verses 24 and 25. W.

**August 19, 1886**

**"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 7" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." There is probably no man living who can fully comprehend this passage. We know that when God came down upon Mount Sinai, he was accompanied by ten thousands of his saints (holy ones), Deut. 33:2, and that they must have had some part to act in that great event; but what part they acted, no man can tell. The details of all that was done within that dense cloud which veiled Sinai's top from human gaze, have never been revealed to man. A parallel to this passage in Galatians is found, however, in Stephen's address to the Jewish Sanhedrim:-

"Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." Acts 7:51-53.

Those wicked men were uncircumcised in heart because they had not kept the law of God. See Rom. 2:25-29. They had violated the law which forbids murder, although they had received it "by the disposition of angels." To the same effect the apostle writes to the Hebrews:-

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just

recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" Heb. 2:1-3.

As we said before, it is useless to conjecture on these passages. Just what part the angels acted in connection with the proclaiming of the law, we cannot tell; we only know that in each of the above texts the statement that is made concerning the angels is made to emphasize the guilt of those who should violate the law, or should reject the gospel, which has reference to the law. With this we must leave this expression, "it was ordained by angels,"-the only really difficult passage in the chapter.

"In the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Verse 20. The expression, "but God is one," indicates that God is one of two parties between whom there is a mediator in whose hand the law was ordained. Now when we read that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5), the conclusion seems irresistible that the "mediator" in whose hand the law was ordained, or disposed, was none other than the Lord Jesus Christ.

If to any one this conclusion seems unnatural, let him remember that the Son is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, and that by him the worlds were made. Heb. 1:1-3. "For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17. He is one with the Father (John 10:30), and therefore is worthy to be called God, and to be worshiped as God. John 1:1. "Without him was not anything made that was made." It would be expected therefore that the active work of proclaiming the law to men should also be performed by the Son. Whatever is done by the Son is the same as if done by the Father.

It will be profitable right here to note how inseparably the law and the gospel are united, and how impossible it is to separate, in any transaction, the Father and the Son. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1:1); but it was the Son "by whom he made the worlds." Heb. 1:2. God formed the earth to be inhabited (Isa. 45:18), and therefore man was made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27); but before man was made, God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. 1:26. This has unmistakable reference to Him who is "before all things," and by whom all things were created. Col. 1:16, 17. Man fell, and thereby lost all hope of immortality, for which he was created. Then Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (1 Tim. 1:15); but "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. 8:31); but he is not alone in his love, neither does he have to move a heart hardened against man; "for God so love the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. And when God spoke the law from Sinai, he said, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex. 20:2); but we know that an angel, in whom was the name of the Lord was with the people, whom they were



to obey (Ex. 23:20, 21), and who spoke to Moses in the Mount Sinai, when he received the lively oracles to give unto us. Acts 7:38. Moreover we are plainly told that it was Christ who was with them in the wilderness, supplying both literal and spiritual food and water. 1 Cor. 10:1-4.

Thus in everything that concerns man, we see oneness of thought and action between the Father and the Son. It is not true that "the Jewish age," so-called, was the administration of stern justice by the Father, and that "the Christian age" is the administration of tender mercy by the Son. If the life of one man had spanned the entire interval between creation and the present time, he could say, "Goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life." There is no change of government between the fall of man and the restoration of all things. As it was the great love of God to the fallen world which moved him to give his only begotten Son for their redemption, we are not surprised to learn that when Christ's ambassadors pray to men, "Be ye reconciled to God," it is God himself beseeching sinners to accept his pardon. Even so when we learn that Christ was with the church in the wilderness, that he was upon Mount Sinai, and that it was in his hand that the law was ordained, we are not surprised to hear him say, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

"Is the law then against the promises of God?" Gal. 3:21. That it is not was shown by the 18th verse. It is directly in harmony with the promise, because by it men are enabled to see and forsake their sins, so that they may receive the promise. So the apostle says: "God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."

Righteousness would have been by the law if such a thing had been possible. If by any means men could have received life without the death of Christ, we may be sure that that means it would have been adopted. God is infinite; his love is infinite; therefore it was at an infinite sacrifice that God gave up his Son to die that the world through him might have life. But there was no other way, for the law once violated could not by any possibility give life. It was ordained to life, but sin caused it to be unto death. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. 3:22.

Blessed conclusion? "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." 1 Tim. 1:13. Therefore, since all are concluded under sin, he came to save all. The provision is ample enough for all, but only those who believe can be made partakers. Unfortunately, too many will not acknowledge the authority of God's law, and will not confess themselves to be sinners, and therefore the "promise by faith of Jesus Christ" cannot be given to them; for we are taught by verse 22, that it is necessary for men to be "concluded under sin," in order that they may be sharers in the promise by faith. This again shows how the law works in harmony with the promise. W.

## "Satan as a Deceiver" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article we showed the admission of Spiritualists themselves that the testimony of the spirits is not to be depended on; and that since they are lying spirits, they must be, as the Bible says, spirits of devils. We know indeed that the spirits that can indicate to man, and work wonders, are spirits of devils because the devils and the angels of God are the only spirits there are. But none of these are the spirits of dead men. Angels, whether good or bad, are an order of beings entirely distinct from men. The Bible declares that "the dead know not in anything;" but angels were never meant, and men never become angels. If it is asked how we know that the spirits of which we speak are not good angels, we reply, that they are lying spirits. They deny the Bible, and the divinity of Christ. A sure test is this: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20.

Then the question arises, "If Spiritualism is of the devil, how is it that men are often healed of diseases, and helped in various ways by it?" People will go to clairvoyant physicians, and will patronize the "mind cure," thinking that if they are benefited thereby to any degree, there can be nothing wrong in it. Say they, "The devil wouldn't do people good, would he?" right here is where thousands will be swept into Spiritualism in spite of themselves.

Notice these texts: "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. 16:13, 14. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Rev. 19:20. Also in Rev. 13:13, 14, we read of the power called "the false prophet," "he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire, down from heaven on the earth than the sight of men, and deceive them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do."

These texts show that the devil performs his wonders solely for the purpose of *deception*. To deceive means to impose upon; to delude; to ensnare by artifice. We are deceived only by false

503

pretenses. The gambler deceives the unwary by pretending to be his friend. Very often a man who is a thief at heart deceives a whole community, so that they trust him as an honest man. He will be very kind to them; he may do them great favors until he can gain their confidence and their property. If the libertine should always appear in his true character, he could never seduce the innocent. But he appears as a virtuous man; he talks of virtue and religion; he appears as the embodiment of virtuous sentiment, until he gains a full confidence of his intended victim. Does he practice those seductive arts that show him to be an apt pupil of his master the devil? Indeed, anyone who has lived long in this world need not be told that

the worst of men often dissemble and appear to be the best of friends of those whom they would ruin.

If this is so with men, should we be surprised that Satan, the arch deceiver, should do likewise? He is the originator of deception and deceptive arts; and wicked men and seducers are only attempting what he can do to perfection. Paul says that he appears as an angel of light. Now it would be useless for Satan to appear as an angel of light unless he acted as one. Thus we are to understand that, so far as possible, he throws aside, or rather conceals, his devilish character, and appears as a friend.

Let it be borne in mind then that when the Bible says that the devil will work in order to deceive those that dwell on the earth, it virtually tells us that he will do things to gain our confidence and goodwill. But just as the seducer has selfish ends in view when he does good acts, so Satan has an object of his own to serve in all his deceptions, and that is the ruin of mankind. And they should answer those who say, "Well, suppose the devil is behind this clairvoyant healing and mind to cure, if we are helped isn't it all right?" We answer, no. Just as we would not receive favors from a villain who had ends of his own to serve by offering them to us, so we ought not to accept favors at the hands of the devil. We do not care to be under obligation to him, for we are sure that for everything he gives he will exact more than tenfold in return. By means of his pretended good services, he is now fastening the chains of error around thousands. Remember, he "deceived them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do."

Then the question has been asked, "Why does God permit the devils to lay their invisible snares for the souls of men? Why does he allow them to be so deceived?" He does not allow them to lay *invisible* snares. His word sheds the clearest light upon them, so that none may be deceived. "We are not ignorant of Satan's devices," if we take heed to the lamp of God's word. But, unfortunately, people will not heed the warning, the Bible is full of admonitions, but these will do no good unless heeded. Says the wise man: "If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God. . . . Then shalt thou understand righteousness, and judgment, and equity; yea, every good path." Prov. 3-9.

But instead of so doing, men hate (true) knowledge, and do not choose the fear of the Lord; therefore, they eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices. Indeed, the Bible plainly declares that no man is ever led away by the deceptions of Satan unless he first rejects truth. Paul says that Satan works "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

To those who are thinking of "trying" the spirits by personal inspection, we would say, Beware. Trust the description that you find in God's word, and go not into their assemblies. God's word is a better guide than human sense. Keep as far away from danger as possible; keep off the devil's ground; in short, keep in Christ, where alone there is safety. W.

**August 26, 1886**

**"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 8" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Verse 23.

It has been abundantly proved that "under the law" indicates, in general, a state of sin and consequently of condemnation. See the comments on Rom. 6:14; Gal. 4:4, 5, 21; 5:18; and Romans 7. The idea of bondage is everywhere connected with sin. It is a cruel master. Paul says: "The law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." In the verse before us, we have the strongest expression on this point that occurs in the Bible. Take earthly laws as an illustration of the fact. When they are violated, the offender is seized as soon as possible, and cast into prison. He is "shut up" to await either the execution of the penalty or a pardon. Of course in earthly affairs miscarriages of justice often take place. Sometimes a culprit is not apprehended, and very often the guilty escape without either sentence or pardon. But from the law of God there is no escape. There is a standing sentence of death on all who violate it, and consequently as soon as a man sins, he brings himself under its curse. He is "condemned already." Moreover, although sentence may not be executed speedily, God's Government does not, like human governments, need detectives to ferret out the criminals. "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good." Prov. 15:3.

As in human governments the criminal is cast into prison as soon as he is detected, so violators of God's law are at once "shut up." As soon as they transgress the law, they are indicted and condemned, and there is not possibility of escape from the threatened penalty. Yes there is just one way of escape. "The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ" will make the man stand free before God. The sinner, as is described by Paul in Rom. 7:14, 24, may strive with all his might to keep the law, and to get rid of the body of death that is fastened to him. But how can the guilty one help himself when he is "shut up" in prison, "in bondage," and securely chained to a body of death? All his struggles are fruitless. He makes an effort to escape in this direction, but finds himself confronted by the prison wall; then he makes an effort on the other side, and there the massive wall opposes an effectual barrier to his progress. He is absolutely "shut up" to the faith which may afterwards be revealed as the only means of escape from present guilt, and from the wrath to come.

Peter carries out the same idea when he calls the wicked antediluvians "the spirits in prison," and says that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to them. 1 Peter 3:18-20. If they had listened to his preaching, they might have been released from prison, for it is the mission of Christ "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Isa. 61:1.

Take notice that in every case of just imprisonment it is the law that seizes the criminal, shuts him up, and keeps him confined until his trial and execution. The

sheriff, jailer, and executioner are only agents of the law. It is the strong arm of the law that gives power to the prison walls and bolts. But for the violated law, they could have no power to confine a man. So the law is in reality the jailer to every criminal. This idea is carried out in the verse under consideration. The New Version makes it emphatic by saying, "But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." The addition of the words "in ward" is not unwarranted. The Greek is *sugkleismenos*, which carries the idea of confinement, from *kleis*, a key. Alford says on the expression, "were kept in ward": "Not simply 'kept,' as authorized version, but as Chrysostom says, as it were in a fortress." And this agrees strikingly with Luther's version, which reads: "*Wurden wir unter dem geaetz ferwahret und ferschosen.*" "We were under the law, guarded and imprisoned." The word "*ferschlossen*" means "locked up," from *schoss*, a lock, a castle, a fortress. All this agrees with the known office of any law, -to confine within prison walls those who violate it.

"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3:24.

The word "schoolmaster" does not convey to us the idea of the original. The Greek is *paidagogos* (*paidagogos*), pedagogue. The *paidagogos* was a slave who attended the children on their way to school, beating them if they were inclined to play truant. He also had charge of them out of school, having the general duty of correcting their manners. We have come to use the word pedagogue as synonymous with school-teacher, but in reality we have nothing which corresponds to the ancient *paidagogos*. In the New Version the word is rendered "tutor," the first definition of which is, "One who guards, protects, watches over, or has the care of another." The word occurs in but one other place in the New Testament, in 1 Cor. 4:15, where in King James's Version it is rendered "instructor." "Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Here the same idea is conveyed as in Gal. 5:24, 25. The Corinthians might have many *tutors*, many who would lay down the law to them, and show them their errors, but they had not many, who, like Paul, would preach "Christ, and him crucified," and with the tenderness of a father win them to faith in Christ. The old meaning of "pedagogue" still attaches to the word "tutor," for it is very common to speak of "tutoring" some person, the idea being that of disciplining, of correcting with authority.

This idea is still further carried out in Luther's translation, where the Greek word *paidagogos* is rendered *zuchtmeister*, which means "a master of a house of corrections;" "a task-master" "a jailer." Before faith came we were kept in prison, under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed; wherefore the law was our master in that house of correction, to lead us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

The reader will notice that the idea that the law acts as a jailer to sinners does not conflict with the idea that it also acts as a tutor, or pedagogue. It acts as pedagogue by virtue of its office as jailer. As jailer it shuts us up in a stronghold from which we cannot escape. Now the more galling this imprisonment is made,

the more our desire to escape is increased; and since there is no means of escape except through faith in Jesus Christ, it follows that the more of a jailer we feel the law to be, the more of a pedagogue it becomes, forcing us to flee for refuge to the hope set before us.

This office the law now has, and it has no other. It cannot pardon; it can only point out our sin. It is this which, directed by the Spirit of God, convicts of sin. Stung by his awakened conscience, the guilty one seeks peace and rest, but the law relentlessly charges him with his sin. All that it will do is to deepen convictions, and thus add to the load that weighs down the sinner. Finally, when he loses confidence in himself, and cries out, "O wretched man that I am," he is forced to cast himself at the feet of Jesus, saying, "Lord be merciful to me, a sinner." This is the only avenue of escape, and it is one that never fails. Thus the law literally drives the sinner to Christ, by shutting up every other way of freedom from guilt. And when the sinner has come to Christ, he learns from the one whose life is but the embodiment of the righteousness of the law. He is thus exhorted to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 3:18. Christ says: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me." Matt. 11:29. He is "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6), that is, the law in its perfection. In Christ he may perform good works, because he walks at liberty. As the justified one abides in Christ and Christ in him (John 15:4), he is enabled finally to grow "unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:25-27.

The best comment on the expression, "after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster," is found in Rom. 8:1-4. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Or this: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Rom. 6:14, 15.

Still another comment on Gal. 3:22-25, and a parallel passage is found in Rom. 3:20-25: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God."

Not only may the above text be applied the same as Gal. 3:20-25, but it must be applied to the same thing, for the argument in each place is exactly the same.

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:27-29.

This closes the chapter, and the argument. In the fourth chapter, an exposition of which has been given, the apostle goes over the ground in another way, to bring out additional points. There, as here, Christ is the focal point. Baptism is for the remission of sins. We are buried with Christ by baptism into death, and by that act we "put on Christ." And if we are Christ's, which honor we attain to only by the exercise of faith, then we are children of faithful Abraham, and with him are heirs of the promise. In this way, and in this way alone, can we be made "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. W.

### **"Humboldt County Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was held in Eureka, on the same ground as the camp-meeting last year, a beautiful alder grove but a short walk from the business center of the city. On our arrival we found that the ground had been well cleared of underbrush and rocks. And that all the lumber necessary for pitching the tents have been procured. The brethren in the vicinity took hold faithfully to assist in the preparation for the meeting, doing a team work, etc., so that when it was time for the meeting to begin, everything was ready.

The camp, although small, presented a very neat appearance. The tents were arranged in the form of a hollow square, with the large tent occupying the principal part of one side. Every tent was floored, sufficient lumber for that purpose having been donated by friendly citizens. The encampment was inclosed, and well lighted.

The Sabbath-keepers in Humboldt County were well represented, about two-thirds of the entire number being present. We hope that by another year those who enjoyed the meeting just passed will have convinced every Sabbath-keeper in the county that their camp-meeting is something that they cannot afford to miss.

There being no business to transact, all the time of the meeting was devoted to religious services and general instruction. There were forty-five services besides the Sabbath-school. Of these, seven were children meetings, once each day, and twenty were preaching or Bible-reading services. The remainder were prayer and social meetings, and meetings for instruction in missionary work and on other important topics.

There were no purely theoretical sermons given, it was sought to show the practical importance of all the doctrines presented, and their bearing on our daily life. Our duty to God and to each other, the love of God to us, and how which should beget in us faith and courage, and also tenderness and love for the brethren, were dwelt upon, and the Lord blessed the efforts. The blessed, melting influence of the Holy Spirit was manifest from the first to the last. We believe that

many received new views of truth and beauty, and will be better able than ever before to withstand the assaults of Satan.

The attendance from the outside was not large, but was quite regular, and the attention and order were excellent. We were never present where there was more perfect quiet and order, and we never before saw so much reverence manifested by unbelievers toward religious worship. The people of Humboldt County, and especially of Eureka, have shown themselves generous and hospitable, and we believe that there is on this Coast no better field for labor.

The general verdict at the close of the meeting was that it had been too short. We had never before met any of the Sabbath-keepers in that section, save two or three, but we left them feeling that we were parting from dear brethren and sisters. Those who are united by the bonds of Christian fellowship cannot long remain strangers. Personally, we felt much strengthened by the meeting. We pray for the continued blessing of God on his cause and people in Humboldt County. W.

## **September 2, 1886**

### **"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 9" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We think the reader who has carefully followed us through the seventh of Romans and the third of Galatians, will have no difficulty in seeing how thoroughly the majesty of the law is vindicated throughout, and its perpetuity shown, and also how beautiful is the harmony between the law and the gospel. Right here we wish to quote a pertinent passage from John Wesley:-

"It is the ordinary method of the Spirit of God, to convict sinners by the law. It is this, which being set home on the conscience, generally breaks the rock in pieces. It is more especially this part of the word of God which is quick and powerful, full of life and energy, and 'sharper than any two-edged sword.' This, in the hand of God and of those whom he hath sent, pierces through all the folds of a deceitful heart, and, 'divides asunder even the soul and spirit;' yea, as it were, the very 'joints and marrow.' By this is the sinner discovered to himself. All his fig leaves are torn away, and he sees that he is 'wretched, and poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked.' The law flashes conviction on every side. He feels himself a mere sinner. He has nothing to pay. His 'mouth is stopped,' and he stands 'guilty before God.'

"To slay the sinner is the first use of the law; to destroy the life and strength wherein he trusts, and convince him that he is dead while he liveth; not only under the sentence of death, but actually dead unto God, void of all spiritual life, 'dead in trespasses and sins.' The second use of it is to bring him unto life, unto Christ that he may live. It is true, in performing both these offices, it acts the part of a severe schoolmaster. It drives us by force, rather than draws us by love. And yet love is the spring of all. It is the spirit of love which, by this painful means, tears away our confidence in the flesh, which leaves us no broken reed whereon



to trust, and so constrains the sinner, stripped of all, to cry out in the bitterness of his soul, or groan in the depth of his heart,-

'I give up every plea beside,-

Lord, I am damned, but thou hast died.'

"The third use of the law is to keep us alive. It is the grand means whereby the Holy Spirit prepares the believer for larger communications of the life of God. I am afraid this great and important truth is little understood, not only by the world, but even by many whom God hath taken out of the world, who are real children of God by faith. Many of these lay it down as an unquestioned truth that when we come to Christ we have done with the law, and that in this sense 'Christ is the end of the law to every one that believeth.' 'The end of the law'-so he is 'for righteousness,' for justification, 'to every one that believeth.' Herein the law is at an end. It justifies none, but only brings them to Christ, who is also, in another respect, the end, or scope of the law,-the point at which it continually aims. But when it has brought us to him, it has yet a farther office, namely, to keep us with him. For it is continually exciting all believers, the more they see of its height, and depth, and length, and breadth, to exhort one another so much the more:-

'Closer and closer let us cleave

To his beloved embrace;

Expect his fullness to receive,

And grace to answer grace."

"Therefore, I cannot spare the law one moment, no more than I can spare Christ, seeing I now want it as much to keep me to Christ as I ever wanted it to bring me to him. Otherwise, this 'evil heart of unbelief' would immediately 'depart from the living God.' Indeed, each is continually sending me to the other,-the law of Christ, and Christ to the law. On the one hand, the height and depth of the law constrain me to fly to the love of God in Christ; on the other, the love of God in Christ endears the law to me 'above gold or precious stones.'" -*Sermon 34, "Properties of the Law."*

The above view of the law is a just one. But all have not so clear an understanding of the law and the gospel as Wesley had. Since some, following the lead of Dr. Clarke, have either confounded the moral law with the Levitical or ceremonial, or else have supposed that the third of Galatians refers principally to the ceremonial law, it may not be amiss to show briefly why it is impossible that the ceremonial law should be the subject of discourse in that chapter. A few points will suffice.

1. Paul says that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Verse 13. Now (a) There was nothing in the ordinances of the ceremonial law to condemn any one. Condemnation could come only through violation of the ten commandments. The ceremonial law was the sum of the gospel ordinances in the Jewish age. And there was no curse in any way attached to it, any more than there is to the gospel. It certainly did not curse those who carried it out with a sincere heart; for such, like David, offered "sacrifices of joy;" and those who neglected it and thus showed their unbelief, were condemned by the moral law alone, because of their sins; as Christ said, "he that believeth not is condemned already." (b) Even admitting that the

ceremonial law had a curse connected with it, or was itself a curse, "we" never had any connection with that law, and consequently could not be redeemed from it. (c) The Galatians, to whom this epistle was personally addressed, were chiefly converts from among the heathen, and had never had any connection with the ceremonial law. Therefore, although Paul might properly tell them to keep clear of it, he could not say that they had been redeemed from it. (d) The result of Christ's being made a curse for us is "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." And the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles only as they are redeemed from iniquity,-the transgression of the moral law.

2. Therefore "the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. 3:22. Only the moral law could conclude men "under the sin." There was nothing in the rites and ceremonies of the Levitical law that was of primary obligation,-nothing that could show men to be sinners.

3. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Gal. 3:23. This is in no sense true of the ceremonial law. It did not precede faith, but followed it. No one ever heard of such a thing as the ceremonies of the Levitical law being performed by one who knew nothing of Christ. But it is true of all men that, before they have faith in Christ, they are "under the law," condemned, and "shut up" to the faith which may be revealed to them, as the only means of freedom from condemnation.

4. "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3:24. By no possibility can this refer to the ceremonial law. This text is sometimes read as though it said that the law was our schoolmaster to point us to Christ, and then it is asked, "What is there in the moral law that points to Christ?" The answer is, of course, that there is nothing. But the text says the law brings us to Christ. We have shown how the moral law does this, by giving the convicted sinner no rest until he flees to Christ. The ceremonial law, however, brought no one to Christ. It was simply the means by which those who already believed in Christ as the one who should be offered for sin, might indicate their faith in him. The ceremonial law comprised the gospel ordinances of the Jewish age. The order was, first the moral law to convict of sin and show the necessity for Christ, and then the rites of the ceremonial law to indicate and keep alive the faith that they already had. See Leviticus 4, noting especially verses 2, 13, and 27. Justification has reference only to the moral law. From the transgression of that, man needs justification; but the law cannot justify any sinner, it can only condemn. And so it drives him to Christ, that he may be justified by faith.

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Gal. 3:25. But it was only after faith came that people had anything to do with the ceremonial law. Is there a man in this age who has more faith than Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or Daniel, who all prophesied of Christ, and who looked to him for salvation? Those men "through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness

were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." Heb. 11:33, 34. And yet all their lives long they performed the rites of the ceremonial law. If Gal. 3:25 refers to the ceremonial law, those faithful men ought never to have offered one of the sacrifices of that law. It was their faith, however, that led them to offer the sacrifices of the ceremonial law, as Paul says, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Heb. 11:4.

"The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3:24. The past tense can be used here only by those who have come to Christ and have been justified by faith, as Paul shows in the next verse. Since the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, it must still be the schoolmaster (pedagogue) to those who are not in Christ, and must retain that office until every one who will accept Christ is brought to him. Therefore the law will be a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, as long as probation lasts. But the Levitical law passed away hundreds of years ago; therefore it cannot be the law referred to here. To put the matter briefly, we may say that if the law is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, to divest it of that office while there are men still out of Christ, yet willing to come to him, would be to prematurely cut them off from hope of salvation.

We would by no means be understood as holding that the ceremonial law does not figure in the epistle to the Galatians. The controversy over the ceremonial law drew out the epistle. But there was in that controversy, which this epistle must have effectually settled for all candid minds, something deeper than the mere question whether or not men should be circumcised. Paul repeatedly asserts that it makes no difference whether or not a man is circumcised. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing." But when men submitted to it as a means of justification, that moment it became a serious matter, for such an act is a rejection of Christ.

Suppose a man has accepted Christ and in him has been made "a new creature." Now suppose that he is led to accept circumcision, or any other work, as a means of justification, thereby rejecting Christ; what will be the immediate result? He will at once go into sin; for out of Christ no man can by any possibility refrain from sinning. No matter to what heights of holiness a man may have attained, just as soon as he loses sight of Christ as his "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," he becomes carnal and cannot please God. This was the case with the Galatian brethren. They had been called into the grace of Christ; but some had troubled them with another gospel—a gospel of works and not of faith—which was no gospel at all, and by accepting it they had lost their faith in Christ, and consequently had become sinners "under the law." And it is on this

535

account that the apostle exclaims, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth (Compare Ps. 119:142, 151), before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" (Gal. 3:19) and again, "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" Gal. 5:7.

But this is sufficient. We did not design to discuss the whole book of Galatians, but simply to show that it gives no comfort to the enemies of the law of God. We wish the reader to keep in view the main thought in our study, -that God desires that all men should be saved. His love is as boundless as the universe, and reaches to the least of his creatures. But he cannot endure it in his presence. Neither could the sinner be happy in the presence of the pure and holy God. Nay, more, it would be impossible for the sinner even to look upon God. Everything that dwells with God must be in perfect accord with him. But all men have violated his holy law, and are by it condemned to death. God has a glorious inheritance promised to the righteous, but who can obtain it? No one can make himself righteous. The sinner studies the law, and learns what sort of a character he ought to have, but that only condemns him the more. It provides no way of escape, but drives him toward the door of mercy, which is ever open. Then, instead of profitless struggles, being justified by faith he has peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus the law proves to be the strongest ally of the promise by faith. And this tutorship it exercises until the Seed comes to whom and through whom the promise was made, and then God's people being all righteous, it ceases to drive them. They are "in Christ," and the law is in their hearts. In Christ they find everything. No need have they now to teach one another the way of truth, because the truth, is in their hearts. More than this, they are all taught of God, and their peace is like a river, constantly flowing. Fully reconciled to God, they see his face, and in his presence find fullness of joy, and at his right hand enjoy pleasures forevermore.

Reader, "now is the accepted time: now is the day of salvation." "To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" but if with sincerity you pray with the psalmist, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me," he will for Christ's sake pardon all your iniquity, and then, being a new creature in Christ, you can say, "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." Ps. 119:97. W.

### **"The Only Sure Guide" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

Says the apostle Peter: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. 1:19. What does he mean by saying that we have a "*more sure* word of prophecy"? Does he mean that we have one word of prophecy that is more sure than some other word of prophecy? By no means, "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (verse 21), and therefore it is all equally true. But the apostle has just before related the experience of the apostles with Christ in the mount of transfiguration, when they saw Christ in the glory which he will have when he comes again to earth, and they heard the voice of God saying, "This is my beloved Son." The apostles were treated to a miniature representation of the coming of the Lord, and so Peter assures the brethren that he had been an eye-

witness of the things which he made known to them. But, nevertheless, says he, "We have a more sure word of prophecy?" That is, the testimony of prophecy is more sure than the evidence of our senses. Therefore we must believe the prophecy, even though it is directly contrary to the evidence of our senses. He who thus accepts the Bible can never be deceived, while the one who trusts even his own senses in preference to the Bible will sooner or later surely be led into fatal error.

### **"Feeding upon Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks what is meant by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ (Gen 6:53-57), and wishes to know if it has any connection with the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. In reply we would say that it evidently has the closest connection. Christ said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." John 6:53-56. Now is evident that no man can literally eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, and this caused the unbelieving to choose to stumble. But Christ meant that by faith we should appropriate him to ourselves, and thus live godly lives for him, just as one lives physically by what he eats. Says Paul: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. 2:20. So Christ continues: "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." John 6:57. It is by faith that we have that close communion with Christ which enables us to live as he himself would live; for "the just shall live by faith."

The Lord's Supper is the visible manifestation of this faith which thus appropriates Christ. When Christ broke bread, he said, "This is my body, which is broken for you." Then he took the cup and said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood: for, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. 11:24, 25. And Paul immediately adds: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup ye do *showed the Lord's death*." Verse 26. It is in the death of Christ, and our death and burial with him, that we are united to him. It is only in his *broken* body that we partake. And in partaking of the bread and the wine of the Lord's Supper, we are fulfilling John 6:53-57 as literally as it is possible for us to fulfill it. Of course this is true only so far as the Lord's Supper is partaken of understandingly, and not as a mere form. He who partakes of it as a mere matter of form, not discerning with the eye faith, the Lord's body, eats and drinks damnation to itself. Such a person does not eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, but eats and drinks simply bread and wine, and of course does not comply with the divine command.

Let no one, however, imagine that Christ's words in John 6:53-57 can be fulfilled *only* when the Lord's Supper is eaten. If the Christian is to live by Christ, and he can live in no other way, he must continually feed on Christ. A man cannot

live a year, a month, or even a week without spiritual food anymore than he can live and grow physically without daily partaking of literal food. The true Christian *abides* in Christ, and Christ *abides* in him; there is daily and hourly communion. He does not receive Christ on a fixed or varying occasions, but Christ *dwells* in him; and so when he partakes of the Lord's Supper, he indicates outwardly that union which always exists, and by that act his union by faith is strengthened. And thus living by Christ who lives by the Father, the Christian becomes "filled with all the fullness of God." W.

**September 9, 1886**

**"Their Wisdom Is Perished" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The subject of the International Sunday-school lesson for August 15 was "Christ Teaching Humility," the text being John 13:1-17. We do not design in this article to consider in detail the subject of feet-washing as a Christian ordinance, for that ground was thoroughly canvassed in the "Notes" in the SIGNS of that week; but we wish to call attention to some of the "expositions" of the text that are given in the various religious journals.

First we pick up the *Christian Union*. It says on verses 12-16:-

"Feet-washing seems here to be as explicitly commanded as the Lord's Supper. Yet there is no evidence that it was practiced in apostolic times, nor is in general use in the Christian church to-day. It is practiced in some Greek convents, by the Pope once a year on Maundy Thursday, and by some minor Baptist sects, chiefly confined to Pennsylvania. This apparent regard of Christ's seemingly explicit command can be defended only on the general ground that no ceremonial is of the essence of Christianity; that what Christ prescribes is not the symbol, but the spirit symbolized."

Then we think it would be well for "the Christian church" to learn the meaning of these words which are found in this connection: "The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." If Christ gave it an explicit command (as he did in this instance), and "the church" has taken it upon itself to decide that compliance with that command is not necessary, then certainly the servant has, in his own estimation, got quite a distance above his Lord.

"No ceremonial is of the essence of Christianity." Very true; but that is no reason for disregarding the ceremony if it is commanded. We should not refuse to follow certain ordinances because those ordinances may be performed in a mechanical matter, but should see to it that we perform them with the spirit. We all know that love is shown by obedience to the expressed wishes of another. We also know that a child may mechanically or from necessity obey any given command, and that then the obedience indicates no love. That is, love is manifest, not by the mere performance of the act, but by the spirit with which that act is performed. Now recognizing this fact, a boy will say, "It seems quite plain that my father told me to care for this garden; but since the essence of love and

obedience is not in any form, nor in outward acts of obedience, I will pay no attention to what he said, but will be sure to have a strong *feeling* of love in my heart." The father would quickly decide that such a son was too "progressive."

It is not true that feet-washing was not practiced in apostolic times, as is shown by 1 Tim. 5:10. But even if the Saviour's command had never been obeyed, that would not be the shadow of a reason why we should not obey it.

Next we pick up the Methodist *Recorder*. On verse 14 it has the following:-

"The command will rather find its fulfillment in all kinds of mutual condescension and help than any literal observance."-*Alford*.

Oh, yes; that settles the matter. Mr. Alford's *dictum* is sufficient. To be sure Christ said, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," but Dean Alford says that he didn't mean what he said, and so we need not trouble ourselves over the matter any more. This is a sample of the pernicious use of commentaries, and of the perniciousness of nineteenth of the comments that are written. When a man gives a scholarly criticism of the meaning of some terms in the original, or when he compares several texts bearing on one point, and shows the necessary conclusion therefrom,-that is legitimate comment; but when he ventures to give his own *opinion* of a text, unsupported by any authority, it were better for that matter if he had never written a commentary; and people who implicitly trust any commentator who will even once give his own *opinion* as to the meaning of a text, are willingly walking into darkness.

The *Christian at Work* has a comment very similar to that of the *Christian Union*. It says:-

"Finally the application of the entire transaction comes out in the words: 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet.' This is not to be literally understood; for neither the apostles nor the members of the early church, though acting under the direction of the Spirit, ever actually practiced feet-washing as a religious rite."

To this we would say, (1) That because a public record of the performance of an act is not kept, that is no evidence that the act was not done. The thing having been commanded, we naturally conclude that it was practiced, except when the church was not led by the Spirit; for obedience to known requirement is an evidence of being led by the Spirit. (2) In 1 Tim. 2:10, feet-washing is mentioned by Paul as a well-known Christian duty, and one entirely distinct from acts of hospitality and relieving the afflicted. (3) Obligation to perform any deed can rest only on an expressed commandment, and not on the action of any other persons. When a thing is commanded, it is our duty to do it, even if everybody else disregards it.

But the *Christian at Work* overthrows its own theory when it says concerning the Saviour's command:-

"It means that as the Lord found it not inconsistent with the highest dignity and glory to minister in all lowliness unto the weakest, so we must find exaltation and happiness by doing likewise."

Just above it said that feet-washing is not to be practiced, because (as it claims) the apostles and the members of the early church did not do so. Then by the same "reasoning," ministering unto the weak and lowly is not to be done

unless "the church" in all ages has done so. Now the veriest tyro in history knows that the great apostasy began in the very days of the apostles, when there were many in the church who loved to have the pre-eminence, and that for hundreds of years the members of the church, instead of finding exaltation and happiness in serving the weak, found it in building themselves up at the expense of others. And so according to the popular exposition of John 13:1-16, it is now every man's duty to look out for himself, regardless of others. When one begins to "*explain away*" the Bible, he may as well *throw* it away.

The *Sabbath Recorder*, however, caps the climax of absurdity in the following extract:-

"In company with a traveling companion, we reached the house of another friend about noon, after a long journey on foot, under a hot sun, and over a dusty road. We had barely passed the customary greetings, and taken our seats in the best room, when the good woman of the house asked us to take off our boots. Seeing that we hesitated, she repeated her request in a manner which plainly showed that she was not joking. We accordingly took them off, and she took them out of the room. Presently she returned them as neatly blackened as they had been for some time. When she set them down she said, 'And thus I have fulfilled my Lord's command to wash the disciples' feet.' And who shall say that she had not done so?"

Everybody ought to say that she did not. In the first place, even if our Saviour's command had reference only to acts of hospitality, it would not be fulfilled by performing such acts and then calling attention to it. True hospitality, as well as true obedience, is unostentatious. But the idea of saying that for one person to black another's boots is a fulfillment of our Lord's word, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," is too absurd for serious comment. According to this exposition, the Saviour's words should be read thus: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to black one another's boots! For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." The simple statement of the case refutes it. Besides, the reader will notice that the act of feet-washing is to be reciprocal: "Ye also ought to *wash one another's feet*." Now allowing that to wash feet means to black boots, in order to have the command fulfilled in the case under consideration, the editor of the *Recorder* ought to have turned around and blacked the good woman's shoes.

The very absurdity of such an exposition as the above is, after all, the most serious thing about it; for it is sad to think that men will thus sport with a divine command. It is nothing less than making void the commandments of God. On the same principle men rest on Sunday, and say that they are thus obeying the Lord's command to "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." With as much reason others are sprinkled with a few drops of water, and say that they are obeying the injunction to be baptized. On such a principle of interpretation there is no conceivable act that may not be construed into obedience to some divine command.

It is sad to think that because of such deviations of plain precepts, men are losing their power to comprehend the simplest truth; but so it is. The Lord says: "Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do



honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." Isa. 29:13, 14. When a wise man turns aside from the plain commandments of the Lord, he becomes the most dangerous of counselors. W.

### **"Who Is Worthy?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

W. D. C. asks: "When will Matt. 25:31-46 be fulfilled? Are 'my brethren' (verse 40) a third class distinct from the sheep and the goats? It seems as if those who have heard the gospel would not be so surprised at the words of Christ."

A reading of the text itself should suffice to answer the question. "When the Son of man shall, in his glory, and all the holy angels with him," can be nothing but the glorious second advent of Christ, when "he shall send his angels with a great sound of the trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one into heaven to the other" (Matt. 24:31); when "he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. At that time, as now, there will be but two classes,-the righteous and the wicked. A reading of the passage will show, that those on the right hand are the righteous, and that those on the left, the goats, are of the wicked. There is not now, nor will there ever be, any class between these two; if a man is not good, he is bad: there can be no middle ground. Says Christ: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12:30.

Now as to the question of surprise which the righteous ask, verses 37-39, we see nothing in it to indicate that those who ask it have never heard the gospel. Humility is the characteristic of the Christian. If they have learned of Jesus, who is meek and lowly of heart, they will be very unconscious of their own worthiness. There will be no

551

spirit of boasting. If they should say, "Yes, Lord, we know that we have done all these things; we have served you faithfully," that would be an indication that they had heard the gospel and vain. See Matt. 7:22, 23. But no such spirit will exist among those who are really Christ's. No one will think of proclaiming his own worthiness, because, as a matter of fact, no one will have any worthiness of his own, but will be "complete in him, who is the head of all principality in power." Col. 2:10. And so instead of thinking of themselves, or claiming anything because of their own merit, the redeemed will with one accord unite in saying, "*Worthy is a Lamb* that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

### **"Camp-Meeting in Santa Barbara County" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting, the third of the kind that has been held in the State this season, was held at Santa Maria, just within the north boundary line of Santa Barbara County. The camp was located in a eucalyptus grove close by the village, and was a pleasant place to see. Its arrangements, as well as the uniform quiet on the grounds, and the promptness and order with which everything was conducted, called forth many expressions of surprise and admiration from all who attended either as campers or as transient visitors. Many had supposed that camp-meetings were always scenes of disorder and confusion; they seemed surprised to learn that people can worship God in a house of cotton with as much decorum and reverence as they can in a house of wood.

The attendance, both of our own people and others, was small. The time of the camp-meeting was a little unfortunate, it being a time when nearly everybody was engaged in threshing. This, of course, was sufficient reason for the limited transient attendance; and the fact that our brethren in that section have newly come to the faith, and could not realize the importance of a camp-meeting, will account for the absence of some of them. But we think that an impression was made on all who were present that will be lasting, and that will not be confined simply to them. Visitors who came out of a curiosity went away to sound the praises of a meeting where all was peace. Visitors who came out of curiosity went away to sound the praises of a meeting where all was peace and quiet; and some who were in the dark as to duty, went away rejoicing in the light of present truth. All seemed very grateful for the instruction given, and no one could doubt but that the souls of all were refreshed, as they testified of their increased knowledge of the love and mercy of God, and of their determination to press forward to new victories in the strength of that love.

The spirit of sacrifice manifested by those that came to the meeting was commendable, and will, we believe, bear fruit. From nearly one hundred miles south, and from an equal distance north, women and children rode in open wagons over mountain roads, camping out at night under their wagons, that they might be present. It is almost needless to add that they were present at the beginning of the meeting, and that they stayed until the close. This is not, however, meant as a reproach to those were present only a portion of the time. We are convinced that all made the strongest effort possible under the circumstances.

The expenses of the meeting were promptly and cheerfully met. As an item of encouragement we also note that the attention of many is being directed to the College, and that some from the southern countries will attend the coming term. We believe that our educational institutions were planted in the province of God, and that upon them largely depends the future of the young among us, as well as the general advancement of the cause. We believe that God designs them to wield an influence that has as yet scarcely been dreamed of but by few.

All left for their homes with good courage, with regrets that the meeting closed so soon, and with a determination that the next one should be more largely attended if their influence could do aught toward accomplishing that result. W.

**September 16, 1886**

**"In the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

The expression, "under the law," occurs twelve times in King James's version of the New Testament, in the following verses: Rom. 3:19; 6:14, 15; 1 Cor. 9:20 (three times), 21; Gal. 3:23 (the equivalent expression "under a schoolmaster," is found also, in verse 24); 4:4, 5, 21; 5:18. In previous articles we have considered all these instances of the use of the term, except Rom. 3:19, and 1 Cor. 9:20, 21. In every case thus far we have found that it indicates a state of sin, and consequently of condemnation by the law. The one who has violated the law is under sentence of death, and so the law is represented as being upon him, holding him down to death.

Now in Rom. 3:19, a different thought is presented to one who reads the text carefully. We will read it: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." On reading this some one will say, "Your idea that 'under the law' means condemned by the law certainly cannot hold here, for that would make the text of no force; it would be the same as saying, 'What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are condemned by the law, in order that every one may be condemned,' and that would be nonsense." The point is well taken, and we should have to conclude that the term "under the law" does not always indicate a state of sin and condemnation, if it were not for the fact that the expression does not really occur in Rom. 3:19 at all. In all the texts which we have heretofore considered, the Greek words which are rendered "under the law" are, *hupo nomon*, which should be rendered, as they invariably are, by the phrase "under the law." But in Rom. 3:19 the Greek words which in King James's version are rendered "under the law" are, *en to nomo*, which cannot properly be translated in any other way than "in the law." The same expression is found in the Greek of Rom. 2:12, where the translators have correctly rendered it "in the law."

The text under consideration should therefore read thus: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are in the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before [margin, subject to the judgment of] God." That is, the law speaks to those who are within its jurisdiction, or, as Professor Boise renders it, "within its sphere," and as a consequence it declares that all the world are subject to the judgment of God, because it shows that all are sinners.

The expression, "that every mouth may be stopped," is very forcible. When a man is brought into court, and charged with any crime, he begins, through his counsel, to plead his own cause, and to try to establish his innocence. But sometimes the evidence of a man's guilt is so overwhelmingly clear that he has no defense to make; his mouth is stopped, and he is forced to acknowledge the justness of the charge against him. So the law of God speaks to those over whom it has jurisdiction, and charges them with sin; and the evidence is so clear

that no one can speak a word in self-defense, but all the world stand condemned before God.

By this rendering of Rom. 3:19, and it is the correct one, we are taught an important truth concerning the extent of the law's jurisdiction. Note these points: The law speaks only to those who are within its sphere; if any such have violated it, it condemns them, and it can condemn no others. The law has no power to condemn any who do not owe allegiance to it, or who are outside its pale. Now Paul has shown (Rom. 3:9-18) that there is not a person on earth who has not sinned, and he therefore emphatically declares that the law, speaking only to those within its jurisdiction, stops *every mouth*, and condemns *the whole world*. There could be no more forcible way of saying that *every individual in the world* is amenable to the law of God. Jews and Gentiles are all in the same condemnation, because they are all within the pale of the law, and have all violated it.

Perhaps some may think that this makes a contradiction between Rom. 3:19 and Rom. 2:12, but there is none. It is true that Rom. 2:12 speaks of those "without law" as distinct from those "in the law;" but those who are spoken of as without law, are also spoken of as having sinned, and we have already learned (1) That "sin is the transgression of the law," and that "where no law is there is no transgression," and (2) that Paul, in verses 14, 15, shows that these same ones who are in one sense without law, "show the work of the law written in their hearts," and that they therefore do have the law. Some sin in the face of the full light of the law, while others sin against only that knowledge of the law which they have by nature; but all are counted as sinners in God's sight, and they could not be so reckoned if they were not amenable to the law; hence he declares that all are in reality "in the law."

Let us now read 1 Cor. 9:20, 21: "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without law." In this text the term, "under the law," occurs four times. In the first three instances, reference to the same thing is made in each case. In the fourth instance, however, in verse 21, the Greek is *en to nomo*, as in Rom. 3:19, and should be rendered "*in the law*." Then the verse would read, "To them that are without law [I became] as without law, (being not without law, but *in the law* to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law."

In order to get the full force of this text, we must note the verse immediately preceding, and the two following: "For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more." "To the weak become I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you." These verses, taken in connection with the 20th and 21st, show Paul's meaning to be that in his ministerial work he sought to adapt himself, as far as possible, to the condition of those for whom he labored. He did not approach all men in the same manner, but adapted his teaching to the

different classes of people whom he taught. He took every one upon his own ground.

To the Jews, he became as a Jew. This he could easily do, for he was himself a Jew, and knew all their habits and customs. The book of Hebrews is an instance of how he became as a Jew to the Jews. From their own history, their Scriptures, and their religion, he demonstrated the Messiahship of our Saviour, and also his whole work in connection with the plan of salvation.

To them that were under the law, he became as under the law, that he might gain them that were under the law. That is, he drew on his own experience as a sinner, that he might successfully labor for those who felt the condemnation of God's law upon them in consequence of their sins. The seventh chapter of Romans is an instance of this. If Paul had not felt the terrible anguish which comes from the knowledge of an offended God, and the sense of impending doom, and the wondrous peace which comes from believing in Jesus, he could never have written a chapter so full of encouragement to the convicted sinner.

To them that were without law, that is, to the Gentiles who had not the written law, and the full knowledge of God, he became as without law, that he might gain them that were without the law. An instance of this is given in his dealing with the Athenians, Acts 17:22-31. He took them on their own ground, and from their own heathen worship, and their own heathen literature; he demonstrated to them the existence of a great Creator, and the certainty of a future general Judgment.

But while he became to them as without law, he says that he was in reality "not without law to God, but in the law to Christ." That is, he all the time recognized his obligation to keep the whole law of God, and that Christ was to him the end of that law for righteousness,-he did all things only by the aid of Christ.

This closes up the consideration of the expression "under the law." Taking out 1 Cor. 9:21 and Rom. 3:19, in which texts, as we have seen, the term does not really occur, we can arrive at this positive conclusion, that in every instance of its occurrence, "under the law" indicates a state of sin and condemnation. And since it is everywhere stated that only those who are in Christ are free from the condemnation of the law, and that all who are not in Christ and have not his Spirit, are under the law, the fact that the law is still in active operation is everywhere demonstrated. W.

### **"The End Near" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

"How do you explain the many passages in the New Testament that speak as if the end was close at hand? *If* the translators got the hang of those passages, those who first read them *must* have understood that the day of the Lord was at hand. Can it be that they spoke only of the persecutions shortly become? or did they think the interval between the persecutions and the advent shorter than it proved to be?

"1 Cor. 7:29 seems to many to teach that the end was near; yet from verse 26, and from Dean Alford's translation, I understand him [Paul] to mean that the

time of trouble was near, and that he is not speaking of the end; but many texts, such as Rom.13:14; 1 Cor. 1:6-8; 1 Thess. 1:10; 1 Tim 6:14; Heb. 10:34, 36, 37; 1 Pet. 4:17; Rev. 1:1, 3, seem to teach those to whom they were written that the end would be in their day." W. D. C.

1. As to the passages that speak of the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, we don't explain them; we simply take them just as they read, and believe them. And we do not doubt but that the translators got the "hang" of those passages; in fact, we are glad to *know* that they got the correct idea of them, because we love the Lord and rejoice in the assurance that he is coming. We should be in a deplorable condition, indeed, if there were no passages in the Bible assuring us that the Lord is coming.

2. We cannot allow that the New Testament writers were deceived as to the coming of the Lord. If we could think that they were to the slightest degree mistaken on this point, we could not be sure that they were not mistaken on every point. We believe that the whole Bible was written by inspiration of God, that it is equally inspired, and all equally true. If they text seems to us doubtful, or difficult to be understood, we lay it to our own ignorance, and not to the ignorance of the holy men of God who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

3. It is a fact that some of those to whom Paul

567

wrote got the idea that the coming of the Lord was going to take place in their day. But they did not get it from Paul's sermons or letters. There were some who were attempting to *deceive* the brethren by a *pretended* epistle from Paul (See 2 Thess. 1:3), and this led Paul to repeat what he had told them while he was with them,-that Christ would not come until after the Papacy had arisen, and had run its course of persecution and blasphemy. Certainly, then, we have no chance to be deceived, and suppose that the immediate coming of the Lord was preached in the first century; for although there are some passages which, taken alone, might seem to indicate that such was the case, we have the whole Bible, and are not obliged to take any one passage by itself. The Bible is one harmonious book. It was written by many men, but they all had the same Spirit, and so in every part it bears uniform testimony.

4. 1 Cor. 7:29 does not say that the Lord's coming is at hand, and therefore we do not need to go to any commentary to find out that Paul was writing of the then "present distress." So that passage, with other similar ones, doubtless refers to impending persecutions, and all were so understood by those to whom they were addressed. The instruction, however, which they contain is directly applicable to those who live when the coming of the Lord is close at hand.

5. When the New Testament writers speak directly of the coming of the Lord, as in 1 Thess. 1:9, 10; Rev. 1:1, 3, we have no right to suppose that they had reference to persecutions, or to anything but the coming of the Lord. The two texts to which we have just referred may be taken as a sample of all. The first one reads thus: "For they themselves show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even

Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." This brings to view the coming of the Lord as the Christians hope. Death is nowhere set forth as the object of the Christian's solicitude. The coming of the Lord is the blessed hope, the consummation of all things, and nothing else could be set before Christians of all ages to stimulate their energies.

As to such texts as Rev. 1:1, 3: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; . . . Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand;" or Rev. 22:20: "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly;" they were literally true when written. The things which John wrote did begin shortly to come to pass. More than that, it could truly be said that the Lord's coming was at hand. We must acknowledge this when we remember that the day of Pentecost was in "the last day" (See Acts 2:16-21), and that Paul wrote in the last days. Heb. 1:1, 2. It was true then that the coming of the Lord was "at hand," although not *immediately* at hand; it is a thousand fold more true now.

6. Everything in the New Testament was spoken or written to individuals then living, and was applicable to them; but it is also applicable to us. Comprehensiveness is a characteristic of the words of inspiration. Yet many things have a more direct application to us than to them. Suppose that the Bible had been only partly written centuries ago, and that all reference to the mere coming of the Lord had been left to be written at the present time; what evidence would we have that it was a divine inspiration? If reference were made to certain signs already fulfilled, everybody would say that was conjecture. But the Saviour gave us ground for the firmest assurances of faith, when centuries ago he foretold his coming, and the signs which would indicate its nearness. The fact that those signs were then foretold, made it possible that any one who accepted the words of inspiration *just as they are recorded*, should be deceived. Let us, then, not spend time in "doubtful disputations," but let us believe that "yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry;" and "let us holdfast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised." W.

**September 30, 1886**

**"How We May Know" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some people refuse to accept the Bible because there are so many things in it they cannot understand. If they could understand the Bible, they would accept it and Christ. Such need never expect to understand the Bible, for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2:14. If a man would understand the Bible, to begin with it is necessary for him to understand and believe, only these two simple verses: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "This is a faithful saying,

and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." 1 Tim.1:15. If he has mastered these two texts and all he has to do to master them is to believe them with his whole heart, then he is a child of God, by faith in Christ Jesus, and being in Christ, he has the Spirit of Christ, and may discern spiritual things. If he grows in the knowledge of Christ, he must necessarily grow in wisdom, for Christ is our wisdom as well as all or redemption. 1 Cor. 1:30. In Christ "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. 2:3. Therefore in Christ we may obtain all wisdom, but out of him we must remain ignorant. So we say to all, if you wish to understand the Bible, confess your sins to God, accept the sacrifice which he has provided, and receive his pardon. There is no Biblical knowledge which is not possible to the thoroughly converted man.

### **"The Sabbath and Conversion" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following question and answer we find in the report of a "gospel service" in San Francisco on a recent Sunday night:-

"Is the Sabbath done away with?"

"If you are a Jew, No. But it is deplorable to see a person claiming to be a Christian, and going back to Judaism. The Sabbath is the seventh day, but they are not converted people who keep it. Some people devote so much attention to the Sabbath question that their religion is all Sabbath and no Christ."

That is, the thing is done and it is not done. We leave the question as to how a thing can at the same time both be and not be, to those who are more skilled in casuistry than we are. We read that "the Sabbath was made for man;" then if it is abolished, it must be abolished for man; and if it is not abolished, it must remain for man. We have great respect for the Jews, but we do not believe that they were any more entitled to be called men that we are; therefore we do not believe the Sabbath was made specially for them. The Sabbath was made for all who are included in the general term "man." If there are any people to whom the term "man" does will not apply, then perhaps the Sabbath was not made for them. Keeping the Sabbath is no more Jewish than is worshiping the true God, or refraining from blasphemy, murder, and adultery. Therefore to keep the Sabbath is not to go back to Judaism.

"The Sabbath is the seventh day, but they are not converted people who keep it." The seventh-day Sabbath is the Sabbath commanded in the law, and the psalmist says, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. The law, including the Sabbath, is that which converts the soul, and brings it to Christ; now if a man, having come to Christ, rejects that which alone could bring him to Christ, he necessarily, in so doing, rejects Christ. Therefore to say that the Sabbath-keeper cannot be a converted man is unscriptural and false.

If the man had said that *not all* could keep the Sabbath are converted, we should be obliged to agree with him. Not all who profess to worshiped the true God, are converted. Not all who profess to accept Christ as their Saviour, are converted. Said Christ: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not



prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7:22, 23. But this does not prove that no one can be converted if he worships God or prophesies in the name of Christ. Yet we might as well say that it does as to say that a Sabbath-keeper cannot be converted.

Answers such as the one quoted above may satisfy those who "love to have it so;" but the fact that these questions are continually being asked, shows that people are thinking about the Sabbath; and in these investigations many will reject the foolishness of men, and will accept the word of the Lord which "endureth forever."

### **"The Pork Question Again" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we wrote a short article for the SIGNS in answer to a question concerning the use of swine's flesh. Shortly after, we gave an explanation of Peter's vision, in reply to one who gave that as divine authority for pork eating. In that we showed that God did not give Peter a vision for the purpose of teaching him that it was his duty to eat pork, but to teach him that he should call no *man* common. We also stated the fact that the distinction of clean and unclean beasts was not peculiar to the Levitical economy, but that it existed from the earliest ages, and that consequently the abolition of the ceremonial law had no effect upon the hog. As proof that the distinction of clean and unclean beasts existed before the Jewish age, we referred to Gen. 7:2, 8; 8:20.

A friend, however, takes exception to this, and claims that Gen. 9:3 shows that there was no distinction, but that all beasts were alike good for food. That verse reads thus, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." Every moving thing that liveth would include not only the hog but rats, toads, lizards, bats, buzzards, porcupines, centipedes, spiders, and scores of lesser vermin, which we think even our pork-loving friend would not wish to have included in his bill of fare. But our friend will say the text says, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you," and we are not at liberty to say that it does not mean what it says, even though it may appear unreasonable. It is true that we are not at liberty to put our construction on the text, but we must allow one text to explain another.

We often find that a comprehensive statement is made in one place, and that exceptions to it are noted in another. For instance we read in Ex. 16:4: "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day." If we should confine our attention to this text we should suppose the people gathered manna seven days in the week, but in the 26th verse we read: "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, and yet there shall be none." Now when we read Ex. 16:4 we read it in the light of the other verse, and know that the Lord meant that they should gather manna every working day; so, likewise, when we read Gen. 9:3, we read it in the light of Gen. 7:2, 8; Lev. 11:7, 8; Isa. 65:3, 5;

66:17, and others, which say that certain animals, the swine among them, are unclean and unfit for food. Therefore we know that the Lord meant that he had given to Noah every living thing of clean beasts for meat, and Noah must certainly have so understood it.

Our friend brings up Rom. 14:2, 3, 14 as evidence that pork eating is allowable. But these texts have no reference whatever to the eating of pork. The question here as in 1 Cor. 8 is concerning things offered to idols. There is no reason to suppose that the word meat means flesh simply; on the contrary, it must necessarily include fruits and grains as well, for these were offered to idols. Now the question was, Is it lawful to eat any food that has been dedicated to an idol? Paul declares that it is, but he would not make it a matter of dispute. If a brother newly come to the faith thought that to eat food that had been offered to an idol was a recognition of that idol, he should be permitted to abstain from it and select food that had not been so dedicated. Neither should those who knew that there was no harm in it cause the weak brother to stumble by partaking of it. Almost all food which the heathen used was dedicated to their gods, so that Christians could scarcely have found anything to eat if it had been true that such a food was not lawful to be eaten. But Paul declared that an idol was nothing and that to dedicate food to it had no affect upon it, and so he said, "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience' sake."

1 Cor. 10:27 is quoted as proof that we are at liberty to eat anything and everything. That reads, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake." The next verse, however shows what is referred to for it says, "But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." If the matter of pork eating had been under discussion it would not have been necessary to say, "asking no questions for conscience' sake," for the man could tell if the dish were pork without asking any questions; but he could not tell that food had been offered to idols, unless he should ask, and this Paul tells them not to do because it is of no consequence.

Again we read, "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." 1 Tim. 4:4, 5 this text is quoted in favor of pork eating, but like Gen. 9:3 it is too comprehensive. There must be exceptions, for there are creatures whose flesh is unwholesome and poisonous. The fifth verse in this case deprives the pork eater of all the comfort which he seeks to draw from it, for no one can find where swine has been sanctified by the word of God.

One more text we must notice. Our friend quotes Col. 2:16, 17, but what has already been said covers of this text. Paul is speaking here of the ceremonial law, and we have already seen that the distinction between clean and unclean animals was before the ceremonial law. All must admit that this distinction was made in the very beginning, for immediately after the fall sacrifices were made to God, and no right-minded person could think that the sacrifice of a hog or other unclean animal would be acceptable to God, even if the Bible said nothing about it. Therefore the distinction of clean and unclean beasts could be no part of the

shadow of which Christ is the body. But if our friend thinks that he can trace some connection between pork eating

599

and the mystery of Christ, we should like to have him show it to us.

We have considered these texts at this length before an explanation of them was asked, and we wish to give the true sense of them. We still adhere to our belief that the eating of swine's flesh is forbidden by the word of God. We cannot believe that the Lord delights in what twenty-five hundred years ago he called an abomination. And we emphatically protest against such a low view of Christ's sacrifice as would lead to the supposition that it was made largely in order that men might be at liberty to eat whatever their perverted appetites might crave. W.

**October 7, 1886**

**"American Romanism" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Catholic Mirror* of September 18 contains a letter from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he announces to the clergy that Pope Leo XIII. has formulated certain prayers which are henceforth to be "said" after every Low Mass, instead of those now in use. Such is the *order* of the Pope. We do not know the nature of the prayers now declared to be out of date, nor why it is that they have lost their efficacy; but we have the text of the prayers which are now declared to be official, and we will favor our readers with them. The first is as follows:-

"O God, our refuge and our strength, graciously look upon thy people who cry to thee; and through the intercession of the glorious and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, of Blessed Joseph, her Spouse, and of thy holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, in thy mercy and kindness hear the prayers which we pour forth for the conversion of sinners, and for the freedom and exaltation of Holy Mother the Church. Christ our Lord, Amen."

The reader will notice that in this prayer Christ is not altogether ignored. After "the faithful" have implored the intercession of Mary, Joseph, Peter and Paul, "and all the saints," they are permitted to close with a reference to the name of Christ. It requires no great discernment to see that among Catholics the name of Christ is not considered to be "above every name."

The second prayer is as follows:-

"Holy Michael, the Archangel, defend us in the battle; for our protection against the wickedness and snares of the devil. Rebuke him, O God, we suppliantly beseech thee; and do thou, O Prince of the heavenly host, by the divine power drive into hell Satan and the other evil spirits who wander through the world seeking the ruin of souls. Amen."

Among the "other evil spirits" who are thus charitably consigned to hell are, of course, all those who oppose the Catholic Church; for "the Church" regards all souls as ruined, who reject her dogmas and ceremonies. The two prayers, taken together, coming as they do from the Pope himself, afford a fair view of

Catholicism at its best. But this is not all. The Cardinal closes with the following announcement:-

"His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. grants to all who recite these prayers, as aforesaid 360 days' indulgence."

Here we have the veritable antichrist itself revealed. The granting of indulgences fitly accompanies the rejection of Christ as sole Mediator. Here we find the Pope promulgating, as a matter of course, the very things which aroused the holy zeal of Luther, and against which the Reformation was directed; yet to-day not one Protestant in ten thousand will give the matter a second thought. Professed Protestants now regarded Catholicism as a "branch" or grand division of the Christian Church, and the National Reformers urge the necessity of courting its favor, and even of submitting to repeated rebuffs if in the end they can but secure the alliance of the Catholic Church. When we consider the increased civilized population of the world in the last four hundred years, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Rome have already more than regained that which she lost by the Reformation. We think we are warranted in drawing the following conclusions:-

1. The Roman Catholic Church is the same to-day that it was four hundred years ago. The general diffusion of knowledge has changed her tactics, but she still works for the same ends as then and secures them. What she accomplished then by force, she now gains by flattery. But her doctrines and principles have not changed in the least, and she is just as ready to use force now, when she can, as she was then.

2. Protestantism is now little more than a name. "Protestants" as a class have ceased to "protest." They are content with the knowledge of the fact that they are the descendants of those who did protest, and they view with indifference the rapidity with which the Church of Rome is extending its conquest of the world.

3. This indifference must arise from the fact that "Protestantism" so-called, has degenerated until it is very like Catholicism. If men were actuated by the spirit of the Reformers, they would as strongly protest against the evils of the "the church" to-day, as those noble men did. The Reformation has been deformed and that which the reformers regarded as the enemy of the truth, their children are ready to embrace as the conservator of truth. Since "Rome never changes," Protestantism must have changed, in order to bring about the state of things.

4. "National Reform" is Romanism under a different title. The Reformers withdrew from Rome, because Rome and they were antagonistic. If there had been oneness of thought and purpose, instead of antagonism, they would not have separated from Rome. But National Reformers are now seeking an alliance with Rome, and so anxious are they for this alliance, that they are determined to press their suit even though they may be repeatedly rejected. If the separation of the true Reformers from Rome indicated their antagonism to her, certainly the desired union of the National Reformers indicates their likeness to her.

5. If professed Protestants are so nearly like the Catholics that they cannot see any menace to the liberty of our country in the insidious advances of the Papacy; and if a degenerate Protestantism is anxious to ally itself with Catholicism, that both "branches" of "the church may be" thereby strengthened,-

then when this degenerate Protestantism, under the name of "National Reform," shall have succeeded in its purposes, it will certainly adopt the *tactics*, as it already has the *principles*, of Rome, and will not scruple to persecute those who cannot be won to its support by milder measures. Indeed, the National Reformers themselves concede this point, for Mr. Sommerville, in the *Christian Nation*, says that it is most certainly right "to take public money to teach principles, *enforce laws*, and introduce customs to which many members of the committee are conscientiously opposed." Papal Rome, in her highest period of exaltation, never did more than this. When a Government or power of any kind *enforces* laws and customs against the conscientious convictions of upright citizens, it is persecution for conscience' sake. The National Reformers make no secret of their adherence to principles like this.

Therefore we say that when national reformers shall have succeeded in their designs, they will have nothing other than an exact image of the Papacy. Scripture is not silent upon this point. The leopard beast of Rev. 13:1-8 is quite generally admitted to represent the Papacy; if any doubt this, their doubts may easily be silenced by the most convincing proof. The power brought to view in the verses following is said to "make an image" to this papal beast, and that image we now see in process of construction. Once men predicted from this prophecy just such an image to the Papacy, in this country; now they do not need to refer to the prophecy to be aware of the fact. It certainly is time, all who value civil and religious liberty to sound the alarm. And the urgent necessity of warning the people against the adoption of papal principles, whether under the name of Romanism or National Reform, is made still more evident by the following announcement of divine wrath upon all who take any part in such iniquitous alliances:-

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14:9-11. W.

**October 21, 1886**

**"Abominable Prayers" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Sunday School Times* we find, in answer to a question asked by a correspondent, a little story which we think aptly illustrates the heading of this article. The incident is thus related by the *Times*:-

"A story is told of a New England deacon, who was visited by a committee of the church, in view of his drinking habit. He met the visitors cordially, and said, in substance: 'I've asked the Lord's help in this thing, and I've left the case with him.

I was afraid I was drinking too much; so I prayed that, if I was in any danger of that, the Lord would take away my love for liquor. But my liking for it holds good, and so I know the Lord approves my drinking."

We think all will allow that such a prayer was little, if any, less than insult to God. The Bible declares God's hatred of drinking habits, when it says that no drunkard shall enter the kingdom of Heaven. A drunkard is one who drinks immoderately; and this man was a drunkard, for he was drinking so much that he was getting alarmed at himself. Then why should he pray for wisdom concerning a thing that is plainly revealed? He knew he was doing wrong; he did not want to stop, and so he made conditions for the Lord, and because those conditions were such that the Lord could not comply with them, his conscience was satisfied. He had his mind made up beforehand what he should do, and might better have gone ahead without the mockery of prayer; the prayer was simply a taking of God's name in vain, and could not be other than an abomination to the Lord.

We think no one will disagree with our conclusion on *this* matter; and yet there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, who are insulting the Lord in the same manner that the drinking deacon did, yet they cannot see the similarity, because the subject of their prayers is different. We have often heard people say, in substance: "I know that the ten commandments are God's and unchangeable laws, and that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day, and of no other. I know that the Bible does not sanction the observance of Sunday. There was a time when I was considerably troubled over this matter—whether I ought not to keep the Sabbath instead of Sunday. So I prayed earnestly to the Lord that I might know my duty. I prayed that if it was wrong for me to keep Sunday, the Lord would let me know; and since then my mind has been perfectly at rest. I am in the Lord's hands; if he wants *me* to keep the Sabbath, he will let the know."

The least that we can say is, that such a prayer, offered under such circumstances, is an insult to the Lord. It is as though a child, knowing what his father had plainly and expressly commanded him to do, should turn right around and ask for some sign by which he might know that the father meant what he said. In such a case the reader can readily imagine what that "sign" would be. So God has given us explicit commands in his word. That word is all that he has given us for a guide in this life, and it is a sufficient guide, for it is able to make us wise unto salvation. That word is for a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path. Of the law of the Lord it is said that it "is perfect, converting the soul," and that to keep the commandments is "the whole duty of man." These commandments are very plain, so that any child can understand them, and now for anybody to pray to the Lord to know if it is to his duty to keep them, is an insult to the one who gave them.

The one who offers such a prayer virtually says: "I don't think the commandments of the Lord are sufficient guide for *me*; they may do for others, but I require something better." Or else he says: "I don't believe the Lord really means what he says." In either case, he turns away from the law, and treats it with contempt. Now does God hear the prayer of such? Hear what is said: "He

that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. Then if the answer to such a prayer comes in the shape of peace to the one who persists in violating the commandment, who has answered it? Not God, for "he cannot deny himself." It must be none other it than the great adversary of the truth.

But will the Lord give any "sign" to such ones that he means what he says? Yes; numerous instances of this are given, but we will cite only one. Balaam was expressly told by the Lord not to go with the servants of Balak, to curse Israel. But he wanted to go, and so he asked the Lord if he really meant what he said. As a result, he became satisfied in his own mind that he might go, and he went. As a "sign" that the Lord meant what he said, Balaam was all but slain in the way, being saved only by his faithful beast, and was finally destroyed with the sword. Num. 31:8; 2; Peter 2:11, 12; Jude 11.

And so all who seek for peace in a way contrary to the law of God, shall perish. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Prov. 21:16. Paul, speaking of those who deliberately turn away from the only source of truth, and try to find peace in a way that God has not appointed, says that "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:11, 12.

Reader, do you want Satan, instead of the Lord, to answer your prayers? If not, then pray only in accordance with God's word. Pray, as did David, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wonderous things out of thy law." Such a prayer, offered in sincerity, God will not fail to answer. And when the Spirit makes known to us "the deep things of God," and we delight in the law of the Lord, we have this precious promise: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what he will, and it shall be done unto you." John 15:7. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 John 3:22. Let us never in our prayers take God's name in vain. W.

### **"Real Knowledge" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is a very common thing to speak of the apostles with the exception of Paul, as uneducated and ignorant men. The enemies of the Bible think to disparage their testimony in this way, and many people who reverence the Bible unintentionally work to the same end by speaking of the apostles as ignorant. Only a short time since we read a statement from a minister, in which "the uneducated Peter" was spoken of. There is just one verse in the Bible which seems to give color to this idea, and that is Acts 4:13, which says that the council heard the boldness of Peter and John and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men. But this is an unfortunate translation. The word rendered "ignorant" means "private," and the meaning is that the council saw that Peter and John, being Galileans, had not studied in their schools, and they marveled

that private citizens who had not sat at the feet of the rabbis, and learned their fine-spun theories, should be able to talk with such power and wisdom.

If we consider for a moment who the apostles were, we shall see that it is a mistake to regard them as ignorant men. They were Jews, and every Jew was expected to give his child a knowledge of the law. The commandment found in Deut. 6:7, "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up," was scrupulously obeyed by every pious Jew. Thus Paul says that Timothy had from a child known the Scriptures. Every Jew, no matter how humble his circumstances, had a knowledge of the law.

Now think what this implied. It meant that he had a knowledge of the Jewish people, and this comprised also a history of contemporary people. He would know as much about the creation and fall and other events of that time as it is possible for anyone to know. The history of the children of Israel in Egypt would make him familiar with the Egyptian people. He would also be familiar with the Assyrians and Babylonians and Persians and the Grecians, with all of whom the Jews had been intimately associated. In short, the humblest Jew must have had a pretty good knowledge of the history of the world. Not only this, but in the Old Testament he would find literature which cannot be equaled in the world. In the psalms and the prophets he would find the choicest poetry and the most sublime descriptions. The one who had made the Old Testament his daily study could not have failed to acquire a good use of language. In the colleges of the present-day young men are engaged for several years in studying the writings of the ancient Greek and Roman authors. They do not do this for the history with which those writings contain, for they could learn that in one-twentieth part of the time in their own language, but they engage in the study of the classics in order to discipline their minds, and to gain a good style of expression. All this may be gained from the study of the Bible, which, as is allowed even by infidels, contains the finest specimens of literature to be found in the world.

In addition to this knowledge, every Jew was required to give his child some trade by which he might be self-supporting; but the theoretical and the practical were combined. The apostles were not exceptions to this rule. They were practical men, able to transact business and to provide for themselves.

But all this was the least of their education. For three years and a half they had been in constant communication with Jesus. Day and night they had been with him, listening to his conversations and receiving instruction from him, and this was a schooling such as other men on earth ever enjoyed. If at the present day a young man could have as his tutor such a man as Dr. McCosh or some other learned professor, and could be with him constantly for three or four years, and could receive daily personal instruction from him, people would envy that young man as one who was having exceptional advantages. But the apostles had the greatest of all teachers, the Son of God himself,-the One of whom even his enemies said, "Never man spake like this man." To be sure, the Pharisees spoke slightly even of him, saying, "How knoweth this man of letters, having never learned." In their selfish bigotry they thought that their schools, which were



devoted to sophistry and vain philosophy furnished the sum of wisdom. But as we read the life of Christ we find that the most crafty and subtle and learned men were no match for him. Without any hesitation he answered their most perplexing questions, and always in the choicest and most direct language.

631

In this school the apostles studied for three years and a half, until they had unconsciously by themselves acquired habits of thought and speech similar to his. Then they received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which illuminated their minds and brought humbly to their remembrance all that they had previously learned. And so when they stood before the Jewish rulers, their enemies marveled that plain unassuming private citizens who had never attended the Rabbinical schools should be able to speak with such power and wisdom: "and they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." In spite of their hatred to Jesus, the Pharisees knew that nowhere else could those men have received the education which they had. Surely the apostles were anything but uneducated men.

In this we may find a lesson that will be profitable to us. People are often heard complaining of their lack of advantages. They excuse themselves from responsibilities in connection with the cause of God, because they have no education. Many think that they are excusable for not having a thorough knowledge of the word of God, because in early life they had no educational privileges. But none are exempted from not knowing the things which God has revealed. All may have true wisdom. Says the psalmist, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." Ps. 111:10. And this means just what it says. The one who studies the word of God with an honest, humble mind, will have wisdom which will be acknowledged even by the unbelieving world. Hear what Moses said to the Israelites:-

"Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." Deut. 4:5, 6.

From this we learn that it was not piety alone that the people were to obtain from the study and practice of the word, for the world does not usually hold that in very high esteem; but in addition to piety they would have wisdom that would be acknowledged as such by worldly-wise men. We find the same thing exemplified to a high degree in the case of Solomon. When he was given his choice of what he would receive from the Lord, he said, "Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad;" and the Lord said: "Because thou hast asked this thing. . . . behold, I have done according to thy word; lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee." 1 Kings 3:9-12. He who carefully studies the Proverbs of Solomon will be convinced that the Lord fulfilled his promise. All the wisdom of the world, and more too, is condensed in that one book. There is not a

thing in human affairs, no business matter of any sort, that is not wisely treated of in the book of Proverbs. The man who makes that book his daily study, and profits by what he learns, will be wise in the sight of both God and man. Thus we profit by the blessing given to Solomon.

Leaving out the matter of inspiration,-the special illumination which the apostles had by the Spirit,-we have the same means of education that they had. We cannot see Jesus in the flesh, but we can nevertheless walk with him. In the Old Testament we have the Scriptures that the apostles had, and in the New Testament we have the words of Jesus to the apostles. If we make them our daily study, we may become imbued with their spirit. The Holy Spirit is given to all who ask for it in faith, for "the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." In Christ are hid "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Why, then, if we have Christ, may we not have these treasures of wisdom and knowledge? We may if we *search* for them. We must not suppose that these treasures are to be received without our making any effort to obtain them. If treasures are hid in Christ, they can of course be found only by the one who has Christ; but since they are *hid*, even he must labor for them. There is no reason why the most obscure Christian should not be *uninformed* in all matters of which the Bible . . .; and being thus informed, his judgment in temporal matters, must be improved. See 1 Cor. 6:2, 3. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." W.

### **"From the Woodland Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have been in camp ten days, but the time has not seemed half that long. Indeed, it seems as though the meetings began no longer ago than yesterday. With had beautiful weather until today, when we have had quite heavy showers; but as the meetings to-day have been most excellent, and there has been no complaining because of the rain, we may say that we have had the very best kind of weather for our camp-meeting. As the plain testimony has been given, and confession of sin has been made, God has shown his willingness to bless in an especial manner. From the first, the meetings have increased in interest, and there have been continued and increased evidences of the presence of the Spirit of God. We have not space on this last page to give anything like a full report of the meetings, even thus far; and as we do not want to spoil the full report that will appear next week, we can only say that the camp-meeting thus far has been good, better, best; and we expect that there is better yet to come. California has never before had so good a camp-meeting. To show that we speak within bounds, we will say that Elder Haskell, who has attended hundreds of camp-meetings, says that this one is the best that he is ever attended. To the Lord be all the praise. W. *Woodland, October 16.*

A later report still further vouches for the earnest spirit of the meeting but the announcement that *over one hundred thousands of dollars* had been pledged to various branches of the cause by Seventh-day Adventists.

## **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS asks: "Who was the author or creator of sin? Was it Satan or God? If it was God, the Creator of all things, how does he vindicate his goodness? what motive had he for doing so?"

Christ said Satan: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8:44. Everything that is right is true, and everything that is wrong is a lie. Therefore when Christ says that Satan is the father of lies, it is the same as saying that he is the father of all evil. God had nothing to do with originating sin. It is entirely out of harmony with his nature, for he is the embodiment of goodness and truth. He cannot lie. It would be an utter impossibility for him to do an evil thing. Whatever he does is right and just (Ps. 111:7, 8), because his ways are the standard of perfection and holiness. He does not have to vindicate his acts to mortals nor give a reason for them. Neither is any mortal required to vindicate the acts of God; they vindicate themselves.

As we have said, sin originated with Satan. It cannot be traced beyond him; but how it originated, or how it first sprung up in his heart, no one can tell, for sin is a mystery. See 2 Thess. 2:7. A reason can be given for whatever can be explained, for to explain a thing is to give a reason for it. Now since sin would cease to be sin if an adequate reason for its existence could be given, it is evident that the origin of sin cannot be explained further than to say that it originated in the breast of Satan.

"I often crave to believe, and cannot," is what a man says of himself in an exchange. We don't believe a word of it. If a man wants to believe a thing he can. A man can make himself believe even the baldest lie ever invented. Certainly then, he ought to be able to believe truth which is supported by the most unimpeachable testimony. Such truth is that of the Bible concerning Christ and the gospel. If a man is not a believer, it is because he doesn't want to believe, he has a greater desire for something with which the truth is incompatible. Some people want to believe and they want Heaven, but they want this earth at the same time; and they can't have both. If a man really wants to serve the Lord, he will do it. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled."

Says the *Christian Union* in answer to a correspondent:-

"If you wish to know the 'mode of baptism' in the New Testament times, there is little doubt that it was ordinarily, and perhaps always, performed by immersion. Whether this is conclusive as to the mode in which it should be performed in our time, is another question."

Ah, yes. There is no doubt but that in the New Testament times immersion was the only baptism, but then-that doesn't necessarily indicate that we should so consider it. But when it comes to Sunday, which the *Christian Union* admits was not in New Testament times considered as the Sabbath, why then-we ought to keep it anyway, out of respect for Christ and the apostles. Very strenuous that "apostolic example" should be followed when the apostles set no example, but

when it is known that they certainly did do a certain thing, then do exactly contrary. Oh, for consistency!

Esau deliberately sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. The Bible says that he "*despised* his birthright." All the brilliant possibilities that were in store for a wealthy prince of the East were counted as nothing compared with a paltry meal of victuals! We say, How could he be so foolish? He was not so near death but that he could have stood it a little longer without food. While he was bargaining with Jacob, he might have been preparing food for himself. The whole Bible-reading world has doubtless been united in condemning Esau for his foolishness. Yet there are thousands and tens of thousand of Esaus in the world to-day when a man says: "I know I ought to keep the Sabbath, but my business would be ruined if I should; I can't do it," he is trading Heaven and all its joys for a portion of this world, which he has no assurance of holding for a minute. He virtually says that an eternity of heavenly bliss is not worth so much in his estimation as a few years of earthly trouble. He despises the heavenly inheritance. How can such a one speak lightly of Esau?

One of the most common objections against keeping the Sabbath of the Lord is this: "If I should keep the seventh day of a week I couldn't make a living. Well, what of it? Is this short life of so much more importance than obedience to the commandments of God? When a man deliberately decides that it is, from that moment his life is not worth the living, since the glorifying of God is all that makes this life of any value. But suppose keeping the commandments of God should involve the loss of life; thousands of men and women have found that they couldn't "make a living" if they obeyed God, yet they chose death at the stake rather than disobedience to God. People honor the martyrs, and think that they too would have stood up boldly for the faith, and then refuse to do a simple duty for fear they *may* suffer some inconvenience. The same people will often suffer ten times the inconvenience from having their own way, with the prospect before them of losing the only life that is worthy of the name-eternal life. "For it is better, if the will of God be so, that if ye suffer for well-doing, than for evil-doing." 1 Peter 3:17.

"By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." Heb. 11:24-26. What is that? He esteemed the *reproach* of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt. How few there are who view things as Moses did? They want to enter into the joy of the Lord, and they profess to believe that the treasures of heaven are worth more than those of earth; but they can't see anything pleasing in the prospect of suffering for Christ. But it is safe to say that those who do not see anything to be desired in suffering with Christ, have no just respect unto the recompense of the final reward. Here is a problem which may be of use in estimating the future happiness of the saints. If reproaches and sufferings for Christ bring more happiness than all things that this world contains, what must be the happiness when "God himself shall be with them, and be there God; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes

closed"? If we do not suffer with Christ, we are not joint-heirs with him, and cannot be glorified with him. Rom. 8:17.

The charm of Christ's teaching lies in its simplicity. But many theological writers seem to forget that there are people who cannot be edified by huge words and high-flown sentences, or else they think that such people are beneath their notice. As a sample of such writing, we give the following extract from a book entitled "The Transfiguration of Christ":-

"On the resurrection of Christ our cosmology must stand; as on Christ himself, the *Logos* must stand all anthropology and theology. The resurrection of the Christ of God is that all-inclusive manifestation of the *Logos*, which in the beginning moved in chaos toward a cosmos, and which at last through that manifestation abolishes the primeval discord of life-and-death, thus giving man his (*Cosmos-Logos*) cosmology."

We trust that there are very few people on earth who could be edified by such reading. How different from the words of Paul, that master logician: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. 10:6-10.

**October 28, 1886**

**"California Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was the largest and the best camp-meetings ever held in this State. Such is the universal verdict. Indeed, all said that it was the best camp-meeting they had ever attended. It was located just outside the limits of the city of Woodland, in a field, which the owner, not an Adventist, kindly granted free of charge. The Woodland Water Company furnished water for the camp, free. This was no small item in the saving of expense. Very much smaller meetings, for one-half the time, have often paid sixty dollars or more for water. The Puget Sound Lumber Company also greatly favored the camp, by taking back, without charge, all lumber that was not cut.

There were one hundred and eighty-five tents pitched, and about eight hundred people camped on the ground. There were more Sabbath-keepers who attended, as some came to the first part of the meeting and went home to allow others to come to the last part; but the average attendance was about eight hundred. The attendance from town was not large, except on the first Sunday. There would have been more present the second Sunday if it had not rained. Those who did attend were well pleased, and the meeting seemed to have a good impression on the community.

During the thirteen days' meeting there were twenty-nine regular Bible-readings, besides several meetings for instruction in holding Bible-readings, twenty children's meetings, six meetings of the Conference, four of the Tract and Missionary Society, three of the Sabbath-school Association, besides prayer and social meetings, teachers' meetings, ministerial examinations, and class instruction in canvassing, and in keeping church, missionary, and Sabbath-school records.

The ministerial examinations were a new feature in this Conference, but were highly appreciated by all the ministers. The instruction given was most valuable, and we believe that the introduction of this feature will tend to greatly raise the standard of the ministry. In this connection we may say that there was never before so great a degree of harmony and brotherly love among the ministers as now. Never before was there so little of the spirit of criticism as during this meeting. This same may be said of the rank and file. This certainly augurs well for the future prosperity of the cause. During the entire camp-meeting we heard not an impatient word or an unkind allusion.

The business meetings were especially interesting. They were the most profitable meetings held. Those who stay away from business meetings, thinking of them uninteresting, deprive themselves of a great blessing. We are thankful that there were not many such at this camp-meeting. The business pertaining to the Conference and Tract Society was performed without the slightest discord. It was especially noticeable that in these meetings the entire congregation was often moved to tears. There was never before so deep an interest taken in the spread of the work, and the salvation of souls.

The addresses from Mrs. E. G. White, that were read at different times, added greatly to the success of the meeting. Her appeals for greater consecration and union had good effect; and as the nearness of the end was vividly set before the people, an increasing spirit of solemnity rested on the congregation. The fact that probation for sinners will soon end, and that the Lord is soon coming, seemed more real to very many than ever before. Heartfelt confessions were made, and as God's tender mercy was manifest in Christ, was set forth, many were enabled to grasp by faith the living promises, and to go free in the Lord. The most encouraging feature was that almost from the first, individuals at the meetings in various parts of the camp would with tears of joy praise God for the blessing of sins forgiven. There was marked evidence throughout the meeting that the Spirit of the Lord was working.

The children's meetings were very profitable, and the interest in them increased till the close. The average attendance at these meetings was about sixty. It was the aim of the leaders to give simple instruction in the great principles of the gospel. The little ones showed great interest in studying the Bible to learn both faith and duty, and the Spirit of the Lord made a deep impression on their hearts. During the meetings twenty-eight children gave their hearts to God, and there was every evidence that they were intelligently and hopefully converted. Several of these were baptized before they left camp, and others who had to leave will be baptized a home.

At three different times during the camp-meeting, efforts in behalf of the unconverted and backsliders were made in the large congregation. At each of these times from one hundred and fifty to two hundred came forward for prayers, and the most of these were labored with personally. At such a meeting on the last Sabbath, thirty-two arose in response to an inquiry as to how many had resolved at this meeting to keep the Sabbath. And the last Monday of the meeting thirty-four were baptized, and probably nearly as many more left the ground desiring to be baptized at home at the first opportunity. Among those baptized was a young Chinese convert, who has been keeping the Sabbath for several months, having made considerable sacrifice to do so. We believe that he is the only Chinese Sabbath-keeper in the United States.

The Sabbath-schools on the two Sabbaths were interesting and profitable occasions. Lessons were well learned by both old and young. The class contributions for the two Sabbaths were \$102.21.

The persons who were appointed to canvass for periodicals during the meetings, did their work well, and met with a good degree of success. The number of subscriptions taken was 314, classified as follows: For the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, 76; *American Sentinel*, 53; *Review and Herald*, 19; *Bible Echo*, 22; *Sabbath-School Worker*, 72; *Pacific Health Journal*, 72. The sales at the bookstand amounted to something over \$700.

On Sunday morning, October 17, Elder Haskell gave a little talk on the work in Australia, New Zealand, and Central Europe, and a letter was read from Brother W. C. White, giving an account of the progress of the work in Russia, and of the imprisonment and release of Elder Conradi. The wants of the cause in California were also briefly stated, and then those who felt that it would be a pleasure to assist the cause with their means, were asked to pledge. Only a general call was made, and there was absolutely no urging, yet in a short time over one hundred thousand dollars was pledged for home and foreign missions. There was one feature of this movement that is worthy of note. Heretofore the bulk of the money raised has been by the poor class, but these pledges were mostly by the more wealthy. To be sure much of this amount was pledged on condition of disposing of property, but there was a strong determination expressed by the wealthy brethren to sell, even at a sacrifice, and to give not only of their means, but themselves to the cause of God. These pledges were not made in a burst of enthusiasm, but were the deliberate action of cool-headed businessmen who knew what they were about, and no one who knows the people of California will doubt that every dollar pledged is good. These men and women have been successful in gathering together earthly treasure, and are now determined to have treasures in heaven.

Besides these pledges, quite an amount of each was contributed in small amounts by those who could not pledge; an organ valued at \$125 was donated to the New Zealand Mission, \$75 was contributed towards buying an organ for the Australian Mission, and a good cow was given to the San Francisco City Mission. These liberal contributions were only the natural result of the good meetings which had preceded, and of the conviction that the end of all things is at hand, and that God is now saying to the servants, as to Moses of old, "Speak

unto the children of Israel that they go forward." At the close of this meeting the Doxology was sung with a heartiness that showed that the people felt blessed in the sacrifices which they had made.

Monday, October, baptism was attended to, and ministers were appointed to their various fields of labor. In the evening Elder A. T. Jones gave a stirring half hour talk on National Reform as it concerns Seventh-day Adventists. This was followed by a praise meeting of an hour, after which Brother R. S. Owen was set apart to the work of the gospel ministry, Elder Loughborough offering the prayer, and Elder Haskell giving the charge. Then the congregation united in singing, "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name." Thus closed the meeting which will never be forgotten by at least a large part of those who attended it, and whose influence will be felt in the work until the saints meet in the kingdom of God. W.

## **November 4, 1886**

### **"What about the Heathen?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

A good many people nowadays are troubled about the heathen. That in itself is all right, if it leads to right action. Paul was troubled about the heathen, so much so that he exclaimed, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." But in the most of this modern worry over the heathen, we have seen no tendency toward a disposition to relieve their needs. In fact, neither the heathen nor the people themselves are benefited by it, and could not be expected to be. The question is, "What is going to become of the heathen who have never heard the gospel." This is answered in two ways. One answer is that they will all be damned; and in this answer people see the destruction of nearly all the heathen without any chance for salvation, because they imagine that but very few have ever heard the gospel. Another answer, and that which is now the more popular one, is that those who "have not had a chance" in this life will be granted a chance in the future life.

The tendency of both these views is deadening to all spiritual growth. Try to persuade a man to accept Christ and obey the truth, and he will ask, "What is going to become of all those who never heard this gospel? Are they all lost?" And so much more interested is the man in the dead heathen than he is in his own living soul, that he will pay no attention to present duty till that question is settled. Moreover he usually has already settled it in his own mind according to the first answer given above, and then says, "Well, if God will condemn men without giving them a chance, he doesn't deal justly, and I will have nothing to do with him." As for the other view, once let a sinner become indoctrinated into the error that some men will have a future probation, and he will quickly draw the legitimate conclusion that all men may have a second probation; and since in matters spiritual there is a universal tendency to await "a more convenient season," such an one will make no effort to turn from the error of his ways.

Now while the most sensible way for each one to do would be to attend to the call of mercy which he knows is extended to him, paying no attention to matters



which cannot possibly concern him, it may be well to note how the heathen stand related to God. The matter is not a complicated one, as we find it in the Bible.

1. Paul says that the heathen are "without excuse," because ever since the foundation of the world, the invisible things of God, that is, "his eternal power and Godhead," are "clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Rom. 1:20. Thus we find that if there are any heathen who do not know, (1) that there is a God; (2) that he is all-powerful, the Creator of all things, and therefore before all things; and (3) that to this Supreme Being his allegiance is rightfully due, it is his own fault. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Ps. 19:1. And so plainly is God revealed in nature that he who says, even in thought, that there is no God, is justly called a fool. Ps. 14:1.

2. There are none who have not some consciousness of right and wrong. Paul says, "For when the Gentiles, which have not the written law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." Rom. 2:14, 15. It is not possible, by the light of nature alone, to know the fullness of the truth as it is in Jesus, but there is not a man upon earth who does not have enough knowledge of what is right to justly condemn him if he does not profit by that knowledge. It is true that men may "not like to retain God in their knowledge," and may ignore the good and practice the bad so persistently as to completely deaden all sensibility, and be given over "to a mind void of judgment" (Rom. 1:28, margin); but the fact that this is done only proves the truth of the statement that all men have naturally a certain amount of knowledge of right and wrong.

3. If a man persists in stifling his conscience, and is determined that he will not do even the little good that he knows, he must inevitably go into deeper darkness and degradation. It would be impossible for God to give him greater light, since he resolutely shuts his eyes to that which he has. And it is just as true that if a man has a fixed purpose to practice all the good that he knows, he will not only be aided in his effort, but will be given greater light. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." John 7:17. "Light is sown for the righteous." Ps. 97:11. And "unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness." Ps. 112:4.

Numerous examples of this are given in the Bible. Abraham was brought up among idolaters. Joshua 24:2. But he loved to retain God in his knowledge, and so resolutely did that which he knew to be right. And because of this integrity of purpose, God called him out from his heathen associates, and revealed his truth to him in an especial manner. The centurion Cornelius is another example. He had risen above his heathen education, and feared the true God, living up to all the light that he had. To him Peter was sent by divine command, to give him the full light of the gospel. So it will ever be. No matter how remote from civilization a heathen may be, if he sincerely desires to do right, God will enlighten him. A minister may not be sent to him, as Peter was to Cornelius, but God's word will

be in some manner conveyed to him, and the entrance of that always gives light. That, without man's interpretation, is able to make any man "wise unto salvation."

4. Moreover, in Paul's day all the heathen had heard the word of life. He says, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. 10:17, 18. These words were spoken, by David, of the heavenly bodies, but Paul applies them to the gospel. And that this is so is proved by his words to the Colossians: "And you. . . hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in his sight; if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." Col. 1:21-23.

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:27, 28. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," except the name of Jesus. Christ was once offered for the sins of men on probation in this life. At the close of this probation, he will come the second time "without sin," for the salvation of those who look for him. When he comes, he no longer bears the sins of any. Now a probation for sinners without any means outside of themselves whereby to be saved from sin, would be no probation at all. But Christ bears no sins except for men on probation in this life, before his coming; and outside of Christ there is no salvation; therefore there can be no probation after this life. Just before Christ comes it will be said: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. 22:11. After that there will be no more "chance" for anybody.

But this fact, together with the fact that the Judge of all the earth will do right, is further evidence that every man on earth will in this life have ample opportunity to "lay hold on eternal life." Indeed, why should it be otherwise? God "hath wrought us for this self-same thing;" that is, he has placed us on this earth in order that we may fit ourselves by his grace for an immortal life; and to say that, when God has placed man on this earth for one definite purpose, he will deprive any of an opportunity to learn what that purpose is, is to charge God with folly. The truth of the matter is that the very fact that man exists on this earth is an evidence that he is having a "chance" for a better existence.

None of these things release us from obligation to do all in our power to spread the gospel, for God usually works through human agencies. He has in mercy to us allowed us to become "workers together with him," that thus we may finally enter into the joy of the Lord. But let no one charge God with folly and injustice, by saying that the heathen or any other people do not have a chance, nor foolishly neglect the word of truth, in the vain expectation of a "more convenient season." "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." W.

**November 11, 1886**

**"The Spirit as Guide" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ told his disciples that he was about to go away, and that they could not follow him, their hearts were filled with sorrow and anxiety. They dreaded to face an unfriendly world alone. He had been their guide and instructor, and they had learned much from his teachings. They knew of no one who could fill his place. Peter had echoed the sentiments of all the disciples when, in answer to Christ's inquiry if they also would go away, he said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." They knew that no one else could do for them what Jesus had done; and the thought of being separated from him was a sad one.

To comfort them, Christ gave them the assurance that he would come again and receive them unto himself, and that by this means they could again be with him. But even this promise was not sufficient, for there would still intervene a long period during which they would be left alone. How could they do without the presence and counsel of their Lord?

Again Jesus meets the difficulty by promising that whatsoever they should ask in his name should be done for them; and he added, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth." John 14:16, 17. This Spirit was to be sent in his name, and was to take his place until his return. Said Christ, "I will not leave you comfortless [orphans]; I will come to you." This coming does not refer to his personal, visible coming, when he will receive his people to himself, but to the Spirit who should come in his name. The Spirit was to be their guide, to prepare them for his coming at the last day.

The offices of the Spirit are many; but there is a special one pointed out in this discourse of our Lord. Said he: "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:25, 26. It is as a teacher that the Spirit is here brought to view.

Many persons entertain very erroneous views as to the manner in which the Spirit operates. They imagine that it will teach them something which the Bible does not contain. When certain Bible truths are presented to them for their observance, they excuse themselves from all responsibility in the matter by saying that they are led by the Spirit of God, and do not feel it their duty to do that particular thing. They say the Spirit was given to guide into all truth; and, consequently, if it was necessary to obey that portion of the Scripture, it would have been brought to their notice. The fact that they do not feel impressed to obey is proof to their minds that there is no necessity for obedience. To such persons the Bible is of no account; they make its truth depend entirely upon their own feelings. And they actually charge God with the inconsistency of authorizing his Spirit to speak in contradiction of his revealed word. The fact that God cannot

lie should convince anyone that his Spirit and his word must always be in harmony.

Christ prayed for his disciples, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." The psalmist David said, "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." From these passages we learn that when Christ said, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," he meant that the Spirit would lead them into a proper understanding of that which had already been revealed. He plainly stated this when he said, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Many things that Christ said were not understood at the time; but they were made plain by the Spirit, after Christ had ascended to heaven. And it is thus that the Spirit teaches us now; it leads those who are humble and teachable into a proper understanding of the written word of God.

Paul gives testimony on this point which is not uncertain. In Eph. 6:13-17, he describes the Christian's armor. The following is the concluding portion: "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, *which is the word of God.*" Christ said that when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, should come, he would "reprove [convince] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Paul says that "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Both these passages are harmonized by the one quoted from Paul to the Ephesians. The Spirit does indeed convince of sin, but it is by impressing on the minds and hearts of men the claims of God's word. The Bible is the sword, the instrument by which the Spirit pierces the heart and lays bare its wickedness. The Spirit is the active agent, but the word of God is that through which it works. The two always act in unison.

We should look with suspicion upon any spirit that counsels opposition to the word of God. John tells us that there are many spirits, and that we are to try them. In Isaiah we are told by what we are to try them: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. It is the spirit of darkness that leads men to act contrary to the word of God. W.

**November 18, 1886**

**"At the Seat of Mormondom" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

Having time on our way East to spend two days at Salt Lake City, we improved the opportunity, and made the most of our time in viewing the city and learning the peculiarities of its peculiar people. We are not of the class who can generalize with the air of authority about a place after two days' stay in it, and shall therefore confine ourselves to what we saw and heard, especially the latter, for as an old Mormon official said, "It isn't what ye see, but what ye hear, that's going to benefit ye."

As one of the days of our stay was Sunday, we attended the general service at the tabernacle. Here we may remark that only one service a week is held in the tabernacle,-at 2 P.M. Sunday afternoons. The city is divided into twenty-one wards, each presided over by a bishop and in each of which there is a meeting-house. On Sunday mornings there is a Sunday-school and perhaps a short service in each of these ward meeting-houses, and another short service at 6 o'clock each Sunday evening. Once a week, as before stated, there is a general meeting in the tabernacle.

Of this tabernacle, as well as of the other noted places in the city, but little need be said, simply because they are noted. The structure is exceedingly plain both within and without. It is oval in shape, being 200 feet long, 150 feet wide, and 70 feet high. The dome rests on low but massive brick columns, which, with the intervening windows, form the wall of the building. Besides these are columns, the roof has no support. The building has the appearance of this huge dish-cover resting upon blocks. But although it is ungainly, its acoustic properties are wonderful. The dropping of a pin at one extremity can be heard at the other extremity as distinctly as though it were a nail dropped close by. And there is no echo. When the building is filled to its utmost capacity,-13,000,-a person in any part of it can hear the speaker without difficulty, provided the remainder of the people keep still; we doubt if they ever do. The organ in the tabernacle is said to be the second largest in the world, and the music and singing were really fine. The singing was done by a large choir of trained singers, and the congregation did not join.

The services themselves struck us as being exceedingly formal. Everything was done in a sort of matter-of-course way, much as a railroad employe performs his routine labor. There was nothing in any of the services that would tend to impress one with a sense of sacredness,-at least so it seemed to us; and we noticed that but few of the congregation acted as though they had come to worship. There was a great lack of interest on the part of the people. Women and girls played with the babies, to which there were many more present than we ever before saw in any assembly, and there was a constant moving about. We are sorry to be obliged to say that this spirit of inattention is not confined to the Mormons; but we never before saw a congregation that was not quiet a part of the time.

For this lack of interest on the part of the people, we think we can see ample reason. Mormonism is, on a small scale, is a State religion. Church membership is a necessary qualification for public office. Church officers are *ex officio* government officers, because the church *is* the government. Under such circumstances, church services must soon become a matter of form, just as the routine duties of a State official are performed mechanically. And when the services are performed mechanically the people will listen mechanically, when they listen at all. Mormonism is a perfect model (except, of course, as to belief) of what the whole country will be when the National Reformers shall have accomplished their design. In time past, when the fear of the United States Government did not stand before the eyes of the Mormons, and the guns of the United States fort did not command the town, a non-Mormon did not have any

rights in Salt Lake City, and it was at the risk of this life that one ventured there, especially if he dropped a word against Mormonism; and when the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution is adopted, no one who does not profess the State religion will have any rights in the United States, and one who ventures to talk, and especially to act, contrary to the established religion, will do so at his own peril. Church officers will then be Government officers as well, and the gospel will, so far as "the church" is concerned, be dead. Then Rev. 18:2 will meet its complete fulfillment: "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." No National Reformer has any right to cast a stone at the Mormons.

On the day that we were at the tabernacle, there was a short address by a "converted Jew," and a sermon by Bishop Whitney. The Jew applied all the prophecies to literal Israel, predicting a return of all the Jews to Jerusalem, there to rule over their enemies, with Christ as their king. One peculiar thing in the services was that the sacrament was administered while the other services were going on. After the Jew's address, one of the elders asked a blessing on the bread, which was then carried around through the congregation by several men, while the bishop began his discourse. After the bishop had spoken about twenty minutes, he stopped very abruptly, and sat down. Then the same elder as before asked a blessing on the *water*, that being used instead of the fruit of vine. The men then began to pass the water, and the bishop resumed his discourse.

The sermon was a history of Mormonism and a representation of its doctrines. Probably this subject was taken because there were many strangers present. It interested us only because it was a summary of Mormonism, by the best authority, and because it contains some egregious errors of which we had never heard before. Otherwise it was somewhat tedious; if we had been as familiar with the subject as a greater part of his auditors doubtless were, we should probably have been about as much bored as they seemed to be.

Following are some of the points of the discourse: Referring to the Jew's address, he said that as the Jews were building up Jerusalem, so the Mormons were building up Zion. Isa. 2:2-5 was applied to the Mormons. "Because we believe in the literal fulfillment of this prophecy, and look for the literal return of Christ to reign over us," said the speaker, "we are stigmatized as traitors." He did not deny that they are in opposition to the Government; the only ground on which they could deny that they are essentially traitors to this Government, is that they do not acknowledge its authority in any particular. Joseph Smith is declared to be the "stick of Ephraim" (Eze. 37:16), and later the Book of Mormon was declared to be the "stick of Judah." He said that the Mormons do not deny the divinity of the Bible; they hold it as equal to the Book of Mormon. But as the Mormons are all Ephraimites, and the Book of Mormon is the "stick of the Ephraim," while the Bible is the "stick of Judah," the inferences seem to be that even though they joined the two sticks together, the Ephraimites would regard their own stick with the greater favor.

The speaker said that when the plates of the Book of Mormon were given to Smith by the angel he (Smith) was able to interpret and translate them because

he had the Urim and the Thummim. Then followed a long account of the Nephites (the aborigines of this country) and their wars with the Lamanites. This country is considered to be the land of promise to Joseph, and the Rocky Mountains are "the everlasting hills." Gen. 49:26. Jacob's blessing was not fulfilled to Joseph in Palestine, since that tribe was not a very powerful in that land; hence it must be fulfilled here. The Nephites came to this country ages ago. When Christ ascended from the disciples upon the Mount of Olives he was wafted across the ocean to this country, where he chose twelve apostles. These were the "other sheep not of this fold" (John 10:16), and to them he spoke the many things which the disciples could not bear. John 16:12. The "lost tribes" of Israel are now somewhere in the frozen North, whence they will someday be led to "Zion" (Salt Lake City) by a prophet who will smite the icebergs so that they will melt before them. In bringing these lost tribes to "Zion" a miracle will be wrought, "beside which the passage of the Red Sea will pale into insignificance." The prophet who is to conduct these tribes is John, who remains "superior to death" until the Lord shall come to reign over "Zion." In the meantime he is probably up North among the "lost tribes." Their claim is that John the Baptist came to anoint Joe Smith to the Aaronic priesthood, and that Peter, James, and John came to bestow upon him the apostleship, and to anoint him to the Melchizedek priesthood. Thus it will be seen that they have every office that the Jews ever had, and many that they never had, and all in a greater abundance; for they have many "high places."

But time would fail us to recount all the absurdities that were dealt out with all seriousness. The next morning, while viewing the tabernacle, and the Assembly Hall, the old Mormon who thought we could be benefited only by what we might hear, gave us many additional ideas. In obedience, no doubt, to the command to "be instant in a season, out of season," he preached us a sermon nearly an hour in length, interrupted only by an occasional question for us. The main thing of interest to us in this discourse was that part which related to polygamy. Many very specious arguments were adduced in its favor, but they all seemed to be summed up in the one statement that is "according to nature." We mentally agreed that it might be compatible with a depraved human nature, but utterly inconsistent with the divine nature of which true saints must be partakers. But the most fanatical Mormon will hardly assert that polygamy is in accordance with the nature of women. To be sure the women talk in favor of it, and many no doubt think that it is of divine appointment; but we are inclined to think that most of them are at heart like the one whom we met, who thought it all right for a man to have more than one wife, but upon been pressed, admitted that she wouldn't like to have *her* husband do so.

Before we heard the particulars of Mormonism from the mouths of its advocates, we thought that Spiritualism was the only form of religion which has not *some* truth in it, but we shall have to make another exception for Mormonism. It is true that they professedly accept the Bible, as do the Spiritualists, and they have "baptism for the remission of sins," and profess to believe some other Bible doctrines; but everything is so distorted as to bear scarcely any semblance to Bible truth. Like Spiritualism,

it is a gigantic delusion, wholly of the devil. It is admirably calculated to catch those who are ignorant of the Bible, and are in a condition to be imposed upon by the hierarchy, and also those who are sensually inclined. It will eventually culminate in Spiritualism pure and simple. Those with whom we talked seem to be really sincere, and we believe they were. The one who discoursed to our benefit had been a Mormon for over thirty years, as a "high priest," and has shown his faith in polygamy by taking four wives. He is doubtless as sincere in his belief as the Hindoo is in his. The originators of Mormonism were beyond question intentional deceivers, but in process of time no doubt came to believe their own lies.

The Mormons exhibit every evidence of temporal prosperity, and, like the ancient Pharisees, they accept this as evidence of the favor of God. If numbers or temporal prosperity, however, are evidence of the favor of God, the Catholic Church would have to be accepted as the true church. But there is just one standard of truth, and that is the Bible, and the Bible alone. Tried by this standard, Mormonism is seen to be a fatal delusion. Yet we doubt not but that there are many deceived ones even among Mormons, to whom God will yet grant repentance, "to the acknowledging of the truth."

As we passed by the magnificent structures built for "worship," for business, or as residences for members of the hierarchy, and saw the evidences of the sagacity of the founders of that city, and then thought of the murderous "Danites," the Mountain Meadow massacre, and the "blood atonement" which is a thing of the past only because of the fear of the hated United States laws, one text continually forced itself upon our mind. It was this:-

"Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil! Thou hast consulted shame to thy house by cutting off many people, and hast sinned against thy soul. For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it. Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and stablisheth a city by iniquity!" Hab. 2:9-12. W.

**November 25, 1886**

**"The Origin of Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

Following is a part of an article by the Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D., which first appeared under the above heading in the *Popular Science Monthly*, and was copied into the *Chicago Tribune* of October 30, 1886. It contains nothing new, for it would be difficult to find anything new on this subject; but it is a very clear and concise statement of the origin of Sunday observance, and is worthy of a careful perusal. We are very glad to see articles of this class given a place in popular magazines and newspapers. It shows that the Sabbath question is rapidly coming to the front. W.



## **"Who Is My Neighbor?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following question has been asked:-

"According to the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-37), who is our neighbor? Do verses 36 and 37 teach that they only are our neighbors who show themselves to be neighborly, and that it is only such that we are to love as our *neighbor* while we are to love others as *enemies*?"

We are not able to find in the Bible any distinction between the treatment of "neighbors" and "enemies." If there were such a distinction, the parable referred to would certainly read differently from what it does. Between the Jews and the Samaritans there was bitterness amounting to almost deadly hatred. See John 4:9; Luke 9:51-54. For this enmity it seems that the Jews were chiefly responsible, as they considered themselves far superior to the Samaritans, whom they regarded with contempt, treating them as dogs. The worst thing the unbelieving Jews could say in reproach of Christ was, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan

711

and hast a devil?" John 8:4. To call him a Samaritan was to brand him with him with infamy.

In the parable we have a man, presumably a Jew, since he was going down to Jericho from Jerusalem, who was maltreated by robbers, and left for dead. Some of his own countrymen, a priest and a Levite, passed by, and left him to his fate. But a Samaritan, one of the despised and hated race, came by, and did to the wounded man as is described. He could not have done more for him if he had been his brother. Now the question is, Who was my neighbor to him that fell among thieves? The answer is, "He that showed mercy upon him," and this answer is accepted. The good Samaritan was neighbor to the disabled Jew, whom he treated as his own neighbor. And yet, the Jew was the enemy of the Samaritan. The only inference is, that when the law says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," we are to hold ourselves ready to serve anybody who needs our assistance, and are not stop to inquire whether the needy person is a "neighbor" or "enemy" and have two standards of action. In other words, our *enemies* are to be treated as our *neighbors*; or, better still, we are to act as though we had no enemies. In our dealings with our fellow-men we are not to consider if any man is our enemy, but are to treat all with kindly consideration.

This is in harmony with our Saviour's words in the sermon on the mount: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Matt. 5:43-45. God dispenses the favors of his Providence impartially on the good and the bad. Blasphemers, as well as those who praise, are the objects of God's kind of care. If we would be his children, we must do likewise. It is not in accordance with human nature so to do. This can be done only when we are fully imbued with the Spirit of him who on the cross

prayed for his relentless persecutors, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." W.

## **December 2, 1886**

### **"Items from the General Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The twenty-fifth annual session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists convened in Battle Creek, Mich., Thursday, November 18, at 9 A.M. As this body has the oversight of all the missionary work done among Seventh-day Adventists, its proceedings indicates the extent of the spread of the Third Angel's Message, then we therefore design to give our readers some of the main features of this session.

The first meeting was chiefly taken up with organization and the appointing of committees, of which the following were named: On Nominations-J. Fargo, J. R. Goodrich, C. L. Boyd; on Resolutions: R. A. Underwood, E. J. Waggoner, A. B. Oyen; on Licenses and Credentials-S. N. Haskell, R. L. Whitney, G. G. Rupert; on Auditing-Harmon Lindsey, D. T. Jones, D. R. Oviatt, J. Fargo, J. H. Morrison, H. Grant; on Distribution of Labor-G. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, R. A. Underwood, D. M. Canright, A. J. Breed, Lewis Johnson, M. C. Wilcox; on Religious Services-R. M. Kilgore, L. McCoy, G. C. Tenney.

The President, Elder Geo. I. Butler, then made an address, in the course of which he gave the following items of interest: The last year has been one of marked prosperity to the cause; the publishing houses have sold more denominational books than ever before; our institutions of learning are attended by more persons who are preparing for the work, than at any previous period in their history; and there was never before so great an interest in the matter of education among our people as that the present time. There is also a greater willingness on the part of people to listen to the truth than ever before.

At the second meeting additional delegates presented their credentials. The Conference, as organized, is composed of delegates representing the following Conferences and Missions:Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, California, Dakota, New England, Minnesota, Kansas, Ohio, Iowa, Nebraska, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Colorado, Vermont, Maine, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Canada, Texas, North Pacific and Upper Columbia (Oregon and Washington), the Central Europe, England, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, North Carolina, and the general Southern field.

The greater part of the second meeting was devoted to the consideration of the Sunday law presentations in Arkansas and Tennessee. In this discussion the following facts were brought out: In Arkansas everything that a man has, even to the smallest particle of household furniture, is liable to be levied on in payment of a fine for laboring on Sunday. Although the sentence usually runs that the convicted person shall pay a certain fine and the costs of prosecution, with the alternative of one day in jail for each dollar of the fine and costs, lying in jail the specified time does not satisfy the judgment. After a man has served out his time

in jail, his property may still be seized, or he may, if he has no property, be compelled to work out the fine. Besides this, the prisoners are treated as convicts having no rights whatever. They are considered as having any conscience, and may be compelled while in jail to labor on the Sabbath, with the alternative of the most barbarous punishment if they refuse. It will then appear that the law violates every principle of justice, and is most inhuman and cruel. And this appears, still more plainly when we learn that offenses such as stealing are not punished with anything like such severity.

More than this, these prosecutions are conducted against only those who keep the seventh day of the week, "according to the commandment." Brother Armstrong, who served out one sentence in jail for doing a little work in his garden on Sunday, stated that when he was brought before the grand jury to testify in another case, he was asked if he knew of the parties who had done labor on Sunday. He replied that he did, and when asked for the names, he mentioned the employÈs of the railroad companies. Then he was asked if he knew of the others. In reply he mentioned the hotel keepers. In like manner he cited the jury to delivery men, hackmen, barbers, and the saloon keepers. Finally he was asked if he knew of any Seventh-day Adventists who labored on Sunday, and when the names of some of them had been obtained, the jury was satisfied. The Seventh-day Adventists were indicted, and the others were not molested. In some cases the brethren have been told that they would not be molested, or that they would be released from the remainder of their term of imprisonment, if they would promise not to keep the Sabbath anymore.

Thus it appears that these Sunday law prosecutions are nothing else than the meanest kind of religious persecution; and that the persecutors are moved, not by a regard for the Sunday, but by a hatred for the Sabbath. This is still further shown by the manner in which the testimony has been gained which has convicted these persons. In some cases two persons, one a professed Sunday observer and the other a Sabbath-keeper, have transacted certain business together on Sunday; the Sunday-keeper would then go and tell of it, and his companion would be arrested, while he would not be molested.

In the face of all these things there are people who have the unblushing effrontery to say that there is no danger of there being any persecution for conscience's sake in this country, and that Sunday laws do not interfere with any man's religion! The fact is, and every candid person must admit it, that Sunday laws as they are executed in this State of Arkansas, are unjust and inhuman, and utterly subversive of every principle of civil or religious freedom. And the people of Arkansas are no different from the people of other States. The law is administered there no differently from what a similar law would be administered anywhere else. The fault is not primarily with the law, but with the people; and when the National Reform movement shall have triumphed, the Arkansas persecutions will be repeated with tenfold severity all over the United States.

We do not believe, however, that the time for the triumph of this movement has come just yet. We believe that the Constitution of the United States is the best and most just document ever made by men, and that it will condemn the iniquitous proceedings that are being carried on under the mask of the law; and

when the Constitution has thus spoken, it will henceforth be so clear to all the world that none need be mistaken, that the work of the National Reform party is a direct attempt to overthrow the best charter of human liberty that is in existence, and to bring in religious oppression.

The greater part of Friday, the 19th, was devoted to the consideration of the wants of the foreign missions. The great want is consecrated laborers. We have only a few items of interest concerning the foreign workers presented by Elder B. L. Whitney, who spoke for the Swiss Conference and Central Europe, Elder M. C. Wilcox, who spoke for England, and Elder A. B. Oyen, who spoke for Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. The Swiss Conference has three ordained and seven licensed ministers. The Conference has fifteen churches and about three hundred members. These churches, however, are not all in Switzerland; two are in Germany, four in France, two and Italy, and one in Romania. Elder Whitney stated that he knew of only three Seventh-day Adventist families in Switzerland who own the houses in which they live, and many of them are in the extremest poverty. Yet notwithstanding this, they have paid into the Conference treasury during the past year, nearly \$10 per member.

In England hard times are still a greater obstacle to the spread of the truth than in Switzerland. In every city there are thousands of skilled workmen who are unemployed. If a man began to keep the Sabbath he is quite sure to lose his position, and if he once loses it, there is little prospect of regaining it since scores as competent as he stand ready to take it. Still, in spite of these things in the way of living out the truth, many conscientious persons are found to take their stand for God and his truth, and they do not starve to death either.

During the year, 8,154 ships have been visited by the ship missionaries in England. These ships carry the truth to every nation under heaven. Through this agency a gentleman in Finland received papers and books and began to keep the Sabbath, and through his efforts a company of twenty Sabbath-keepers has been raised up, who will soon be visited by Elder Matteson.

Many other instances were related, showing how the truth of the Third Angel's Message cannot be hid, but we can mention only two. A gentleman, a Baptist, received part of a copy of *Present Truth*, wrapped about some goods. He became deeply interested, and called at the office and bought the back numbers of *Present Truth*, also of the pamphlet "Truth Found," and the tract "Who Changed the Sabbath?" which he saw advertised. He is much awakened over the Sabbath question.

Elder Whitney also mentioned a very interesting circumstance. Brother Vuillenmier baptized a company of twenty-two persons at Neuchatel. A report of this was published in a religious paper in Paris. This report was read by some French Baptists in the Argentine Republic, South America, and awakened their interests. One of this company had been in Switzerland, and he told the others that the people who performed this baptism keep the Sabbath. As a result of this six of the company had begun to keep the Lord Sabbath. They have sent for *Les Signes des Temps*, published at Basel.

In England there are now three organized churches of Seventh-day Adventists, containing eighty-one members. There are besides this forty who are not yet church-members.

In Norway the people are religiously inclined, and are willing to listen to the truth. It is quite easy to convince them of its binding claim, but quite difficult to induce them to take their stand, owing to their limited means of obtaining a living. Still poverty does not deter all. In Norway there are three churches and 175 members. The Swedish Conference has ten churches and 250 members, besides 100 Sabbath-keepers not yet connected with any church. Denmark has nine churches and 250 members.

These facts but poorly show how the truth is spreading. Still there is a great work to be done. This does not indicate, however, that it will be a long while before it is done. The work will all be done within this generation, for "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Before this generation passes away the Lord will come, and the work of warning the world will have been completed. Therefore the only conclusion is that if those who come to work have been intrusted are unfaithful to their trust, God will set them aside and

727

put his work into the hands of those who will connect with him and follow his opening providence. The cause will go on to triumph whether we do or not.

The religious services thus far have been interesting and profitable. Yesterday morning (Sabbath, Nov. 20) at 5:30 A.M., Elder Butler delivered a most impressive and instructive discourse to the ministers and missionary workers. At 10:30 Elder Haskell delivered a sermon on the Judgment which made a solemn impression on many minds. In the afternoon there was a social meeting, and in the evening a large congregations gave careful attention to a lecture by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, on the "Religion of the Body." The meeting has only just begun, and more items of interest may be expected next week. *Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 21. W.*

### **"Good and Bad Gifts from God" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do,

728

he shall even live in them." Eze. 20:11.

"Wherefore, I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." Eze. 20:25.

These two texts have been the subject of a good deal of controversy, and the latter one has been used by infidel cavilers as an argument against the goodness of God. The two verses, occurring as they do in such close connection, and referring to things so directly opposite in their nature, are worthy of a careful consideration. Fortunately the data for the explanation of both verses is supplied in the context. A misunderstanding of these texts, as in all other cases, arises from not considering the connection and not comparing scripture which scripture.

As to the meaning of the first verse there can be no difference of opinion. It evidently refers to the ten commandments. These statutes and judgments were delivered to the people when they had been brought out of the land of Egypt into the wilderness; and the statutes are the only ones "which if a man do, he shall even live in them." Some one may object that no one can live by keeping the commandments, but that is only because no one has done them. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:24), therefore no man can be justified by the law in the sight of God. Nevertheless it is a fixed and universal truth that "the *doers* of the law will be justified."

If the judgments "which if a man do, he shall even live in them" are the perfect and holy ten commandments, then the "statutes that were not good," and the "judgments whereby they should *not* live," must be something directly opposed to the ten commandments. This will more readily appear by reading the entire connection, which we quote:-

(7) "Then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt' I am the Lord your God. (8) But they rebelled against me, and would not hearken unto me; they did not every man cast away the abominations of their eyes, neither did they forsake the idols of Egypt; then I said, I will pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt. (9) But I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen, among whom they were, in whose sight I made myself known unto them, in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt. (10) Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. (11) And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. (12) Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them. (13) But the house of Israel rebelled against me in the wilderness; they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them; and my Sabbaths they greatly polluted: then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them. . . . (15) Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands; (16) because they despised my judgments, and walked not in my statutes, but polluted my Sabbaths: for *their heart went after their idols*. (17) Nevertheless mine eye spared them from destroying them, neither did I make an end of them in the wilderness. (18) But I said unto their children in the wilderness, Walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols; (19) I am the Lord your God; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them; . . . . (21) Notwithstanding the children rebelled against me; they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgments to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. . . . (23) I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries; (24) *because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers' idols*. (25) *Wherefore I gave*

*them also statutes [that were] not good, and judgments whereby they should not live;* (26) and I polluted them in their own gifts, in that they caused to pass through the fire all that openeth the womb, that I might make them desolate, to the end that they might know that I am the Lord. (27) Therefore, son of man, speak unto the house of Israel, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Yet in this your fathers have blasphemed me, in that they have committed a trespass against me. (28) For when I had brought them into the land, for the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to them, then they saw every high hill, and all the thick trees, and they offered there their sacrifices, and there they presented the provocation of their offering: there also they made their sweet savour, and poured out there their drink offerings." Eze. 20:7-28.

No one, after reading the above scripture, can fail to see that the "statutes that were not good," and the "judgments whereby they should not live," were the heathen statutes, and the rites of heathen worship. If any additional evidence is needed, read verse 31, which says, "Ye pollute yourselves with all your idols," and verse 39, which says: "As for you, O house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God; Go ye, serve ye every one his idols, and hereafter also, if ye will not hearken unto me: but pollute ye my holy name no more with your gifts, and with your idols."

In this last verse the whole matter is summed up. God gave them laws of truth, good laws, the doing of which would lead to life. But the people hated these holy commandments, and turned to the worship of dumb idols, which is expressly forbidden by the commandments, and the end of which is death. Therefore God gave them up to their own desires, and allowed them to have their own way.

As still further proof, we have the testimony of Stephen. In his speech before the council, he covered the same ground that is covered by the prophet Ezekiel in the 19th chapter. Said he:-

"And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you away beyond Babylon." Acts 7:41-43.

Here it is expressly stated that because they refused to worship God, he turned and gave them up to worship the host of heaven, and the figures made to represent the heavenly bodies.

Again, the psalmist covers the same ground, in the following words:-

"Hear, O my people, and I will testify unto thee; O Israel, if thou wilt hearken unto me; there shall no strange god be in thee; neither shalt thou worship any strange god. I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt; open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it. But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts; lust; and they walked in their own counsels." Ps. 81:8-12.

The dealing with Israel is but a repetition of God's dealing with the heathen, who, "when they knew not God, they glorified him not as God," "and changed the

glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts;" he also "gave them up unto vile affections;" "and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient." See Rom. 1:21-28.

Moreover it is just in this way that God will deal with all who despise him and his truth. Of those who "received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved," the inspired apostle writes:-

"And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:10-12.

God always gives people just what they want. If they really want righteousness, he fills them with it, as it is written, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled." Matt. 5:6. But if they deliberately choose to do wrong, and hate the good, God gives them up to be "filled with all unrighteousness." Rom.1:28, 29.

Of the twelve spies, ten brought back in evil report, and two good report. Num. 13 and 14. Ten of them said, "We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we." The other two said, "Let us go up at once, possess it; for we are well able to overcome it." The ten rejected God and his promises; the two trusted him, and relied upon him for aid. The sequel was in harmony with the principle commented on in this article. Those who said they could not go up, never did go up; all those who said they were able to possess the land, did possess it.

God will not force anybody into the path of righteousness. If men wish to walk therein, he makes the way very plain. But if they refuse and rebel, he gives them ample scope for the exercise of their own will. We conclude, therefore, if that it is best for a man to walk in the way of the Lord, and to keep his commandments. It is a terrible thing for a man to be given up to the pursuit of his own way. "For that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord; they would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices. For the turning away of the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall destroy them. But whoso hearkeneth unto me shall dwell safely, and shall be quiet from fear of evil." Prov. 1:29-33. W.

**December 9, 1886**

**"Items from the General Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

Since my last report, there have been meetings of the Conference, the International Tract and Missionary Society, Publishing Association, Health



Institute, and Sanitarium Improvement Company. The three associations last named have completed their business, of the other associations, much of the work is done in committees, some of which have not yet reported. We shall give only a few items of general interest, that were brought to light during the meetings of the various associations.

Perhaps the committee whose recommendations arouse the most likely interest, is the Committee on Destitute Fields. This committee has not yet completed its work, but has made the following recommendations, which have been approved by the Conference:-

1. That Elder S. N. Haskell go to England.
2. That Elder E. W. Whitney, of New York, go to Central Europe.
3. That W. L. H. Baker and why, of Pacific Press, Oakland, go to millboard, Australia, to labor in the office of the *Bible Echo*.
4. That M. G. Huffman, Indiana, labor in Virginia.
5. That B. F. Purdham, of Virginia, labor in Indiana.
6. That Elder E. W. Farnsworth go with Elder Haskell to England.
7. That Elder S. Fulton, of Tennessee, labor in Florida.
8. That E. E. Marvin, of Indiana, go to Tennessee to assist Elder Rees.
9. The Elder G. G. Rupert, of Kentucky, go to British Guiana, S. A., visit other parts of the Southern field as he may think best.
10. The Elder W. D. Curtis, of Kansas, go to Australia
11. The Elder H. Shultz, of Nebraska, devote his time to the German work in America, under direction of the General Conference.
12. The Elder J. F. Hanson, of Chicago, labor among the Scandinavians of the New York City and Brooklyn.
13. That Elder Louis Johnson, of Minnesota, devote a portion of this time to the Scandinavian work in Chicago.
14. That Elder J. H. Cook, of Kansas, go to Kentucky at his earliest convenience, to take the place of the Elder G. G. Rupert, who goes to South America.
15. That Elders C. L. Boyd, of Oregon, and D. A. Robinson, of Massachusetts, go to South Africa as soon as they can leave their present fields of labor.
16. That Elder John Fulton, not of California, go to the North Pacific Conference to labor with Elder Boyd, and to take the place of the latter when he shall go to South Africa.

In connection with the meetings of the Conference, and of the International Tract and Missionary Society, the following interesting facts were made known:-

The number of pages of tracts distributed by this society during the year, is 1,250,000. Besides this, the society uses over 600 copies of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, 350 of *Gospel Sickle*, 250 *Sentinels*, 100 *Good Health*, and over 400 copies of periodicals. This is, of course, entirely outside of what is done by the various State Tract and Missionary Societies.

There are over thirty city missions, employing about one hundred workers. During the year, 19,243 Bible-readings have been held by the city mission workers, with families and individuals. It must be remembered that the city mission work is but little over a year old, and that most of the missions have been

established but a few months. These workers have sold reading matter to the amount of \$6,266.90, and had given away a very large amount besides. They have also taken 1,287 yearly subscriptions to various denominational periodicals, besides many for less than a year.

In connection with the city missions in a few of the sea-ports there are ship missionaries. In this work 6,225 ships have been visited, and supplied with 1,100,353 pages of reading material, and 97,411 papers. Two hundred and twenty-nine ships are regularly supplied with the SIGNS OF THE TIMES or some other denominational journal.

To show how God can make even the wrath of men to praise him, we give an incident related by Bro. A. T. Robinson, of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Mission. A clergyman who sought the interest that was being awakened for the truth, as a result of the faithful labors of the city missionaries, made an appointment to preach against the Sabbath, announcing as his subject, "Who Changed the Sabbath?" A young man, a printer, saw the announcement, and as he had had some curiosity on that subject, he and his wife went. Instead of gaining intimation upon the Sabbath question, he heard a tirade against Seventh-day Adventists. This did not satisfy the young man, but it served as an advertisement of the mission, where he went and heard the truth. As the result of this one sermon against the Sabbath, six persons have begun to keep it "according to the commandment." Since the mission started in Brooklyn, only a short time ago, seventeen have begun to keep the Sabbath.

Bro. W. H. Saxby, of the Washington (D. C.) Mission, gave an interesting account of his work. He found great difficulty in starting the work, but has sold in that city over \$700 worth of books, and has held nearly 1,000 Bible-readings. Thus the truth is spreading.

The meetings of the Health Institute Association brought out many interesting facts, of which we can give only a few. This work was established in 1867 under the name of Health Institute, but it was reorganized in 1876 under the name of Medical and Surgical Sanitarium. The Sanitarium is located at Battle Creek, having a large core of competent physicians, with J. H. Kellogg, M.D., as superintendent. The business has outgrown the frame building that was first occupied, and now occupies a building with the following dimensions:-

Entire length, 475 feet; height, 84 feet; width of main part, 40, 46, and 54 feet; length of promenade in verandas and halls, more than half a mile; floor space, more than two acres. This building is probably the most perfectly ventilated structure in the United States, is heated by steam, and lighted by the Edison incandescent electric light. Each room has an independent supply of fresh, pure air at all times, without the necessity of opening windows, and the ventilation and heating are so arranged that one room may have a warm, moist atmosphere, while that of the adjoining one may be cool and dry, if so desired. The sewerage is perfect, and such is the care taken that nowhere about the building, from basement to attic, is there the slightest unpleasant odor.

The main building will accommodate nearly 250 patients, and about 150 more can be accommodated in the cottages near by, and belonging to the institution. During the past year the patronage has been larger than ever before. The

average number of patients has been about 225, and the entire number treated within the year is not less than 1,200. Of course a small army of helpers is needed to properly care for so many, and of these there are about 150. The receipts from patients for the year have been over \$122,000, against \$86,000 last year.

To feed a large family requires over 1,200 barrels of flour a year; 1,000 bushels of potatoes, and 700 barrels of apples. Four barrels of milk per day is consumed. The table is bountifully supplied with healthful food tastefully serve. One rarely sees so large an institution as this carried on with so little apparent friction.

While this institution is not sectarian, and patients of all classes are received, all having perfect freedom in matters pertaining to the conscience, it is the aim of the managers to have a religious influence pervading the house. Family worship is regularly sustained morning and evening, and on Sunday evenings there is usually a sermon in the parlor. Religious services for the helpers are also frequently held. There is a Sabbath-school of 160 members in connection with the institution, and also a missionary society conducted by the workers, which uses 300 copies of *Good Health*, 200 copies of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and 50 of the *American Sentinel*.

During this session of the Conference, the early-morning is devoted to religious services, a social meeting being used to help, the days are devoted to business, and the evening to preaching or some other interesting exercise. Monday evening was left for the teachers' meeting of the Battle Creek Sabbath-school, which those from abroad were invited to attend. On Tuesday evening (Nov. 23) there was a Bible-reading by Elder A. T. Robinson; on Wednesday evening a sermon by Elder I. D. Van Horn, and on Thursday evening one by Elder M. C. Wilcox, of England. Friday evening was devoted to a consideration of some teachers of the city missions, the time being occupied by Elder N. C. McClure, of San Francisco, Elder A. T. Robinson, of Brooklyn, Elder H. W. Miller, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and Elder George Starr, of Chicago. On Sabbath there was a sermon by the Elder S. N. Haskell, on the subject of education.

Every day at eight o'clock A.M. a large class of ministers and other laborers has met in the tabernacle to receive instructions from Dr. Kellogg on the subject of health and temperance. These meetings are very interesting and profitable, and those who have attended are becoming fitted to preach the gospel of health, while they are teaching people the way of life eternal. W. *Battle Creek*, Nov. 28.

## December 16, 1886

### "Items from the General Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The past week has been a busy one for those attending the Conference, yet we have but few items of interest to the General reader. The election of officers of the General Conference has taken place, resulting as follows: President, Elder Geo. I. Butler; Secretary, Elder U. Smith; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. M. J.

Chapman; Treasurer, A. R. Henry; Executive Committee, Elders G. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood. Following this election, the Constitution was so amended as to call for seven members of the executive board, instead of five, and the Nominating Committee were instructed to recommend two persons to complete the required number.

There was probably never before a session of the General Conference in which so much attention was given to the work in foreign countries as has been in this one. This is what we should naturally expect; for since the Third Angel's Message is to be preached "in all the world, for a witness unto all nations," it would be natural that the nearer we come to the end, the more extensively will the message be preached. Provision has been made in this Conference for England, Scandinavia, Central Europe, South America, South Africa, British Honduras, and Australia. The additional items voted by the Conference, according to the recommendation of the Committee on Distribution of Labor, are as follows:-

1. That . . .bles and wife, of Vermont, go to Indianapolis, to take charge of the mission in that city.

2. That R. M. Rees, Tennessee, spend what time he can in looking after the work in North Carolina.

3. That W. C. Sisley and wife, of Michigan, go to California. Sister Sisley to conduct the missionary class in Healdsburg College.

4. That E. W. Farnsworth remain in Battle Creek until he goes to England with Elder Haskell, and that Sister Farnsworth take charge of the missionary work in the College filling the place hitherto filled by Sister Sisley.

5. G. W. Anglebarger and wife, of Ohio, go to Atlanta, Georgia, to superintend the mission to be established in that city.

6. Richard Coggeshall, now at Basel, Switzerland, is to go to the publishing house in Christiania, Norway, as soon as consistent, to spend several months giving instruction in printing and press work.

7. Ludwig Henricksen, of Iowa, goes to Norway to instruct and assist in the Bible-reading work.

8. Sisters Fannie Bolton and Hattie Annes are to go to Washington, D. C., to work in the mission there.

9. Elder F. D. Starr, of Illinois, after spending a few months in obtaining all information possible about city mission work, colporteur work, etc., is to go to Basel, Switzerland, to devote himself especially to the German work.

10. Elders S. S. Smith and C. W. Olds, of Wisconsin, are to labor in Alabama and Mississippi.

11. Elder T. H. Gibbs, of the New Orleans Mission, is to spend some time in British Honduras, looking after the cause there, and baptizing those who are ready for that ordinance.

12. Geo. A. King, of Michigan, accompany Elder Rupert on his trip to British Guiana to assist him by selling publications.

13. Chas. F. Curtis is to go to Atlanta, Georgia, to work in connection with the mission to be established there.

14. Elder M. C. Wilcox is to return to England, to edit the British paper.

15. Sister Mary Heilsen, of Battle Creek, will go to Christiania, Norway, to labor in connection with the publishing work.

The Sabbath-school Association, after adopting a revised constitution, elected the following officers:-

President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, A. R. Oyen; Secretary, Winnie Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, A. B. Oyen, W. C. White, J. E. White, G. H. Bell, D. M. Canright, Winnie Loughborough.

The Committee on Contributions brought in a recommendation that the contributions for the coming year be given to the following missions: first quarter, South Africa; second, Norwegian; third, Central European; fourth, British. This report was, after some remarks, amended so as to recommend that during the coming year the Sabbath-school of the United States support the South African Mission. This proposal was heartily supported, and was adopted with enthusiasm. We believe that in carrying out this recommendation our Sabbath-school will experience more of the blessing of God than ever before. W.

**December 23, 1886**

**"The End Approaching" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14. This language occurs in the discourse which the Saviour delivered in answer to the question: "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The entire chapter in which these words occur is an answer to this question. The question as to whether or not the Lord will come again is not mooted. There was no uncertainty in the minds of the disciples on this point. They very well knew that the Lord would come to reign over his people; all that troubled them was to know the signs which should precede his coming. These the Saviour proceeded to give. Besides the physical signs in the sun, moon, and stars, which have all been fulfilled, he gave the one which heads this paragraph, and which is now in process of fulfillment.

What is "this gospel of the kingdom"? It is that which our Saviour preached in all his earthly ministry. Matt. 4:23; Mark 1:14. "Gospel" means "good news." The gospel which is to be preached "in all the world," "to all people," is the good news of a Saviour, "which is Christ the Lord." Luke 2:10, 11. A Saviour must save people from something, and so we find that Jesus saves his people from their sins. Matt. 1:21. But the wrath of God (Rom. 1:18; Eph. 5:5, 6), resulting in death (Rom. 6:23), is visited upon all sin; so that the salvation of people from sin must also be salvation from the wrath of God, and so it is. Rom. 5:9. Being saved from sin may be equivalent to being justified by faith, but being saved from wrath is the final and complete salvation from sin and all its consequences. And this is the salvation of which Isaiah speaks when he says that "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an *everlasting salvation*." Isa. 45:17. It is that salvation which the

apostle Peter says shall be brought unto us "at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1:9-13.

This final salvation is the end or object of our faith. 1 Peter 1:9. People may talk as much as they please about doing right for its own sake, but the fact remains that if there were to be no future life there would be no incentive to right living. Paul says that "if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15:19), and in harmony with this he continues that if there is no resurrection we would do well to eat and drink, and get all the enjoyment we can from this life while it is passing. 1 Cor. 15:32. What comfort would it be to a sinner to assure him that his sins are all forgiven, but that there is nothing for him beyond this present life? None at all. In such a case forgiveness of sins would profit him nothing. So then the preaching of the gospel comprehends not alone the announcement that Christ died for sinners, but that through his death he has brought immortality to light. We believe that no one who has ever professed to preached the gospel has omitted the fact that an eternal inheritance awaits the overcomers.

But this eternal inheritance is "reserved in Heaven," and is to be revealed only "in the last time." 1 Peter 1:4, 5. It is only when Christ comes "the second time" that salvation is brought to them that look for him. Christ himself told his disciples (John 14:1-3) that he would come again to receive them unto himself so that they might be with him, plainly indicating that they could be with him in no other way except by his second coming. Even though they should die they could that be with him unless he should return. Compare John 8:21 and 13:33. And in harmony with this Paul says, "by the word of the Lord," that "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.

Now what have we found? Just this: that the gospel brings to view the eternal redemption, and that any preaching of the gospel which should omit the future inheritance of the saints would be very incomplete; and that there is no future inheritance for the saints unless the Lord comes again. Therefore we are justified in saying that the preaching of the gospel necessarily includes the preaching of the second coming of Christ, and that those who ignore or deny the second coming of Christ, do not preach the whole gospel. Still further: in the fourteenth of Revelation we read of three messages that immediately precede the second coming of Christ. Verses 6-14. The first of these passages announces they are of God's Judgment come, and it and the two which follow given instruction how to prepare for that event. The Third Angel's Message includes both the others, and contains the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,-the sum of all the instruction necessary to make "the remnant of Israel" a pure people, prepared for the coming of the Lord. It is the gospel in its simplicity and purity, and is therefore the gospel just as it was preached by Christ and his apostles. It announces the second coming of Christ, and tells how to be ready for that event. Therefore we confidently affirm that our Saviour's words in Matt. 24:14 may justly be paraphrased thus: "And the Third Angel's Message shall be preached in all the

world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." We think that no one who has carefully followed this brief exposition can dissent from this conclusion.

This thing,-the preaching of the Third Angel's Message in all the world, to all nations,-is all that remains to be done before the coming of the Lord; and this work will be cut short in righteousness; "because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." Rom. 9:28. And short indeed it must be, for we *know* from our Saviour's own words, that his coming is so near that he is "even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. The generation now living upon the earth will witness the coming of the Lord with all his holy angels. There is no conjecture about this, no assumption. It is just as true as that Christ is the Son of God.

"But," some one will say, "it is impossible that Christ should come for many years if every nation must first hear of the Third Angel's Message; because there are vast multitudes who have not even heard that there is such a thing." We have known many who stumble over this, even of those who believe in the soon coming of our Lord. Let us see what force there is in this objection.

1. It is not necessary to the fulfillment of our Saviour's words, that the Third Angel's Message should be preached to every individual in the world. Then will there not be partiality shown? No; and for this reason: There are thousands who have had, besides the light which comes from nature, a partial knowledge of the gospel, and have rejected it. They have deliberately rejected the light which they had, and have steeled their hearts to the influences of God's Spirit. Now of what use would it be to carry the Third Angel's Message to such? None at all. It would be casting pearls before swine. If they have refused a little light because it condemned their evil deeds, they would certainly reject greater light for the same reason. We may not know who are and who are not worthy to receive the full light of the gospel, but God knows, and will direct the truth to all who are not already reprobate.

2. There are, no doubt, thousands of whom we have no knowledge, who are living out the truth of the Third Angel's Message. When Elijah thought that he alone of all the inhabitants of Israel worshiped the true God, the Lord said to him, "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." 1 Kings 19:18. We are to apt to think that nothing is being done except what we do, forgetting that God has infinite resources at his command.

3. It is not necessary that all who believe shall have heard the voice of the living creature. The Bible contains everything necessary to making a man "perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," and for years Bible societies have been scattering Bibles broadcast over the world. The Spirit of God can guide the reader of the Bible into all truth, even though he have no human preceptor. Add to this the reception of the tract or a paper which may start a new train of thought, and the reader can readily see how there may be thousands living out the Third Angel's Message, who are entirely unknown to the great body of believers.

4. Lastly we want to consider what progress is being made in the preaching of "the gospel of the kingdom,"-the Third Angel's Message,-in all the world. Here we

must caution the reader against jumping at conclusions. He must not base his calculations simply on the comparative few who are now known to be professing the truth. Some will reason thus: "This message has been preached for forty years, and there are only about thirty thousand who are known to be Seventh-day Adventists; therefore it will take perhaps as many years more to warn the whole world." This is very defective reasoning. We should consider, not simply the number who have been warned, but the improved facilities for warning the world.

(1) As a matter of fact every civilized nation has already received to a greater or lesser extent the knowledge of the Third Angel's Message. There is not a nation under heaven that is not known to contain Sabbath-keepers; and by the thoroughly-organized system of missionary work which has been adopted, every one of these Seventh-day Adventists is a center from which the truth may radiate. True, there are few of these as compared to the great mass of professed Christian; but the Bible does not say that the gospel shall be preached as a converter of all nations, but only as a *witness* either for or against them.

(2) Through the agency of the press it is easier to reach a million people now than it was to reach a hundred in the days of Paul. Let us note the progress that has been made in this branch of the message. About thirty-five years ago Elder James White published the first paper devoted to the dissemination of the last gospel message. It was a very small sheet, containing about one-eighth as much a matter as the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, having no subscription list, and no prospect of support or of regular publication. The whole of the first issue was carried to the post-office in a small carpet sack. From that date the work has not taken a retrograde step. Now the Seventh-day Adventists have fully equipped houses of publication in Battle Creek, Mich.; Oakland, Cal.; Basel, Switzerland, Christiania, Norway; Great Grimsby, England, and Melbourne, Australia. These are all devoted to the spread of the Third Angel's Message. In these offices the truth is published in the following languages: English, German,

775

French, Italian, Spanish, Danish, Norwegian, Holland, and Romanian. We have not the facts at hand concerning all these offices of publication, and will therefore take as a specimen the central publishing house at Battle Creek, Mich., which we have just visited, the items which we have gathered are as follows:-

The amount of floor space occupied in the buildings is about 40,000 square feet. The number of hands employed is about 130. The institution issues the following periodicals: *Review and Herald*, an 8-page semi-monthly; *Youth's Instructor*, a 4-page weekly; *Simme der Warheit* (German), an 8-page semi-monthly; *Advent Tidende* (Danish), a 16-page semi-monthly magazine; the *Harold* (Swedish), a 16-page semi-monthly. The circulation of these periodicals aggregates about one hundred and forty thousand copies a month. Besides this, there are sent out from this office books, pamphlets, and tracts to the amount of a ton for each day in the year.

These are simple, unvarnished facts concerning the central office of publication. Let the reader weigh them well, considering that other offices are putting out a proportionate amount, and that in every part of the world men and



women are industriously circulating this reading matter, and then let him ask how long it will be before all people will have been warned of the speedy coming of Christ. Truly this thing is not being done in a corner. In a future article we shall show that within a space of time that may be reckoned by months, "this gospel of the kingdom," despised and hated though it may be, will be the all-absorbing topic of the day. The great newspapers of the land will herald it, and its bitterest enemies will assist in lifting it up as a witness to the people.

May the Lord help all to awaken to the importance of the present time; may we not delay action until the prophecy is fulfilled, when it will be too late for action; but may we do our part in fulfilling the prophecy, thus saying by our actions as well as by our words, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." W.

### **"Educated Brutality" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is becoming more and more apparent that the principal aim of the university athletic clubs is by organization to promote brutality. In some recent note from a certain university we read of the reorganization of the foot-ball club, and it was said that new men will take the places of those who have "preferred to retire on account of disabilities resulting from the double series of last year's games." Not long since while on a railroad train we heard some college students talking of their contests, and one of them told how he went on a certain occasion with a loaded cane, expecting to have a part in a college "rush," but for some reason he did not have an opportunity to use his murderous weapon.

The following from the *Independent* will give some idea of the point to which college athletics have now come. Its outspoken condemnation is just, and is richly deserved.

"Eleven big animals from Yale University and eleven big animals from Princeton College expressed our gratitude to God on Thanksgiving day for his mercies during the year, by such a beastly fight as ought to be prohibited by law and punished as the fights of the prize ring are punished. This is plain language, but it is none too strong. Let it be understood that we do not have the least objection to manly sport. We believe and would encourage it. But this is nothing of that sort. There is a game of foot-ball, or was, which was manly and healthful. It was a game of pluck and skill. The game as now conducted is only organized brutality. First there was a quarrel as to where the game should be played. This preliminary quarrel was so prolonged and bitter that prepared the way for a contest which should not be a game, but a fight full of animosity.

"Under the Rugby rules the ball as partly kicked from the beginning to the end of the game, but is seized and carried, and the effort of the players is by all possible violence to take the ball from a player who holds it. He can be caught and pounded with the fist, thrown on the ground and stamped on with all one's fury. At Princeton on last Thanksgiving day it was well understood that there would be no mercy shown. The game, so called, was a slugging match. The brutes pounded and kicked each other, and that they did not kill each other was through no restraint, but by the mercy of God. One of the players was severely

injured and had to be carried off the field. It was an unmanly, degrading, beastly exhibition of malice and cruelty.

"Then after the contest the fights were continued whenever Yale and Princeton men came together in a drinking saloon or at a hotel bar. At one public the proprietor had to turn off the gas to stop a fight. Of course there was gambling over the result. It is not foot-ball we object to, but such foot-ball; not games, but gambling; not contests, but drunkenness. Such games as this of last Thanksgiving day should be strictly forbidden by our colleges. They are a disgrace to a Christian university, not to say a Christian age, and they would not be permitted to disgrace even the dirty streets and dens of Five Points. Shame on all those who participate in such at Princeton."

**December 30, 1886**

**"Did the Patriarchs Know Christ?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

A very common answer to the above question is that they did not, or that they had at the most a very limited knowledge of Christ in his work, and had no just conception of the plan of salvation. Such a position we believe to be wholly erroneous, and subversive of Bible truth. If it were so, it would show that God's ways are not equal, and that in different ages of the world he has different ways of saving men; and still worse, the holding of such a view dishonors Christ, by virtually denying that in all things he has the pre-eminence. We therefore wish briefly to give a scriptural answer to the question.

Going back to the time of a fall we find Christ promised to Adam and Eve, as the one who should conquer sin and Satan. Said the Lord to the serpent: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3:15.

Some may say that this is so slight a reference to the Messiah, that the fallen pair could not possibly have derived much, if any, hope from it. We are not to suppose that the very brief record in the first three chapters of Genesis contains more than a bare outline of what the Lord spoke to our first parents. But whether this was all the information that was given them or not, it is certain that they fully understood the consequences of their sin, and knew just how they might find pardon. This we know from the fact that in process of time both Cain and Abel brought offerings to the Lord, to the latter of which the Lord had respect, while he rejected the former. Why was this difference shown? Because Cain's offering, being only the fruit of the ground, indicated no faith in the promised Redeemer, while Abel's offering, being of the firstling of his flock, showed faith in the Lamb of God, which alone could take away the sin of the world.

This is what the apostle Paul says in Heb 11:4: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh." That is to say that Abel's sacrifice was the sacrifice of faith, and by it he obtained

that righteousness "which is through the faith of Jesus Christ, the righteousness of God by faith."

Coming down to the time of Abraham we find the clearest evidence of a full knowledge of Christ. The covenant that God made with him was confirmed "in Christ." Gal. 3:17. It was therefore Abraham's faith in Christ that was "counted unto him for righteousness." Moreover, Abraham's faith was so great that he was called the father of the faithful; and the highest position to which a person can attain is to be a child of Abraham. The most perfect Christians on earth only "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." Rom. 4:12. This is because Abraham sought Christ's day and was glad. John 8:56. He saw and understood the complete work of Christ, and being justified by faith he rejoiced in hope of the glory of God. See Rom.5:1, 2.

Still later we have the record of Moses. Paul tells us that it was his faith in Christ that led him to leave the court of Egypt. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." Heb 11:24-26. This shows only that Moses had full faith in Christ, but also that unbelievers have a knowledge of him, for if it were not so Moses could not have suffered the "reproach of Christ."

Those Israelites who are willing also to suffer the reproach of Christ were sustained by him, for Paul says that "they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10:4. And this shows that the pious Jews were as truly Christians as are any people who may believe in Christ of the present time. By the sacrifices which they offered they indicated their faith in the Redeemer who was to die on Calvary, just the same as we do in the Lord's Supper eat the bread and drink of the cup "to show the Lord's death till he come." To say that they did not understand Christ's mediatorial work is to deny the Scriptures of truth.

But there were many Jews who did not believe in Christ. So there are now in the church many professed Christians who know nothing of Christ. The preaching of the cross is really foolishness to them as much as it ever was to the Greeks, although they may not scoff at it. When Christ appeared in the flesh the great body of the Jewish nation rejected him. Even so he has told us that when he comes the second time faith will be a rare thing on the earth. But we must remember that the reason why the Jews rejected Christ was because they did not believe the sacred Scriptures, just as the reason why the Son of man when he comes will scarcely find faith on the earth, will be because of the growing skepticism in regard to the Bible. Already professors of religion openly say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" To those unbelieving Jews Christ said: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John 5:45-47.

Taking a more general view, we learn that not only Moses but all the prophets taught the facts concerning Christ and his work. Peter says that the prophets "prophesied of the grace that should come onto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1:10, 11. And even a slight acquaintance with the prophets will serve to show that every feature in Christ's ministry, both on earth and in Heaven, was foretold by them.

In Dan. 9:25-27 we find the time when the Messiah should appear given with the utmost exactness. Micah (chap. 5:2) told that he should be born in Bethlehem of Judea. Isaiah foretold the fact that he should be born of a virgin. Compare Isa. 7:14 and Matt. 1:23. Zechariah foretold Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Zech. 9:9. Daniel's vision revealed the exact time when Christ should be crucified. Dan. 9:27. In that wonderful chapter, the fifty-third of Isaiah, the people were told of his life of humility and death of his final ignominious death; that "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" that his soul was to be poured out unto death as an offering for sin, and that "with his stripes we are healed." Moreover the fact that he should be buried with the rich, is plainly stated. David foretold the well-known incident of the crucifixion when he said by the Spirit: "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." Ps. 69:21. He also speaks of the piercing of Christ's hands and feet (Ps. 22:16) and prophecies of the action of the Roman soldiers in these words: "They parted my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." Verse 18. He also understood that Christ should be born of his line, and knowing that his throne is to endure "as days of heaven" (Ps. 89:29) he prophesied of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul should not be left in the grave, and that his flesh should not see corruption. Compare Ps. 16:8-10 and Acts 2:25-31.

David also describes Christ's ascension to Heaven after his victory over death (Ps. 24:7-10) and also declares that Christ is to sit at the right hand of God until his foes are made his footstool. Ps. 110:1. The prophet Zechariah declared that Christ was to sit as a priest upon his Father's throne, securing, in conjunction with the Father, peace for troubled humanity. Zech. 6:12, 13. And Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of the glorious second coming of Christ to execute judgment on the ungodly. Jude 14.

But time and space would fail to speak of all that the prophets have said concerning Christ. Let one more text suffice to cover the whole ground. The apostle Paul declared himself to be a "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ;" he gloried in the cross of Christ, and preached nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. Christ was his constant theme, yet when he stood before Agrippa he said: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, *saying none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come*; that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show a light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." Acts 20:22, 23. If the apostle Paul in all his preaching did not go outside of what Moses and the prophets had said, they certainly must have given very accurate information concerning Christ.

Who can read how Isaiah saw Christ "sitting on a throne high and lifted up," or and how Ezekiel saw "visions of God," or how Enoch "walked with God," and doubt but that these men had a most intimate knowledge of Christ and his work for fallen man? And that not only they, but multitudes of others, had a knowledge of Christ, is proved by the fact that they "through faith subdued kingdoms, brought righteousness, obtained promises," and that besides Christ there is no salvation in any other, "for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. W.

## The Signs of the Times, Vol. 13 (1887)

January 6, 1887

### "A Few Principles of Interpretation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS OF THE TIMES is an expository journal. The main object for which it was established was to present Scripture truth in the simplest and clearest manner possible. During the coming year it will be our endeavor to make it meet this object more fully than ever before, and as a preliminary, we wish to lay down for our readers a few of the principles which we shall invariably follow in our interpretation, and which, if followed, in a prayerful and candid spirit, cannot fail to lead a person to a proper understanding of the sacred word.

1. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. We accept this fully, and apply it to the entire Bible. The Bible does not simply *contain* the truth, but it *is* the truth, and the whole truth. Aside from the Bible there can be no moral or spiritual truth and light. And whatever disagrees with the Bible, whether it be in the realm of morals or of science, must be false. The principle here laid down must underlie all sound Biblical exegesis. If this be not admitted, it can be of no use to any to study the Bible.

2. The Bible is one connected, consistent, harmonious book. It is composed of many books, but these books form only *one Book*. They are not independent one of another. This Book was written by many different persons, yet it has only one author, and that is the Spirit of God. The different parts are inspired by the same Spirit, and have one purpose; there is a vital connection between them. They are characterized by oneness of thought. As Christ prayed that his disciples might be one, so that the world might know that the Father had sent him (John 17:21), so the perfect harmony between the various parts of the Bible is proof that it came from God. If we accept the Bible as the inspired word of God we must expect to find it harmonious throughout, for God cannot deny himself. So whoever wishes to study the word of God with any degree of satisfaction, must first fix in his mind the fact that the Bible cannot contradict itself.

As a corollary to this principle it might be stated that the Bible does not need to be "harmonized." To attempt that is a thankless task, because the Bible is already harmonized. It is an instrument that was tuned by the Almighty himself, and every string vibrates in harmony with every other. All that the Bible student has to do is to study the harmony that already exists. If two texts *seem* to be contradictory, the student may rest assured that he does not understand one or the other, or perhaps either one. But when the position which he holds on one text is upheld by other texts bearing on the same point, and is not contradicted by any other text; that is, when a position taken in regard to any text is consistent with the entire Bible, that of itself is evidence that that position is correct; for the Bible could not agree with a false position.

3. The Bible must interpret itself. By the Bible man may be "*thoroughly* furnished unto all good works;" hence it cannot need the addition of matter outside of itself.

4. One part of the Bible cannot be fully understood when taken by itself, apart from its connection, or without reference to the remaining portion of the Bible. This might also be called a corollary to the second proposition laid down. If the Bible is one connected whole, then all the parts are necessary to the formation of that whole. There is a mutual dependence between all the parts, and therefore in considering one part, attention must be given to the other parts. True, we *may* not misunderstand one portion of the Bible even though we study it by itself; but it is certain that we cannot have a complete understanding of it until we study it with reference to the Bible as a whole. This principle is as true of an entire book of the Bible as it is of a single text. There is no book of the Bible upon which light is not thrown by every other book in the Bible. To say that any two books in the Bible have no connection, is almost equivalent to saying that the Bible is not all inspired by the same Spirit.

5. Terms used in one place in the Bible, with a certain signification, must have the *same meaning* attached to them *in every other place* where they occur, provided the same subject is under consideration. If this be not true, then we have no certain means of knowing what the Bible teaches. Let us apply this principle. In the eighth chapter of Daniel we find a symbolic prophecy in which certain days are mentioned. Now to say that these days mean literal days of twenty-four hours each, would make nonsense of the prophecy, for we should have several great kingdoms covering a period of only a little more than six years. But in Eze. 4:3-6 we find another prophecy, also symbolic, in which a day is expressly declared to stand for a year. So we conclude that in every prophecy where a day is used as a symbol, it signifies a year.

In like manner we find horns used as a symbol in the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in both of which chapters they are plainly declared to symbolize kingdoms. Therefore we justly conclude that whenever in the Bible a horn is used as a symbol, it represents a kingdom or nation.

Let the reader study these principles well, and get them fixed in his mind, and they will help him out of many a difficulty in his study of the Bible. We think these principles are sufficient for present consideration. Next week we shall present a few more that are equally important. W.

## **"The Underlying Motive" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* of December 18, 1886, says:-

"We are glad to find the Central Labor Union of this city taking action on one point in line with the intelligent Christian sentiment of the country. This action is in regard to the enforcement of the Sunday laws. The present movement in favor of Sunday closing was undertaken, it is understood, partly in response to the appeals of labor organizations. These appeals were based, not on religious or moral grounds, but on the necessity to laboring men of one rest-day in seven. The friends of Sabbath observance will be pleased to receive help even up to this point."

This is another proof of the fact that all classes of people are getting ready to unite in demanding a rigid observance of Sunday. The churches are, with few exceptions, a unit on this matter; the various temperance societies are pledged to it; Labor Unions and Knights of Labor are calling for it; even anarchists, all of whom are infidels or Spiritualists, are swinging into line. Surely there is need for some one to lift a warning voice against the tyranny that seems about to be imposed on the people.

The *Christian Union* of a late date also says:-

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath is to be preserved at all-and we are sanguine of its preservation-the non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to reinforce the religious demand for Sabbath rest; and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable."

Yes, that is very evident. But why should we, or anybody else, be compelled to accept a Sabbath which is not "ours." Those who claim Sunday as *their* Sabbath, may keep it if they will, but we don't own any Sabbath, and don't intend to own any. The Lord has a Sabbath, however, which he expects us to keep, and we intend to keep that, and no other.

But look for a moment at the selfishness of the proposed action in favor of Sunday. Here is a man who would like to keep Sunday, but who thinks that he cannot keep it unless they have a law compelling him to do so. The reason for this is that his neighbors do not keep Sunday, and if he rests on that day they will get ahead of him in business. To be sure there have been men who have been willing to lose everything in maintaining what they believed to be right, but his Sunday religion is not of that kind. And so, in order that he may not lose a cent by doing what his unenlightened conscience tells him he ought to do, he insists that his neighbors must be compelled to do the same thing, even though the enlightened conscience of some of them may tell them that they ought not to do so.

The whole Sunday movement is prompted in large measure, not by love for truth, or what is supposed to be truth, but by love of self. And inasmuch as the Sunday-sabbath is purely a human institution, having its origin in selfishness, this is as high a motive as we ought to expect. W.

## **"Manner of Christ's Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Bible furnishes a sufficient answer to every theological vagary that men can devise. One of the modern ideas is that the Lord has already come, and that Christians, or at least those who call themselves such, are already in the immortal state. This idea is not really new, for Paul had to combat it eighteen hundred years ago. Writing of profane and vain babblings he said: "And their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." 2 Tim. 2:17, 18. Indeed, if church history be diligently studied it will be seen that all the "new theology" of these days, is only a revamping of the musty ideas of the church "Fathers," who were really the "fathers" of all heresy.

But there is no dogma of modern spiritualistic theology that is more directly contradicted by the Bible than is the one that Christ either has come the second time, or that he comes as often as a good man dies, or that in some way his second coming is a mysterious affair of which nothing can be known until it has taken place. In the chapter which contains the Sabbath-school lesson upon which comments are made in another column, we find the following plain and emphatic words of our Saviour himself:-

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:23-27.

This one text is sufficient to enable any one to determine the literalness of Christ's coming. First, false christs will arise; men will say to us, "Christ is out here in the desert;" the command is, "Go not forth;" others will say, "He has appeared in such and such a meeting;" the command is, "Believe it not." But why may we not believe some of these tales? Why should we not investigate *all* of them, lest perchance Christ should come and we not know of it? Simply because he will not come in a secret manner. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." No one can fail to see the vivid lightning flash that covers the whole sky; even though the eyes be closed, that wonderful glare cannot be wholly shut out. And the coming of Christ will be like the lightning's flash, for brilliancy, because he "shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels" (Matt. 16:27); or, as Paul says, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8.

We said that no one can avoid seeing the vivid

7

lightning flash. So no one can avoid seeing the Son of God when he comes. The apostle John says: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because



of him." Rev. 1:7. Although those who have rejected Christ will be loath to see him; although "they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth" (Isa. 2:19), and will cry to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. 6:16), they will not be able to escape his piercing gaze, nor to shut out from their eyes his terrible and overwhelming glory.

In that day there will be no need of anybody's saying, "Lo, here is Christ, or lo, there." There will be no chance for mistake. "For *the Lord himself* shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God." 1 Thess. 4:16. That trumpet's mighty sound will shake the earth; the graves will be opened; those who sleep in Jesus shall rise first, clothed in immortality, while the living righteous ones will be changed "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," and all together will be caught up to be forever with the Lord.

These events are near at hand. The signs in the heavens, which Christ announced as indicating his coming near, have been fulfilled. And now that we are in the time when Satan may be expected to work with "all power and signs and lying wonders;" when as an angel of light he will profess to be Christ, it is needful that we indelibly fix in our minds those truths concerning Christ's second coming, which alone will keep even the elect from being deceived. If we store our minds with the simple truths of the Bible, we shall have wherewith to unveil the deceptions of Satan; and thus God's word will be a light to our feet and a lamp to our path. W.

### **"A Fulfilling Parable" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

#### The Commentary. (Sabbath, January 22.)

"Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Matt. 24:32-34. This parable occurs in the midst of one of the last discourses given by our Lord. As indicated in the heading of this note, the parable relates to the present time, and therefore claims our earnest attention. In order to appreciate its force, we must briefly glance at the preceding part of the chapter.

The twenty-third chapter of Matthew records the woes which Christ pronounced against the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees, and his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, because of her rejection of all that was good. When he went out of the temple, his disciples called his attention to the wonderful buildings of the temple, the pride of the Jewish nation. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Verse 2.

"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Verse 3. Here we have two distinct questions. The first, "When shall these things be?" That is, When shall the temple be overthrown? The second, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It is possible, and from the close connection of the questions seems quite probable, that the disciples supposed that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple would be at the coming of Christ and the end of the world. But whether they thought so or not is immaterial. In his answer, Christ most plainly indicated that the two events were to be widely separate.

It is worthy of notice that the disciples did not question as to whether or not Christ would come again. They well knew that he was to come at the end of the world, when the resurrection would take place. See John 11:24. Their question had reference only to the *time* of his coming, and the signs which should indicate its nearness. So in the answer, to which the entire chapter is devoted, Christ does not proceed to teach them that he will come, but, considering that as well understood, he proceeds to tell how it may be known when his coming is near.

But first he utters a caution: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Verses 4, 5. In verses 23, 24 he repeats this warning. On this point we can do no more at present than to call attention to the fact that Christ did not reprove his disciples for asking, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?" On the contrary, he gave a very full answer. Then surely it must be right to think about the time of Christ's coming.

The Saviour then presents a brief view of the world between the two advents, and mentions a few facts relative to the condition of the world in the time immediately preceding his second coming. Thus in verses 15, 16 he answers the first question of the disciples, telling them when to expect the destruction of Jerusalem. Compare Luke 21:20. After that, "Then," said he, "shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Matt. 24:21, 22. This can refer to nothing else than the great persecution which the "elect," the people of God, suffered during the Dark Ages. Under Pagan Rome the saints suffered severely, but the persecution by the heathen was trifling compared with that practiced by professed Christians, after an apostate Christianity had been lifted to the throne of the world. The persecution of true Christians by professed Christians took place within the 1260 years of Papal rule, from 538 to 1798 A.D. At times the persecution was lighter than at other times, but all the time the saints were being *worn out*, until the Reformation had taken sufficient hold of the people to cause it to cease. This took place in the eighteenth century, some years before the expiration of the 1260 years of Papal supremacy. As the Papacy had not arrived at its full strength when it was exalted, so its power gradually waned until it was debased. And thus, those days of persecution were "shortened."

Right in the little season between the cessation of the great persecution and the close of the 1260 years, in 1798, occurred one of the notable signs of the

second coming of Christ-the darkening of the sun and moon. Matthew records this as coming "immediately after the tribulation of those days" (Matt. 24:29); but Mark is more definite, and says that it should take place "in those days, after that tribulation." Mark 13:24. This was fulfilled in that supernatural darkening of the sun which cause May 19, 1833. True, there have been many light meteoric showers, but this was one the like of which has never been seen, either before or since, and can be fitly described only in the language of the prophet: "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." Rev. 6:13.

It was to these things that our Saviour referred in the text quoted at the beginning of these notes. When the fig-tree, "and all the trees," says Luke (21:29), puts forth leaves "ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand." No one needs to consult an almanac when he sees such signs; every one knows that they are sure precursors of spring. "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Luke 21:31. Matthew (24:33) records it: "Know that it is near, even at the doors." We are not to guess, nor to imagine, but to *know*. We are commanded to be just as sure of it as we are that summer is near when the buds begin to swell. Who then can say that it is fanaticism to say that we know that the Lord is soon coming? To doubt that his coming is near would be to make Christ a liar. Let us not be found so doing.

"Even at the doors." This is given as an incentive to watchfulness and right living. Says James, using the same figure: "Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be

11

condemned; behold, the judge standeth before the door." James 5:9. Who dare indulge in bickering and strife? The Judge standeth before the door, and if he should open it and find us engaged in contention, or nursing selfishness and malice and envy, how deplorable would be our condition! Of such an one Christ says: "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Matt. 24:50, 51. "Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." Verse 42. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

The evangelist, Dr. Graves, writes thus to the *Herald of Truth*, about his work in Los Angeles: "Brother Dorsey has baptized every Sunday since I closed labors there." Well, he may keep on baptizing every Sunday as long as time lasts, but he can never make it a Christian institution.

The *Catholic Mirror* says: "Strange as it may seem, counterfeit money, under the existing law, can be passed with impunity on Sunday." No doubt the law has an eye to the eternal fitness of things. Sunday being a counterfeit Sabbath, has doubtless an affinity for other counterfeits, and the law-makers have taken this into consideration.

In his last report to the *Christian Statesman*, Secretary Wylie tells of a National Reform meeting which he held at Akron, Ind., and says: "The meeting was spiced up with a few questions by a Seventh-day Adventist." That is all that he says of the matter. Now we now a few of his readers who would like to have a taste of that same spice. We have frequently read in the *Statesman* about questions propounded by Seventh-day Adventist or Seventh-day Baptists, but have never been favored with any of them. Why is it that they never go into the particulars of such cases? Perhaps if the brother who put those questions would send us the details of the affair, we might know why the spice of the meeting was not reported.

We are sorry to begin the new volume with an apology, but we are forced to do so. The type for our new dress was ordered weeks ago, but overland freight trains are uncertain, and the type did not come until long after it was due. Having made all calculations for the new type, we had no option but to wait for it. It did not arrive until after the time when the SIGNS usually goes to press. As soon as it came, we put on more than a double force, and by working without an hour's intermission, we have succeeded in getting the paper out only two days late. Under the circumstances we think we are to be congratulated for our promptness, rather than blamed for our delay, and we believe that our friends will be considerate with us. We intend after this the paper shall be furnished to our patrons promptly on time.

At the last meeting of the Congregational club of Chicago, the subject under discussion was the relation of evolution to Christianity. Rev. J. L. Scudder said that the influence of science upon theology had been profoundly good. He said it had "forced theology back into its own proper field," and even there had modified it for good by forcing it to become scientific in its own sphere. It will be noticed in this statement, that science has done all the crowding. Before it theology has meekly retired. It is now in "its own proper field." Formerly theology presumed to understand the first and second chapters of Genesis, but science taught it not to interfere with matters too deep for it. Other parts of the Bible are also wrested from the feeble grasp of theology, and made "clear" by science. Some parts of the Bible, are still allowed to be within the province of theology, but that theology has become so "scientific" that it has learned better than to believe that the Bible means what it says. Modern theology is getting to be pretty poor stuff; it doesn't amount to much either as science or as theology.

A correspondent of the *Christian Standard* says: "My conviction is that the Sabbath began at creation. It would be just as reasonable to say that the Lord's day began two thousand years after Christ's resurrection as to say the Sabbath began two thousand years after creation." That man's conviction is sound, but it should lead him a little farther. Why did the Sabbath begin at creation? The answer must be because it commemorated the finished work of creation. Then why should the Sabbath ever cease? Is it not as necessary for us to remember God's power and goodness as it was for Adam? It certainly is. "But ought we not to commemorate Christ's resurrection?" Most certainly; but we should do so in the divinely appointed way-by Christian baptism. That, and that alone, can fitly show our faith in the resurrection of our Lord.

A. G. C.-In the matter of what things are and what things are not allowable on the Sabbath, each one must be conscience for himself, taking the precepts in the Bible as a guide. Caring for domestic animals, feeding horses, milking cows, etc., is, of course, a necessary act, as it is an act of mercy. If a man is employed by a non-professor, we should suppose, under ordinary circumstances, that it would be proper for him to do such necessary chores on the Sabbath, especially if he lived at the home of his employer, and had the regular care of the animals. But these remarks would not apply to a case where there was no work but that of caring for stock. We cannot see how a Sabbath-keeping could consistently engage to work for an unbeliever on a dairy or a stock ranch, and perform his regular daily work on the Sabbath. We do not think that Eph. 6:5, Col. 3:22, and 1 Tim. 6:1 apply to such a case as this. But we cannot tell people what their duty is in particular cases, even if we knew all the circumstances. Each one must make the application of principles for himself, being careful not to make too liberal an application when dealing with himself, however lenient he may be with others.

A correspondent asks what Paul has reference to in 1 Tim. 5:23: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." The reference seems to be very clear. It seems that Timothy was not strong, and Paul advised him to use a little wine. There would be no trouble over this verse, if people had not imbibed the notion that the juice of the grape does not become wine until it ferments. This is a mistaken notion. The expressed juice of the grape is wine; if it has not fermented, it is sweet wine, just as the fresh juice of apples is sweet cider. Sweet wine is non-intoxicating, and is wholesome; it is often an aid to weak digestion. Therefore Paul advised Timothy to use a little of it. But fermented wine is not wholesome, and produces a decidedly bad effect on the stomach, and therefore we know that the text cannot have reference to fermented or alcoholic wine.

The New England Conservatory of Music, at Boston, Mass., conducted by Dr. E. Tournie, proposes to give free instruction to those who are preparing for foreign work, who come bearing suitable indorsement. The instruction will include vocal and instrumental music, the art of teaching vocal music to children; a general knowledge of piano and reed-organ tuning and adjusting, such as will make it possible for them to meet the practical wants of isolated fields; and a knowledge of the fundamental principles of harmony, sufficient to enable them to arrange native music and write the accompanying parts. We feel sure that this generous offer will meet with a hearty response.

### **"The Signs for 1887" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

With the beginning of the volume we put on our new dress, we have a new type throughout, the general heading is new and enlarged, and the running titles, department heads, etc., are all new. In fact, everything about the paper is new, except the truths which it advocates; they are as old as creation, and yet even they are new. The columns have been slightly increased in length and diminished in width, thus giving the paper a more symmetrical appearance than formerly.

The new dress has involved considerable outlay of means, but we have had in view, as at all other times, only a desire to please our patrons, and to make the paper one for which they could work with enthusiasm. We believe that the changes which we have made will materially aid those who are soliciting subscriptions. A canvasser ought to be able about to take subscriptions on the strength of the good looks of the paper alone.

But we do not design that anyone who may take the SIGNS OF THE TIMES because he is favorably impressed with its appearance and make-up, shall have occasion to revise his opinion when he begins to read its contents. We hope to make the SIGNS more readable than ever before, while at the same time Bible truth is presented in as clear and forcible a manner as possible. We think that this hope is not without good foundation, because, (1) satisfactory as the paper has been to his readers in the past, we see where improvements may be made; (2) correspondents who have heretofore helped give character to the paper, will still continue to enrich its columns; and (3) we have the promise from other able writers, that during the coming year they will contribute to the SIGNS.

The departments will be the same as heretofore. Under the head of General Articles, there will be each week an article from Mrs. E. G. White, which alone will be worth price of the paper. Besides this, there will be a good variety of contributed and selected matter.

The editorial department will contain expository articles, answers to questions on Bible subjects, brief comments on texts of Scripture, and notes on current events in the religious and secular world. While the SIGNS is purely a religious journal, the political kaleidoscope will be carefully watched, because in the actions of the nations of the world, divine prophecy is being fulfilled. True to our name, we shall always endeavor to discern and declare the signs of the times.

In the Missionary Department there will be reports from both the home and foreign mission field, with such descriptions of those fields as will make them and the work done in them seem more real to the untraveled reader.

The Commentary is really a branch of the editorial department, and will contain notes on the International lessons, and the comments on the Scripture covered by the lessons in the *Youth's Instructor*. It is designed to make this department invaluable to Bible students everywhere.

We shall still continue to furnish matter on health and temperance, which will be of practical value to every individual; and the Home Circle will, as ever, be instructive while it amuses the children or beguiles a weary hour for the parents.

In short, it shall be our aim to so conduct the paper that those who read it may be better fitted to discharge the duties which they owe to themselves, to their families, to their neighbors, to their country, and to God, and may be directed into the path of life the eternal. With this aim before us, we have confidence to ask our friends for their assistance in placing the SIGNS OF THE TIMES before many thousand new readers during the year 1887.

**January 13, 1887**

## "The Primary Idea of Sunday Observance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the *Christian at Work*:-

"As to Sunday itself, there ought to be no question as to the underlying motive for its maintenance by the State; with the religious features of the day the State has nothing whatever to do; the primary idea is Rest, with a very bit R-Rest for man and beast; that was the fundamental idea of its establishment by divine authority."

The editor of the *Christian at Work* should occasionally look over the files of his paper to refresh his mind as to what he has said in time past. No longer ago than February 18, 1886, he said:-

"We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that. . . it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance."

And on January 8, 1885, the *Christian at Work* said editorially:-

"We rest the designation of Sunday on the church's having set it apart of its own authority. The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment. . . . The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the *gradual concurrence* of the early Christian church; and on this basis, and none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest."

Yet in the face of these candid admissions of fact, the same paper now speaks of the establishment of Sunday "by divine authority." We would like to ask a few questions: 1. Is "the church" divine authority for anything? 2. If it is, which part of the church has that exaltation? for it is well known that "the church" has many conflicting divisions, or as it is sometimes expressed, "There are many branches of our Zion." 3. Does the *Christian at Work* claim that "divine authority" rests in "the church" as a whole, and that, like the infallible Popes of Rome, it can make contradictory opinions equally true? or when it speaks of "the church" does it mean to be understood as referring to the Roman Catholic Church? 4. And if it means this, why does it not adopt all other festivals imposed by the same "divine authority"?

The fact is, and the *Christian at Work* knows it very well, that there is no divine authority for Sunday-keeping. The fourth commandment is the only Sabbath commandment there is in the Bible, and that enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and of no other day. It is also a fact that the Bible is the only "divine authority" in the world, because it is the only revelation of the will of God. Therefore, it is also a fact that Sunday has no divine authority whatever, commanding it as a rest-day of any kind. Moreover, divine commands are never *gradually* given. The ten commandments were given at one time, by the voice of God. But evil has always come in by the "gradual concurrence" of those who thought their own way preferable to the will of God. The fact that the observance of Sunday instead of the Sabbath was "brought about by the gradual

concurrence of the early Christian church," after the days of the apostles, unmistakably stamps that institution as a product of the great apostasy.

But granting the claim that Sunday was established by authority of some kind, let us notice the statement of the *Christian at Work*, that physical rest is the primary idea of that establishment. If that be the case, then no State has a right to enforce its observance upon those who do not feel like resting. Night is the time for sleep, but no Government has the power to enact that a man shall be forced to sleep, if he is not sleepy. If Sunday is only for physical rest, then the State has no more right to say that a man must rest upon it if he is not tired, than it has to say that a dose of morphine shall be given to every man who does not feel like going to bed at ten o'clock at night. But if the advocates of Sunday shall, in order to avoid this dilemma, claim that there is a religious idea also to the Sunday rest, then we still insist that the State has no right to enforce its observance, for civil Governments have nothing to do with matters of religion. Gallio of old had a just conception of the extent of his power as a civil ruler, when he said to the Jews who wanted him to condemn Paul:-

"If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters." Acts 18:14, 15.

We leave Sunday worshipers to settle the matter among themselves as to the grounds upon which they observe Sunday, if it is possible to fix upon the "primary idea" of an institution that was established without precept. But for the Sabbath we can say that the primary idea in its establishment is worship, and not physical rest. The Sabbath was made for man, in order that he might know and remember God, and not for his personal ease. And here we will say that the man who labors so hard during the week that physical rest becomes of necessity the primary idea in his Sabbath observance, does not remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. If a man feels in need of physical rest and recreation, there is no objection to his taking it on Sunday; but there is a commandment from the Lord himself, for every man to rest on the Sabbath, and that without regard to the wants of his physical nature. W.

## **"The Bible, Commentaries, and Tradition" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we gave a few principles of interpretation and promised to add a few more this week. As what we now wish to give is very intimately related with what has already been given, we will first recall those points. We noted first, that the Bible is absolute truth and that anything that disagrees with it in the slightest particular must be false. Second, that the Bible, though composed of many books, is one Book with one Author; that there is perfect harmony in all its parts. Third, that the Bible contains all truth, because that by it a man may be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" and that therefore it must be its own interpreter. Fourth, that one part of the Bible cannot be fully understood if taken out of its connection, or without reference to the Bible as a whole. There is no



book in the Bible upon which light is not thrown by every other book in the Bible. On this point the following from Dr. P. S. Henson's introduction to the book, "Christ in the Gospels," is excellent:-

"In what we call the Bible, God has given us many books penned by many writers, each presenting such views of truth as his mental and spiritual nature made him specially adapted to be the vehicle of. Not that anyone of these Scripture writers was left to wander at his 'own sweet will,' so that we must largely discount his deliverances on account of his human imperfections and the possibility of his misapprehending what the Lord would have him teach. That were indeed to undermine utterly the authority of the Scriptures, and 'if the foundations be destroyed what shall the righteous do?' We do most thoroughly and invincibly believe that 'holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and that therefore what they spake may be absolutely relied upon. But while we believe that all that each one said was truth, God's truth, we do not believe it was all the truth. You must have *all* that *all* of them said, in order to be sure that you have all the truth. 'Which things we speak,' writes the apostle Paul, 'not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, *comparing spiritual things with spiritual.*' And only by such collation and comparison can God's truth be comprehended in all the breadth and beauty of its meaning. You cannot obtain any accurate representation of a building by taking only a single view. As the photographer is accustomed to take two pictures, from a little different point of view, and when both these are looked at at once, as in a stereopticon, you see not two pictures, but one, and that not a flat surface such as each of the pictures shows, but a solid that stands out in its massiveness before your eyes. And yet even then you do not see the hinder part, but only half the building. To see it all in its completed symmetry, we should be obliged to have four views, and to look at them all at once. But this is, of course, impossible, inasmuch as we have not four eyes, but only two. But the principle applies, though its application be impossible. Singularly enough there are just four Gospels. The metropolis, lieth four square. Four pictures have we here of the matchless Man of Nazareth,-four pictures, and all so much alike that sometimes captious critics have said that there was only one original Gospel and the other three were copied from that. Four pictures, and yet all so different that other skeptical critics have alleged that there are glaring discrepancies in them that are hopelessly irreconcilable. The pictures, of course, must be *alike*, for all of them are pictures of Him. The pictures, of course, must be *unlike*, for each of the portrait painters had his own peculiar point of view. And yet it takes all four to give us the Christ of history in all the completeness of his humanity and divinity."

This is just as true of the whole Bible as it is of the four Gospels. Lastly, we showed that a term used in one place in the Bible must have the same meaning in every other place where it occurs, especially if the same subject is under consideration.

Under the third proposition, that the Bible must interpret itself, we wish to say a few words on the use of commentaries. Commentaries may be a great help to the Bible student, or they may be a great curse. No matter how good a commentary may be, if a person relies implicitly upon it, taking all its statements

as final upon any subject, he might better never see it, for he simply puts it in place of the Bible. Commentaries may be used only as they throw additional light on a point already established, or when the commentator leads to the understanding of a point, by unfolding to us the Bible evidence upon it. Many persons will quote a decision from Barnes, or Scott, or Clark, or Olshausen, or some other person, and rest satisfied with that. Now allowing that their statement of the case is correct, of what use is it to us if they do not show us the steps by which they arrived at such a conclusion; or how can we know that their statement is correct if we do not have those steps? If the commentary does not lead us to the Bible then it is worse than useless. No matter how great a man may be, his opinion on a matter of Bible doctrine is of no account whatever unless it is backed by Bible evidence. And therefore in teaching others we should never quote commentaries for the purpose of biasing the mind or in any way influencing the judgment, before the Scripture has done its work. If a thing is true it may be proved by the Bible; if it cannot be proved by the Bible, it is of no consequence whatever, no matter who may hold it.

If a man relates to us an item of news, we almost invariably ask, "How do you know?" This does not necessarily indicate that we doubt his statement, but that we want to have the same ground for belief that he has. We should not be less anxious for trustworthy information on Bible subjects than we are on the news of the day. If a commentator makes a statement, he is in duty bound to tell us why he makes it, and we should demand this before we accept it. Otherwise we cannot be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If the statement involves some duty, and we perform that duty, not knowing the full reason therefore, we shall be following some man, and not the Bible. The Bible then is the test of whether or not a man is a good commentator. If he proves every statement by comparing scripture with scripture, so that we can see for ourselves the reasonableness of his propositions, then his work becomes a blessing. If he does not, then, even though his statements be true, his work is of no account. He is like a man who climbs to the top of a building, and pulls up after him the ladder by which he ascended, but still expects others to follow him.

There is a growing and almost irresistible tendency to depreciate the value of plain Scripture statements.

23

This is seen in the fact that when a direct Bible argument is given on some point that is new to the hearer, the first questions will almost invariably be, "Who believes this? What men have advocated this view?" Those who ask such questions are really exalting the human above the divine. They virtually say that the Bible needs human indorsement. We should have such confidence in the Bible that we will accept what it says no matter who, nor how many persons, may teach to the contrary.

Another point that should be firmly fixed, is that tradition should be wholly disregarded in interpreting the Bible. No matter how old a tradition may be, it should not be allowed to bias the judgment in the least. We cannot know whether tradition is true or not until we compare it with the Bible; and since we have to first examine the Bible to ascertain the truth of tradition, it is evident that tradition

can be of no help to us in interpreting the Bible. We must first understand the Bible, before we can know what credit to give to tradition.

Many people suppose that those who lived nearest to the time when the Bible was written, must have known a great deal more about the Bible than we can. The popular idea of this is expressed by Rev. James Chrystal in his "History of the Modes of Christian Baptism," chap. 3, where, speaking of the testimony of holy Scripture, he says:-

"This is the source of doctrine, but it should ever be interpreted by the historical witness of the earliest ages of the church. In other words, in case a doubt should arise regarding the proper interpretation of a passage relating to a certain doctrine or rite, we should not despise the voice of the early successors of the apostles. It is a principle of common sense as well as of sound criticism that the historical witness of the Christians who lived the nearest the apostolic age, is of the greatest importance in determining the meaning of obscure or disputed passages of the New Testament."

But it should be remembered that the apostles had no "successors." There have been a great many men who have lived since they did, but they have not been apostles. If nearness to the apostolic age gives extra light on the Bible, then those who lived at the same time that the apostles did ought to be still better guides than those who lived after they did; but we find that some of the gravest errors were taught by men who were contemporaries of the apostles. For a single example, see 2 Tim. 2:17, 18. In closing this brief statement of principles, we would adopt the words of Dr. Killen, who speaks of the early church Fathers as follows:-

"It would seem as if the great Head of the church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors, who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and the flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and, if we have the "unction from the Holy One," we may enter into the meaning of the Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenaeus. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous of the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of the most ancient interpreters, '*Cease ye from men.*' The opening of the Scriptures' so as to exhibit their beauty, their consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of 'the key of knowledge.' When tried by this test, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry is better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is use, making wise the simple.'" - *The Ancient Church, section 2, chapter 1, last paragraph. W.*

## **"Prisoners and Freeman" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

Being unable to furnish the current Sabbath-school lesson for the Commentary Department this week, we occupy a portion of the space answering the following questions which we have received:-

"Who is addressed in Isa. 40:8, 9? Who are the prisoners, and when and from what are they to be freed? P. B."

The verses referred to read thus:-

"Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; that thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places." Isa. 49:8, 9.

By reading the preceding verses in connection with these, we readily learn who is addressed. "And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him." Verse 5. "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Verse 6. These passages show unmistakably that Christ is the one addressed. Compare with verse 6 Luke 2:29-32. The eighth verse itself shows that Christ is addressed, in the words, "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people." Compare with this Isa. 55:4, 5.

The "day of salvation" is the entire time during which God's mercy to man is manifest in the gospel. In this day-this acceptable time-Christ is heard in behalf of the people, and is given for the objects mentioned in verses 8 and 9. One of these objects is the opening of the prison, and saying to the prisoners, Go forth. It might appear to some, from the words that immediately follow (verse 10), that this has reference to the opening of the graves at the last day; but from almost identical language used elsewhere in prophecy, and applied by our Lord himself, we are obliged to place the opening of the prison within the "day of salvation." We quote Isa. 61:1, 2: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

When our Lord went into the synagogue at Nazareth and read this much of the prophecy, he closed the book, and said to the people: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke 4:16-21. The fact that he said this, and that he refrained from reading the next clause,-"and the day of vengeance of our God,"-shows that all that he read is fulfilled in the day of grace. But the dead are not raised until the day of mercy is past. Therefore the "opening of the prison to them that are bound" must be during the "day of salvation."

Then we have to inquire, Who are bound, and what is their bondage? The following verses will set us in the way of the correction answer: "They [the wicked Jews] answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:33-36. From these words we learn that sin is a bondage, and that it is from this bondage that Christ sets men free. To further show that sin is a bondage we need only to refer to Rom. 7:14 and 2 Peter 2:19, out of a multitude that might be quoted.

Again, we know that Christ's special work is to save people from sin. See Matt. 1:21. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." 1 Tim. 1:15. "Looking for . . . our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus 2:13, 14.

Both these points, namely, that sin brings men into bondage, and that Christ releases them from this prison, are brought out in the following passage:-

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which [*i.e.*, by the Spirit] also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached unto the spirits in prison; this was in the days of Noah, while the long-suffering of God waited. God's long-suffering waited one hundred and twenty years, and during this time his Spirit was striving with the wicked antediluvians. See Gen. 6:3. Those wicked men were in the bondage of sin; Christ was ready and anxious to give them freedom,-the same freedom that Noah had, namely, the righteousness which is by faith,-but they refused to be made free, and were therefore destroyed.

Still further: We have seen that men are bound in prison because of sin. Said Paul, "The law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." Rom. 7:14. Now "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and therefore it is the transgressed law that shuts men up in prison. David said, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45. But when he turned aside from the commandments he was at once bound as a criminal.

This bondage in which the transgressed law holds its victims until they accept freedom in Christ, is most forcibly indicated by Paul in the following words: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Gal. 3:22, 23.

It is well known that human law casts its violators into prison. The sheriff who arrests the criminal, the judge who sentences him, and the jailer who locks him up, are only the agents of the law. The massive bolts and prison walls simply represent the outraged law. Now notice the parallel in the case of a transgressor

of divine law. Having willfully sinned, he is justly accounted guilty of a violation of the whole law. James 2:10. For a time he is unconscious of his bondage. aid Paul, "I was alive without the law once." The office of the Spirit is to make men conscious of this bondage. See John 16:8. It does this by bringing the word home to their hearts, for the Bible is the Spirit's sword. Some, it is true, resist the influence of the Spirit, and never become conscious of their need until it is too late. But we will consider the case of one upon whom the Spirit works effectually. As the truth is impressed upon his heart, his prison walls seem to contract about him. Whereas before he thought he had unlimited freedom, he now finds that he is in a narrow cell, the walls of which are the ten commandments. He resolves that he will be free, and starts out in one direction. But he has taken the name of the Lord in vain, and the third commandment says, You can't get out here. He turns in another direction, but he has borne false witness, and the ninth commandment presents an effectual barrier to his escape in that direction. Whichever way he turns, a commandment, stronger than any earthly prison wall, drives him back. He is shut in on every side. But Christ is the door that ever stands open. Toward this door the inclosing walls seem to drive him, and he is shut up to it as the only avenue of escape. At last he escapes through this door, and becomes in Christ a free man. In Christ he is as though he had never sinned, and in him he is, "made the righteousness of God." That is, he becomes a commandment-keeper, and therefore continually walks at liberty. He has now only to stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has made him free.

One more point. Christ is the tower of the flock, "the *stronghold* of the daughter of Zion." Micah 4:8. Now turn to the exhortation of the prophet: "Turn you to the *stronghold*, ye prisoners of hope; even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto you." Zech. 9:12. The blood of the covenant (verse 11) is still offered before the throne of God, and is powerful enough to set every prisoner free. Therefore we are all prisoners of hope. We may all be free if we will. No matter how high our sins may seem to be piled up against us, backed by the law of God, we need not despair, for the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin; and where sin abounds, grace doth much more abound." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the morning of the 8th inst., Brother and Sister W. C. Sisley and child arrived in Oakland on the steamer from Portland, Oregon, where they had spent a few days on their way from Battle Creek, Mich. They would have arrived the day before, but for the fact that the steamer was delayed by fogs. Sister Sisley comes to take charge of the missionary instruction in the Healdsburg College, in which work she has had long experience, and Brother Sisley will devote a little season to the recovery of his health, which is very much impaired. We heartily welcome this addition to our force of laborers on the coast.

Now that the holidays are over, we may expect to find something in our religious exchanges besides stories of feasting and gormandizing. One would almost suppose that the majority of the people of the United States had been

kept on a starvation diet for several months before Christmas, and could think of nothing during the holiday season but something to eat. And this also is a sign of the last days; "for as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, . . . and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

Quite recently three lodges of the Knights of Pythias, at Little Rock, Arkansas, united in a service of sorrow and season of prayer for the dead of their order. This was in accordance with a law of the Grand Lodge, enacted in 1884, making it obligatory to hold such a season of prayer for the dead once a year. At the service referred to, the hall was crowded, and the service was said to have been solemn, yet, "resplendent with beauty and pure thought for those who have gone, and for those who have yet to cross the dark river." It is said also that "the deep strains of the organ seem to tell those who heard it that there was a great beyond." We can heartily endorse the following comment by the *Christian Standard*:-

"How can any enlightened Christian have fellowship with such superstition and mockery? If we are to trust what we have seen with our own eyes, these Knights of Pythias had better bestow their sympathies on the parents of *the living* of their order, that they may be kept from patronizing saloons and drinking freely of beer on their gala days."

On the evening of November 28, while the General Conference was in session at Battle Creek, Mich., Dr. J. H. Kellogg, superintendent of the Sanitarium, delivered an address on "Social Purity," to an audience of over one thousand persons in the tabernacle. The substance of that address we have before us in a neat pamphlet of forty pages, which was published in accordance with the unanimous request of those who listened to it. That the subject of social purity is one which urgently demands attention must be acknowledged by anyone who reads even the head lines of the daily papers, or who knows anything of human nature. In this pamphlet the subject is presented in an earnest and faithful manner. The dangers existing at the present time are vividly set forth, and the means of escaping these dangers is clearly indicated; yet nothing is said that could shock the most fastidious, or in any way tend to awaken an impure thought. The address should be in the hands of everybody who reads anything. Single copy, ten cents; liberal discount on large orders. Address, Health Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

It is claimed by Sunday observers that Sunday should be kept in honor of Christ's resurrection. Then the same people will urge that laws ought to be made compelling all classes of people to rest on Sunday. This would, of course, include infidels and atheists. That is, they would have Christ's resurrection commemorated by those who do not believe in Christ. What else would that be but enforced hypocrisy? But some will say that by enforcing the memorial, as they claim, belief would eventually follow. That is to say, that if all the merchants in town should hang out signs advertising hardware for sale, their stores would in time fill themselves with hardware.

Says the *Oakland Tribune*:-

"The year 1886 will long be remembered for its labor troubles and strikes. But, notwithstanding the universal strikes over the country, we have yet to learn of anything being gained by the strikers. We cannot recall a single instance where any advantage has been gained by a strike which might not have been obtained by negotiation."

There is truth in this. A little consideration will show any thinking man that strikes and boycotts are not only violation of the golden rule, but they are disastrous to the parties engaging in them. Even when men succeed in getting an increase of wages by a strike, it will almost invariably be found that the increase does not compensate for the loss sustained in getting it. The grasping individual, as well as the grasping monopoly, usually overreaches to his own detriment.

In speaking of the main argument in favor of the "new theology," namely, that it is demanded by "the spirit of the age," the New York *Christian Advocate*, under the heading of "a cause for alarm," states the following fact, which is worth noting as a sign of the times:-

"Nevertheless, the stubborn fact stands out too boldly to be denied-the church of Christ is so deeply infected by the peculiarity of the times as to be made weak thereby. Hence, instead of being able to authoritatively oppose, to successfully counteract, to effectually neutralize it, she is in danger of being shorn of her strength and robbed of her spiritual beauty by its subtle and continuous working."

As was to be expected, the Andover professors who have been teaching the "new theology," that the probation of man does not cease at death, have the sympathy of all Spiritualists. The "new theology" is, in fact, only one form of Spiritualism, and its advocates will surely find it that is ample scope for the exercise of their talents. It should be understood that the Andover professors are not being *persecuted* for their "advanced" ideas. The simple fact is that they have agreed, as a condition of having a position in the college, to teach in harmony with certain doctrines, and have violated their agreement. Probably some of the theories which they agreed to teach are as unscriptural as is their new departure, still that does not alter the fact that they have broken their pledge. But notwithstanding the strictness of Andover rules, we venture the prediction that both accusers and accused will ere long be standing together again in the fold of Spiritualism.

"Sunday or no Sunday?" Is the way the advocates of a rigid Sunday law put the case. It is a very common thing to hear that "we have no Sabbath in California," since the Sunday law was repealed. Such expressions are simply admissions of the fact that the Sunday institution derives its support solely from human enactments, and that without such support there would be no Sunday sabbath. It is indeed a truth that those who ignore the Sabbath of the Lord, as enjoined in the fourth commandment, have now no sabbath in California, for the only thing which gave Sunday its religious character in this State has been withdrawn. But we have never heard any complaints from those who keep the seventh day of the week, "according to the commandment." Such ones find no difficulty in keeping the Sabbath, although there has been no civil law whatever enforcing the observance of that day; the law of God is found to be all-sufficient.



If Sunday-keepers had so good a law in support of *their* institution, they would never clamor for an inferior one made by man.

**"Unreliable" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

To the editor of the *Golden Gate* (Spiritualist) says:-

"Whoever surrenders his individual judgment, and places his trust implicitly upon the communications of spirits, as given through promiscuous mediumship, is almost certain to be deceived. It matters not how confiding his trusts, or implicit his faith, nor how sincere or honest he may be in his intentions, he will find the average spiritual message a broken reed, if he attempts to lean upon it to the exclusion of the staff of his own reason."

This is just what students of the Bible could tell any Spiritualist. The spirits which they consult are lying spirits, because "they are the spirits of devils." There must be to Spiritualists great comfort in listening to what they know to be lies. We prefer to listen to what we know to be truth.

**"Salvation Army Methods" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union*, in reporting the visit of General Booth to that city, makes the following criticism upon the methods of the army. We think the criticism is entirely just. And as the National Reform party is now courting the Salvation Army, it can very readily be seen what a worthy accession the National Reform will gain when it shall have won the army. But the accession will be entirely worthy of the cause:-

"The criticism which I make is not against his methods so much as against the positive way he asserts the salvation of those who go to his anxious seat to be prayed for. All the force of the meeting is directed to get sinners forward to be converted on the spot, even if they are half intoxicated. If they feel right, and submit, they are called 'saved.' They sing 'I am saved, I am saved.' The soldiers are taught to proclaim their own salvation. If they were called new recruits and the Salvation Army, and the process of beginning were called enlisting, it might not be offensive, but the positive assumption that one has been saved during the five or ten minutes of a special prayer, the scene having much that is *outré* and intensely exciting, is an exercise of the knowledge that only Omniscience has the right to assume. I am not criticising the fact that God can save men instantly when they turn to him in penitence and love, but only the great danger there is in the positive declaration that this peculiar process, which seems to me to have large admixtures of the mechanical, transplants men into assured salvation. After listening to General Booth, I almost regretted that I remained to witness the closing scene. The army is always demonstrative whenever the preacher alludes to those who have just been saved. To break new converts on a public platform with banners and march them through the streets as those who are 'saved' seems to me an arrogance that the Salvation Army should not encumber itself with. I recognize the power there is in their methods of appeal to the low and

degraded, but the gospel inculcates modesty and humility, and converts ought not to be inflated by supercilious ideas concerning themselves, made boastful and left in danger of rushing headlong into spiritual pride, which is the most insidious foe to the Christian life."

### **"The Sure Word (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Concluded.)*

The third chapter of the second epistle of Peter contains some positive evidence concerning the sure word of prophecy, which, as we have seen, points out the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The chapter opens with the statement that the epistle is written for the purpose of stirring the brethren up to take heed to "the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets." There is special reason for this admonition, because just before the end, the darkness will be more intense, as the apostle Paul says, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:13. And these evil men will scoff, saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." 2 Peter 3:4. That this is a falsehood, and that they ought to know better if they do not, Peter declares in the next two verses, saying:-

"For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished."

The phrase "the earth standing out of the water and in the water," does not at all express the idea of the original. The Greek word which in the Authorized Version is rendered "standing," should, as the margin indicates, be rendered "consisting." Robinson's "Lexicon of the New Testament," says of the word: "*to place together* parts into a whole, *i.e.*, to constitute, to create, to bring into existence. Hence, in the N.T., intransitive, *to be constituted, created; to exist*," as in Col. 1:17, "by him all things *consist*." Wakefield translates the passage thus: "A heaven and earth formed out of water and by means of water." Bloomfield says: "The earth. . . being formed out of water, and consisting by means of water." Murdock's translation of the Syriac has it: "The earth rose up from the waters, and by means of water, by the word of God." The meaning is that the earth in its chaotic state was simply a watery mass, as indicated by Gen. 1:2: "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the *deep*. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the *waters*."

"Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." When God gathered the waters together into one place, and made the dry land appear, he evidently stored large quantities of water in the interior of the earth. This is indicated in the second commandment, by the phrase, "the waters which are under the earth," and by Ps. 136:6: "To him that stretched out the earth above the waters," and also by Ps. 24:1, 2. In the flood which destroyed the earth in the days of Noah, the waters in the interior of the earth united with the rain from heaven, as the record says: "The same day were all the fountains of the

great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." Gen. 7:11. The idea of the passage in Peter's epistle is that the very element from which the earth was formed, was made to contribute to its destruction. Having disproved the assertion that all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation, the apostle draws a parallel, thus:-

"But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:7. Instead of "are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment," a better translation would be "stored with fire, reserved unto the day of Judgment." Now the comparison is at once apparent. By the word of God, the earth, in the beginning, was formed from the watery mass which God had spoken into existence. Part of this water was stored up in the earth, and by the word of God was afterward caused to overflow the earth and contribute to its destruction. And the same word of God, which performed this, has stored the interior of this present earth with fire, and is keeping it till the day of Judgment, when, as in the case of the waters of the flood, the fire within the earth, uniting with that which comes down from God out of Heaven (Rev. 20:9), will destroy it.

Particular attention should be given to the word "kept." Instead of all things continuing as they were from the beginning of the creation, the earth has within it the elements of its destruction, and it is only the power of God that stays the catastrophe.

Some have fancied that this chapter teaches that the earth will be annihilated at the Judgment-day. This is a mistake. This earth will be destroyed in the same sense that the original earth "perished" by the waters of the earth. It was all broken up, and the face of it was changed, so that the earth after the flood had no resemblance to the earth before the flood. This was the last and greatest curse caused by sin, and completed the desolation of the earth. But the matter which composed the earth was not destroyed. So by the fires of the last day "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," but they will not be annihilated. From those melted elements, "new heavens and a new earth" will be formed, which will have no more resemblance to this sin-cursed earth than this earth does to Eden, the garden of God. The people that shall dwell in it will all be righteous (Isa. 60:21); and "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God." Isa. 35:1, 2.

The "sure word of prophecy" tells us again and again that this earth shall be destroyed by fire, and that in that fire the ungodly shall be burned up. Scoffers say that they see no evidence that any such event will ever take place; but the apostle Peter assures us that the instrument of the earth's destruction is already prepared, and is stored within it. Just as surely as the earth was once destroyed by water, so surely will it again be destroyed by fire.

"But these prophecies were spoken hundreds, and some of them thousands, of years ago, and there is no more evidence of their fulfillment now than there

was when they were uttered." Thus argues the scoffer; but it is a vain argument; (1) because it is not true, and (2) because of the following statement:-

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." 2 Peter 3:8.

God "inhabith eternity." The flight of time makes no difference with his plans. Compared with his eternity, the entire 6,000 years of earth's existence are but a span. Says the psalmist, "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." Ps. 90:4. Therefore the apostle concludes that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness." That which seems to men forgetfulness of the promise, is only a kindly delay to allow dilatory men to secure the promise. In God's reckoning, it is only as the three days grace which men allow for the payment of a promissory note.

It should not be forgotten that while a thousand years is with the Lord as one day, one day is as a thousand years. This is too often overlooked. While he may take a thousand years for the fulfillment of a promise, and then it will be the same as though performed the next day, he can do in one day the work of a thousand years. Therefore there is no warrant for settling down to carnal ease, thinking that it will necessarily be a long time yet before the work of God on earth can be accomplished. "For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness; because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." Rom. 9:28.

Having now examined some of the prophecies concerning "the power and coming" of the Lord, we will next turn our attention to some of the prophecies that mark the progress toward the fulfillment of the promise. W.

**January 20, 1887**

**"Safety in the Time of Trouble" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago, in an article on the punishment of the wicked, we quoted Isa. 33:14 as a text which is to some a stumbling-block in the way of their believing that the wicked are to be eternally destroyed. The text reads thus: "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" The difficulty arises from the supposition that the prophet means, Who of us shall suffer from the devouring fire, or in other words, Who of us shall in the last day be found sinners? But that is not the idea of the text. The true meaning is found when we read the answer to these questions, which is found in verse 15: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; He shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks; bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure." From this we learn that the prophet does not mean to ask who among us shall be sinners; but who among us shall be righteous. And, therefore, when he says, "Who among us shall dwell with

the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" he does not mean to ask who shall be punished with this fire, but who shall escape it. Thus the text has no reference whatever to eternal torment.

But the question will be asked, How can it be said that the righteous shall dwell with devouring fire and with everlasting burnings? This will be understood after we have quoted a few texts. The psalmist, speaking of the coming of the Lord, says: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. And again: "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about." Ps. 97:3. In Hab. 3:3-6, we find the following: "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand; and there was the hiding of his power. Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; his ways are everlasting." From the sixteenth verse of this chapter we learn that this is the description of the time of trouble that shall just precede the coming of the Lord. It is the same that is referred to in the ninety-first psalm, where we read of the "terror by night," the "pestilence that walketh in darkness," the "destruction that wasteth at noonday," and the plagues which the wicked shall suffer, and which the righteous will see although they shall be unharmed by them.

Now if with these texts we read Joel 1:15-20, which also describes the time of trouble, we shall understand about the devouring fire and the everlasting burnings. That text reads thus:-

"Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come. Is not the meat cut off before our eyes, yea, joy and gladness from the house of our God? The seed is rotten under their clods, the garners are laid desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. O Lord, to thee will I cry; for the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, and the flame hath burned all the trees of the field. The beasts of the field cry also unto thee; for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." Read also Joel 2:1-3.

We find from this text that just before the coming of the Lord, there is a time of trouble for the wicked, in which there is pestilence, and plagues, and devouring fire; and that the righteous witness these plagues that are poured out upon the wicked, but are protected. The enemies of the Lord will be consumed by the devouring fire, but those who are described in Isa. 35:15, will be able to dwell with everlasting burnings. Of such a one Isaiah says: "He shall dwell on high;" David says, "He shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." While the meat is cut off because the corn is withered, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, "Bread shall be given him, his waters shall be sure." And while the wicked behold only a desolate wilderness he "shall behold the land that is

very far off." This last reference also shows that the time of the everlasting burnings is before the coming of the Lord.

The thirty-fourth chapter of Isaiah gives the result of this time of trouble. There it is said of the earth that "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch" (verse 9); and to show that it is the same everlasting burnings that accomplishes this, verse ten says: "It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever." Now, to show that even this is limited in duration, and that the fire ceases to burn when that upon which it feeds is consumed, read the next chapter, especially the first two verses: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God."

Happy indeed will be the lot of the man who in that awful time of trouble can say of the Lord, "He is my refuge and my fortress; my God; in him will I trust." They who in this day of salvation wash their robes of character, and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, can say in that day when God stands and measures the earth, scattering the everlasting hills, and causing the perpetual hills to bow: "God is our God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof." Ps. 46:1-3. Who would not wish for such confidence in a time when fearfulness surprises the hypocrites? W.

### **"Sunday the First Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

A new subscriber asks how we know that Sunday is the first day of the week. We would reply that we know it in just the same way that we know that the day called Saturday is the seventh day of the week. It should be remembered that the names of the days of the week are of comparatively modern origin. Anciently the days were known only by their numbers, First, Second, etc., and this numbering is still adhered to and is universally understood, although it is more common now to speak of the days by the names that have been given to them, instead of by the numbers. The Sabbath is that which marks the week. God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh, and he commanded man to rest on every succeeding seventh day, giving him permission to work the six intervening days. These periods of seven days are called weeks. Ever since the creation, there have been some who have kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, but for our purpose it is not necessary to go back further than the time of Christ. Christ and those who followed him kept the Sabbath according to the commandment. See Luke 4:16; 23:56. This was of

course the seventh day. It was the same day which the Jews kept. The Jews have kept the same day from that time to this. We find them in all parts of the world, yet they are all agreed as to the observance of the Sabbath. This shows that the day which is now called Saturday is the true seventh day, the day which was observed by Christ and which is enjoined in the fourth commandment. The day which follows the seventh day is now called Sunday. Now if we turn to Matt. 28:1, we shall find that the day which immediately follows the seventh day Sabbath, is the first day of the week.

As further proof that there has been no change in the reckoning of the days of the week, we have the fact that Jesus rose on the first day of the week, and that, from within two or three centuries after his resurrection up to the present time, the day of Christ's resurrection has been quite generally observed in the Christian church. If you ask people why they keep Sunday, they will always tell you it is in honor of Christ's resurrection on the first day of the week. And thus the keeping of Sunday is in itself evidence that those who observe Saturday are observing the true seventh day, and are therefore obeying the commandment of the Lord.

### **"Churchly Iniquity" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Matt. 24:12. These words were spoken by our Lord concerning a time just before, and reaching to, his second coming. It should serve as a complete refutation of the idea that the world will be converted, and that there will be a millennium of Christian joy and peace before the coming of the Lord. This verse not only teaches that iniquity will abound, but, with the next verse, shows that the iniquity will continue even until the end. "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Whoever is saved when the end comes, will have "endured" something; his path will not have been one of ease, but he will have "come out of great tribulation."

The same thing is taught by the apostle in 2 Tim. 3:1-5: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."

This shows that the reason why those who shall be saved when the Lord comes, will have been called upon to "endure," is because they will have passed through perilous times; and the reason why the times will be "perilous," is "because iniquity shall abound." It also shows that this abounding iniquity will be in the professed church, for it is committed by those who have "a form of godliness."

Now, if we read carefully Matt. 24:12, we shall see that the iniquity there referred to is iniquity practiced under the garb of religion. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." The iniquity is committed by those who have love, and causes that love to decline. Surely, then, we shall have just the opposite of Christian joy and love in the world before the Lord comes; for not only is iniquity to abound, and perilous times to exist as a consequence, but this state of things is to be right in the church.

But how can it be that such crimes as those mentioned in 2 Tim. 3:1-5 can exist in the church, when

39

they are the very ones that now characterize men of the world? Easily enough, for the church and the world will be one. All the world will belong to the church. This will not be brought about in the good old way known to Paul and Luther and the Wesleys, namely, by conversion, but by Constitutional Amendment, a plan very similar to that adopted by Constantine and Charlemagne, who brought people into "the church" by thousands. Citizenship and church membership will be one and the same thing; and this will result in bringing into "the church" all the political hacks, ward politicians, "Boodle ringers," and whoever has an itching pain for Government coin and influence, and his name is legion. The "love of many" will necessarily "wax cold" before they can lower the standard sufficiently to receive such ones into church fellowship; and contact with the same class will by no means tend to restore that which they have lost.

But before this state of things can be fully brought about, men must reject the truth of God, especially that which relates to the Sabbath. And because of their rejection of the truth, strong delusion will be sent upon them that they should believe a lie. 2 Thess. 2:10-12. This blindness will cause them to call evil good and darkness light, so that although iniquity will be abounding, they will say that all is well, the world is converted, and the temporal millennium has come. Then, as prophesied by Isaiah, they will say, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." And *then*, "when they shall say, Peace and safety," then sudden destruction shall come upon them," and they shall not escape." 1 Thess. 5:3. Then the Lord shall arise to shake terribly the earth, and those who have exalted themselves shall be humbled, "and they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty." May the Lord grant us grace to humble ourselves now, that in that day we may be exalted to a place at his right hand. W.

### **"A 'Non Sequitur'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Congregationalist* of December 23 gives a brief notice of the Bible-class which is regularly held by Dr. Meredith, in Tremont Temple, Boston, noting especially the teaching of the last International lesson of the year. In this notice we find the following:-

"In teaching this lesson, as well as one or two others lately, Dr. Meredith has expressed the opinion that we are not living in the last days of the world, but says he expects it to continue for centuries and ages, adducing as evidence of this the



immense quantity of coal and minerals of various kinds stored up in the bowels of the earth apparently for the use of mankind."

It is astonishing that Bible students will call such statements as this "evidence" that we are not in the last days. While we would not call Dr. Meredith a scoffer, he certainly is in the line of the fulfillment of Peter's prophecy that in the last days men shall say, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. 3:2), and thus himself furnishes evidence that we are in the last days.

The argument, for such we will call it by courtesy, is this: Because there is an abundance of fuel in the earth, therefore it must be consumed. It would be just as reasonable to say that because a man has enough wheat in his barn to last him ten years therefore he must of necessity live until he has consumed it all. The Doctor forgets that sometimes those things which are designed for the use of man are made the instruments of his destruction.

When the world was created it was a watery mass. Peter says it was "standing out of the water and in the water." 2 Pet. 3:5. By the word of the Lord the waters were gathered together unto one place and the dry land appeared. Much of this water was stored in the bowels of the earth. It was doubtless there for man's use, just as now we draw from the earth water to supply our needs. Now suppose we imagine Noah preaching that in a few years the Lord would destroy the earth. Up speaks some wise philosopher and says: "That cannot be, for there are vast quantities of water stored up in the earth for man's use, and the earth cannot be destroyed until all that water has been consumed. But the water supply can never be exhausted, and therefore the world can never be destroyed." No doubt he would have been applauded by the people for his wisdom. Nevertheless, "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." 2 Pet. 3:6. And the water which was stored within the earth, together with that which came from heaven, was the means by which the earth was destroyed.

The apostle says that those who deny the Lord's soon coming are willingly ignorant of the facts which we have just related. He says: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3:7. In this we cannot fail to see that the apostle draws a comparison between the future destruction of the earth by fire, and its former destruction by water. Just as the water out of which the earth was formed, and which was stored within the earth, caused its destruction, even so now the combustible material stored within the earth, will, together with the fire that comes down from God out of heaven, cause the earth to be dissolved.

It is a very unsafe thing to draw conclusions from nature, contrary to the statements made in the Bible. It is true that God has abundant provision for the support of mankind on this earth for ages to come. But he has never pledged himself to support a people who are unworthy of support. When the people of the earth have forgotten him, or while professing to know him deny him by their works, he will count them as chaff fit only for the flames, and by the very things

wherein they trust, he will destroy the world and them that dwell therein, and will create a new heavens and a new earth, wherein the righteous shall dwell. W.

### **"Lot's Choice" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

#### **NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.**

(February 6.-Gen. 13:1-12.)

Though the place of Sodom and Gomorrah was as beautiful "as the garden of the Lord," the people were so corrupt that neither earth nor Heaven could endure them but a little while longer. "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners exceedingly before the Lord." And "pride, fullness of bread, and

43

abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination." Eze. 16:49, 50. This was the iniquity of Sodom.

And though Lot found the place beautiful, he found the people abominable; and his righteous soul was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked; for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds." 2 Pet. 2:7, 8. But "evil communications corrupt good manners." And although Lot is given by the word of God the title of "just" and "righteous," yet his family was so far influenced by the "evil communications" of those wicked people, that his wife did not escape destruction, and his daughters, though they escaped, showed themselves more thoroughly familiar with the wicked ways of Sodom than with the righteous ways of their father. "Lot's choice" was a miserable choice. Worldly prosperity is no evidence of the fear of God, but rather tends to make the naturally corrupt heart still more corrupt. Let it be the aim of all to "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, that we may all be partakers with him of the same promise in view of which he ever lived and walked.

### **"Good and Bad Angels" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Those who accept the teachings of Spiritualism, seem to think that we are inconsistent when we say that the spirits with whom they communicate are spirits of devils. For, say they, we read of men who appeared to Abraham and to Lot, and that angels are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation, and such beings certainly cannot be spirits of devils. Of course they are not; but the angels who came to Abraham and Lot did not claim to be the spirits of their dead friends. The angels whom our heavenly Father sends to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation, and who were sent to minister to Christ in the wilderness of temptation and in the garden, do not contradict God's word, by saying that they are the spirits of men who died, when the Bible says that the dead know not anything. They are angels of light, and angels of

darkness; angels who are pure and holy as when God created them, and angels who sinned, and thus lost their first estate. But none of these angels were ever men. They were created angels, and were never of the same nature as men. How may we know the difference between the good and the bad angels? Try them by the word of God. "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. If they contradict the Bible, or in any way throw discredit upon it, know that they are of the devil, who is a liar and the father of it.

### **"Men Never Become Angels" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Little children used to be taught to sing, "I want to be an angel." It was a vain wish, but they didn't know any better. Man was made "a little lower than the angels." Those who are counted worthy of a part in the first resurrection, will be made "equal unto the angels." Luke 20:35, 36. They will be equal unto the angels only in that they cannot die any more. But equality does not mean identity, but the contrary. If we say that one thing is equal to another, we indicate that there are two distinct things. So when the Lord said the righteous will in the resurrection be equal unto the angels, he indicated most emphatically that they would not be angels.

"But," says an objector, "Moses and Elias were seen on the mount; how do you account for their presence there if the dead are unconscious and do not become ministering angels?" Easily enough. Elias never died but was translated without seeing death. Moses died and was buried by the Lord, by whom he was afterwards raised from the dead. That he was raised is proved by two things: 1. Christ and Satan disputed about the body of Moses. Jude 9. Satan has the power of death (Heb. 2:14), and therefore claims all the dead as his lawful prey. Christ has been through the grave, bringing with him its keys (Rev. 1:18), and therefore he has the power to divide the spoil with Satan. See Isa. 53:12. That is, he will take from Satan those servants of Christ whom Satan has claimed as his own. So Christ took his faithful servant Moses, referring Satan to the Father, as the vindication of his right to do so. 2. The Bible plainly declares that the dead know not anything, and that their thoughts perish as soon as the breath goes forth. It further expressly states that the dead cannot converse with the living unless they are first raised from the dead. Therefore we know that when Moses appeared on the mount of transfiguration, it was not as an angel, nor as the spirit of a dead man, but as a man who had been dead and had been raised to life.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last Sabbath, January 15, the Oakland Church had the pleasure of listening to a sermon by Elder W. P. Curtis, lately from Kansas. The discourse was based on Matt. 16:19, and was an outline of the fundamental principles of the doctrine of the true church of Christ, with a statement of the danger to which the church has been and is exposed, and a description of the final triumph of the faithful. On

Sunday, January 16, Brother Curtis and family sailed for Australia on the steamer *Alameda*. He will stop at Honolulu a month or two, to help along the work there.

Not long ago several of the clergy of Chicago, yielding to the argument (?) that "to the pure all things are pure," and to an invitation to of the National Opera Company, attended the performance of certain ballets that they might, as the invitation ran, "give a fair opinion as to whether the dance, as present with artistic refinement in the American Opera ballet, is not an attractive, artistic, and morally innocuous adjunct to the opera." It is almost needless to say that no sooner had these men yielded to this operatic sophistry than they were told by the friends of the ballet that they "went there to satisfy their curiosity and see what it looked like;" that "the excuse that they desired to inform themselves that they might more forcibly condemn it, is too thin;" that they knew very well before they went what they would see, "for it is a matter of conceited, undisputed, universal knowledge. Yet they went there to see whether it was better not!" and finally, that having gone themselves they could not well object to their parishioners going. All of which should be a lesson to the clergy of Chicago.

The *Christian Standard* says of the request of the thief on the cross, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" (Luke 23:42):-

"He had no doubt reference to the kingdom as it will be manifested at the second coming of Christ-the kingdom of the glorified, though he had no clear conception of its nature."

Nobody can tell how clear a conception he may have had of the kingdom of Christ, but it is certain that in his request he had reference to the second coming of Christ. This truth is more clearly marked by Griesbach's text, which reads, "Remember me in the day of thy coming." And since Christ's coming in his kingdom is at his second coming (Matt. 25:31) we see that the thief made his request intelligently. What Christ promised was simply that his desire should be fulfilled. An emphatic declaration was made to the effect that when Christ should come the second time the thief should then be with him; he should be remembered. The word "to-day" simply makes the declaration the more emphatic.

In the trial of Professor Smythe, of Andover, for heresy, Professor Baldwin, of Yale College, one of the counsel for the defense, is reported by the *Independent* as follows:-

"The doctrine of probation after death, Professor Baldwin maintained, has already done much, and was destined to do more, to overcome agnosticism, the most hurtful error which prevails at the present day among men."

An "agnostic" is one who does not believe anything, and doesn't *profess* to know anything although he really thinks that he knows more than all the world beside. Professor Baldwin says that the doctrine of probation after death has converted men from agnosticism. That is, they believe it, and therefore they can no longer be called agnostics. How convenient it is to be able to invent doctrines that will take infidelity away from men whether they will or not. Thus, the doctrine of probation after death tells the sinner that if he doesn't repent in this life, he will be all right, because another "chance" will be given him after death. This, being in accordance with his desires, is of course readily accepted. In this way the "larger

hope" converts men. We submit that it is better to be an agnostic than to believe a lie; for the man who believes a lie rests satisfied with his condition and cannot be moved.

### **"The 'Larger Hope'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The "larger hope" is being much talked about now. This "larger hope" is that if men do not accept Christ in this life, they will have a chance to repent after death. It is no new thing. Satan set before Eve a "larger hope" than the Lord did. He persuaded her to believe that she would be much better off if she went outside of God's command. She soon found out her mistake. The antediluvians cherished a "larger hope" than Noah did. He, poor credulous soul, thought that if he did get into the ark he wouldn't be drowned. Their hope was not so circumscribed. Their free minds took a much wider range, and they thought that they would be saved enough if they ignored the ark. But "the flood came, and destroyed them all." The men of Sodom were not so narrow in their beliefs as Lot was. He believed that his only hope lay in flight from the city. They had a "larger hope," and therefore would not put themselves to the trouble to flee. "But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all." "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Those who cherish this "larger hope" will then find out their mistake. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." This hope is large enough to take in the whole creation; "for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This hope is limited to this life, for when Christ comes the second time it is "without sin, unto salvation." Nevertheless, the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and whosoever will may take the water of life as a gift. Who could ask for any larger hope than this? Well might the apostle exclaim: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,  
Is laid for your hope in his excellent work!  
What more could he say than to you he hath said,  
Who unto the Saviour for a refuge have fled?"

### **"Bible Justice Vindicated" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a Spiritualist paper we find the following quotation from Pascal:-

"Nothing appears so revolting to reason as to say that the first man should impart guilt to those who, from their extreme distance from the source of evil, seem incapable of such a participation. This transmission seems to us not only unnatural, but unjust. For what can be more repugnant to the rules of our despicable justice than to condemn eternally an infant, yet irresponsible, for an offense in which he appears to have so little share, that was committed 6,000 years before he came into existence?"

Doubtless many besides Spiritualists will adopt that language as their own, and will fancy that in so doing they are bringing an unanswerable argument against the doctrines of Christianity. But everybody who has read the Bible to any purpose knows full well that it does not teach that either infants or adults are condemned for an offense committed either 6,000 years or half as many minutes before they were born. Neither is one person condemned for the offense of another, no matter when that offense is committed. The Bible plainly declares:-

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Ezek. 18:20. And the same thing was taught to the Jews in their earliest history. Thus: "The father shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." Deut. 24:16.

The Bible nowhere countenances the idea that one person shall suffer for the offense of another. But it does recognize the fact that a stream cannot rise higher than its source. If Adam had retained his purity, he would have begotten children with tendencies to right doing; but having fallen, his posterity must necessarily be born with tendencies to evil. This evil nature with which all men are born, is strengthened by evil practices, so that although "by one man sin came into the world," death justly passed upon all men, "for that *all have sinned*." To those who charge the Bible with partiality and injustice it may always be said: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures."

### **"The Gospel Manual" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

Such is the title of an excellent little book, a copy of which we received some days ago from the author, Rev. Samuel Slocombe. As described by the title page, the book is "an arrangement of the four Gospels into one continuous record of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, with notes and appendix." Unlike some other works of the same nature, this book does not give *all* the four Gospels; that is, where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing, only the fullest account is given. But while this may be an objection to a critical student, there are no doubt many who will be pleased with the simplicity of the work.

The appendix contains some interesting thoughts on the "characteristics of the Gospels," besides "brief notes, mostly chronological," which are explanatory rather than a controversial, and are "indicative," the author says, "of the reason for adopting a particular course in the presence of conflicting views."

The convenient size of the book, 192 pp., five and one-half by six and one-half inches, and the price, from fifty cents to one dollar and twenty-five cents, according to binding, together with some of the features before mentioned, will no doubt make it quite popular. It can be obtained of George C. McConnell, 757 Market St., San Francisco.

**January 27, 1887**

**"Things We Should Know.óNo. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

As finite beings, our knowledge is necessarily limited. There are many things that it is impossible for us to know. In fact, that which we know is a very small amount in comparison with that which we do not know; and much of that which we think we know is only conjecture. People sometimes think they know a great deal about nature, but such ones only think so because of their ignorance of the vastness of God's works. Sir Isaac Newton, after a lifetime of contemplation of the works of nature, and investigation of physical phenomena, said that he was like a child playing with pebbles on the shore of the ocean, while the vast expanse was still before him unexplored. And when we come to things supernatural, our knowledge is still more limited. We can know nothing of them, except they are revealed in God's word. It is idle for us to conjecture concerning the size of the throne of God, the height of the tree of life, the width of the streets of the New Jerusalem, or of the river of water of life. These things have not been revealed to us, and hence it is not necessary that we should know them.

But there are some things which are very plainly made known, and these things it is our duty to know. If we remain ignorant of them, it is a sin. In a few articles we shall consider some of the things that we may and should *know* without any mixture of doubt.

In Deut. 4:30 Moses says: "Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in Heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; thee is none else."

This may be called the first element of knowledge, because whoever says "There is no God," is a fool. Ps. 14:1. A man may be ignorant of a great many things and yet not be a fool; but one who is ignorant of things existing around him, who is unconscious of the existence of the sun, the air, the blue sky, the towering mountains, or any of the works of creation, and who looks upon all with indifferent eye,-such an one we say is a fool. But that is virtually the condition one must be in if he denies the existence of God, for God is known by his works. Says the psalmist, "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." Ps. 96:5. Again, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Ps. 19:1.

A knowledge of God is inseparably connected with a knowledge of his creative power. The psalmist says again: "Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." Ps. 100:3. This is shown still farther by the fact that the heathen lost their knowledge of God through failure to recognize his creative power. Thus Paul says that the heathen who know nothing of God are without excuse, because ever since the creation of the world the eternal power and godhead of God may be seen from the things that are made. And then he says that darkness came upon them "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful." What would it be to glorify him as God? Evidently to

properly recognize him as creator, for it is that which distinguishes him as the one true God. Thus the psalmist, after declaring the power of God above all gods, says: "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name." Ps. 90:8.

But if we acknowledge God as creator, and consider it in our heart, to what will that lead? It will lead to the perfect doing of his will. Obedience is due only to superiors by inferiors. It is a principle of law that one who is dependent on another is in duty bound to obey the will of that other just to the extent that he is dependent on him. Man is dependent upon God for *everything*-*"in him we live, and move, and have our being,"*-and therefore he is in duty bound to yield obedience to the will of God in every particular. And if a man recognize this supremacy of God, and his own dependence, he will do the will of God. That obedience to God is a necessary consequence of a recognition of his supremacy, or, rather, is the only way in which his supremacy can be recognized, is shown by the following verses, one of which has already been quoted:-

"Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments." Deut. 4:39, 40.

The same thing is still further seen by the fact that ignorance of divine truth springs directly from disobedience. Paul says that strong delusion shall come upon men, so that they shall believe a lie, for the reason that they receive not the love of the truth. 2 Thess. 2:10-12. And again he warns the people to watch lest they be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. Heb. 3:13.

It will not be denied that a knowledge of God is of the utmost importance, and that it is a primary duty; and since we can retain our knowledge of God only by doing his will, how important it is that we keep his commandments. In obeying any precept of God we recognize his authority, and increase our knowledge of him; but there is one duty, the performance of which leads especially to the knowledge of God. In Ex. 31:13, 17, we read these words of the Lord:-

"Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."

Here the reason is given why the keeping of the Sabbath leads to a more perfect knowledge of God. The Sabbath commemorates the completed creation. The Sabbath is given for this very purpose. It can be properly kept only when we consider the wonderful power and goodness of God. In the ninety-second psalm, which is for the Sabbath day, the psalmist speaks of the necessity of praise to God, and says: "For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands." Verse 4.

The same thing that is stated in Exodus is repeated by the Lord through the prophet Ezekiel: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:12, 20. In these words the Lord expressly declares that the Sabbath is the only means that he has given whereby



men may preserve a knowledge of him. And so when we read the command, "Know ye that the Lord he is God," it is equivalent to a command to keep the Sabbath.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This is the day which commemorates creation. No other day calls attention to the power of God. Changing the day of rest is the first step toward complete loss of knowledge of God. When we read that the heathen became what they are because "when they knew God they glorified him not as God," and remember that the glory of God is his creative power, and that keeping the Sabbath is the means by which we recognize that power, we do not see how the conclusion can be avoided, that the first step toward the degradation revealed in Rom. 1:23-31 was the refusal to keep the Sabbath which God had sanctified.

The "man of sin" became such by thinking to change the times and the laws of God. The attempted change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, is the boast of the Catholic Church. To this she points as the badge of her authority. And this fact marks the Papacy as essentially heathen. Thus: By the act of changing the Sabbath it claimed the place and authority of God. Paul says of the Papacy: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4. One power can usurp the place of another only by changing, or attempting to change its laws. But if the Papacy puts itself in the place of God, showing itself to be God, it must necessarily ignore the existence of the only true God; and thus it is that by changing the Sabbath the Papacy becomes essentially heathen. It matters not that the Papacy counts for nothing unless the action corresponds. Paul says of certain ones: "They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him." Titus 1:16.

It is the rejection of the truth that is going to land the mass of the people of the last days in the worst kind of infidelity. See 2 Thess. 2:9-12. The Sabbath of Jehovah was, so far as we have any record, the first truth revealed to man (see Gen. 2:1-3), and it is the primary and most essential truth, since it pre-eminently teaches the existence and power of God. It is this truth which the Papacy has sought to overthrow, thus putting itself in the place of God; it is against this truth that Satan, the arch-enemy of God, exerts all his hellish arts, that he may lure men from allegiance to God; and it is the rejection of this truth which will make men an easy prey to Satan's strong delusion, and bring them under the wrath of God.

Let us then keep the Sabbath of the Lord in spirit and in truth. Let us not substitute a way of our own choosing, thus exalting ourselves to the place of God. If by the faith of Christ we earnestly strive to keep the commandments of God, we shall "follow on to know the Lord;" and in the earth made new, where all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, we shall be permitted every Sabbath (Isa. 66:23) to see God and to worship before his throne, acknowledging his goodness and power, in that he hath made all things new. W.

## **"Laborers in the Vineyard" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks us to give an explanation of the parable of Matt. 20:1-16. It is the parable of the vineyard, in which the householder went out early in the morning to hire laborers for his vineyard, agreeing with them for a penny a day. Afterward he went out at the third hour, the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh, each time finding some unemployed persons whom he set to work, agreeing to give them what was right. When the evening came he told his steward to give the laborers their hire, beginning with the last and ending with the first. To the last he gave a penny each. The others who had worked the entire day, seeing this, supposed that they should receive more, but they received just what they had been promised, - a penny each. When they murmured at this, the householder said to one of them: "Friend, I do thee no wrong; didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way; I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?"

In explaining this parable all difficulty will be removed if we remember that those who were hired at the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh hour came as soon as they were called. When the householder found men standing idle at the eleventh hour, and asked them, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" they answered, "Because no man hath hired us." The parable, therefore, gives no countenance to the idea that men may delay the acceptance of the gospel until the last hour of their lives, and then fare as well as those who have served the Lord all of their lives. It has no reference whatever to men who have had a knowledge of the gospel but who have put off accepting it. It refers to those who have not received the light of truth until late, but

55

who accept it as soon as they receive it. As Jesus spoke the parable, it no doubt had its specific application to the Gentiles, who had not enjoyed equal advantages with the Jews.

Now as to the payment. The householder made a fair bargain with those whom he had hired first, giving them good pay, as wages went then; therefore when they received a penny apiece they received all that was their due, and had no reason to complain. If the master wished to give others the same amount for half an hour's labor, he had a right to do so. Indeed, if he had wished to give money to those who had not labored at all, it would have been doing no injustice to those who had received all that they had been promised. Applying the parable to those who are called to labor for the Lord, we learn that it is not so much the amount of labor that men do as it is the readiness with which they labor, that is taken into account. God promises eternal life to all the faithful, and those who labor faithfully from the time they are called, even though they are not called until the eleventh hour, will receive the same reward as those who have labored a longer time, but with no more faithfulness.

## **"The Day of Salvation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber asks, "What day is the psalmist speaking of in the twenty-fourth verse of the 118th psalm?" The text is easily answered if we consider the context, which is as follows:-

"Open to me the gates of righteousness' I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord; this gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter. I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Verses 19-24.

The subject under consideration is salvation, for which the psalmist is praising the Lord. This appears still more clearly when we read the entire chapter. He recognizes the fact that salvation comes through Christ, by saying: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner." The fact that the subject of salvation is under consideration, and that he says, "Open to me the gates of righteousness; I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord," is evidence that the psalmist is not speaking of any special literal day, but that he uses the word "day" in the sense of a period of time, as in Prov. 24:10; Eccl. 7:14, and other places. Just as there is no special day of the week when men may have prosperity or adversity, so there is no special day when men may enter the gates of righteousness or may seek salvation. Ever since the fall, men could enter the gates of righteousness at any time they chose. Thus it will be until probation ends.

And so the day spoken of here by the psalmist, is the day of salvation of which Paul speaks in 2 Cor. 6:2, for he says: "For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured

57

thee; behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." That this is not limited to any particular day, nor even to what is called the Christian dispensation, may be seen from the fact that these words were written seven hundred years before Christ, and are quoted by Paul. See Isa. 49:8.

Again, the day spoken of is the day in which the stone which the builders rejected becomes the headstone of the corner. It is the day of salvation, that is, the whole period of time in which God's grace is manifest toward sinners, that Christ is the head of the corner, because the entire plan of salvation centers in him. Paul says to the Ephesians: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. 2:19, 20. This shows that Christ was the corner-stone in the days of the apostles and prophets, and this is only in harmony with what Paul says in 1 Cor. 3:11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Again Christ refers to the same day to which David does, in John 8:56, where he said of the Jews: "You father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." Abraham saw the day of salvation, and entered into the gates of righteousness. The gospel was preached unto him (Gal. 3:8) and he rejoiced in it as did David. To say that John 8:56 refers to a certain day of the week, would

make nonsense of the text; but no more than it would to limit Ps. 118:24 in like manner.

With the above explanation it is unnecessary to enter into an argument to show that the day to which David refers is not the first day of the week. Indeed, that has been shown already. It is not on Sunday or upon any other special day of the week alone that men can enter into the gates of righteousness and rejoice because of salvation. But "now"-that is, the present time, this period of probation-"now is the accepted time;" "now is the day of salvation;" therefore Paul says: "Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, Rejoice." W.

### **"Christ the Archangel" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

In hymns and prayers and exhortations we often hear of "angels and archangels." In the Bible we find no such expression for it is not an admissible one. Archangel means the chief or head of angels. Now while there must necessarily be among the armies of Heaven many angels who are high in authority, there can be but one who is chief of all. The same people who use the term "archangels," often use the term "arch-enemy" or "arch-deceiver." In this case they have reference to Satan, the chief enemy of God and men. Knowing that Satan is the prime instigator of all evil, they do not think it necessary to specify who is meant when they say "arch-enemy." There could be but one. So there could be but one archangel.

The Scriptures enable us to tell with exactness who the archangel is. In 1 Thess. 4:16 Paul says: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." In John 5:26-29 we read the words of Christ. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Here we learn that it is the voice of the Son of God that calls the dead from their graves. The previous text says that it is the voice of the archangel; therefore, the archangel is the Son of God. Then certainly there can be but one archangel; for in all things Christ has the preeminence.

Again we come to the same conclusion by a comparison of Jude 9 and Dan. 10:21. Jude says: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation." In the book of Daniel (chap. 8:16; 9:21) we find that the angel Gabriel was commissioned to interpret the visions of the prophet. In chapter 10:21, before he begins a most important revelation, he says: "There is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince." Here the expression, "Michael your prince," has undoubted reference to Christ, but we have already learned (Jude 9) that Michael is the archangel. Dan. 10:13 strengthens the position that Michael, the archangel, is Christ, for we there read (margin) of "Michael, the first of the chief princes." This is in harmony with what was said

before, that although the armies of Heaven must have many leaders, there could be but one head over all, and that is Christ. W.

### **"Christ, Angels, and Men" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we noted that angels and men are two different orders of beings. Man was made "a little lower than the angels." Ps. 8:4, 5. Paul says of Christ that "he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Heb. 2:16. This shows a difference between the nature of angels and the nature of men. But it shows also a difference between the nature of Christ and that of angels. Christ did not take the nature of angels; that statement would be uncalled for, if he already had the nature of angels. He was higher than the angels, and when he humbled himself, he came down, not to the nature of the angels, but was made a little lower than the angels, even to the level of man. Heb. 2:9.

That Christ is higher than the angels, is plainly stated in Heb. 1:4, where, speaking of the exalted position which the Son occupies, at "the right hand of the Majesty on high," Paul says: "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." "For unto which of the angels said he [God, the Father] at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" Verse 5. The angels are sons of God by creation; Adam was also, but now that the race is fallen, we can become sons of God only by adoption (Rom. 8:14-16; Col. 4:4-6); but Christ is the Son of God by birth. He is the only begotten Son of God. He is the archangel, not because he is the highest angel, but because he, as Son of God, is head over all the angels. Jesus is the first of the creation of God (Rev. 3:14), not that he is the first of created beings, but in the sense that he is the head of all created things. "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent* says: "It is curious that the Westminster Confession of Faith knows nothing whatever of the millennium, and provides no place for it." There is something curious in that, because it happens to be exactly the Bible position.

A lady, evidently a Spiritualist, writes in an exchange as follows, about Christianity and Buddhism: "/ see nothing to prevent fusion, conciliation, and unification of the two faiths, if rightly understood." One who has that idea may be very well informed concerning Buddhism, but certainly knows nothing about Christianity. And it is altogether a mistake to call Buddhism a "faith." It is really the absence of faith.

"Much reading of German metaphysics and theology has opened windows for many a soul; but it has also opened cellar doors leading to unfathomable depths of darkness." So says the *Christian Union*. But we remember that the same fountain cannot yield both sweet water and bitter, and therefore we believe that the so-called windows of German metaphysics and theology are cellar doors leading to unfathomable depths of darkness. The simple Bible truth never leads men to darkness.

A Methodist minister in Pennsylvania caused a sensation a few days since by declaring that he did not believe in the divinity of the Bible and did not know anything about immortality or whether there is a God, and that he had finally concluded not to preach what he did not believe. It would be a good thing for the cause of genuine Christianity if all the ministers who are in the same state of doubt would be equally candid. Infidelity in the pulpit, though concealed, makes infidelity in the pew.

In the trial of the Andover professors, Professor Churchill, "in allusion to the slight connection of his chair of elocution to the theological instruction, remarked in pleasantry that he never allowed his pupils to pronounce *sheol* with a circumflex. It must always be with the *downward* and *grave* accent." There are many ministers who would have people believe that *sheol* means a place of torment, when it means simply the grave, the place of the dead. Such would do well to learn from Professor Churchill. When he gives *sheol* a *grave* accent, he is certainly orthodox.

Elder Jones writes from the College: "The present term may fairly be counted as the most prosperous in the history of Healdsburg College. There are now about one hundred and fifty students in attendance. The family at the Students' Home now numbers ninety-two. There are two Bible classes, one numbering sixty-six, and the other fifteen. There are also two missionary classes numbering together about the same as the largest Bible class. All in the Bible and missionary study seem to enter into it with a will. The spiritual condition of the school is quite good-in the family at the Home it is very good. The teachers and managers are all of good courage, and are thankful to the Lord for the favor which he has bestowed upon the institution."

Said Christ: "I am come that they might have life." John 10:10. To the Jews he sorrowfully said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5:40. These texts prove that if Christ had not come, men could not have had life; for he would not come to give men what they already had. And it proves that although Christ has come to give life those who do not come to him cannot have life. Christ said: "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers." That is the truth to-day. All who come between men and Christ, who teach men that they may have life without accepting Christ, are thieves of the worst sort. They steal from their deluded victims their only hope of life. If the man who takes from his neighbor that upon which he depends to sustain his life shall receive sevenfold, surely the one who takes from his neighbor that upon which he depends to sustain his life shall receive sevenfold, surely the one who takes from his neighbor the Bread of eternal life shall receive seventy and seven fold.

Let it be understood that life and death are exactly opposite terms. Life means existence. So long as a man has breath, he has life, no matter what his circumstances may be. He may be in poverty, or suffering the utmost agony, yet he is alive. Eternal life is simply eternal existence. The statement that the righteous are to have eternal life does not necessarily imply that they will be happy. That they will have perfect happiness is true, but it could not be learned from the simple statement that they shall have eternal life. When we are told that they shall dwell eternally in the presence of God, we know that they will have fullness of joy. But we are told by men, not by the Bible, that the wicked are to suffer eternal torment. If that were true, they also would have eternal life; for man cannot be in torment unless he is alive. The Bible tells us, however, that "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (John 3:36); and further that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction." 2 Thess. 1:9. So then he who rejects Christ does not simply reject happiness, but dooms himself to everlasting destruction,-death from which there is no resurrection,-"the blackness of darkness forever."

Sunday before last the South Street Presbyterian church, Morristown, N. J., received eight persons by letter, as follows: One from the High church "House of Prayer," Newark; one from St. Thomas Episcopal Church, New York City; one from a close communion Baptist Church; one from a Lutheran Church; two from the Church of England; and two from Congregational Churches. The *Independent* sees in this "an indication of the great advance of the lay masses who compose the Christian churches of this country, toward the obliteration of denominational lines, and a practical church union." True; and when there is this church union, and the State by its laws upholds religion, what will we have but union of Church and State?

#### **"Driving to Church on Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

The old question of riding to meeting on the Sabbath is up again. A good sister who thinks that people ought not to drive their horses to meeting on the Sabbath, quotes a part of Ex. 20:10: "Thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle;" and says, "I would ask why one part of the fourth commandment is taken up, and the other part is left out, by Seventh-day Adventists?"

We would reply that such is not the case, except by here and there an individual. The sister who asks the question has herself done this very thing, for she quotes the commandment as though it entirely prohibited work of any kind, both for man and beast; but this is not the case. The clause preceding the one which she quoted reads: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all *thy* work." Now in view of this part of the commandment, it is evident that when the Lord says, "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work," he means that we shall not do any of our own work, but does not mean that we shall not do his work; for the commandment teaches that the Lord's work is to be done on that day. Christ said: "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day,"

thus showing that to do something is in accordance with the law of the Sabbath; only that which we do must not be our own work.

If, as is very evident, the commandment, "thou shalt not do any work," means simply that we shall not do any of our own work, then the same thing follows in regard to our son, or daughter, or cattle. They must not do any work of a purely secular nature. Now to not forsake the assembling of ourselves together for exhortation, is a divine command. But it is absolutely impossible for people to assemble together on the Sabbath day without doing some work, for it is often a good deal of work to walk two or three miles. The work necessarily involved in walking to meeting, is, therefore, allowable, for it is not for worldly profit; and, therefore, by the same rule, it is allowable for a man to drive his team to church, if he or his family are not able to walk. The Lord does not require that cattle shall keep the Sabbath more strictly than their masters.

**February 3, 1887**

**"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Our good friend, the editor of the *Herald of Truth* (Baptist), has shown zeal in his efforts to uphold the Sunday-Sabbath, which would be commendable if it were in a better cause. He has ransacked the coast from Washington Territory to Southern California to find men who had skill in making assertions appear to be argument, and has had several different men try their hands at building under the Sunday institution a cobweb support which would look strong and beautiful if not examined too closely. It has been of slight importance that these men have differed materially in many of their statements, since they all agreed in one thing, namely, that Sunday is the Sabbath, and this conclusion would serve to satisfy people who are already convinced. It would seem, however, that their efforts have not fully satisfied the editor of the *Herald*, for of late he has been very earnest in his endeavor to have the State Legislature enact a law compelling all people to keep Sunday. From this it appears that he has not the utmost confidence in the power of the arguments of his correspondents to substantiate the claims of Sunday. The strongest argument for Sunday, namely, the law of the land, has been reserved for the last.

We do not wonder that the editor of the *Herald* thinks it necessary to appeal to something besides theological arguments, when we read the last one that was offered before he began to work for the civil argument. It was written by one Gilbert S. Bailey, D. D., and although the editor said in regard to it, "It is not often that the *Herald of Truth* carries such a weighty and timely utterance of an honored Baptist, as in this number," we think that on second reading he must have revised his opinion. The article, however, was thought worthy of being put in tract form for extensive circulation, and we notice it, not because it contains anything which the SIGNS has not answered again and again, but chiefly that our readers may understand just what, among California Baptists at least, is considered "a weighty and timely utterance" in behalf of Sunday.



After a paragraph of assertions, the Doctor states the following proposition, which he says he will prove:-

"The disciples of Christ commenced the religious observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and Christ himself was present with them and gave them his sanction and blessing."

This proposition he considers under three heads: 1. The Scripture proof. 2. Proofs from church history. 3. Testimony of the Fathers. The first text which he quotes in proof of his proposition is John 20:19: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." On this text the Doctor says: "Four times on this day of his resurrection he appeared to his disciples, and this last time is particularly described." "Jesus imparted to his disciples the Holy Spirit, and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as ambassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct, and to guide them in teaching others."

In harmony with his statement that the disciples began the observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, the Doctor evidently means to convey the idea that the disciples were gathered together in a religious meeting in honor of Christ's resurrection. That this assumption has no foundation whatever in fact, may be seen by anyone who will take the trouble to read a few texts of Scripture. We will notice those texts which refer to the day of his resurrection.

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." Mark 16:9-11. No comment is needed on this, and we will let the sacred historian proceed with his narrative: "After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them." Verses 12, 13. This appearance to the two disciples who were going into the country is described in detail in Luke 24:13-25. There we learn that as they were walking along the road, Jesus joined them, but they did not recognize him. They had heard the story of the women to whom Jesus had appeared earlier in the day, but did not believe that Jesus was risen. And it was not until they sat down to supper that Jesus made himself know to them. Verse 30, 31. This was at the close of the day. Verse 29. They immediately arose and returned to Jerusalem, a distance of eight miles, and found the eleven gathered together, to whom they told the experience of the day. But as we have already learned from Mark 16:12, 13, the eleven, did not believe them. This is made still more evident from Luke's account of the appearing of Christ to the eleven, for he says that when Jesus came into their midst and said, "Peace be unto you," they were terrified. Jesus, noticing their terror, showed them his hands and his feet to convince them that he was a real being and the one whom they had seen crucified. And even then, although the truth was beginning to force itself upon them, "they yet believed not for joy." Here, then, we

have some of the particulars concerning the meeting spoken of in John 20:19, and we find that instead of having a meeting to commemorate Christ's resurrection, the disciples did not believe that he had risen. Thus the first text which the Doctor quotes in support of his proposition contradicts it.

But this is not all. Mark tells what they were doing there together that evening. After having told how Jesus appeared to the two as they went into the country, and how they had told the eleven but had not been believed, he continues: "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark 10:14. Thus we find that instead of holding a religious meeting on the evening of that first day, they were simply eating supper, and so Christ appeared to them and asked them for something to eat, in order that he might convince them that he was not a phantom but a real being. They had food ready at hand, "and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them." Luke 24:42, 43. Now if the reader wishes to know how the disciples happened to be together that evening, he may read Acts 1:12, 13, where he will find that they all lived at the same place. From the time of the last Passover until the day of Pentecost the disciples had one dwelling-place. So, then, the idea that when Jesus met with the disciples on the evening of the resurrection they were holding a religious service in honor of his resurrection, is not merely an unwarranted assumption, but is a positive contradiction of the Scriptures. This is a fair specimen of these "weighty and timely utterances" in behalf of the Sunday. The editor of the *Herald of Truth* says that his paper is not often honored with such a "weighty and timely utterance" on the Sunday question as this of Mr. Bailey's. If that is so, he has cause to congratulate himself.

But there is still another point. The Doctor quotes with great confidence the fact that Jesus said to the disciples, "Peace be unto you." He says: "Jesus imparted to his disciples his Holy Spirit and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as ambassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct and to guide them in teaching others." But what has this to do with the sanctifying of Sunday? He said, "Peace be unto *you*," and not, "Blessed is this day." He endowed the disciples with the Holy Ghost, but imparted no sacredness to the day. First-day writers are wont to lay great stress on the fact that Jesus blessed his disciples one Sunday evening, as though that imparted any sacredness to the day. If they could show an instance where the day itself was blessed, it would be more to their purpose.

Some may, however, think with Dr. Bailey, that by thus breathing on the disciples and imparting to them the Holy Spirit, he "gave the highest possible approval to their meeting;" but when they remember what we have already proved, that their meeting was simply a family gathering around the supper-table, they will hardly think that an every-day affair like that needed a special act of divine approval. If the reader will bear in mind that what Jesus said was *to his disciples*, and not *about a day*, they will be saved from jumping at a false conclusion. When Jesus said to his disciples, "Peace be unto you," it was without the slightest thought of specially sanctioning what they were doing, but because

they were terrified at his appearance when they supposed that he was dead. John 20:19 would never be quoted as an argument for the sacredness of Sunday if that institution were not in desperate straits. An unprejudiced person who did not know that the Sunday must be maintained at all hazards, would read that text a thousand times and never get the idea that it could be used as an argument for Sunday. W.

*(To be continued.)*

### **"The Curse of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother in the State of Minnesota asks the question, "What is the curse of the law?" and wishes an answer through the SIGNS. We could give a categorical answer in one word, and say, "Death," but this would not relieve the brother's difficulty, as he wants better authority than our unsupported word. We will therefore take a little more space and let the Bible answer. We cannot refrain, however, from expressing our astonishment that such a question should be asked, because a knowledge of what the curse of the law is almost necessarily precedes the acceptance of the gospel.

The only place where the term "curse of the law" occurs in the Bible is Gal. 3:13, which reads as follows: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The text itself contains the answer to the question asked. For since Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us, if we know what Christ suffered for us, we shall of course know what is the curse of the law. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture to prove that Christ suffered death for us, yet in order to make the argument complete we will quote a few texts. Paul says (Rom. 4:25) that he "was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Isaiah says (chap. 53:8), "He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken."

Again Paul says (Rom. 5:6-8): "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Death, then, is what Christ endured in order to redeem us, and that this is the curse which he suffered and from which he redeemed us, is plain from the last clause of Gal. 3:13: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." This refers to Christ's death by crucifixion, as Peter says in Acts 5:30: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." The argument then

71

stands thus: Men were under the curse of the law; Christ came to redeem them from this curse; in order to redeem them from this curse, he had to endure the same curse; what he endured was death; death, therefore, is the curse of the law.

This is a sufficient answer, but we will give further Scripture evidence to prove the same thing. Paul says in Rom. 8:7 that "the carnal mind is enmity against God," for the reason that "it is not subject to the law of God." But "to be carnally minded is death" (verse 6), therefore we must conclude that death follows the violation of the law; and this is only what Paul expressly declares in Rom. 6:23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now in Deut. 30:15-20, death is expressly shown to be the curse which God pronounced against sinners. We quote verse 19: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." We read also (Rom. 5:12) that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Thus we know that death is the curse that follows sin. But "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4); therefore death is the curse for transgression of the law; or, in other words, it is the curse of the law.

Once more; Paul says that the doers of the law shall be justified; that is, if men never violated the law they would have the favor of God. But the favor of God is life (Ps. 30:5); therefore obedience to the law would secure life. Compare Matt. 19:17. But "all have sinned" (Rom. 3:23), and "therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3:20. This means that the law condemns everybody, since all have violated it; and since justification by the law means the favor of God and life, it follows that condemnation by the law means the wrath of God and death. And this argument is summed up in one sentence, thus: "The commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Rom. 7:10.

Scripture proofs on this point might be multiplied indefinitely, but we think these are sufficient to establish the almost self-evident fact that the curse of the law is death. W.

### **"Is It Peace?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Elsewhere in this paper the reader will find articles bearing on the present war preparations in Europe. Scarcely a day passes but that some new feature is not reported. For instance, "The German army possesses a new explosive called roburite. It is reported to be stronger than melinite. The method of its manufacture is a secret. It is exploded by intense heat." Again we learn that "the Austrian war budget is to be increased twenty-five million dollars." We are also told that the Austrian Landsturm will supply one million additional men, and that the rules which have just been published show that nothing except men from the service. All agree that no such war preparations have ever before been made in Europe, even when war had been declared, whereas now there is general peace.

Some of the comments made by the daily papers concerning these things strike us as being decidedly strange. The S. F. *Evening Bulletin* says:-

"Never in the history of Europe have war preparations been made on so large a scale. Yet who can say that these preparations may not tell in the interests of peace?"

The Oakland *Evening Tribune* says:-

"Everything portends war. A spark may ignite the combustible material at any moment. Such preparations for war have not been known in Europe for many years; but each nation being prepared may be the very cause of preventing war."

We fail to see any promise of peace in preparations for war. The peaceable men of a community are not the ones who always go armed. Men do not carry weapons unless they expect to use them at some time. True, they may not have any definite hostile determination, but they go armed so that they may be "prepared" when any provocation is given. Men who never intend to fight, never carry arms.

So with nations. Where there are warlike preparations, there is expectation of war. The nations of Europe are not members of any peace society. They have been known to fight when they had less strength and less confidence in their strength than they have now. They are extremely jealous of one another. The increased preparation of any one nation will not frighten the others into greater desires for peace, since they all are keeping equal pace in the work of arming. These preparations mean nothing else but war. It may not come for some time; the longer it is delayed the greater will be the preparation; and when at last the spark is dropped into the magazine, there will be such a commotion on the continent of Europe as the world has never seen. It will then be demonstrated whether or not the people of the United States can, as the *Tribune* says, look complacently on and profit by the struggle. It is now almost too soon to be so positive in regard to that matter. W.

### **"The Nations Are Angry" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Interior* of January 20, 1887, gives an excellent view of the condition of Europe. The word of God says that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet "the nations were angry." Assuredly this is the case now. And when the elements do break loose, with such immense armaments, and such multitudes of soldiers, what can the result be but destruction upon destruction? Whether it comes sooner or later the certainty is that it must come, and it can only be as described in Jeremiah 25:32, "A great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth." And yet in the presence of those things men will preach peace and safety, and the speedy coming of a glorious millennium of peace on earth!

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received an envelope containing two post-office money orders, and some postage-stamps, but not a line to indicate from whom the money came, nor where it should be applied. Whoever has sent money from

which he has received no return, would do well to communicate with us at once. We would like to know what to do with the money.

Through the courtesy of J. H. Kellogg, M. D., member of the Michigan State Board of Health, we have received the thirteenth annual report of that body. It contains many interesting statistics, and directions for avoiding disease. The book also contains the report of Professor Vaughan's experiments with poisonous cheese, some extracts from which we shall give in our Health and Temperance Department.

We clip the following item of news from a secular paper:-

"The Saturday half-holiday movement promises to be stronger than ever in the East the coming summer. A bill has been introduced in the New York Legislature making the entire day Saturday a legal holiday, and there is a strong popular sentiment behind it."

This means the enforced observance of Sunday; for the advancement of the counterfeit sabbath is just in proportion as the Sabbath of the Lord is depreciated.

We learn from the report of a sermon by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, of San Francisco, that although Solomon "has been called a very wise man," he possessed wisdom only to a limited degree," but was not a wise man nor a profound man." The *learned* speaker said that Solomon "was always asking questions about everything, never seeing into anything." The declaration is in the face of the following words addressed to Solomon by the Lord: "Lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee." 1 Kings 3:12. But Solomon didn't live in the nineteenth century, and was consequently ignorant of many things that are *known* by modern "divines." However, we would rather know only a few things that are true, than to know so many things that are not so.

The following we clip from a secular paper published in an interior town:-

"The basket social given at the Christian church last evening was very well attended, and was a very pleasant and enjoyable affair. The mating brought about by the sale of the baskets was voted a most happy thought, and created no end of fun and laughter. After the supper, a season of social entertainment was had, and at a late hour the meeting broke up, all present having had a jolly good time."

This was in a "Christian" church. If it were indeed a Christian church we would not greatly blame those who see no need of their becoming Christians. People can do such things as that without the trouble of making a profession of Christianity. In the days of Noah, people were doing the very same things; but they were not the ones who went into the ark. In the days that were before the flood, "they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage," no doubt having "a jolly good time," and "no end of fun and laughter," until the day that Noah entered into the ark. So absorbed were they in their fun that they "knew not until the flood came, and took them all away." And "so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

The *Christian Union* makes merry over the regulations of the West Boston Bridge Corporation, a section of which stands thus: "And the said proprietors

shall meet annually on the first Tuesday of June, providing the same does not fall on Sunday." Well, that does sound funny, but the lawyers who drew it up doubtless know what they were about. They had evidently read the "arguments" for Sunday-keeping, in which we are gravely informed that the first day of the week is "the eighth day," and they very naturally concluded that it must be easier for the first and the third days to be identical than for the first and the eighth, especially since there are but seven. Since the Sunday advocates have shown us how variable the days of the week are,-the first day being both the seventh and the "eighth,"-people can't be too careful in specifying, if they want them kept separate.

On another page mention is made of the new explosive, roburite, which the Germans have discovered, and which is considered to be far more powerful than melinite, which has recently been invented by two French officers. Of course the composition of both explosives is a secret, but they are known to have terrible power. Melinite is said to have ten times the destructive power of nitro-glycerine. A shell charged with a quantity of this explosive would be capable of doing deadly work. It is also reported that while the manufacture of this material is going on, its inventors are experimenting with a new rifle powder which explodes without making any smoke, and which will enable a body of infantry to fire on the enemy from cover, without betraying their position by clouds of smoke. Science has been developed to its present state of advancement principally for the purpose of enabling armies to exterminate one another as speedily as possible. As has been remarked, "chemists are developing into wholesale slaughterers of men."

A religious exchange says:-

"Omaha has 100 saloons paying \$1,000 per year license, and that money goes into the school fund. The result is that the public schools of Omaha are as fine as any in the country."

What a blessing saloons are, to be sure! It is evident that if Omaha only had a few more saloons, it might have the very best public schools in the country; and since nothing is more desirable than good schools, it follows that a few more self-denying philanthropists ought to start saloons in that city. How good the honest drunkard-makers must feel to have the assurance of the religious press that they are the principal supporters of civilization and education. The journal, however, forget to note two points: (1) That in order to get that one hundred and sixty thousand dollars for the public schools, the people of Omaha and vicinity must pay the saloon-keepers not less than one million dollars, at a low estimate; and (2) that Omaha is about the hardest town in the interior of the United States. Six hundred per cent. per annum, besides hundreds of criminals and paupers, is a pretty high rate of interest to pay for money, even for educational purposes.

In recording an interview which she recently had with a lady of some note, Miss Francis Willard says: "I was glad to note her fair, unpunctured ear-a proof of wholesome instincts." Miss Willard is a woman of excellent sense. While it is true that many ladies of refinement and taste do disfigure their ears with rings and pendants, it remains a fact that the custom is borrowed from the savage races. The more barbaric a people are, the more so-called ornaments they put on.

When we see a lady with unpunctured ears, we involuntarily, like Miss Willard, give her credit for good sense or else for good training.

In our notice of the "Gospel Manual," two weeks ago, we stated that "where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing, only the fullest account is given." This was an error on our part. The author says: "I am not aware of a single chapter or page where this is done. My aim was to produce a book which should embody the entire contents of the four Gospels, *except* where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing *in the same* words. Verbal differences of statement, embodying faintest shades of meaning, are all interwoven into the general narrative." This feature is certainly an important one, and greatly enhances the value of the book. We very gladly do the author the justice of correcting the error which arose from a too hasty examination on our part.

### **"The 'True Educator'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have seen a good many college and school journals "edited and conducted wholly by the students," and there are a few that come to us occasionally. The most that can be said for the majority of such journals is that they serve to keep the students out of worse employment. Too often they are filled with local notes and jokes which can interest no one but the students themselves, and which have anything but an elevating effect on them. The *True Educator*, published at South Lancaster, Mass., is emphatically not one of this class. While it is published by the "Academy press," and the mechanical work is done by the students, it is edited by the principal of the Academy, Prof. C. C. Ramsey, who is making it just what it claims to be, a journal "for teachers, students, parents, and school officers." We can conscientiously say of it that it improves with every number. Professor Ramsey is one who believes that "it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing," and is untiring in his efforts to make both the Academy and the journal worthy of the patronage of all. The *True Educator* is warmly recommended by some of the best teachers in the country, because it is just what its name implies. Subscription price per year, seventy-five cents; combined with the *American Sentinel*, on dollar, the price of the latter paper alone being fifty cents. Address, *The True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass.; or Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.

**February 10, 1887**

### **"Things We Should Know.óNo. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Eccl. 11:9.



Here is another thing we must know. The knowledge of this naturally follows from the knowledge of the existence of God. He is our Creator, and therefore has a right to claim that we shall do his will; but if this is so, it necessarily follows that judgment must be passed upon us, to see if we have done his will. The text is addressed to young men; but since God is no respecter of persons, we must conclude that all classes of people will alike be brought into judgment.

That all the world will be brought into judgment, is positively stated in the Bible. In his sermon on Mars Hill, Paul said that God "now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:30, 31.

What shall be the standard of the final judgment? If we are to know that for certain things God will bring us into judgment, it must be that we can know what to do in order to secure a favorable decision. We have already learned that, being wholly dependent on God, we are bound to conform to his will in every particular; therefore we must conclude that God's will is to be the standard of judgment. This conclusion is supported by the words in the Lord's prayer, which indicate that when God's kingdom comes his will will be done by all.

What then is the will of God, by which we are to be judged? Paul gives the answer in the following words: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." Rom. 2:17, 18. How was it that those whom Paul addressed knew the will of God? Because they were instructed out of the law. Then it must be that the law of God contains the will of God. This is still further shown by the words which David uttered prophetically in behalf of Christ: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:7, 8. It was Christ's delight-more than his meat or drink-to do the will of God. He ever did the will of the Father. This was because the law of God was in his heart, so that all his actions were spontaneously in harmony with it. But acting in harmony with the law of God, was doing the will of God; therefore the law of God is identical with his will.

Once more: When the young man came to Jesus and asked what he should do that he might inherit eternal life, Jesus answered: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19:17. In his sermon on the mount, he said: "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 7:21. Therefore keeping the commandments of God is equivalent to doing the will of God.

The law of God, then, is to be the standard by which all men shall be judged. This is incidentally shown in the passage already quoted from Romans: Thou "knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." According to the marginal reading it is, Thou "triest the things that differ, being instructed out of the law." The law of God is that by which we try things that differ, by which we decide what things are honest and just and

pure and lovely and of good report, and what are not. This, we say, is incidental proof that we are to be judged by the law of God, the ten commandments; for it is manifest that we must judge our actions by the same rule by which God will judge them.

In the text quoted at the beginning of this article, Solomon tells the young man to have his own way if he will, to walk in the ways of his heart, and in the sight of his eyes, but to *know* that for "all these things" God will bring him into judgment. Then we are to know not only that there will be a judgment, but that the judgment will take into account our thoughts; for the ways of a person's heart are the ways which his heart devises or thinks upon. This is plainly stated in the next chapter: "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12:14. This agrees with the words of Paul, that when the Lord comes he will "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." 1 Cor. 4:5.

We have seen that the judgment is to be in accordance with the law of God; and since every secret thought is to be brought into judgment, it follows that the law of God takes account of even the thoughts of the heart. Read now Eccl. 12:13, 14: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God, and keep his. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Here we see that the fact that God will bring every secret thing into judgment, is given as a reason why we should keep the commandments of God. This shows again that the law is so spiritual as to detect the slightest deviation from it even in thought.

With this agree the words of Paul: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4:12. As showing how the law discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, we refer to the words of Christ in Matt. 5:18-22, 27, 28, where we find that a single hateful thought or lustful look is accounted a violation of the sixth or the seventh commandment.

There is an intimate connection between Eccl. 11:9 and Eccl. 12:13, 14. The latter text is an exhortation to keep the commandments of God, based on the truth that by those commandments God will bring "every work into judgment, with every secret thing." The former text is an emphatic command to those who seem bent on having their own way, to *know* that "for all these things" God will bring them into judgment. And since that judgment is to be based on the commandments of God, and is to take into account every secret thought, it follows that Eccl. 11:9 is virtually a command for us to *know* that the ten commandments cover every possible deed or thought, and demand perfect obedience. It is a command for us to study the law, and to meditate in it day and night. If we are ever at a loss to know how perfect the law requires us to be, we have only to consider the life and character of Jesus. He "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." This was simply because the law was in his heart. Any one who models his life in accordance with the law of God, will be just like Christ, and the law will be satisfied with nothing less.

This righteousness cannot be attained by our own individual effort. Of ourselves we can do nothing: but Christ, who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, in order "that we might be made the righteousness of God *in him*." And so the command to know that God will bring us into judgment for every secret thing, includes the command not only to know that the law of God is to be the standard of that judgment, but also that through Christ alone can we attain to that perfect righteousness which the law demands. If Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, then we can exhibit in our actions the righteousness of the law, for if we have Christ in the heart we must have the law there also. And having lived thus, when we are brought before the judgment seat, and God fixes upon us his piercing gaze, he will see, not us, but the image of Christ, and because he lives we shall live also. W.

### **"Barkis Is Willin'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a movement on foot in California to secure a law exempting from taxation private and denominational schools and churches of all faiths. Dr. Stratton, of the University of the Pacific (Methodist), is doing all in his power to secure influence in favor of such a law. In pursuance of that object, he called upon the Catholic Archbishop Riordan. To his evident surprise he found that the archbishop expressed not only a willingness but a desire to co-operate with him and others in securing such legislation. We could have told him without going to inquire, that the Catholics would be in favor of having church property exempted from taxation. There are more than four times as many Catholics in California, as there are of Protestants of all denominations; and it is certainly not far out of the way to say that the Catholic Church owns at least twice as much property as do all the Protestant denominations combined. President Stratton may rest assured that he can count on Catholic co-operation in any scheme tending toward the support of the church by the State. Such a law would be a good deal in the nature of special legislation in behalf of the Catholic Church.

For our part, we have no hesitation in expressing our disapproval of such a law, leaving the Catholic Church out of the question. The church is not, or should not be, a pauper. Let Christians support the churches. It would certainly be an act of injustice to tax infidels and other non-professors, to support something in which they have no interest, or to which they are decidedly opposed. When Christianity has not enough strength to stand alone, but must lean on the State, it has not enough vitality to carry on aggressive evangelical work, and is not worth supporting.

But Dr. Stratton found out something else when he called on the archbishop. He says in a letter to the *Advocate*:-

"Among other subjects of conversation were the questions of temperance, and Sabbath [Sunday] observance, and he expressed a desire to co-operate with all Christian people, or others, in promoting these causes."

Will not a mother care for her own child? Here again we could have told Mr. Stratton that he would find the Catholic Church more than ready to co-operate

with Christians, "or others." Sunday is a child of the Papacy, and professed Protestants may depend upon it that she will not disown her offspring. The Doctor's interview with the archbishop convinced him that the Catholics have been misrepresented. "The Church," is a pretty good thing after all, and will aid greatly in matters of "reform." Strange that intelligent Protestants can be so blind! But this only serves to show how professed Protestants are preparing the way for the triumph of Roman Catholic principles in this country. Meanwhile the wily prelates of the Catholic Church are chuckling over the situation. They well know that if they were to take the initiative in attempting to secure State patronage and Sunday legislation, there would be an outcry which would work disaster to their projects; but they are perfectly willing to "co-operate" with Protestants. True Protestantism, however, will never lend itself to become a catspaw for Catholicism. W.

### **"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

#### **"AFTER EIGHT DAYS," PENTECOST, AND TROAS**

The next "weighty utterance" that we find is the following:-

"We have no account of their meeting again *until a week later*, after eight days according to the Jewish reckoning. No meeting is mentioned on the old Jewish seventh day; but *on the first day of the next week*, their second Lord's day, they met again and Thomas was with them, and again he said, 'Peace be unto you.'"

We never before heard that Thomas said to the disciples, "Peace be unto you," and perhaps Dr. Bailey did not mean to say so; but if he had positively declared that it was Thomas instead of the Lord that said, "Peace be unto you," he would have been no further out of the way than he is in saying that the second time Jesus met with the disciples was on the first day of the week. The assurance with which he says, "We have no account of their meeting again until a week later," would lead a novice to suppose that John plainly states that it was just one week later, and that the "after eight days," which the Doctor repeats in an *aside*," is simply his own explanation of the Bible term. What John really says is this: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you." John 20:26. Dr. Bailey tells us that "after eight days" is the Jewish expression for one week. It would have been more satisfactory to the inquiring reader if he had given a few examples of such use of the expression, in proof of his statement. Since he did not, we will quote a few instances of similar expressions, which will plainly show that "after eight days" does not mean just one week.

In Hosea 6:2 we read: "After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." If "after eight days" means just seven days, then "after two days" ought to mean just one day, and the prophet should

have said, To-morrow he will raise us up. But the prophet evidently said just what he meant, namely, that after two days is the third day. This is the Jewish as well as the common-sense mode of reckoning, and according to it "after eight days" would be the ninth day. Therefore if we begin our count with the day on which they first met, the earliest that we can place this second meeting would be the next Monday evening.

But some one will say that the Jews were not always exact in their reckoning of time. Very true, and we will give an instance of this inexactness. In his account of the transfiguration, Mark says: "And *after six days* Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves." Mark 9:2. Luke, in relating the same event, says "And it came to pass *about an eight days after* these saying he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray." Luke 9:28. From these two accounts we find that "after six days" may mean "about an eight days after;" therefore if it is claimed that John did not mean to express the exact time, we must admit that "after eight days" means at least about ten days after, and this would bring the meeting to the middle of the next week. But by no possible conclusion can the meeting recorded in John 20:26 be placed earlier in the week than Monday evening. How, then, must we regard the statement which the Doctor makes immediately following, that this meeting is "*specifically mentioned as on the first day of the week.*" We are unwilling to believe that he would willfully tell an untruth in order to deceive those who might be ignorant of the exact wording of the text, and we are therefore obliged to suppose that when he wrote his article he did not look at the Bible, but simply quoted from a too treacherous memory. Whichever way it is, it shows the desperate straits in which a man is placed when he attempts to maintain Sunday sacredness.

Let us now look at the text itself a moment, and see how simple the narrative is. Remember that we have already shown that the disciples had one common dwelling-place at this time. On the evening of the resurrection, Jesus had come into the room while they were eating supper, to convince them that he had actually risen. For some cause not stated, Thomas was not in when Jesus came. Although they all lived at one place, it is not to be supposed that they never stirred from the house. But after eight days (whether nine or ten or more, there is no means of knowing) they were all "within." And then Jesus appeared to them again. Whether they were eating supper at this time or not is not stated. But knowing the facts as they are stated, how foolish seems the following question: "What higher sanction could Jesus give to this meeting for worship on the first day of the week, *this change from the seventh day to the Lord's day?*" The Doctor's method of argument seems to be something like this: Assume that certain things were done at a certain time; if this assumption happens to be contrary to the Scripture, then change the assumption into an emphatic declaration, so as to make people think it must be so, even though the Bible says it is not; and then from these erroneous assumptions and declarations draw a conclusion with such an air of confidence that people will think that it must be so.

The next "argument" is the following:-

"We have no account of the disciples meeting for worship on any seventh-day Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ to the day of Pentecost, which was also *on the first day of the week.*"

Inasmuch as the day of the week on which Pentecost came that year is not mentioned, it seems rather a lame thing from which to build an argument for Sunday sacredness. It is about equal to the argument on John 20:26. If the pouring out of the Spirit upon the disciples upon the day of Pentecost were intended as a sanction for Sunday observance, it certainly would not be too much to expect that something should have been said about Sunday. On the contrary, however, no hint is given as to the day of the week, and some of the ablest commentators do not pretend to know what day it was, one among whom is Dr. Hackett, a Baptist commentator; he holds that Pentecost came that year on the seventh day of the week, while there are some who hold that it fell on Monday. This shows that they are of the same opinion as Dr. Barnes, who says that it is a matter of no importance what day of the week it was. And that is exactly true. If there were any significance as to the day of the week, the day would certainly have been mentioned. We could easily show from the Scriptures that that Pentecost was on the seventh day of the week, but we shall not take the time, because it would not add a particle of strength to the Sabbath argument. Even if it were plainly stated that that wonderful outpouring of the Spirit was on the seventh day of the week, we should not think of quoting that as an argument in favor of the Sabbath. At the close of creation God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, and no subsequent act could add to the sacredness there put upon it.

88

And here we will say that even if the statements which Dr. Bailey has made concerning meetings for worship on the first day of the week were true, they lack the essential element to make them of any force in favor of the Sunday; namely, a Bible statement that any sacredness was ever imparted to Sunday. If the mere being together on a certain day were proof of the sacredness of that day, then we would have, according to John 20:26, either Monday, or Tuesday, or Wednesday as a sacred day, for it was on one of these days, we do not know which, that Jesus met with his disciples the week after the resurrection. The day of the ascension of Christ, forty days after his resurrection (see Acts 1:3), was on Thursday, and on that day the disciples all met together with Jesus, and he blessed them, and they worshiped him. See Luke 24:50-52. If Dr. Bailey has any confidence in his method of argument, he ought to keep Thursday. The fact that he does not keep Thursday as sacred, even though Jesus met with and blessed his disciples on that day, shows that he does not really believe that Christ's meeting with and blessing his disciples on the evening of the resurrection imparted any sacredness to that day. Yet that is all the argument he has in favor of Sunday. So far as the Bible is concerned, there is just as much authority for keeping Thursday as there is for keeping Sunday. The Doctor continues:-

"Was this new order of Sabbaths or *meetings on the first day of the week* kept up by the apostles and by the churches which they established under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? They bade the churches 'not to forsake the

assembling of themselves together.' On what day did they meet to break bread, and worship? When Paul was at Troas, where a Christian church had been previously formed, we are told in Acts 20:7: 'And upon the *first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread*, Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight.' Here again is specifically recorded their customs of assembling on the *first day of the week*, led by an inspired apostle. Were they right or wrong in this?"

Notice how adroitly everything is turned in behalf of the Sunday. The apostle says to the Hebrews: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together;" and behold, it is quoted as an argument for Sunday! Because he tells the disciples to meet together for exhortation, it is taken for granted that he must mean for them to meet on Sunday. We are a little surprised that the Doctor did not say that we are here specifically commanded to meet on the first day of the week. We have heard Hebrews 10:25 quoted thus: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together on the first day of the week." Dr. Bailey here neglected a rare opportunity to make another "weighty utterance" in behalf of Sunday.

But now what about this meeting at Troas? The apostle and his companions had been with the church there an entire week. Acts 20:6. If anyone thinks that Paul spent seven days with the church in Troas, and did not hold a meeting until just before he started away, he has read the life of Paul to little purpose. If Paul did not hold a meeting every day he was there, he did differently from his ordinary custom. See Acts 19:8-10. We have, however, the record of only one meeting with the church at Troas, and when did that take place? The record says, "On the first day of the week." But on what part of the first day of the week was it? It was in the night, because they had "many lights," and it is plainly stated that the meeting lasted all night. But according to Scripture reckoning, the day begins and ends at sunset. See John 1:5, 8, 13, etc.; Deut. 16:6; Lev. 23:32. The first day of the week, then, begins at sunset Saturday evening, and ends at sunset of the following evening. Therefore a night meeting on the first day of the week must be held on Saturday evening, and that is just when the meeting was held which is recorded in Acts 20:7-11. Then having held this meeting in the night of the first day of the week, what did Paul do in the day-time? Luke tells that he departed when it was light, and traveled on foot to Assos. That this is the view that must necessarily be taken even by Sunday-keepers, when they are not specially set to uphold that institution at all hazards, will be seen by the following extract from Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul:-

"The labors of the early days of the week that was spent at Troas are not related to us, but concerning the last day we have a narrative which enters into details with all the minuteness of one of the gospel histories. It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath. On Sunday morning the vessel was about to sail. The Christians of Troas were gathered together at this solemn time to celebrate that feast of love which the last commandment of Christ has enjoined on all his followers."-*Chap. 20, par. 9.*

After describing the meeting, the departure of the ship with Paul's companions, and Paul's departure on foot, the same writers says:-

"Strength and peace were surely sought and obtained by the apostle from the Redeemer as he pursued his lonely road that Sunday afternoon in spring among the oak woods and the streams of Ida."-*Par. 11.*

So much for Paul's sanction for Sunday worship. Perhaps, however, some may insist that the meeting was held in the night following Sunday, and that Paul's journey was on Monday; then according to their assumption that Paul tarried there a week in order to be with them at their regular time of meeting, they must necessarily claim that he passed over the whole of the first day of the week without having any meeting, and did not meet with them until the setting of the sun and the gathering darkness showed that the first day had passed. Whichever way they fix it, the record of this meeting gives no aid or comfort to the advocates of Sunday observance.

Now one word about apostolic example, for that is the stronghold of Sunday advocates. If apostolic example has to be followed at all, it must be followed closely. It will not do to discriminate and say that we must follow certain apostolic practices, but may neglect others. Therefore our friends who are such sticklers for apostolic example, must hold their meetings in the dark part of the first day of the week, and never in the day-time on Sunday, for the entire Bible contains no account of a religious meeting on Sunday in the day-time. And the meeting at Troas is the only recorded instance of a meeting on the first day of the week, even in the night. W.

### **"Holiness of Angels" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ spoke of the condition of the righteous after the resurrection he said, "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels." Luke 20:36. Thus the angels in Heaven are immortal. But there is another feature in which the saints will resemble the angels, and that is in their holiness. This quality is a characteristic of the angels. This is so well known that an angel is almost a symbol of purity. When they are mentioned in the Bible the adjective "holy" is often applied to them. The servants of Cornelius told Peter that their master had been "warned from God by an holy angel." Acts 10:22. In Matt. 25:31 Christ himself applied the term to all the angels of Heaven. He said: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Without these direct statements as to their character, we would know that they are holy, for Christ says of these "ministering spirits," they "do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 18:10. And only the pure and holy in heart can see God. Matt. 5:8; Heb. 12:14.

In what does the holiness of the angels consist? What is it that makes them holy? It must be in that they do the will of God. That the will of God is done in Heaven, is evident from Matt. 6:10; and since there are none in Heaven except the angels who do the will of God, it is a necessary consequence that they are the ones to whom Christ refers. God is holy, and the doing of his will would make one like him, holy. From Rom. 2:17, 18 we learn that God's law is his will; and that this is the will which the angels perform, and which constitutes their holiness,



is plainly stated in Ps. 103:20: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." The perfection of the angels, then, is due to the fact that they keep the perfect law of God.

Christ taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." Matt. 6:10. This shows that a time will come when the commandments of God will be kept on earth even as the angels now keep them in Heaven. This will be in the new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. But although the change of the earth from old to new will be quickly effected, and although man's change from mortal to immortal will be brought about in the twinkling of an eye, the change to holiness is a gradual work. "Heaven is not reached at a single bound." The work of sanctification is a progressive work. Therefore the fact that the commandments of God will some day be kept by men on earth even as they now are by the angels in Heaven, shows that they who hope to be among the equals of the angels must now be keeping the commandments of God.

### **EVIL ANGELS**

We read in 2 Peter 2:4 that "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." This shows conclusively that the angels were once on probation as Adam was in the garden of Eden, and that those who are now called the holy angels have had their characters tested, so that they are now placed beyond the reach of temptation. It shows also that the angels who sinned can have no hope of a restoration to the favor of God. Peter says that God "delivered them into *chains of darkness*." We can understand what this means by comparing a few texts. From 2 Peter 2:19; Gal. 3:22, 23; Rom. 7:14 we learn that sin is bondage. The person who is in the darkness of error is in a state of bondage. Moreover, we learn from 2 Thess. 2:9-12 that those who persist in rejecting light will finally be given up to believe a lie. The same thing is taught in Rom. 1:28. That is, those who persistently sin in the face of great light, will finally be left in the bondage of sin without hope of escape. This is what is doubtless meant by the angels that sinned being delivered into chains of darkness. They had light and knowledge greater than man had, as they were a higher order of creatures than he was. In the face of this light, and in defiance of the love and mercy of God, they deliberately chose the way of darkness. Having once chosen the bondage of sin, their choice was irrevocable. They were in "chains of darkness" that could not be broken. And so until the Judgment day ends their miserable careers, they are in darkness. They are darkness itself. Darkness and error are inseparable from them. Wherever they are, their presence contaminates; and their sole aim is to perpetrate lying wonders which shall lure men away from the truth into the same chains of darkness with themselves. Let us never forget to pray, "Deliver us from evil."

## CARE OF GOOD ANGELS FOR MEN

But if "the rulers of the darkness of this

91

world" are actively engaged in trying to overthrow us, and drag us down to eternal ruin, we have the assurance that "angels that excel in strength" are "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Heb. 1:14. Every "little one," every child of God, has one for his especial guardian. Matt. 18:10; Acts 12:15. Not only so, but all the heavenly host are intensely interested in the whole human race, and anxious for the conversion of each sinner. Says Christ: "I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Luke 15:10. When Jesus was born in Bethelhem of Judea, there was joy in Heaven. It was not sufficient to send a single angel to announce his birth, but a multitude of the heavenly host must accompany him to sing their joy at the good tidings which should be to all people. So great was the joy among the angels over the fact that fallen man's Redeemer had actually come, that it would seem that they could not remain quiet in Heaven. They must flock to witness the joy of the humble shepherds, and to proclaim their own.

Seeing then that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16); that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); that Christ is at the right hand of God making intercession for us (Rom. 8:34); and that all the holy and mighty angels of God are interested and loving messengers of light and strength to those who are striving against sin, may we not even in the face of Satan's hosts say: "In all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. 8:37-39. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last Wednesday, February 2, Brother W. I. H. Baker and Sister Josie Baker sailed on the steamer *Australia* for Honolulu, whence, after a stay of ten days, they will sail on the *Mariposa* for Australia. Brother and Sister Baker have been faithful laborers in the office of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and we shall miss them both here and in the Sabbath-school. Many prayers and good wishes will follow them on their journey, and to their new field of labor.

The *American Sentinel* for 1886, bound either in paper or I cloth, can now be furnished in any quantity. In either style it is very convenient for carrying, and can thus be used for reference by ministers who are traveling from place to place. Nowhere else can so many facts and arguments be found on the vital subject of "National Reform." No one who wishes to be intelligent in regard to this matter

should fail to procure a bound volume of the *Sentinel*. Price, in paper, sixty cents; in cloth, one dollar. Address *American Sentinel*, Oakland Cal.

An Eastern paper says: "The Jews are talking of changing their Sabbath to our Sabbath, beginning with the year 1900." We do not see how this thing can be done; the Jews might easily abandon the ancient Sabbath and go to keeping another day; but to change "their Sabbath"-by which we suppose is meant the seventh day, "the Sabbath of the Lord"-to "our Sabbath"-which, we take it, means Sunday-is just as impossible as to change Monday to Thursday, or 12 o'clock noon to 12 o'clock midnight. God has spoken, and said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and though "hand join in hand," and both Jew and Papist think to change the times and laws of the Most High, all his commandments will still be sure, they will stand fast forever and ever.

The *World's Advanced Thought* thus patronizingly notices the progress of a prominent "divine:"-

"The *Christian Union*, called by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, repudiates the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as 'inconsistent with Scripture, antagonistic to science, and a product of a Pagan and materialistic habit of thought.' If the Reverend Abbott would get hold of a file of the paper edited by Andrew Jackson Davis twenty-five or thirty years ago, he could pick up a good many such views that were held by the last generation of spiritual Spiritualists, and that the spiritual Spiritualists of the present consider too well established to be live subjects for discussion."

It must be encouraging to "the leaders of Christian thought" to be assured by the very "spiritual Spiritualists" that they are making advancement in the spiritualness of Spiritualism.

It is stated that there were 3,247 arrests for gambling in Los Angeles last year, but that only twenty-two of the arrests were of white men. The others we suppose were Chinamen. It is touching to see the tender regard which the California policeman has for the morals of the benighted brethren who are among us. No one supposes for a moment that the number of Chinese gamblers exceeds the number of white men who indulge in the same vice; and the only reason we can give why the police do not arrest the white man as well as the Chinamen, is that they think the former were beyond reformation. Heathenism is not dependent on race or color, and we very much doubt if the Asiatic heathen could give any information in vice to those who are of American or European birth.

When Peter speaks of the manner in which the prophecies were given, he says: "But there were false prophets also among the people." Wherever you find anything of value, you will find a counterfeit. Those false prophets arose for the purpose of bringing the true prophets into disrepute. In like manner we might expect that when prophecies are interpreted by the word of God, there will be false and absurd interpretations, calculated to make sensible people disgusted, so that they will resolve to have nothing to do with any interpretations of prophecy. There are some professed Adventist journals which persist in setting a time for the coming of the Lord, although the Lord said, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man." They have been at this work for years, and have set no less than a score of different times for the Lord to come. In order to make their

computation seem to be correct, they manufacture history without any regard to fact. The time now fixed by these pseudo-Adventists is 1889. We earnestly protest against such tampering with prophecy and history; its effect is only to cause people to disbelieve that the Lord is coming at all. It is enough for us to know that the coming of the Lord is near, "even at the doors." We are not required to understand the things which God has not revealed.

The Papal Consistory has been postponed till the early part of March, when the new foreign cardinals will receive their hats.

### **"No Sunday Law for California" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The readers of the SIGNS will remember the account that was given of a Sunday Law mass-meeting in San Francisco several weeks ago, and of the vigorous efforts that were being made by the clergy of California to induce this Legislature to enact a rigid Sunday Law. Petitions have been circulated in all parts of the State, and several have been presented to the Assembly. A few days ago an effort was made to create a boom by means of a mass-meeting in the Assembly Chamber, which was granted for the purpose. But although the meeting was presided over by the Speaker of the House, and eloquently addressed by several clergymen and one member of the Legislature, it did not seem to have the desired effect on the members generally. On Friday, February 4, the Committee on Public Morals reported back a petition in favor of a Sunday Law, with the recommendation that the Speaker appoint a committee of one to prepare and introduce a bill in accordance with the petition. The House refused to take the action recommended. It said that there were only four votes in favor of it. This settles the Sunday Law question for this session of the Legislature. We are glad that there is in our Legislature so clear a sense of justice and a perception of the fitness of things. We earnestly pray that the Legislators of other States where the Sunday conflict is raging, may be gifted with equal good sense. California has at present a Sunday law amply sufficient to meet the demands of good order; it is insufficient only to meet the demands of bigotry.

### **"The Great Strike in New York" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is getting to be a good deal more than a local affair, and is assuming proportions that entitle it to more than the space of a news item. A dispatch of February 4 says:-

"The only hope the strikers have of success is to so hamper business as to bring about a settlement by arbitration. There are now on the strike nearly 49,000 men, with perhaps half that number out of work through the stoppage of business incident to the strike."

Another dispatch of same date says:-

"The Country General Committee of the United Labor party adopted the following resolution last night:-

"That is, in the opinion of those now conducting the strike, it becomes necessary to call out on the strike, men of other branches of industry affiliated with our party, we recommend they obey the summons, even to the point of stopping all the wheels of industry, and in time they may learn how necessary to society producing workers are."

Still another says:-

"The White Star steamship *Republic* and the Cunard Line steamship *City of Chicago* scheduled to sail to-day with the transatlantic mails, will not be able to get off because of the strike."

Another dispatch of February 5 says:-

"The calkers and joiners at work repairing the *Chyandotte*, the steamer that was damaged by the explosion of an infernal machine, struck. They had no grievances, but struck out of sympathy with the freight-handlers. Their places will be filled to-day by non-union men. The coopers employed along the piers, with the mill-wrights, joined the strike to-day. The painters and mechanics on the *Union* Line also struck. The Italians who took the place of the strikers at the Hudson River depot quit work in the afternoon."

We are workmen ourselves, and we have a strong sympathy for them when they are oppressed. But we cannot sympathize with them in lawless acts even when they are oppressed, and much less when they have no grievance. Those who first struck may have had a grievance; but for all other workmen to join them, and to deliberately plan to stop all industries, is simply barbarous selfishness. Thousands of poor people will suffer from cold and hunger because of this strike. We insist that there is no monopoly in this country so regardless of the rights of the poor as are the Labor Unions. This is emphatically an age when men are "lovers of their own selves."

## February 17, 1887

### "Human Law Against Divine Law" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Standard* having been asked what the duty of an elder of a church is with a member who stays away from church service during the busy part of the year, and spends the "Lord's day" in labor, the editor of the *Standard* replies as follows:-

"The course of the brother referred to is in direct violation of the law of the land, and is, therefore, directly opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures, which insist that Christians shall be law-abiding citizens."

It seems to us that that is a roundabout way of answering the question. Why could not the editor of the *Standard* have come direct to the point, and given the commandment which the brother was violating by laboring on Sunday? The reason is obvious; because there is no such commandment. If we were asked what should be done with a church-member who persisted in laboring upon the Sabbath, the answer would be to deprive him of church fellowship; and the reason for such action would be that he had violated the fourth commandment,

which forbids secular labor on the seventh day of the week. But it is impossible to name any scripture which a man violates by working on Sunday, and therefore such an one can be accused only of violating the law of the land.

Could anything more clearly show that the Sunday-sabbath is wholly a man-made institution, having nothing but human authority to support it? We could not frame an argument that would show the utter worthlessness of Sunday more clearly than does this admission by one of its advocates; for the reader may rest assured that if the editor of the *Standard* had known of any divine law against Sunday labor, he would have quoted it without delay. The Sunday-sabbath has no sanction in the Scriptures, and therefore is not binding on anybody.

It is said, however, that the law of the land forbids Sunday labor, and that the Bible commands us to obey the laws of the land, thus sanctioning Sunday rest. The Bible does nothing of the kind. Paul says that every one should be subject to "the higher powers," because they are ordained of God; but by that very statement he recognizes a power still above the "higher powers," and that is God, the highest power. All men owe allegiance to this highest power, and if the "higher powers" are unmindful of their duty, that does not absolve us from our allegiance to God. If they make laws which contravene the laws of God, then the Bible tells us that "we ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29. Now the law of the land, forbidding labor on Sunday, is in direct opposition to the law of God, which says: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Ex. 20:8-10. Therefore we are bound to disobey any human law requiring us to regard Sunday as a sacred day. We cannot, even by implication, admit that Sunday has any claims to reverence.

Some years ago there was a law in the United States to the effect that if a slave left his master, and escaped to a State where slavery was not allowed, anybody finding him should return him to the one who professed to own him. Any man who would refuse to send a fugitive slave back into bondage, was liable to heavy penalties. We do not know how the editor of the *Standard* regarded that law, but we do know that many men who plead for Sunday observance on the same ground that he does, namely, that it is required by the law of the land, utterly refused to be bound by the Fugitive Slave Law. Christian men despised the law, and deliberately violated it. And they were justified in so doing. Why? Because slavery is an accursed thing, and because the Fugitive Slave Law was in direct violation of the command of God, which says: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." Deut. 23:15, 16.

It is a maxim, even in human law, that if the human law is contrary to the divine law, the subject is in duty bound to break that law. No human law can claim a moment's consideration when it conflicts with the law of God. We venture the assertion that if Congress should enact a law requiring men to take the name of God in vain, the editor of the *Standard* would not only ignore that law, but would use all his eloquence to persuade others to trample upon it. If he would not

obey the law of the land, when it is in opposition to the third commandment, why should he plead for it when it is in opposition to the fourth?

Let the reader not forget that one of the ablest and staunchest advocates of Sunday has plainly admitted that there is no divine command for Sunday observance. And he is not the only one who has made such an *admission*. Remember also that there is a most emphatic commandment of the Lord, enjoining the observance of the seventh day of the week, and setting apart the other six days, Sunday among the rest, for labor. Then let him decide whether he ought to obey God rather than men. W.

### **"Infant Baptism—An Explanation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

"In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of January 6, there is an article over Brother R. F. Cottrell's name headed, 'One Error Leads to Another,' in which is quoted an extract from a Methodist minister's discourse upon baptism, and Brother C. says: 'It is hard to see how the Baptists can answer this argument while they hold to the change of the Sabbath.' Does Brother C. believe in infant baptism, or that baptism came in the room of circumcision? A TRUTH SEEKER."

To both these questions we can answer, No. Brother Cottrell does not believe in infant baptism, nor that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Neither of these things is believed by any writer for the SIGNS. In the article referred to he means that he does not see how the Baptists can from their own standpoint answer the argument of the Methodist minister. Thus: It is stated that the New Testament nowhere expressly enjoins the observance of Sunday, improperly called "the Christian Sabbath," and this is true. It is also a truth that the New Testament, and the Old too, for that matter, says nothing about infant baptism, neither does the New Testament intimate that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Baptists reject so-called infant baptism because it is not commanded, yet they keep Sunday, which also is not commanded, now if they persist in the observance of Sunday without any divine command therefore, it is evident that they cannot consistently repudiate infant baptism on the ground that it is not commanded. This is an instance of *argumentum ad hominem*. The writer does not mean to intimate that it is right to baptize infants, but to show how inconsistent those are who reject that ceremony because it is not commanded, and accept another ordinance which is equally unfounded. Baptists are right in their position upon baptism; if in all things they were consistent with this, they would keep the Sabbath.

There is just one text in the Bible which is sometimes referred to as showing that baptism takes the place of circumcision, although it gives no color whatever to that idea. It is Col. 2:10-12, which reads thus: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." The very reading of it shows that baptism is not the

circumcision referred to, because it says, "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," and baptism cannot be administered without hands. This circumcision made without hands is the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," and is the same as the circumcision of the heart, spoken of in Rom. 2:29. It is the spiritual observance of the commandments, which is accomplished only in Christ, see Rom. 8:3, 4; 2 Cor. 5:21. The putting off of the sins of the flesh is the same as the crucifixion of the old man, that the body of sin might be destroyed (Rom. 6:6), or the becoming dead to the law by the body of Christ (Rom. 7:4), and is properly followed by burial with Christ in baptism, as is indicated in Col. 2:10-12. W.

### **"My Lord Delayeth His Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

"True, our Lord delayed his coming, but as a thief suddenly he is coming to many every day, and to all he will finally come at such an hour as we think not." This quotation isn't from the Bible, but from a denominational newspaper. As we read it, we could not help thinking how blind so many professed Christians are upon the simple subject of the coming of the Lord. It will be noticed that the writer of the above takes it for granted that the Lord is coming. How did he learn that truth? Evidently from the Bible. But how could he learn it from the Bible that the Lord is coming, without learning some of the particulars concerning his coming? That is a mystery.

Is the Lord "coming to many every day"? The Scriptures are silent about the many comings. Christ said, "I will come *again*," which means only once more; and Paul plainly declares that he will come "the *second time*." Since Christ is to come only the second time, it is evident that he is not coming to many every day.

Another evidence that the Lord is not coming to many every day, is that when he comes everybody will know it. Said Jesus, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:27. "A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. When he comes, he will possess the throne of his glory, and will come in all the glory of the Father. Matt. 25:31; 16:27. So great will be the glory that it cannot be hid from the eyes of any; so the apostle John says: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." Rev. 1:7.

The extract which we quoted to begin with, implies that Christ comes at the death of individuals. This idea is overthrown by the Scriptures which we have quoted, but we have direct testimony as to how Jesus will come for his saints. Paul said to the Thessalonians that he would not have them in ignorance concerning their dead friends, and gave them some words of comfort. Did he say, "Christ has come and taken your friends to be with him." No; he said, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him [that is from the dead]. . . . For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and



remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:14-17. Thus we find that when the Lord comes he will take all his saints at once and not simply one at a time, and there will be a sound that will not only be heard by all who are upon the earth, but which will penetrate the graves and awake the dead.

It has been eighteen hundred years since our Saviour's first advent, but that is no evidence that his second coming is delayed. If a man tells us that he will come to see us at a certain time some distance

103

in the future, we cannot accuse him of delaying his coming until the set time has passed. Christ did not set any time for his coming, but he gave certain signs, as the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars, which should show it to be near. After rehearsing these signs, he said of his coming, "When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. And then he added: "Verily I say unto you, This generation [*i.e.*, the generation which should witness these signs] shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." So long as any are alive who witnessed these things, there is no reason to say that the Lord delayeth his coming; and Christ's promise that he will come before the generation passes away, cannot fail.

It is true that the signs which the Saviour gave to mark the nearness of his coming, are long in the past. But we are not therefore justified in saying, "My Lord delayeth his coming." None but the evil servant says that, even in his heart. Matt. 24:48-51. True it is that to that servant the Lord will come "in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder." Surely this should serve as a warning against any servant saying that our Lord does delay his coming.

The fact that the signs of Christ's coming have been fulfilled, should lead us to say, not that our Lord delays his coming, but that it must be very near. If we take this position, and watch, we need not be taken unawares. Said Christ: "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Luke 21:34. Paul said: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." 1 Thess. 5:4. "Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." W.

## **"2 Peter 3:10" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother beyond the mountains asks concerning this text, "Does it state that the earth as well as the works is to be burned up? Why is *also* omitted in the Revised Version? May it not be made plain from other scriptures that the earth will not be totally destroyed?"

We think that "also" is correctly omitted in the Revised Version. The Scriptures are very plain upon the point that the earth will not be totally destroyed. On verse 11 Clarke says:-

"All these things shall be dissolved. They will be *separated*, all *decomposed*; but none of them *destroyed*. And as they are the original matter out of which God

formed the terraqueous globe, consequently they may enter again into the *composition* of a new system."

And Barnes, on verse 10, says:-

"So far as the action of fire is concerned, the *form* of the earth may pass away, and its aspect be changed; but, unless the direct power which created it interpose to annihilate it, the *matter* which now composes it will still be in existence. . . . The word rendered *burned up*, like the word just before used and rendered *fervent heat*-a word of the same origin, but here *intensive*-means that they will undergo such a change as fire will produce; not, necessarily, that the matter composing them will be annihilated."

You will be interested and no doubt instructed by reading a sermon by Wesley on this subject.

A few texts of Scripture will place the matter beyond all doubt.

The Saviour said (Matt. 5:5), "The meek shall inherit the earth." Psalm 37 says the same thing and adds, "Their inheritance shall be forever." Man would never have lost the earth if he had not sinned. By sin the earth is defiled and corrupted; but Paul says of our inheritance that it has been purchased and is waiting for redemption. Eph. 1:14. This can refer only to the earth.

We may conclude from the words of Peter that the new earth will bear the same relation to the "earth which now is," that this bears to the earth which was before the flood. There can be no doubt then, when the "fountains of the great deep were all broken up," and the "windows of heaven were opened," that the face of nature was so changed that everything looked new and strange to Noah. And so will it be when the fire has passed upon the earth, melting the elements and turning the "into a lake of fire;" when it comes forth beautified and free from every sign of the curse, well may it be called "a new earth." The most important point is that we heed the admonition of the apostles in verses 11-14 of this chapter.

### **"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

The next statement that is made is the following:-

"Sometimes they made collections for the poor. What day did Paul request them to attend to that? Was it the seventh day, the Jewish Sabbath? No; Paul said (1 Cor. 16:2): 'Upon the first *day of the week* let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' Why should the first day of the week be designated instead of any other, unless it was a special day set apart for religious purposes?"

Like many other Sunday advocates, Dr. Bailey needs only to find the words "first day of the week" in a text, in order to have an argument for Sunday. No matter what the subject of the text is, if it contains the expression, "first day of the week," that seems to be sufficient to convince them that Sunday is the Sabbath. On this text we have this to say: Paul did not tell them to attend to the business

on the seventh day of the week, because it involved work which should not be done upon the Sabbath. The poor saints in Jerusalem needed help, and Paul had taken upon himself the work of securing contributions from the Gentile converts. See Gal. 2:9, 10. And now in pursuance of this duty, he writes to the brethren in Corinth, directing them to each one by himself lay by in store a certain amount, according as he had been prospered. The amount to be laid by could only be determined by a consideration of the business of the preceding week, so that he might know what his profits had been. There is no more similarity between what he directed them to do and the modern church collection, than there is between daylight and darkness. That these contributions were not taken to the church and there placed in the contribution box, is shown by what Paul wrote to these same brethren in his second epistle a year later. We quote:-

"For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready; lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up before hand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness." 2 Cor. 9:1-5.

Note the expressions in the above. Paul had boasted of the forwardness of the Corinthian brethren, and had thereby stirred up many to contribute liberally. Some of these liberal brethren of Macedonia were going with Paul to Jerusalem, and he feared that he might possibly arrive in Corinth and find the Corinthian brethren unprepared with their donation. In that case, both he and they would be put to shame before the Macedonian brethren. To guard against this possibility, he sent some of the brethren ahead to gather up the individual contributions, so that everything might be ready when he should come. This text is of itself sufficient refutation of the assumption that in 1 Cor. 16:2 Paul directed the brethren to make a collection in church on the first day of the week.

In further proof that these weekly contributions were not to be made in church, we cite the words of the text itself: "Let every one of you lay *by him* in store." Whoever can see in this a direction to put money in the church contribution box, might naturally be supposed to find in the first clause of the fourth commandment a direction to keep the first day. The man who drops his penny into the box or plate which the deacon passes before him in church, puts his money *away from him*, and not *by him*. The following translations of this clause will be sufficient to convince anybody that the contributions were not to be made in church:-

"Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, 'by one's self, *i.e.*, at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, '*apud soi*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martir, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chuz soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bci such scffrest*,' by himself at home. The Dutch, '*by hemslven*,' same as the

German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se,*' in his own presence at home. The Spanish of Felipe Sico, '*en su casa,*' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso,*' with himself. The Swedish, '*nuce sig sief,*' near himself. I know not how much the list of authorities might be swelled; for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."-*J. W. Morton, Former Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.*

The next "argument" from Scripture is the following:-

"In writing to the Colossians, Paul says (Col. 2:16); 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath day.' . . . This letter to the Colossians was written by Paul thirty years after Christ's death and resurrection. Thus we see that the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week."

Here again the Doctor has evidently quoted from memory; for in the text the last expression is plural instead of singular, thus, "of the Sabbath days," and not "of the Sabbath day." How from this text he finds his conclusion that "the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week," is entirely beyond our comprehension; for the text makes no mention of the first day of the week. Let us see what the text really means. We quote it together with the seventeenth verse, which the Doctor found it convenient to omit:-

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

Here we have holy days, new moons, and the Sabbath days, which are shadows of things in the work of Christ. This shows that Paul has reference to the ceremonial ordinances which were introduced after the fall and the promise of the Messiah. The twenty-third chapter of Leviticus contains a record of the appointment of these Sabbath days. It will be noticed that they are all connected with meats and drinks (see verse 27); and, further, that they are entirely distinct from the Sabbath of the Lord (verse 38). In the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day of the week, there is nothing shadowy,-which prefigures Christ,-because it was given in Eden when man was first created, and when there was no need of a sacrifice being made. In the text in Colossians Paul has not the slightest reference to the Sabbath of the Lord. In the preceding verse he has stated that the law of types and shadows had been nailed to the cross; since it consisted only of shadows, it necessarily ceased when the substance came; and therefore Paul says that no one need be judged for the performance or nonperformance of its provisions. To show that this conclusion is not a new idea of our own we quote the following:-

"The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals; such as the new moons, and particular Sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done

away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere the 'remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time."-*Clarke, on Col. 2:16.*

104

"The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to *the* Sabbath properly so called. There is no evidence, from this passage, that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe *any* holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to declare that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number-'*the* Sabbath'-it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to affirm that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not on the *moral* law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law-no one of the ten commandments-could be spoken of as "a *shadow* of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation."-*Barnes's Notes on Col. 2:16.*

The Doctor's "Scripture proof" of the proposition that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, closes with the following:-

"In the closing book of the divine record, sixty years after the resurrection, the apostle John, who had leaned on Jesus's breast at the supper, exclaims, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Rev. 1:10. He held it in precious observance; and the Spirit, which was given so abundantly at Pentecost on the seventh Lord's day, comes again to John sixty years later so richly that he says: 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Thus not only the Christians at Jerusalem, but at Troas, Corinth, Colosse, and John in Patmos, places many hundred miles apart, are keeping the Lord's day, the first day of the week, as the Christians' day of religious worship, or the Christians' Sabbath. The order of things, as we have seen, was sanctioned by Christ and the Holy Spirit immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and established by the inspired apostles wherever they preached the gospel. I have now presented the scriptural proofs of these facts."

What does Rev. 1:10 prove? Simply this: that John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. The "reasoning" which allows that text to be used as a proof of Sunday sacredness is unworthy of a child. The apostle uses the term "Lord's day," and straightway grave doctors of divinity will assume that he must necessarily mean Sunday. And what is the ground of this assumption? Simply this: that a few hundred years after the days of the apostles, men began to call Sunday the Lord's day, and that custom has obtained quite general sanction in the Christian church. Now because men at the present day call Sunday the Lord's day, they assume that John must have done the same. Thus they interpret

the Bible according to their own ideas and practices, instead of regulating their ideas and practices by the Bible. A more pernicious method of using the Bible cannot be conceived. It is by this sort of reasoning that the Catholic Church upholds the worship of images and all of its other abominations; and from that church professed Protestants have borrowed it in order to uphold the Papal institution of Sunday. Throughout the New Testament we find no sacred title applied to the first day of the week. It is nowhere called the Sabbath, and nowhere is it said to be the Lord's day or a holy day. It is simply called the first day of the week. If we could find one text stating that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, that would be sufficient, and we might then conclude that the apostle had reference to Sunday in Rev. 1:10; but in that case we should never hear our Sunday friends quote this latter text in favor of Sunday; they would most assuredly take the text which contained the proof.

But is it possible for us to know what day is referred to in Rev. 1:10? Certainly. The fourth commandment says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:10. The Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, expressly mentions the Sabbath as his day, thus: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day." Isa. 58:13. And Jesus, when the Jews had falsely accused him of breaking the Sabbath, said: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. These texts prove most emphatically that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, the day which the Jews observed,-the seventh day of the week,-is the Lord's day. No other day of the week is entitled to that appellation.

We have now examined all the Scripture evidence that can be brought to bear in favor of Sunday as the Sabbath. And what have we found? No argument whatever, but evidence to show that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath. But suppose we had found that the disciples had held religious meetings on Sunday; suppose it were true that the meeting on the evening of Christ's resurrection was a religious service, and that the gathering "after eight days" could be shown to have fallen within the compass of a week of seven days, and that it also was a religious meeting, what would be lacking to couple this argument in favor of Sunday sacredness? The essential element of proof would be lacking. No matter if we might have found the disciples meeting every first day, we could not call it the Sabbath unless the Bible called it so. Without a Bible statement authorizing the change, no man has a right to suppose that any change has been made. Those who would regard Sunday as the Sabbath, might learn a lesson from Balaam of old, who said: "If Balak would give me is house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." Num. 22:18. W.

### **"Immortality of Angels" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

In place of the regular Sabbath-school which would be commented upon this week, we occupy the space in answering the following questions concerning the angels. Since the ministration of angels is the subject of the present series of

lessons, these notes will not be devoid of interest to the Sabbath-school scholars, as side lights.

"Do the angels now have immortality? If they do, how are we to understand 1 Tim. 6:15, 16, where it is stated that God only has immortality? This text is often used to prove that no part of man is immortal; why does it not prove the same with reference to the angels, or even of Christ himself?"

Immortality is unending existence; it is exemption from death. Christ says of those who shall gain the world to come, that they cannot die any more, because they shall be equal unto the angels. Luke 20:35, 36. This indicates plainly that the angels cannot die, and that they are therefore immortal. And yet it is a truth that God only has immortality. This seeming paradox is explained by John 5:26, 27, where we read: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." God has "life in himself;" he is immortal by nature. He not only has life for himself, but he has life to bestow upon others. "The gift of God is eternal life."

It is in this sense that God only has immortality. He is self-existent, and his existence is self-perpetuating. He is the source of all life. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." The angels, when they were created, were placed upon probation. Some of them sinned, and "kept not their first estate," and they are kept "in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," when they will utterly perish. Others remained loyal to God, and are now confirmed in immortality. But they, just as will be the case with the redeemed saints, depend upon God, the source of life, for their immortality, and they have no power to confer immortality upon others.

The case of Christ is different. He is the only begotten Son of God. As such he not only possesses immortality, but he possesses the power to confer immortality upon others. Thus we read: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26. And again: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Verse 21. This life which Christ has in himself, and which he can bestow upon others, was not given to him after a successful probation, for Christ was never placed on probation, as created beings are. He was *by inheritance* a more exalted name and station than even the angels. Heb. 1:3, 4. All that he has, is his by inheritance; immortality, and the power of bestowing it upon others, is his by virtue of his being the Son of God.

This statement concerning Christ does not at all militate against the statement that God only hath immortality; for Christ is God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1:1. Whatever attributes belong to the Father, belong also to the Son. When we read that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we must understand the term "God" as including both the Father and the Son, for without the Word "was not anything made that was made." And so the Father "hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." John 5:22, 23.

"Is there any Scripture authority for speaking of Gabriel's trump as the one that shall raise the dead?"

None whatever. The angel Gabriel is on high in position in the courts of Heaven, as we learn from the mention of him. He was commissioned to make it known to Daniel the interpretation of his visions. See Dan. 8:16; 9:20-22. He was also sent to foretell the birth of John the Baptist, when his words "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God" (Luke 1:19), seem to imply a more intimate relation to God than that of ordinary angels. From Rev. 22:6 we conclude that the work of revealing secrets to the prophets is intrusted to one certain angel. The angel who showed John the wonders recorded in Revelation, said, "I am thy fellow servant, and [the fellow-servant] of thy brethren the prophets." Then Gabriel was the one who talked with John. This view is strengthened by Rev. 1:1, where we learn that Christ saw a . . . angel to convey his messages. Thus: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he [Christ] sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John."

But it is the voice of the Archangel that shall raise the dead (1 Thess. 4:16, 17), and the name of the Archangel is Michael. Jude 9. Michael, the Archangel, is none other than Christ, for it is the voice of the Son of God that causes those who are in their graves to come forth. John 5:28, 29. The trumpet that sounds is the "trump of God." Only once in the history of the world has that trumpet sounded, and that was when the Archangel, the Son of God, spoke the ten commandments from Mount Sinai. Then the earth quaked. When it sounds at the last day, not only does the earth quake, but heaven also. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

"With what day of the year in the Roman (or common) calendar does the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar correspond? Is it the 22nd of October? If so, please explain. "W. T. H."

There is no fixed day of the Roman calendar which corresponds to the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month. This is due to the fact that, like our months, Jewish months differ in length, and that every second or third year an extra month is inserted, so that some years have thirteen months. Last year the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar came on October 10; this year it will come on September 28.

In a recent murder trial in San Francisco, the jury disagreed, ten of the jurymen voting for acquittal. One of the two who held out for the punishment of the criminal, quoted from the Bible in support of his opinion, and the papers are making a great ado about it. One paper says that the dissenting juror, in reply to a question, said that he believed that the sun stood still at the command of Joshua, "and that, as stated in the Bible, the sun went round the earth, and that the earth is flat." The newspapers furnish us with a great amount of information about the Bible, which we could never find out by the Bible itself. The man who can find the statement in the Bible, that the sun ever "went" around the earth, or



that the earth is flat, will be entitled to a hearing through the columns of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

"Is it right for Seventh-day Adventists to join themselves to the Good Templar Lodge? Does the Bible approve of it? A. R."

No; it is not right for Seventh-day Adventists, or anybody else professing to be Christian, to join any secret society. There is nothing in the Bible to justify secret societies, but much to condemn them. Said Christ, "In secret have I said nothing." The church is the recognized body of Christ, and to it is intrusted all reforms. It is the only true benevolent society in existence. It is only when the church loses sight of its legitimate work here on earth that its members join secret societies. Moreover, secret societies are incompatible with true freedom; for whoever pledges himself to something of which he is ignorant, becomes a voluntary slave.

The *Christian at Work* has settled the question of communion wine. It is confident that unfermented wine ought never to be used, because it claims that unfermented wine is not wine at all. But then it doesn't think the wine should be strong; if it has anything fermented about it, that is sufficient. Its reason for this is the extraordinary *discovery* that the wine with which our Saviour celebrated the Supper with his disciples, was "a light claret mixed one-half with water"! It beats all how much more some people know than what is written. And now, since the Bible says nothing about wine of any kind at the institution of the Lord's Supper, but simply mentions "the cup," and "the fruit of the vine," will the *Christian at Work* or some other wise body please tell us what kind of a vine produces "a light claret mixed one-half with water"? The only "fruit of the vine" of which we have any knowledge, is grapes, and the unfermented juice thereof.

A subscriber asks if question 2 of the Sabbath-school lesson in SIGNS of January 20, entitled, "Who the Angels Are," is answered correctly. We answer, No; angels are not mentioned in any of the following books of the Bible: Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Ruth, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Esther, Proverbs, Solomon's Son, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Titus, James, and 1, 2, and 3 John. We printed the lesson that week as it was sent to us, without giving it careful examination as we ought. We have not yet got beyond making mistakes ourselves, nor overlooking them in copy furnished by others, but we aim to be correct, and are anxious to make amends when our attention is called to a blunder.

This mistake, however, does not detract from the truth intended to be taught by the lesson. If angels were mentioned only once in the Bible, their existence would be as fully proved as if they were mentioned on every page. Every statement made by Inspiration is true; and truth cannot be made more true by repetition.

Sunday morning February 13, the brigantine *Tahiti* arrived in San Francisco, thirty days from Tahiti, bringing home Brother J. I Tay, who has been absent on a missionary tour in some of the islands of the Pacific since the first of last July. He is in good health, and reports a most prosperous trip. We hope to be able to give some items from him next week's SIGNS.

## **"Sunday in Massachusetts" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Judiciary Committee of the Boston Common Council, to whom was referred an order for the mayor to petition the Legislature for such modifications of the Massachusetts Sunday law as may be necessary, have reported, and the report, together with the full text of the proposed new act, is printed in the *Boston Herald* of January 28. From the report it seems that the Sunday law of Massachusetts is the same now as when enacted in 1672, except that compulsory church attendance ceased in 1836. The committee say that inasmuch as this law was framed before there was a single city in the State, whereas more than half of the present population is in cities, and inasmuch as the introduction of steamboats, railroads, and other modern inventions has materially changed the habits of the people, the time has come for such a revision of the law as shall recognize existing facts. They say that it is not true that there has been any desire to appropriate any portion of Sunday to the purposes of business, but that while labor organizations demand the reservation of Sunday as a day of rest from toil, there is an equal demand for a cessation of unreasonable and superstitious restrictions. They also claim that the radical difference between town and country life prevents the possibility of any one single law being equally applicable to both.

Speaking of those who observe the seventh day of the week, the report says:-

"Nearly all of these persons are Israelites, but the great majority are shop-keepers, and are thereby debarred from earning their living on Sunday, after giving up Saturday as a matter of principle. This large class of our citizens, one which is noted for its sobriety, economy, and respect to our laws, is increasing in number daily, and is entitled to some special legislation. It is a curious anomaly that when the Puritans reestablished the Jewish Sabbath in practice [that is, with respect to the strictness of observance], they selected another day of the week, without any Scriptural warrant therefore. The result is that they especially punish the Israelites, who alone have perpetuated and believed in the real Sabbath of the Old Testament."

They also enunciate the following truth, which, in the zeal for rigid Sunday laws, is being quite generally forgotten:-

"If it be true that mankind is entitled to one day of rest in every week, it is no less true that mankind is entitled to six days of lawful work in every seven."

In harmony with the above principle, the proposed act provides that,

"Any person belonging to any recognized religious sect, who conscientiously and habitually refrains from work on Saturday, may carry on any secular trade or business on Sunday, within his own house, shop, or working place; provided that he does not thereby annoy any religious assembly during their hours of worship."

There are some other features which we shall notice at another time. We shall await with interest the action of the Massachusetts Legislature on this proposed amendment to the Sunday law of that State. While it grants to Sabbath-keepers the right to quietly labor on Sunday, it guards the day in a very strict manner. It is

simply a proposal to make, in a law which is itself unwarranted, a single concession in behalf of justice. If it should be rejected, it will indicate a degree of bigotry which will show that this is anything but an "enlightened age."

**February 24, 1887**

**"Concealed Infidelity" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

"The gentle Nazarene did not die to become an atonement for the sins of a fallen world, but to set an example to mankind of fidelity to principle, even unto death. His pure life and noble teachings speak to the soul now as never before."

The above we find in an editorial in the *Golden Gate*. We would like to ask how the writer found out that there was such a person as the "gentle Nazarene;" how he knows that his life was pure and his teachings noble; and where he learned about his death. The answer must be, in the New Testament; for nowhere else do we find any account of Jesus of Nazareth. There are in one or two profane histories, references to Jesus; but if the Bible had never been written, the world would have no knowledge of the life, character, and teachings of Christ. Whoever, therefore, accepts the truth that there was once a person on earth whose name was Jesus, and that his life was the perfection of purity, and his teachings the perfection of wisdom, must do so solely on the authority of the Bible.

But the same book which gives the history of Christ, tells us the manner and object of his death. Peter says (Acts 2:23) that he was taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain; and he says also, that he "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." 1 Peter 2:24. We read also that righteousness shall be imputed to us, "if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. 4:24, 25. We read again, that "God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. Again we read that we are justified "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Rom. 3:24, 25. The same book which tells about the life of Jesus says, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:5, 6.

These statements concerning the death of Christ might be multiplied indefinitely. They teach plainly that Christ did die as an atonement for sin, and that those who believe in him may be justified from sin. The same book which tells about the noble character and pure teachings of Christ, gives the above reasons for his death. If we accept the first, we cannot reject the other. The one who denies the atonement of Christ, convicts himself of inconsistency when he

professes to believe that Jesus lived and taught. The historical narrative includes the death of Christ as well as his life.

Moreover, Jesus himself said: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3:16, 17. Now the man who says that the teachings of Jesus were pure and noble, and yet says that he did not die for the sins of the world, stultifies himself, for he virtually asserts that Jesus taught that which is not true.

Our object in noticing this statement from the *Golden Gate* is to expose a sort of infidelity that is becoming very common. It is a concealed infidelity, with which Spiritualists expect to entrap many professed Protestant Christians. They refer to the historical narrative of the Bible as though they accepted it fully, and thus gain the confidence of the unwary. Having thus concealed their hatred of the Bible, they proceed to undermine faith in it by perverting its teachings. The infidel who denies the Bible as a whole, rejecting even its historical statements, is not half so dangerous as one who professes a portion of it in order that he may more easily undermine its principles. It is simply an aggravated case of Judas betraying his Lord with a kiss.

It is not Spiritualists alone, however, who do this sort of thing. There are thousands who call themselves Christians, who segregate the Bible, calling this or that portion uninspired and throwing it overboard, if it runs counter to their preconceived opinions or perverse practices. If everyone who makes a profession of Christianity, should awake some morning and find the Bible or Bibles in his possession a perfect blank, with the exception of those portions which he really believed, there would be few whole Bibles in existence, and the supply of blank paper would largely exceed the demand. W.

### **"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

We now come to the examination of "proofs from church history." Under this head Dr. Bailey begins thus:-

"Mosheim, one of the most reliable of church historians, and chancellor of the University of Gottingen from 1747 to 1775, in Vol. I, p. 45, says: 'All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the *first day of the week* on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.'

In Murdock's Mosheim (book 1, cent. I, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 40, we find a statement somewhat similar to the one which Dr. Bailey credits to Mosheim, but it is not expressed in nearly so strong language. We presume the Doctor quoted from Maclaine's translation, which is well known to be a paraphrase of Mosheim,

rather than a translation. But we will accept the quotation just as it is given to us, for it is of no importance anyway. According to the quotation given, Mosheim states that the observance of the first day of the week was founded "upon the express appointment of the apostles." Now where did he learn this? Did Mosheim have access to some writings of the apostles that we have not? Is it true that we have only a fragment of the Bible, and that somewhere there are inspired writings hidden away, which no one but Dr. Mosheim has been privileged to see? If there are such documents, and if Mosheim found in them an "express appointment of the apostles," fixing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, it seems as though he might have had the goodness to give less favored mortals the exact words of that "express appointment." But we have never heard of any Protestant so bold as to claim that there are in existence inspired writings of the apostles, other than those contained in the New Testament. Now if the apostles did expressly appoint the first day of the week as the Sabbath, that appointment may be read by everybody. Why, then, did not Dr. Bailey quote direct from the apostles, instead of saying that Mosheim says so? Simply because the apostles never made any such appointment. If they had, the reader may rest assured that Dr. Bailey would have given it in his "Scripture proofs."

Right here it will be worth while to remind the reader that the apostles were not law givers. They had no authority to appoint a Sabbath day. All that they were commissioned to do was to declare the words of Christ. See Matt. 28:19, 20. But even Mosheim does not profess to make the statement credited to him, on the authority of the apostles. He states that it "appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers," that this example was derived from the appointment of the apostles. We accept Mosheim as a standard church historian, but when he tells us what the apostles did, he is on ground where the most unlearned can judge of the truth of what he says. Although he was a very learned man, there is not a child fourteen years of age who may not be just as well informed as to what the apostles said and did as he was. Mr. Bailey's argument from history is simply this: He says that the apostles kept Sunday, and appointed its observance. We ask him what authority he has for such a statement, and he says that Dr. Mosheim says so, and Dr. Mosheim says, "The most credible writers" say so. There is altogether too much "they say" about this. We should prefer to hear the apostles themselves speak. They are "the most credible writers" of whom we have any knowledge. Since the custom of the early church has been stated, we might cite a few instances from history. In note 4 of the section before referred to, Mosheim says: "Perhaps also Good Friday, the Friday on which our Saviour died, was from the earliest times regarded with more respect than other days of the week." Again he says:-

"The Christians assembled for the worship of God in private dwelling-houses, in caves, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the first day of the week, and here and there on the seventh day, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Most of them likewise held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter on which he was crucified."-*Book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 3.*

We hope that our friends who observe the first day of the week on the authority of Dr. Mosheim, will show their consistency by keeping also Wednesday and Friday.

Two or three quotations are also made from Neander, but as they are to the same effect, simply telling what certain professed Christians did, we will not stop to repeat them. We are not so much interested in what some people may have done, as we are in what the Bible commands *us* to do. Even the best intentioned people do not always do what they ought to do. In Gal. 2:12, 13, we find that even the apostles Barnabas and Peter were at one time guilty of dissimulation, but we do not therefore conclude that we ought to do the same.

Before leaving this part of the subject we will, however, give one of Mr. Bailey's quotations from Neander with his comments thereon:-

"Again Neander says: 'Those churches however which were composed of Jewish Christians, though they admitted with the rest the festival of Sunday, yet retained also that of the Sabbath; and it was from these that the custom became general in the Eastern churches of distinguishing this day as well as Sunday.' That is, the custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first, arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?"

This quotation shows that Christians in the early days observed the seventh day of the week, and Mosheim in the same paragraph from which a quotation has already been made, says that for doing this "*the other Christians taxed them with no wrong.*" This proves positively that those in early church who observed the first day of the week did not do so because of any apostolic appointment, and that they did not know of any such appointment; for if they had, they would have taxed those who did not follow it with doing wrong. These facts prove what Dr. Scott says in his comment on Acts 20:7:-

"The change from the seventh to the first day of the week appears to have been gradually and silently introduced, by example rather than by express precept."

Mr. Bailey says: "The custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?" We say most emphatically, No, to both sentences. We do not want to follow the example of anybody, in direct opposition to inspired teaching. And we say also that the custom of keeping the seventh day did not

arise from "Judaizing Christians," but from the commandment of Jehovah, who said in thunder tones from Mount Sinai: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." We would that some people's professed fear of acting contrary to inspired teaching had more sincerity in it. All of the ten commandments were given to the Jews, who differed no more from the heathen around them in that they kept the seventh day, than they did in that they abstained from blasphemy and theft. Those who refuse to

keep the Sabbath, lest they be like the Jews, can be consistent only by rejecting the entire Decalogue. W.  
(*To be continued.*)

### **"Is It Strange?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time since, a religious writer of considerable prominence, in commenting upon the resurrection of Dorcas, said:-

"Imagine Dorcas's surprise when she first opened her eyes. Here she was back in the world again. How strange it is to discover that no one of those persons who were raised from the dead ever attempted to tell the story of what they saw or heard."

The grave is spoken of as that "undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler returns;" but as a matter of fact many have returned, yet none have ever opened their lips to relate what they heard or saw while dead. Now if the dead are conscious, this is passing strange. If it be true that death is simply the separation of the soul from the body, which has acted as a clog to it, restricting its free exercise, why is it that in those instances where the soul has been returned to its lodgment, no note is made of the wonderful things learned while it was permitted to expand unrestrained?

We say that it is indeed wonderful that no revelations have been made of what is beyond, if, as the poet says, death is only transition, and the soul is more acutely conscious in death than it ever was during life; but we do not bring forward the fact that no such revelation has been made, as proof that the dead are not conscious. We have proof of a more satisfactory nature, which clears the subject of all doubt, and explains why those who have been raised from the dead were silent as to what took place during their absence from among the living. The testimony is abundant, but we have space here for only following:-

Those who are dead are asleep: "Consider and hear me, O Lord my God; lighten mine eyes, lest I *sleep the sleep of death.*" Ps. 13:3. "It is in vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows; for so he giveth his beloved *sleep.*" Ps. 127:2. "And many of them that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. 12:2. "In their heat I will make them feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and *sleep a perpetual sleep*, and not wake, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:30. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15:16-18. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep.*" "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thess. 4:13, 14.

People who are in a sound sleep are entirely unconscious of what is going on, and the Bible says that the dead are unconscious: "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom,

in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. 9:5, 10. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:3, 4.

Many more texts might be added but these are sufficient for our purpose. They are direct statements of fact, and need no explanation. There are only two things that can be done with them: Either accept them as literally true, or reject them altogether. But if we accept the Bible as the infallible word of God, we are not left to wonder why those who have been raised from the dead never told the story of what they saw or heard. They had none to tell. They were unconsciously sleeping, and were unable to take note of passing events. Then it is not a strange thing after all.

But there is one strange thing about this matter, and that is how, in the face of all these Bible texts, a Doctor of Divinity could write such a paragraph as that quoted at the beginning of this article. W.

### **"Scripture Statements vs. Conjecture" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

We cannot refrain from expressing the wish that the writers of the Sunday-school lesson notes in some of the religious papers, would occasionally read what the Bible says upon the subject of the lesson. If they should, it would save them from some egregious blunders, and would be a mercy to the pupils whose ideas are moulded in large measure by the lesson notes in their favorite journals. The lesson entitled "Lot's choice" was improved by nearly everyone to moralize on the wickedness of Lot. The *Christian Standard* writer ended his sentimentalism as follows:-

"Lot pitched his tent towards Sodom, then entered the city, ceased to be shocked by its gross sins and idolatry, was humiliated by being captured and plundered by the five kings. His soul hardened against even such direct warnings as angel messengers from Heaven. At last forced to flee from the city empty-handed, and look back on what once seemed the garden of the Lord, as a fiery furnace, he makes his home in the caves of the earth, and finally ends life a drunken outcast, dishonored by men and disowned by God."

Now read in 2 Peter 2:4-8 that God condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah with an overthrow, turning them into ashes, "and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds)."

Lot may have been selfish in his choice of territory, although the Scripture nowhere gives any intimation of such a thing. But we do have emphatic testimony to his righteousness, and that he himself was uncontaminated by the horrible wickedness around him, and from which he suffered greatly. Unscriptural morals are among the worst things written.

In this connection we would call attention to the International Lesson Notes that are given every week in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. The writer indulges in no guess-work, but directs the student's attention solely to the Bible. Sunday-



school teachers and students will find it to their advantage to read the Commentary Department in the SIGNS. Those notes alone will more than make up for the price of the paper.

### **"The Lord's Prayer" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ was on earth he prayed often, sometimes spending whole nights in prayer. Of course none of these prayers are recorded. We have, however, the record of several prayers which he offered in public, prominent among which are the prayer at the grave of Lazarus, and the one for his disciples, just before his betrayal and crucifixion. But neither of these is referred to by the term, "the Lord's prayer." That prayer is the brief petition which our Saviour gave as a model for all prayers. And a model it is indeed. It comprehends everything that it is possible for man to desire from God. There are no circumstances or conditions in life that are not covered by this petition. Yet this must be understood as applying to followers of Christ, and not to unconverted persons, even though they be convicted of sin. This will appear in the course of our comments upon the prayer.

There is no other form of words ever devised which can be used as a prayer over and over again for years, and still retain its freshness. This is simply because this one was given by One who knew man's needs. But our Saviour did not design that his disciples should simply repeat the words which he gave them. This is evident from the introduction: "*After this manner* therefore pray ye." It was designed as we have said, as a comprehensive model. Let us consider it well, that we may henceforth pray with more of the Spirit and the understanding.

### **"OUR FATHER"**

What tenderness is expressed in those words! What infinite condescension it reveals on the part of God to allow poor, frail mortals to address him thus. His greatness is unsearchable and his ways past finding out. Before him, "The nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity." Isa. 40:15-17. He walks "upon the wings of the wind" (Ps. 104:3); he "hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet." Nahum 1:3. And yet this awful God has the tenderness of a parent, and his ear is open to the supplications of those who whisper, even in faintest accents, "Our Father;" for we are told that "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." Ps. 103:13. Although God is the "high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," he has assured us that he dwells with him that is "of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." Isa. 57:15. Thus the first words of the Lord's prayer bring us into the most intimate relation with the great Creator.

Even in the first word alone there is a great truth conveyed. It shows the relation of those who can call God Father. They are brethren, having common hopes and needs. Even in his secret devotions, the Christian is not to make his petitions wholly personal. He is not to be shut up to his own needs, but is to remember that he is only one of a great family, whose welfare ought to be with him scarcely second to his own. Paul wrote to the Romans: "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers." Rom. 1:9. It is possible for a person to be selfish even in his petitions for overcoming grace; but it will be found in that case, as in all others, that selfishness defeats itself. Every Christian will bear witness to the fact that the richest blessings have come to him when, even though almost overwhelmed with a sense of his own need, he has coupled his petition for pardon and strength, with a request for a blessing upon others besides himself. And so, even in the closet, we are to say, "Our Father."

It is not everybody, however, who can say, "Our *Father*." We hear much of the "Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," but the Bible says nothing about such a thing. All men are not sons of God. Paul reminds the Ephesians of the time before they were converted, saying, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:12. In the first verses he shows still more plainly that men are not by nature the children of God. He says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were *by nature the children of wrath*, even as others." Again the apostle warns the Ephesian brethren against the sins to which they had formerly been addicted, saying, "For because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." Eph. 5:6. See also Col. 3:6.

123

But the plainest statement of all, that men are not by nature the children of God, was given by our Saviour himself. To the wicked Jews who said, "We have one Father, even God," he said: "If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. . . . Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." John 8:41-44. Putting these texts together, we learn that all who know not God are the children of wrath; they are the children, or recipients, of wrath, because they are children of disobedience because they are the children of the devil. Now a person cannot at the same time be a child of God and a child of Satan. Nor is it necessary that one should be as hardened as were the Jews to whom Christ spoke, in order that they may be called children of Satan. "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." John 8:34. If a person is a child of disobedience and of darkness, he is not a child of God. "All have sinned;" and therefore none are by nature children of God.

How do people become children of God? If they are not natural children, it must be by adoption. So Paul says: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba [Father], Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8:14-17. In like manner he writes to the Galatians: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." Gal. 4:4-7.

In the above text it will be noticed that the Spirit is the pledge of our adoption. It is called the Spirit of adoption, because only those who have it are sons of God. Indeed, its reception constitutes us sons of God. If we are children, then we are heirs of God; and so Paul says that the Spirit is "the earnest [or pledge] of our inheritance." Eph. 1:14.

If we are heirs of God, we are joint heirs with Christ. All that Christ has or is to have, we shall have also. He is the Son of God by birth; the only begotten Son of God. Angels are the sons of God (Job 38:7) by creation. Adam was a son of God in the same way, only a little lower than the angels. If he had not sinned against God, his descendants would like him have been sons of God. But he transferred his allegiance to Satan, and so no man from Adam down can be a son of God except by adoption. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3.

From this brief study of the Scripture it is clearly evident that since the Lord's prayer begins, "Our Father," it cannot be used by one who is not a child of God. For those who are in a state of nature, and thus children of wrath, there is another prayer. It is, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." They cannot address the Creator as Father, but only as God, the Judge who, however, is able to save as well as to destroy. If they have once been adopted into the family of God, and have lost their heirship through sin, the same prayer is applicable. With David, under like circumstances, they may cry: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions." "Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities." "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit." But only those with whose spirits the Spirit of God bears witness that they are children of God, can with confidence repeat the tender words, "Our Father."

Yet not a long time must the sinner lie a suppliant at the throne of God, unable to utter those words. God is longing for the world to become reconciled to him. When the prodigal son, who had forfeited his right to a place in his father's house, said, "I will arise, and go unto my father," not as a son but as a servant seeking mercy, his father met him while he was yet a long way off. He met him not as a master, but as a father. The humble prodigal did not have time to call

himself a servant before he was embraced as a son. And so, although no one in a state of nature can properly repeat the Lord's prayer, at the first sincere petition for mercy, which the repentant sinner puts up to God, the Spirit of God is sent forth into his heart, and he becomes a son, and can confidently and joyfully say, Father, Father. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a significant statement in Kate Foote's last Washington letter to the *Independent*. She says: "Washington needs hospitals. At present there is only one which receives an appropriation from Congress,-the Catholic hospital." Straws show which way the wind blows.

Elder C. I. Boyd, of Oregon, is spending a few days visiting with friends in Oakland and Healdsburg. Last Sabbath he preached to the church in Oakland, on the spirituality of the law of God. Elder Boyd is this far on his way East, whence he intends to start some time in May for his new field of labor in South Africa.

Last Friday the overland mails which were snowbound in the Sierras for five days began to arrive. The experience of the several hundred passengers who were imprisoned in a snow shed for five days, was not pleasant, but no accident occurred to any. The *Mariposa*, upon which Brother Byron Belden and wife sailed for Australia, was delayed six days after her regular sailing time, awaiting the arrival of the English mail.

Just as we were closing up this number of the SIGNS, we received a copy of the *Weekly Gazette*, of Little Rock, Arkansas, which contains the speech of Senator Crockett in behalf of those whose conscientious observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, has caused them to be oppressed by the present unjust Sunday law of that State. The Senator speech is in support of a bill which he had introduced, granting immunity to those who keep the Sabbath, and which is referred to by our correspondent, in another column of this paper. We shall publish the speech in our next issue. It is an able effort, and well worth reading.

An Eastern paper says: "A strong temperance movement has been developed in London." And the reason for the statement is formed principally in the fact that upon "a recent Sunday all the drinking places in that great city were closed." But as the saloons continue running as usual six days in the week we fail to see that any great strength has been developed in behalf of *temperance*. To close saloons only on Sunday is to tacitly admit that the liquor business is legitimate on all other days. "Sunday closing" and "high license" are not in the interests of prohibition; for the more "respectable" and law abiding the saloon business becomes, the more dangerous it is, and the harder to suppress altogether.

Some time ago we were taken severely to task for designating as Mormons those people who masquerade under the high-sounding and pretentious title of the "Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints." A late number of a paper published in Oakland by one of this sect has found its way into our hands, and in it we find a long eulogy of Joe Smith, the founder of Mormonism,

an extract from the "Book of Mormon," and a fierce onslaught upon Congress and the Federal Courts for the "persecution" of the Utah polygamists. Surely this *is* Mormonism. It should be understood by all, that any who eulogize Joe Smith, and who profess to be his followers, must be, theoretically, at least, in favor of polygamy, for he introduced the Turkish harem into the United States, as the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" plainly shows.

Last Friday evening, February 18, a meeting was held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, to discuss the merits of the Sunday bill which is now before both Houses of the California Legislature. Addresses were made by Lawyer Fox and Dr. Briggs, of Napa. Two leading clergy of Oakland occupied the stand. The bill now under consideration prohibits all labor on Sunday, but provides for the exception of those who conscientiously believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and who actually observe it, provided they do not disturb any Sunday observer by their labor. We have not space to give any report of the meeting, but will simply say that the remarks which elicited the most applause, both from the clergy and the people, were those in which the speakers declared that no exception should be made in favor of anybody, even though they kept Sabbath strictly, and did not disturb anybody by their labor on Sunday. The section exempting Sabbath-keepers was severely criticized. They do not expect the bill to be passed at this session of the Legislature, but they say that they must agitate the matter so thoroughly that the next Legislature will not dare to refuse what they want. Agitate, agitate, agitate, is their cry. We propose to help them. Next week we shall give some space to the bill and to their discussion of it.

It is no slight testimonial to the care with which our news columns are gotten up, that our exchanges copy the items quite largely. Some of the most "live" papers sometime transfer our news matter almost bodily to their columns, and thereby show their good taste. It is doubtless enterprise like this which makes them live papers. None of our matter is copyrighted, and we are glad to be of use to others. We think we can say to our patrons, without fear of contradiction, that there is no other weekly paper that furnishes the news of the day so fully and so accurately, and at the same time so concise and free from all irrelevant matter, as the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It contains all the news that you could learn from a daily paper, and is free from sensational and vulgar rubbish.

Said Dr. Briggs at the recent Sunday Law Meeting: "The saloon on the 'Lord's day' [Sunday] is full of deadly peril." Well, isn't it full of deadly peril on other days? Is it ever anything else but an unmitigated curse to society? Does it not make paupers and criminals whenever it does anything? Certainly it does, for it has no other work but to make criminals. Then why single out Sunday as the time when it is full of deadly peril? Would Dr. Briggs say, "A murder committed on Sunday is a terrible thing?" If he should it would be true, but would it be any more terrible than if committed on Monday? Such an expression would seem to affirm that it would be. And so his statement concerning saloons on Sunday implies that they are harmless on other days. Yet it is claimed that the Sunday movement is in the interest of temperance! We can demonstrate that it not only is not, but that it tends to the strengthening of the liquor traffic.

The *Interior* says that it would "admit a colored man to membership in our church without hesitation, provided there were no such church of his own accessible; but if there were, we would advise him to go to his own. If this be wrong, then there is no limit this side of the perfect fusion of the two races into a yellow mass inferior to either of them." The *United Presbyterian* calls this "strained reasoning." It is worse than that. It is based on the rapidly growing theory that the church is a society into which none but those of "our set" can be admitted, and that church fellowship is equivalent to admission into "good society." We pity those who have so limited an idea of what Christian fellowship means that they would receive none but those who have been as highly favored by nature as they. The apostle Paul says of those who have "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him," that "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all." What the churches need is more of Christ and less of "society."

He who is satisfied with simply believing the truth, is not entitled to the name Christian. The prayer of the Saviour, Father, "sanctify them through thy truth" (John 17:17), was for all in every age who should believe; and the soul in whom that petition is not being answered may well doubt that he is born of God.

### **"A Sign of the Times" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Princeton Review* for January, there is an article by the late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., of Princeton, on "Religion in the Public Schools," in which the following significant words occur:-

"All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants-disciples of a common Master-to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teachings of our public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics."

The *Occident*, of San Francisco, says of Dr. Hodge's article, "It may be considered a dying legacy of this able and lamented minister." And of the portion in which the above paragraph occurs, it says: "These suggestions are worthy of earnest consideration." Here we have the spectacle of one of the leading Presbyterian divines in the content advocating virtual union with Catholicism, and admitting that Catholics have as much truth as Protestants, and the whole thing approved by his brother Presbyterians. Shades of Knox and Calvin! Where is Protestantism? It has already turned, or is fast turning, Catholic. What the end will be, it needs not a prophet to foresee.

**March 3, 1887**

## **"The Coming of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under this title, after speaking of the several unscriptural and fanciful interpretations which are given to the promise of our Saviour, "I will come again" (John 14:3), the *Methodist Recorder* says:-

Other interpreters regard it, and we think correctly, as referring it, and we think correctly, as referring particularly to the personal appearing of Christ at the end of the world. It is a broad, comprehensive promise, intended not only for the apostles, but for believers in every subsequent age. It is the same as if he had said, "I will not stay always in Heaven; I will, after awhile, at a time which it is not now proper to reveal, come back to you."

The object of Christ's departure from his disciples, as he plainly informs us, was that he might prepare a place for them. And the object of his coming again, he declares, will be to receive them to himself, that where he is, there they may be also. This very clearly shows that his coming again does not refer to his appearance to his disciples after his resurrection, nor to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, but to his second coming, at the end of the world, to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all them that love him.

This visible, personal coming of Christ is that which was announced by the angels to his disciples at his ascension. "This same Jesus," said they, "which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." This is in harmony with the entire teachings of God's word on the subject. The apostle Paul assures us that "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." And, "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." "For," says he again, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

When Christ instituted the last Supper, he commanded his followers to observe it in remembrance of him, until his coming again. The volume of divine truth closes with the blessed assurance of his coming. "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

This is the glorious hope of the church and of every true believer, the return of the Saviour-the coming of the Bridegroom. The church shall not always mourn her absent Head. Believers in Jesus shall not always be left in orphanage. The Master says, "I will come again." Blessed assurance and hope!

## **"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

**THE FATHERSÓTHEIR UNRELIABILITY**

The next head under which Mr. Bailey "proves" his proposition is the testimony of the Fathers. And right here a quotation from the *Examiner and Chronicle*, a standard Baptist paper, is to the point. Some years ago a correspondent of this paper, signing himself Rev. Philetus Dobbs, D. D., stated that he had received a letter from a young minister, asking how he should prove a thing when there is nothing with which to prove it; and a portion of his reply is as follows:-

"I regard, however, a judicious use of the Fathers as being on the whole the best reliance for anyone who is in the situation of my querist. The advantages of the Fathers are twofold: First, they carry a good deal of weight with the masses; and secondly, you can find whatever you want in the Fathers. I do not believe that any opinion could be advanced so foolish, so manifestly absurd, but that you can find passages to sustain it on the pages of these venerable sages. And to the common mind one of these is just as good as another. If it happens that the point that you want to prove is one that never chanced to occur to the Fathers, why you can easily show that they would have taken your side if they had only thought of the matter. And if, perchance, there is nothing bearing even remotely or constructively on the point, do not be discouraged; get a good, strong quotation, and put the name of the Fathers to it, and utter it with an air of triumph; it will be all just as well; nine-tenths of the people do not stop to ask whether a quotation bears on the matter in hand. Yes, my brother, the Fathers are your stronghold. They are Heaven's best gift to the man who has a cause that cannot be sustained in any other way."

The aptness with which this applies to the case in hand will be seen as we proceed. But first we want to give a few quotations to show in what esteem that Fathers are held by some of the best writers, who are themselves first-day observers. We first quote from Mosheim. Speaking of certain works by Clement, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, etc., he says that these works are lost, and adds:-

"But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words like a nut by the shell; and, neglecting the former as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning."-*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part. 2, chap. 3, sec. 5.*

Archdeacon Farrar in his latest work, "History of Interpretation," says of the Fathers:-

"There are but few of them whose pages are not rife with errors,-errors of method, errors of fact, errors of history, of grammar, and even of doctrine; this is the language of simple truth, and not of slighting disparagement."-*Pp. 162, 163.*

On page 164 of the same book, Farrar says:-

"Without deep learning, without linguistic knowledge, without literary culture, without any final principles either as to the nature of the sacred writings or the



method by which they should be interpreted,-surrounded by Paganism, Judaism, and heresy of every description, and wholly dependent on a faulty translation,-the earliest Fathers and apologists add little or nothing to our understanding of Scripture. . . . Their acquaintance with the Old Testament is incorrect, popular, and full of mistakes; their scriptural arguments are often baseless; their exegesis-novel in application only-is a chaos of elements unconsciously borrowed on the one hand from Philo, and on the other from Rabbis and Kabbalists. They claim 'a grace' of exposition, which is not justified by the results they offer, and they suppose themselves to be in possession of a Christian Gnosis, of which the specimens offered are for the most part entirely untenable."

Dr. Clarke in his comment on Proverbs 8 says of the Fathers:-

"But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority, nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine their authority is with me nothing."

Chambers's Encyclopedia says of the Fathers:-

"Of those who head the list, the Apostolic Fathers-so called from their supposed connection with Christ and the apostles-very little need be said, as their writings, which are mostly of an ascetical character, have come down to us in a corrupt and mutilated state, and as the writers themselves owe their chief celebrity to the times in which they happened to live."

We might add many more testimonies to the incompetency and unreliability of the Fathers, but we will pass to notice the special ones which are referred to by Mr. Bailey. He begins thus:-

### **TESTIMONY OF "BARNABAS"**

"Barnabas was a fellow-laborer with Paul. Several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published, believed by many of the best scholars to be genuine, though not inspired. Yet as a witness of the customs of the early churches, we may believe his testimony. General epistle of Barnabas 13:9, 10: 'Lastly he saith unto them, Your new moons and your Sabbaths, I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it; the Sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made, when, resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to the disciples, he ascended into Heaven.' Did not Barnabas know what day the early churches were to keep as the Christian Sabbath?"

We are strongly of the opinion that Mr. Bailey has never seen a set of the writings ascribed to the Fathers. He says "several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published." We have two editions of the Anti-Nicene Fathers, and in neither of them is there more than one epistle ascribed to Barnabas. All the church historians of which we have any knowledge speak of "*the* epistle of Barnabas," but never of the epistles. But that is a matter of no consequence, for if there were forty "epistles of Barnabas" the world would only be so much the

worse off. We will now investigate this so-called "epistle of Barnabas," and its author. Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, in his introductory note to the epistle of Barnabas, published by the Christian Literature Publishing Company, says:-

"The writer of this epistle is supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew of the times of Trajan and Hadrian. He was a layman; but possibly he bore the name of 'Barnabas' and so has been confounded with his holy apostolic namesake."

The original introductory note by those who translated the epistle for the Edinburgh edition contains the following:-

"Nothing certain is known as to the author of the following epistle. The writer's name is Barnabas, but scarcely any scholars now ascribe it to the illustrious friend and companion of St. Paul. . . . On perusing the epistle the reader will be in circumstances to judge of this matter for himself. He will be led to consider whether the spirit and tone of the writing, as so decidedly opposed to all respect for Judaism-the numerous inaccuracies which it contains with respect to Mosaic enactment; and observances-the absurd and trifling interpretations of Scripture which it suggests-and the many silly vaunts of superior knowledge in which its writer indulges-can possibly comport with its ascription to the fellow-laborer of St. Paul. When it is remembered that no one ascribes the epistle to the apostolic Barnabas till the times of Clement of Alexandria, and that it is ranked by Eusebius among the 'spurious' writings, which, however much known and read in the church, were never regarded as authoritative, little doubt can remain that the external evidence is of itself weak, and should not make us hesitate for a moment in refusing to ascribe this writing to Barnabas the apostle. . . . In point of style, both as respects thought and expression, a very low place must be assigned it. We know nothing certain of the region in which the author lived, or where the first readers were to be found."

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:-

"The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian."

Mosheim says:-

"The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was in my judgment the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first] or the next, who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul."-*Book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 21.*

135

These last two quotations show how little is known about the man who wrote this epistle. One supposes that he was a Jew, the other a Gentile, and none pretend to know when he lived.

McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia says:-

"An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him. . . . The writer evidently has unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed the blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed."

Dr. Kitto in his "Encyclopedia of Religious Literature" says:-

"He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; his views of the Old Economy are confused and erroneous; and he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at utter variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable that Barnabas, 'the son of prophecy,' 'the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,' was not the author of this epistle."

Dr. Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," sec. 121, says:-

"A genuine production of Barnabas would doubtless have found a place in the Canon, with the writings of Mark and Luke and the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, the contents of this epistle are not worthy of him. It has many good ideas and forcible testimonies, such as that in favor of the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but it goes to extremes in opposition to Judaism, and indulges in all sorts of artificial, sometimes absurd and allegorical fancies."

But what if he does? What if the epistle is a forgery made by some unknown and irresponsible person? What if its writer was an ignoramus who indulged in the most absurd notions? He gives "valuable testimony" in favor of the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and that is sufficient to secure the epistle a place in "Christian literature" as long as time lasts. It will not be long, we apprehend, before these principles will be carried out to a greater extent, and the vilest man will be welcome in so-called Christian churches, if he is only zealous in his observance of Sunday, and in persecuting those who do not observe it.

But what about this "valuable testimony" given by this fellow who steals the name of Barnabas? Why, he says that "we keep the *eighth day* with joyfulness." Perhaps some admirer of this epistle will tell us when the "eighth day of the week" comes, and how Sunday can be both the first day and the eighth day of a week of seven days. We might quote from the epistle abundance of matter demonstrating the truth of what has been said about it, but much of it is unfit for publication in these columns. We will however give one quotation, which the author of the epistle regarded as much more valuable testimony than that concerning the "eighth day." In the last part of chapter nine he says:-

"Learn, then, my children, concerning all things richly, that Abraham, the first who enjoined circumcision, looking forward in spirit to Jesus, practiced that rite, having received the mysteries of the three letters. For (the Scripture) saith, 'And Abraham circumcised ten, and eight, and three hundred men of his household.' What then was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted-ten by I, and eight by H. You have (the initials of the name of) Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace (of our redemption), by the letter T, he says also. 'Three hundred.' He signifies therefore Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this who has put within us the engrafted gift of his doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy."

With this we leave the pseudo-Barnabas. W.  
(*To be continued.*)

## **"Sunday-Law Meeting in Oakland" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

According to previous appointment in the newspapers of Oakland and San Francisco, a meeting in the interest of a Sunday law was held in Oakland, on the evening of the 18th ult. This meeting was called for the purpose of "discussing the merits" of the bill which was introduced into the Legislature February 15, by Mr. Knox, of Los Angeles. Unlike the convention that was held in San Francisco, last fall, and which was reported in the SIGNS of December 9, this meeting was remarkable for the unanimity of sentiment expressed. The meeting seemed to have been carefully planned, and everybody knew just what was expected of him. The principal speakers of the evening were Mr. Fox, an Oakland criminal lawyer, and Rev. Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Napa. The stand was occupied by quite a number of the leading clergy of Oakland, who manifested their approval of the sentiments expressed, by frequent applause.

As showing how careful the managers of the meeting were to secure perfect harmony, we will state that at the close of the meeting some resolutions favoring a Sunday law were read, and, as reported in the papers, were adopted by "a rising and almost unanimous vote." But we were there, and saw the proceeding. The chairman called for all who favored the resolutions to arise. Perhaps more than half the congregation arose, when the chairman immediately announced, "Carried," without giving any a chance to dissent except by keeping their seats. This is possibly a good way to get a vote "without a single dissenting voice," in order to spur on unwilling legislation, but it is not a good way to convince thinking people of the justice of a cause. Any cause that cannot endure a free expression of opinion, and that is not so strongly entrenched in reason and justice as to be willing to court the fullest investigation, ought to fall by its own weight.

The bill under consideration is known in the lower House as Assembly Bill, No. 520, and reads as follows:-

"SECTION 1. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section two hundred and ninety-nine, which shall read as follows:-

"299. Every person who shall expose to or offer for sale any goods, wares, or merchandise, or shall keep open any store, workshop, or other place of business, bar, or saloon, or shall sell or give away to be drunk as a beverage any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquor, upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:-

"300. Every person who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gaming, or other public sports, exercises, or shows, on Sunday; and any person who shall keep open on Sunday any place where such public sports, exercises, or shows are carried on, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:-

"301. Every person who shall either labor himself or compel his apprentice, servant, or other person under his charge or control, to labor or perform any

work, other than works of necessity or charity, on Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"SEC. 4. This Act shall not extend to any person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as a Sabbath, and who actually observes such Sabbath; *provided*, that in the pursuit of his labor or business he disturbs no other person.

"SEC. 5. Each violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be construed to constitute a separate and complete offense; and for each violation the person or persons offending shall be liable to the penalties provided for any law.

"SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect immediately."

Mr. FOX, the first speaker, read the first four sections of this bill, and then announced himself as unqualifiedly opposed to section 4. Said He: "The strongest argument in favor of a Sunday law is based on the law of nature. It is an argument which is presented by God himself. Everything that lives must have a weekly day of rest, or must suffer. This is a divine command, made manifest through all nature. Hence all civilized nations should provide for the observance of that command; and you cannot provide for it unless you make the day of rest universal. Therefore the Sunday law must not except anybody."

This bit of sophistry was greeted with uproarious applause, the clergy on the stand using both hands and feet vigorously. We cite this to show the spirit actuating those who plead for a Sunday law. We were privately informed by one of the reverend gentlemen who was instrumental in getting up the meeting, that the managers were not responsible for the sentiments expressed by Mr. Fox, and that they did not indorse him. We told him that if that were the case they should have disavowed such sentiments at the time. Instead of a word of dissent, however, the other speaker of the evening came out still more emphatically, mentioning Seventh-day Adventists by name, and said that although he had respect for them as a people, no exemption should be made in their behalf; and this statement was also received with applause. If the advocates of Sunday laws are in favor of justice, they have an unfortunate way of showing it.

Let the reader carefully examine the proposed law, and then consider Mr. Fox's "strongest argument," by which he "proved" the impossibility of making any exception in favor of Sabbath-keepers. The bill provides that no work whatever, except works of necessity or charity, shall be performed on Sunday by anybody, unless he has actually rested on the seventh day of the week. Thus the proposed law, if carried into effect, would insure a weekly rest of one day to every individual in the State; and yet the speaker claimed that the "law of nature" which demands a weekly rest could not be obeyed if section 4 were retained. Is not "sophistry" a mild term to apply to such "argument"? He virtually claimed that this "law of nature" demands that the weekly rest shall fall on Sunday; that if men rest on Saturday instead of Sunday they will suffer physically! The only "law of nature" which demands that men shall rest upon Sunday, and on no other day, is the natural depravity which is in the heart of man, which receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.

To say that such a law as was pleaded for at that meeting would not be unjust, and would not result in the persecution of those who conscientiously

observe the seventh day of the week, is an insult to the intelligence of thinking people. Read the speech of Senator Crockett on pages 131, 132 of this paper, for a refutation of such a claim.

The speakers were careful to let it be understood that they did not want a religious law, but a civil law. They did not want any law in behalf of religion, but only to help the poor laboring man. This is a bit of sophistry that looks so plausible that it will catch very many. Of course they want a civil law, for a State law could be nothing else. But Sunday is a religious institution; we do not mean that it is a divine institution, but that it is purely a church ordinance, and therefore a religious institution, even though human in its origin. Now a State law compelling men to keep Sunday is a civil law, to be sure, but a civil law establishing a custom of religion. Such laws constitute, so far as they extend, a union of Church and State. Baptism is purely a religious ordinance, but a State law compelling all men to be baptized would be a civil law. But such civil laws are what we protest against. We do not believe in the State stepping out of its sphere to interfere in matters purely religious.

But it was not possible for those who took part in the meeting to conceal their desire for a law upholding Sunday in its religious aspect. In his opening prayer, Dr. Gray prayed that the people might be made to feel the necessity of "hedging about with legal enactments that holy day which came to us from Sinai." (?) The Doctor must have misspoken himself, for it is not the seventh day, but the first, that they desire to have upheld by civil law, and he well knows that the Sunday-sabbath has no more connection with Sinai than has the Friday rest of the Mohammedans. But nevertheless he showed what he wanted. He also prayed that the people of this city, and the legislators, might "realize the sanctity of the Lord's day." And Dr. Briggs, in his speech, complained that moral instruction was relegated

136

to the churches, and then the people were allowed to go their own ways on Sunday, so that they could not get at them to give the needed moral instruction. That is to say, the gospel which they preach has not power enough to reach the masses, and they want a law enforcing Sunday observance, so that people will be drawn to church on Sunday for want of any other place to go. With such a desire in the minds of the Sunday-law advocates, how long would it be before they would beg for a law compelling all people to go to church on Sunday, if they should find that in spite of the rigid Sunday law, the people persisted in neglecting church privileges?

We have still further evidence that it is not simply in the interest of good order, and to insure rest for the laboring man, that the Sunday law is wanted. Mr. Fox said: "Strike out section 4 [loud "Amens" from the ministers behind him], because it gives everybody a choice of two days; and then those who don't want any Sunday won't have any." True; pass a law requiring all people to keep Sunday, excepting those who keep the Sabbath, and then those who believe in keeping the seventh-day instead of the first, won't keep Sunday! Of course not; and that is what some, at least, of these Sunday-law advocates object to. We can inform them that whatever law they pass, those who conscientiously believe that "the

seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," will not keep Sunday. When civil laws run in direct opposition to the plainly expressed commandment of the Lord, duty is very clear.

We have not space in this article to notice all the "arguments" that were put forth to show the absolute necessity of a strict Sunday law. They were all as strong as those which we have mentioned, and we shall refer to them in future articles. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not antagonize persons, but principles. We do not charge the reverend gentlemen who plead so strenuously for a strict Sunday law, with having a desire to oppress any people because of their conscientious convictions. We are perfectly willing to concede that they are deceived as to what would be the inevitable result of such a law as they desire; and we write for the purpose of enlightening people as to what the result will be. The bill if passed with section 4 struck out, would cause the most bitter persecution to arise against those who observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. It would be persecution of conscience' sake as much as any persecution instigated by the Inquisition. If the bill should be passed as it stands, it would grant, at the most, religious toleration, and not such religious liberty as should be guaranteed in this land of boasted freedom. It would leave the conscientious Sabbath-keeper liable to be arrested at the instance of every hyper-sensitive person who might fancy himself disturbed by quiet labor on Sunday; and although many of these charges might not be sustained, no end of trouble would be caused.

For this reason, we propose to do all in our power to agitate this matter. It is scarcely possible that a Sunday law can be passed at this session of the Legislature; but the friends of such a law say that they propose to begin now to work the matter up in season for the next session. We shall work with them; and while they show one side, we will show both sides. This is not a local matter, but one that concerns everybody; for the same arguments are used wherever Sunday laws are proposed. We desire that the matter shall be so fully canvassed that no one can be ignorant as to the natural working of Sunday laws; so that when such laws are finally adopted, as the prophecy foretells that they will be, no one need work for them except those who are perfectly willing to see persecution practiced upon the conscientious minority. W.

### **"Andrews' History of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

This highly valuable book, after passing through two editions, has been revised, and enlarged by the addition of another chapter, and now appears for the third time, not in its former small type and plain black binding, but printed in large, clear type and bound in handsome and substantial style.

As many of our readers are aware, this work, by the late Elder J. N. Andrews, is the most complete history of the Bible Sabbath, and also of the first day of the week, ever written. And as it gives a multitude of facts not published elsewhere in the English language nor in any one book, and not attainable by any except those who have access to the largest libraries in this and other countries, no one can

be said to be thoroughly intelligent upon the Sabbath question till he has read this work.

As a writer, Elder Andrews had few equals and no superiors in his chosen field; and his "History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week" bears evidence upon every page, not only of his ability to present in a thoroughly readable and interesting manner a subject often considered dry, but also of his ripe scholarship and of his great historical accuracy. Every statement made is supported either by plain and appropriate texts of Scripture, or by the most reliable historical reference.

Containing as it does a complete history of the Sabbath for 6,000 years, and of the first day of the week from the earliest periods, the book is one of rare value, and it should be in the hands of the people everywhere. The work contains 548 pages, a table of contents, a perfect index of subjects, an index of authors quoted and also one of Scripture texts used, besides a fine steel engraving of the author. The size of the page is 5 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches, and the general style and appearance of the book entitle it to a place in the finest libraries; while its literary merits cannot but favorably impress all who read it.

If the friends of the Bible Sabbath do their duty, hundreds of copies of this book will be sold in the future where scores have been in the past. This work is now in a shape that it can be handled as a subscription book; and in the hands of those whose hearts are in the work, it will no doubt sell as well as any religious publication. The Sabbath question is now being discussed all over the land as never before, and *now* is the time to sell the "History of the Sabbath."

The book is bound in three styles: cloth, with sprinkled edges, price \$2.00; library, marbled edges \$2.75; half Morocco, gilt, \$3.75.

For terms to agents, write to Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., general agents for all territory west of the Rocky Mountains, or to *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich.

## **"The Lord's Prayer. 'Who Art in Heaven'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

### **"WHO ART IN HEAVEN"**

The fact that God is in Heaven is often used to indicate his power and majesty. The expression occurring in the model prayer indicates that whoever prays should recognize the greatness of the Being whom he addresses. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. 11:6. We quote a few texts to show the comprehensiveness of the expression, "Who art in Heaven."

Ps. 103:19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. 115:3: "But our God is in the Heavens; he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased." These texts show the power of God. The same thing is found in 2 Chron. 20:6: "O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in Heaven? and rulest not thou over all the kingdoms of the heathen? and in thine



hand is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?" Whenever it is designed to indicate the power and majesty of God, his dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned.

Ps. 11:4: "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men." Here God's dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned to show his omniscience.

Jer. 23:24: "Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill Heaven and earth? saith the Lord." Here the omnipresence of God is indicated, as also in 1 Kings 8:27: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the Heaven and Heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded." And also Isa. 66:1: "Thus saith the Lord, The Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?"

Eccl. 5:2: "Be not rash with thy mouth and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in Heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few." Here the fact that God is in Heaven is given as a reason for sobriety and carefulness of speech.

Thus we find that the expression in the Lord's Prayer, "Who art in Heaven," stands for a recognition of the power, the majesty, the omnipotence, and the omniscience of God. All these things should be borne in mind when we approach the throne of grace. This thought will tend to produce reverence and awe. Multiplication of words and "vain repetitions," for which Christ condemned the heathen, arise from the fact that the petitioner thinks more of himself than he does of the one whom he is addressing. The heathen gods were so contemptible that the heathen worshiper could not help thinking more of himself than of his god; for heathen worship, in its inception, was self-worship. See Rom. 1:21-23. But the God whom we worship sits upon the circle of the heavens, and he who has a just sense of his greatness will come with reverence into his presence, and will confine his words to just the things which he needs.

### **"HALLOWED BE THY NAME"**

This follows as a natural consequence of that which precedes. The one who remembers the words, "There is none like unto the God of Jerusalem, who rideth upon the heavens in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky" (Deut. 33:26), will of necessity "fear that glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

For the present, the address of Elder C. I. Boyd, is Battle Creek, Mich. care of *Review and Herald*.

All communications for the President of the North Pacific Conference or Tract Society, should be addressed to Elder John Fulton, box 18, East Portland, Oregon.

We hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Ninth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of California, for which we are indebted to our friend, Hon. N. A. Young of San Diego. This report contains some valuable temperance matter of which we shall give the readers of the SIGNS the benefit.

The *Interior* sometimes views things just as they are, and when it does, the prospect which it sees is not very flattering. Following is an instance:-

"The hope for the suppression of Socialism in Germany obviously does not lie in the Roman Catholic Church. Just now it is not easy to discover where it does lie. It might lie in the Protestant church, if that church would unite, and then, by works of humanity and love, prove that it had not lost both its life and its power. Of such a union and such efforts there seems to be no immediate prospect."

The same thing might be said of almost any other country.

It seems that the Pacific Coast is destined to be the place where spiritual manifestations shall most speedily attain the highest development. The *Golden Gate* says:-

"Certain it is that California, and especially the region along the coast, is remarkably favorable for spiritual and mediumistic development. There is probably right here in San Francisco a larger proportion of mediumistic persons than in any other city in the Union, and some of these mediums are equal to the best in the world."

We presume that this is so; but we regard it as anything but a compliment to California to be told that the devil can work through people here better than he can anywhere else.

The Rev. Hugh G. Pentecost, of Newark, N. J., preached on a recent Sunday evening on Henry George. Said he: "For my part it is clear that Henry George is in the straight moral position; and since the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right, the time will probably come when all rents will go to the general Government." We care nothing about this indorsement of Henry George, but we do object to the idea that "the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right." We are sorry to see people give assent to such a sentiment. There has not been a century since the fall, in which, the great body of humanity was not wholly wrong. Unless people submit to be directed by the law of God, they must go wrong. And we have not much reason to hope that the great body of humanity will make great progress toward the truth of God when those who should lead them in the way preach on Henry George and kindred subjects, instead of preaching Christ and him crucified.

The Oakland *Enquirer* of February 20 said: "Last night's Sunday-law meeting excited considerable enthusiasm among those present, but it would be a difficult thing indeed to pass an act compelling those who regard the seventh day as the Sabbath to observe the first day. This is what all the speakers advocated, but they did not take counsel of discretion in doing it. There is a powerful element in the Christian churches, which would fight to the death against such a proposition." We would fain believe that our contemporary is correct in its estimate of the feeling in the church in regard to a Sunday law. But not, in their demands that Sabbath-keepers should also keep Sunday, we are very sure that they did not take counsel of justice and religious liberty.

A correspondent of the New York *Observer* makes this confession, which must be very discouraging to those who are looking for a temporal millennium, when all men will be converted:-

"We are compelled to believe by the stern army of facts and figures that at the end of this boasted century of missions, while not 3,000,000 converts, nominal and real, have been won to Christianity in pagandom, the heathen and Mohammedan are 200,000,000 more than they were at the beginning of the century; that the votaries of those faiths increase seventy times faster than the followers of Christ. The church is outstripped on its own methods. They evince in these modern days a propagandism and aggressiveness far superior. The necessity in the foreign field cannot be overtaken on the present line of church work."

Yet many church people will persist in saying that the world is growing better.

"Against a Sunday law, but in favor of enacting a Sabbath Law," is the heading of an article that appeared in the Oakland *Tribune* one day last week, protesting against the proceedings at the recent Sunday-law meeting. The heading is most misleading. We do not know any man or body of men who are in favor of enacting a Sabbath law. The Sabbath is upheld by the law of God, and needs nothing more. If it were proposed to enact a law enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, and there was any probability of its carrying, we should vigorously oppose it. Our opposition to the enactment of Sunday laws is not alone on the ground that Sunday has no divine sanction, and is a working day as much as Monday or Tuesday, but because we are against the principle of the State legislating in matters of religion. The enactment of Sunday laws stands for union of Church and State, and this should be opposed by all Christians.

Some people have queer ideas of what constitutes religious liberty. Here in California the good people are trying to get a law that will compel all people to keep Sunday, even though some conscientiously keep another day; yet the Sunday people do not see in that any infringement upon religious liberty. And now comes the *Christian Church News*, and claims that a constitutional amendment prohibiting the "manufacture, gift, or sale of spirituous, malt, or vinous liquors, except for medicinal, mechanical, chemical, or scientific purposes," is oppressive because it does not provide for the use of intoxicating wine at communion. The editor says: "It is clear an infringement upon religious liberty, and an attempt to set aside the conscientious convictions of men." All of which causes us to conclude that with very many people "religious liberty" means liberty for themselves to do as they please, and compulsion for others to do likewise.

Said a clergyman to a seventh-day friend: "If you like to keep Saturday instead of Sunday, I could not say you would be breaking the law of God; but the people of God are against you." Well, that is a little strange. If God is not against us for keeping the seventh day, how can his people be against us? Are not the people of God those in whose heart is the law, and who do his will? God's people are those who walk with him; and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Consequently his people cannot be against Sabbath-keeping. Moreover, if God is not against the keeping of the seventh day, then it cannot be wrong; for

he is against all wrong; and if he is not against it, and it is not wrong, it must be right, and in harmony with his law, and so it is. See Ex. 20:8-11. And if God is not against seventh-day Sabbath-keeping, because it is in harmony with his law, and is right, he must be against Sunday-keeping, and it must be wrong; for two opposite practices cannot be right. We choose every time to be on the side of the Lord, even though we should be opposed by thousands calling themselves his people.

We hope that no one will delay to read the article beginning on the third page of this paper, entitled, "A Plea for Justice." The article is a speech by the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, of Arkansas, delivered in behalf of the bill which he had introduced into the Legislature of that State, allowing observers of the seventh day immunity from the penalties of the Sunday law. For two years a rigid Sunday law has been in force in Arkansas, with the result that religious persecution was rampant. We have mentioned this persecution several times, and have given some of the particulars; but we are glad to be able to give this testimony from a disinterested person. We hope that the people of other States where Sunday laws are being pressed, will consider well the experience of the people of Arkansas. Notwithstanding the intolerance of the law, and the persecution which it engendered, there were not wanting professed ministers of the gospel, who wished to have the law remain unchanged. Colonel Crockett, who, by the way, is a grandson of the famous David Crockett, gave the bill in favor of liberty his personal attention in both Houses, and by his energy and eloquence secured its passage in the Senate by a vote of 26 to 2, and in the Assembly by a vote of 55 to 16. The cause of religious freedom is greatly indebted to him for his successful effort in its behalf.

Our readers are aware that a few weeks since the German Parliament refused to pass the Government measure known as the Septenate, a bill to provide for a large increase in the German army, and to provide for its maintenance for a period of seven years. Immediately upon the defeat of the bill, Prince Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag, and writs were at once issued for the election of a new Parliament.

The members of this new body have now been elected, and a majority is assured for the Government bill. This was accomplished, however, by the direct interference of the Pope himself. Hitherto the Papal influence has not been wanting in political matters even in our own country, but it has been exerted secretly through bishops and priests; but in this instance the "holy father" himself addressed a brief but mandatory letter to his vassals in Germany, directing them to support the Government candidates; hence Prince Bismarck's victory.

The question of passing the Septenate bill was purely a political one, and concerned only the German people, who will be taxed to raise the immense sums which the new Reichstag will be asked to vote, and from whose ranks will be drawn the many thousands of additional men which the iron chancellor demands. And yet the lawful electors of the empire were not left to decide the question; it was decided not in Germany but in Rome; not by the people of a sovereign State but by the foreign head of an alien church. The fact is most

significant, and shows how entirely even the great powers of the earth are at the mercy of the Papacy.

**March 10, 1887**

**"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

### **TESTIMONY OF IGNATIUS**

The next Father who is quoted as authority for the observance of Sunday is Ignatius. We quote here all that Mr. Bailey claims for him.

"Ignatius was the bishop or pastor of the church of Antioch in Syria from the year 70 to 107. He was a disciple of John, and was pastor at Antioch for twenty-five years before John's death. In his epistle to the Magnesians 3:3 he says: 'Wherefore if they who were brought up in these ancient laws come nevertheless to newness of hope, no longer observing *Sabbaths*, but keeping the *Lord's day*, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, some deny.

"Also Ignatius (quoted by Edwards in 'Sabbath Manual,' p. 113) says: 'Let us Christian no more Sabbatize, keep the Lord's day.' 'Let everyone that loves Christ keep holy the Lord's day, the resurrection they, the highest of all days.'

"Ignatius was arrested at Antioch when the Roman emperor, Trajan came there about the year 107, and was sent to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom, being torn in pieces by wild beasts. Did this early martyr and a disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch Syria, a church which had the ministrations of inspired apostles-did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath and a day of worship? Incredible!"

For the benefit of those who are not acquainted with the Fathers we will state that all of the epistles credited to Ignatius exist in two forms, the longer and the shorter. It is very evident, even allowing that Ignatius wrote any epistles, that both those forms cannot be correct. And there is no question, even among scholars who endorse Ignatius but that the longer form is a corrupt text. In the above quotation the reader will notice that two statements concerning the Sabbath are credited to Ignatius. When we state, however, that these are the same, both being taken from the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Magnesians, the first from the shorter form, and the longer, the reader will see that it is found necessary to multiply even spurious testimony, in order to uphold the Sunday institution. We might state, moreover, what is the case, that in the original text of this so-called epistle by Ignatius, there is no reference whatever to the "Lord's day." But inasmuch as that statement, although a truth, must be taken by the general reader upon our word, we will allow the assumption that the epistle has been correctly translated, and will give argument upon which the reader can judge for himself.

It will be noted that considerable capital is made of the fact that Ignatius suffered martyrdom for the truth, and that therefore his testimony concerning the Sunday Lord's day must be valued. Thus Mr. Bailey says: "Did this early martyr and disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch in Syria, a church which had the ministrations of inspired apostles-did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord's day, the Christian sabbath and day of worship? Incredible!" To this question we have two answers:-

1. Because a man lived in the days of the apostles, and even in a church which had their inspired ministrations, it adds nothing to the weight of his testimony. Hymeneus and Philetus had the benefit of the labors of the apostle Paul, yet they overthrew the faith of many Christians, by teaching that the resurrection was already passed. 2 Tim. 2:17, 18. Diotrefes was not only one who loved to have the pre-eminence in the church, but he held a position of influence, since he had power to cast people out of the church; yet he openly rejected the teaching of the apostle John, and cast out of the church those who would receive it. 3 John 9, 10. Paul said to the elders of the church at Ephesus: "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29, 30. From this we know that very early in the history of the Christian church, men who were pastors in the church began to teach heresies; and that the heresies which they taught were not trivial is shown by Peter, who after writing about the giving of the prophecies said: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as their shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." 2 Peter 2:1. The fact that Ignatius was a bishop, and that to in the first century, would not make his teaching any more to be believed than though he lived in the present day. Nay, more. When that teaching directly contradicted the teaching of the Scripture, it would only make him the more blameworthy. But we need not impeach the integrity of the Ignatius, for,-

2. There is no reason to believe that Ignatius of Antioch ever wrote any epistle at all. In support of this assertion we shall make a few quotations. The translators of the so-called Ignatian epistles, in their introductory notice, after stating that there are fifteen of them, say:-

"It is now the universal opinion of critics, that of the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which work at various dates, and to several special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated bishop of Antioch.

"But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius ('Hist. Eccl.' iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer period. It is plain that one or the other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and scholars have

for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius."

"But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. Thus said Lardner, in his 'Credibility of the Gospel History' (1743): 'I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgement of the larger. . . But whether the smaller themselves are the genuine writings of the Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question.'"

Mosheim says:-

"A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistle ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it altogether a case of much intricacy and doubt."-"*History of Christianity,*" cent. 1, sec. 52.

Neander says of the so-called epistle of Ignatius: "Even the shorter and more trustworthy addition is very much interpolated."

Dr. Schaff ("History of the Christian Church," Vol., sec. 119), says:-

"The doctrinal and churchly views of the Ignatian epistles are framed on a peculiar combination, and somewhat materialistic apprehension of John's doctrine of the incarnation, and Paul's idea of the church as the body of Jesus Christ. In the 'Catholic Church'-an expression introduced by him-that is, the episcopal orthodox organization of his day, the author sees, as it were, its continuation of the mystery of the incarnation and the reality of which he outpoured great emphasis against the docetists; and in every bishop a visible representative of Christ, and a personal center of ecclesiastical unity, which he presses home upon his readers with the greatest solicitude, and almost passionate zeal. He thus applies those ideas of the apostles directly to the outward constitution, and makes them subservient to the principle and institution of the growing hierarchy. Here lies the chief importance of these epistles; and in this respect we have found it necessary to distinguish them already in the section on the organization of the church.

"It is remarkable that the idea of the episcopal hierarchy should be first clearly and boldly brought out, not by the contemporary Roman bishops, Clement, but by a bishop of the Eastern Church; though it was transplanted by him to the soil of Rome, and their sealed by his martyr blood. Equally noticeable is the circumstance that these boldest documents of the hierarchy seven became so interpolate, curtailed, and mutilated by pious fraud, that it is to-day almost impossible to discover with certainty the genuine Ignatius of history under the hyper- and pseudo- Ignatius of tradition."

Dr. Killen:-

"It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that, upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe, between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. . . Calvin knew that an apostolic must have been acquainted with an apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the productions of an age when the pure white of Christianity was really obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it. 'There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.'" - *Ancient Church.* Period 2, sec. 2, chap. 3, par. 12.

We might quote much more to the same effect if we had space, but it is not necessary. The argument from Ignatius may be summed up thus: First, the testimony credited to him is in direct contradiction to the Scripture teaching. Second, the whole thing is a forgery. Third, it is quoted twice so as to increase the effect. This is the kind of testimony which is invariably quoted to supplement the so-called argument from Scripture in favor of Sunday. Since it is customary to reserve the strongest argument for the last, this affords a good comment on the strength of the argument from Scripture for Sunday. W.

*(To be continued.)*

### **"Something New But Untrue" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

We thought we had heard all the arguments that could by any possibility be brought against the Sabbath; but we have just come across one that to us is absolutely new. This one comes all the way from Texas, and is the joint product of a Methodist minister, a professor in a college, and an "orthodox theologian." We find it in a little pamphlet entitled, "The Sabbath Day Examined." It is our design to give our readers the benefit of everything that is offered against the Sabbath, and so we give this. In deference to the high authority whence the book originates, we do not venture to change the grammatical construction in any particular. The reader will notice from the way the matter is introduced, that it is one of a class of similar arguments:-

"Before leaving this class of arguments, we will introduce one more which is of itself sufficiently strong to preclude the idea of the most sanguine Sabbatarian of going back to creation to begin with number seven for Sabbath. I have before me a little book in which it is stated that an orthodox theologian asked a Sabbatarian, 'From when do you date your Sabbath?' 'From creation, sir,' was the reply. Now if you will just listen to me, I will prove that you do no such thing. Is



the Sabbath a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, the observance of it by Adam would have been a violation of the law which God gave to him. 'Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat.' The same as to say, 'The observance of the Sabbath by Adam before he sinned would have knowledge of good and evil, and of itself a sufficient reason for all the sin and misery that the world has ever known from that day until the present.'

We are not told what reply the Sabbatarian made

151

to the "orthodox theologian" who got off the above. No doubt he was so much overwhelmed by such a torrent of "orthodox" theology and "orthodox" grammar and logic, too, that he could not reply. But we have had time to take breath since we read it, and so we venture to turn the tables on the "orthodox theologian" as follows:-

1. Is marriage a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, then the entering into the marriage state by Adam would have been a violation of the law of God, which forbade him to know good or evil. Therefore Adam, according to our orthodox theologian, was not married until after the fall, and was not in the transgression.

2. Has God the elements of good or evil in him? Is he good or evil? If either, then if Adam had known anything about him before the fall, it would have been a violation of the commandment which God gave to him, that he should know good or evil. But God is good; he is goodness itself; therefore, according to the argument of that "orthodox theologian," we must conclude (a) that Adam did not know God until after the fall; (b) that since he did not know God until after the fall, he never received from God any commandment concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and that (c) consequently, Adam never having received any commandment from the Lord, never fell, but continued a clam-like existence, neither good or evil, but half way between both, like Mohammed's coffin suspended between heaven and earth!

But someone who has not had the superior advantages of that college professor or the "orthodox theologian," may be simple enough to say, "These conclusions directly contradict the plain statements of the Bible." Of course they do; and so does the conclusion of the "orthodox theologian," in regard to the Sabbath. So also does every "argument" which is fabricated against the Sabbath which God gave to man in Eden, and proclaimed in thunder tones from Sinai. The lofty theories of many an "orthodox theologian" would tumble to the ground instantly, or, rather, would never be raised, if he should take counsel of the Bible, and should accept its plain statements.

The tree which was forbidden to Adam was the tree of the knowledge of good *and* evil, and not of the knowledge of good *or* evil. Adam knew good; so long as he regarded the command of the Lord, he could not know anything else, and God did not design that he should; but when he transgressed the Lord's command, he knew evil as well as good. This transgression, which made him evil, brought "death and all our woe," and it also brought into the world a flood of just such

absurd, contradictory, unscriptural, and wicked "arguments" as that put forth against the Sabbath by that reputed "orthodox theologian." W.

### **"Discrediting Prophecy" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Another time-setter who would be nothing if he were not sensational, has arisen in New York, and declares that the world will come to an end in the year 1900. Of course all his so-called calculations are the most foolish kind of guess-work; for there is absolutely no prophetic period which reaches this side of 1844. But that will not prevent this man from finding followers; he could, however, acquire no notoriety whatever if it were not for the newspapers, some of which are devoting considerable space to notices of his vagaries.

The more absurd any proposition is, the more widely it is sure to be circulated by the secular press. If it were not for this fact, weather prophets, perihelion theorists, and time-setters, might about as well go out of business. But as this time-setting is a most fruitful source of unbelief, we can scarcely hope that the devil will allow it to slumber; and it behooves those who have received the truth, and who have an understanding of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary, to give heed to the words of the Saviour: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open to him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching."

### **"Unconcealed Infidelity" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

By this term we do not refer to the blasphemous rantings of Ingersoll, but to the infidelity that is preached from Christian pulpits and scattered broadcast by the religious press. This is scarcely a Bible doctrine, or a fact of sacred history that is not positively denied by some professing to be religious teachers. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth; but that truth has been so long and so generally denied by religious teachers, that he believes the simple Bible statement, is considered an old fogy. To believe the simple statement of the Bible is considered a mark of ignorance. Our attention has been especially directed to this matter of late by several noted instances of clerical infidelity, a few of which we will notice.

An English clergyman has recently published two books on "Christ and Christianity," in one of which, entitled "A Picture of Jesus," The following version is given of the miracle at Cana:-

"The Virgin is evidently a little discomposed. The run on the wine is, no doubt, due to the people who came in the retinue of her Son. She cannot bear that members of her own family should put to shame the giver of the feast and so close a friend. "They have no wine, my dear Son-you see there are too many, in consequence of-'Hush!' Jesus stops her, with exquisite sensibility and gentle

courtesy. He will not have attention called to the fact of there being any deficiency.

"No doubt Jesus and his disciples had brought wine enough, at least for themselves, *according to custom*. But now, is it not possible-even likely and Christlike-that with loving thoughtfulness, and knowing the extra concourse in consequence of his presence, Jesus may have said to his disciples, 'If we go, we must not be burdensome to our friends; they are not rich; many will follow us; the sacred rights of hospitality, by which at least a season none may be excluded, must not be put to shame; take plenty of wine, and let it be *good-the best* wine. But don't let it be known; we must not do a kindness to get praise by others, at the expense of wounding our host's feelings; let us so manage that, if possible, he may not even know that his wine ran short; let us leave our supply *outside*, it need only be used if called for, and then served up out of the *host's own pots*. The water pots at the door are sure to be empty by that time, it will be most convenient to put our wine in them at the right moment, and no one will be likely to notice that it is not the host's own wine.'

"So when the wine 'runs short,' Jesus himself steals away from the feast-the servants quickly get in the wine, fill up the water pots under his directions-and the whole had been done so quietly that the first thing noticed is that wine is being poured out of pots usually containing water. Some noticed *that*; the *servants*, we are told, knew about it, and could have been the real explanation; but the *ruler* of the feast did not even know that the wine had failed; he only noticed that what was now served was the best wine."

The above was written by one who writes "Rev." before his name; and we have seen it printed in a prominent denominational journal, without a word of dissent. Instead of being called a picture of Jesus, his book should have been entitled "a Caricature of Jesus." For no one who has ever read the simple narrative in the second chapter of John, could believe that the one who wrote the paragraph above had any other motive than to ridicule the Bible account. The evangelist plainly states that the servants, at the command of Jesus, filled the six stone water-pots, and as plainly states that that water was made wine; yet this man professing to give a picture of Jesus, has represented him as using deception in order to perpetrate a very clumsy trick. It is not simply that the miracle is denied, but Jesus is represented as being actually dishonest. No professed infidel ever did more to bring the Bible into disrepute by his coarse jokes upon it, than has this professed minister of the gospel. We cannot believe that a man who presents Jesus in such a light as he does, can have any faith in him or in the Bible.

In its issue of December 9, the *Christian Union* reprints an article from the *Popular Science Monthly*, which begins thus: "There is no weed weedier or more ubiquitous than the common thistle. In Paradise, it is true, if we may trust John Milton and the Sunday-school books-wise, as usual, beyond what is written-there were no thorns or thistles." The one who wrote that has read the Bible to little purpose, if he has read it at all, or else he doesn't accept the Bible as final authority on any subject. The Bible says that at the close of creation, "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold it was very good." Gen. 1:31. Thorns

and thistles are not good. Also we are told that "out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food." Gen. 2:9. And the growth of thorns and thistles is expressly declared to have been the direct consequence of the sin of our first parents: "And unto Adam he [God] said, Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it at all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring to thee." Gen. 3:17, 18. It would be well if many who nowadays presume to write upon Bible subjects had as much knowledge of the Bible as John Milton had; better still if they believed it as fully as he did. The quotation which implies that thistles grew from the beginning, and were in Eden, is perfectly in keeping with the rapidly-increasing tendency to leave God out of the account altogether, and to hold that the world evolved itself.

Again, in the *Christian Union* of January 20, the editor, Lyman Abbott, makes an exhibition of infidelity in his comments on the current Sunday school lesson. The lesson is upon the call of Abram, Gen. 12:1-9, and is entitled "The Faith of Abram." We make a few quotations from the article:-

"And so he went out, 'not knowing, whither he went;' not knowing, I may add, by whom he was led. He went by faith, obedient to the command of that inward sense which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen. He crossed the Euphrates, passed over the desert and entered the unknown land which he determined should be his home. He pitched his tent and built an altar near to what afterward became Bethel; and initiated his entrance in a new country by a new worship. He called, it is said, upon the name of the gods. In treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture; the conjecture is reasonable that he first introduced into use, and so into the Hebrew Scriptures, the plural form *Elohim*, the gods, as a method of expressing his faith that the many Lord and gods of the Chaldaic religion were but different names or expressions for the one God who is the Master and Maker of all. As Paul commended the altar to the unknown God, and whom the Athenians unknowingly worshiped proceeded to declare unto them, so Abraham, not attacking even by implication the polytheistic beliefs of his father's house, grouped in thought all the gods of the earth and the heavens together, and took the first step toward a true monotheistic worship by calling on the name of the gods, as though in the many he would recognize but One.

Some persons may in the above a sample of the advanced theology, but we can see only a sample of advanced infidelity. The Scripture says, "Abraham believed God;" Lyman Abbott says that Abraham was not sure that there was any God. The Scripture tells us the simple facts about the call of Abraham, where he was when he was called, how old he was, where he went, and where he stopped on the way, and the instances connected with his journey; Lyman Abbott says, "in treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture." We submit that the only room there is for conjecture is by ignoring the Bible narrative. The writer of the above conjectures that because the word "*Elohim*" is used (not however by Abraham, but by Moses, the historian), therefore Abraham had the gods of Chaldea in mind when he built the altar and worshiped at Bethel. He

might as reasonably conjecture that Moses had the many gods of the Egyptians in mind when he wrote, "In the beginning God [*Elohim*] created the heavens and the earth."

But the writer continues:-

152

"Of course I am well aware that there are able theological writers who suppose that modern theology was furnished to Adam in Eden, and to Abraham in Ur, and to whom this whole rendering of Abraham's immigration will seem secular, if not profane. To them the plural *Elohim* is an evidence that Abraham believed in the Trinity, and his erection of an altar is conclusive proof that he comprehended the atonement. If religion is something external to man, we may certainly conceive it prepared ready-made and given to him, like the dress of skins which the Lord God made for Adam and Eve in the garden. But if religion is character, if it is what man *is*, not what he *has*, in the crude and ruder states of human development, religion must be simple and crude in its forces; then, as we are content to teach our children the very simplest truth is concerning God, and their duty toward him, and their right of trust in him, so we not only may, but we must, think God has taught the race."

The trouble is that his theory does not allow that God is the author of religion. In fact, it ignores God entirely. Instead of allowing that God is the teacher of the race, it makes man his own teacher, and religion something that is evolved from his own inner consciousness. If religion is not something external to man, then it is only human and not divine. The Bible says that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" but the writer of the above paragraph, in claiming that religion is something that is developed within the individual man, being crude at first, but becoming more perfect as the man becomes better educated, does away entirely with the necessity for a God. His theory is infidelity pure and simple.

To show that this charge is well founded, and that the editor of the *Christian Union* has in his comments entirely ignored God, we make one more quotation:-

"So perhaps from this simple story we may get a simple and clear idea of what is that calling and election which has been a theological trouble to so many minds. Abraham was the first in the long line of God's 'chosen people;' and he is himself designated in the Bible as 'called' and 'chosen.' We are called whenever we feel within an inspiration to a higher life or to some special divine action; we make our calling and election sure when we are obedient to the voice divine.

"To listen to and obey this voice is faith. Abraham 'believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.' Abraham's creed at this time, if I have read his story correctly, must have been of the simplest kind. He could have believed in no Bible, for he had none; in no divine, atoning Saviour, for he had apparently been told of none; there is nothing to indicate that he knew anything about the future state, nor anything more about God than a general conviction that *Elohim* was one, not many. He knew less than the Magi who followed the star. But, like them, he followed. His inward convictions were very few; what they revealed to him was very simple; but he followed them whithersoever they might lead him."

We have in the above at least one direct contradiction of the Bible. Paul says (Gal. 3:8, 17) that the Gospel that was preached to Abraham, and that the covenant that God made with him was confirmed in Christ; Lyman Abbott says that Abraham had no belief in a divine atonement, because he had been told of none. But even worse than this is his theory of the call of God, and his comment on the statement that Abraham believed God. This call, we are told, was simply inward inspiration; and his faith was simply obedience to the promptings of his own heart.

The Bible says that "Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness;" but we are told that what he believed was simply an impulse from within; therefore we must conclude if we except Dr. Abbott's theory, that the God that Abraham worshiped was himself; and that his faith being counted to him for righteousness was simply his own self-approval! This is the doctrine of Spiritualists and infidels. We never picked up a Spiritualist paper that does not counsel its readers to follow the promptings of their own heart. If following one's inward convictions wherever they may lead him, with no regard for a supernatural revelation, were what is meant by faith, then there would be multitudes of people upon the earth who could truly claim to be children of faithful Abraham. But that is not faith; nothing is safe except obedience to the plainly expressed will of God.

It is a matter of very little importance what any single individual believes. We have no controversy with Lyman Abbott. If he wishes to believe that the Bible is a myth, he has that privilege, but we cannot help feeling righteously indignant when we think that such stuff as we have quoted is sent out to tens of thousands of Sunday-school scholars, many of whom will accept it as legitimate comment upon the Scripture. It is a terrible pity that honest students of the Bible cannot be allowed to receive the pure and unadulterated word of God.

The blindness and infidelity concerning the Scriptures that we find among men in high position, is simply appalling. Yet people will say, "If the seventh day and not the first is the Sabbath, why have not these learned ministers of the gospel found it out and preached it?" We reply, If the Bible is the inspired word of God, why have not these men found it out and why do they not preach it, instead of teaching their own gain imagination? When a man can pervert simple Bible and history as has been done in the quotations we have made, it is not surprising that he cannot see a scriptural duty which interferes with his convenience. And yet these men, notwithstanding their unconcealed infidelity, will be blindly followed by thousands. W.

**"The Lord's Prayer. Thy Kingdom Come" *The Signs of the Times* 13,  
10.**

E. J. Waggoner

**"THY KINGDOM COME"**

In this brief petition is contained one of the most comprehensive requests ever made by mortal man. Thousands have repeated the simple phrase

thoughtlessly, and thousands who have pronounced the words with all the reverence possible for them, have had very limited ideas of what they were asking for. Someone has well written:-

"Thy kingdom come;' thus day by day  
We lift our hands to God, and pray;  
But who has ever duly weighed  
The meaning of those words he said?"

Let us try to weigh the meaning of the words, that we may utter them more intelligently. It is certain that if we know the full meaning of the petition, we shall not lightly make use of it.

First, we will notice that the Lord's prayer shows the kingdom to be still future. That prayer is for all Christians; it is a model for us, just as much as it was for the personal followers of Christ. We are to pray for the kingdom of God to come; but that would be out of place if the kingdom were already set up. That it was not set up in the days of Christ's first advent, is shown by the question which his disciples asked as they stood upon the Mount of Olives, just before he was taken out of their sight. Said they, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts 1:6. Christ did not say, It has already been restored, but "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons

155

which the Father hath put in his own power." That is, It is not for the disciples to know when the kingdom will come; but they are to pray for it; if they knew that the time for the kingdom were fixed, it would be useless to pray for it. That God has not made known the time of the coming kingdom, is shown by the statement that he has put it "in his own power." He is not under obligations to set up the kingdom at any specified time, for he has not appointed any; it is all within his own power.

Many people have the idea that "the kingdom of Christ and of God" is a spiritual kingdom, that it is simply the reign of the Spirit in the hearts of believers. It is true that the gospel plan is termed a kingdom, as in Col. 1:13 and Rev. 1:9; but that kingdom,-the kingdom of grace,-began as soon as man fell, as soon as he had need of "the grace of God which bringeth salvation;" but the kingdom referred to in the Lord's prayer is, as we have seen, still future; consequently that kingdom cannot be the gospel. Moreover, the apostle James says: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" James 2:5. Here he speaks of a kingdom that is *promised* to those who love the Lord,-a kingdom of which they are *heirs* through faith. It is this kingdom for whose coming we are to pray.

### WHAT THE KINGDOM IS

When Adam was created, he was made king of the earth, as is shown by these words: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue

it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1:27, 28. This dominion was forfeited by the fall, and the world passed into the hands of the one who had conquered Adam,-Satan,-who is now "god of this world." Not that God has no control over the earth; for even when he gave the dominion to Adam, he did not relinquish any part of his own universal dominion; but Satan took as much of the dominion as was given to Adam. He is not able, however, to go beyond the bounds which God sets for him. See Job 1:12, 2:6.

When David was king over Israel, God promised him that his throne should be "established forever." 2 Sam. 7:16. This promise was often repeated, and God said, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Ps. 89:34-37. Yet notwithstanding this promise, it was not long before the whole kingdom of Israel was overthrown, and the people were taken into captivity; and although many of the people were afterward allowed to return to their own land, the kingdom was never restored. The kings who afterward reigned in Jerusalem were simply the creatures of the Roman power, which controlled Judea and all the rest of the civilized world.

But David himself, it seems, never expected that his throne should be established forever with earthly monarchs upon it. He understood that Christ was the one referred to, who should rule over the kingdom. So Peter, after quoting David's words in Ps. 16:8-10, said: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell the grave, neither his flesh did see corruption." Acts 2:29-31.

Christ, then, is the one who is to "restore again the kingdom to Israel." It is to be a literal kingdom for he is to sit upon the throne of David. When the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that she should be the mother of Jesus, he said: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:32, 33. The coming kingdom must, therefore be as literal a kingdom as was that of David.

The kingdom is, however, to be different, in that it will be perfect and sinless. Said the prophet, addressing Christ by inspiration; "And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Micah 4:8. And the Lord himself, in his promise to David, said: "Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more." 2 Sam. 7:10.



These two texts teach us that the dominion of Christ is to be the same as that given to Adam,—"the first dominion,"—that it will be the earth in its Eden beauty and freedom from the oppression of sin. And so we read the words of Peter, who, after speaking of the fire which shall melt the earth, and shall destroy sin and sinners out of it, says, "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Peter 3:13. This promise is recorded in Isa. 65:17-25. Read those verses, and then read the parallel passage in Amos 9:13-15. Then read Amos 9:11, 12, and you will see that this new heavens and new earth is in the time when the Lord has restored the kingdom to Israel. So we learn that when we pray, "Thy kingdom come," we are simply praying for God to set up his own reign of righteousness in the earth made new.

### **SETTING UP OF THE KINGDOM**

But let not the subject be dismissed with this simple statement of the truth. Around the fulfillment of this promise cluster the grandest and most tremendously important events. That kingdom is ushered in by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, as Paul indicates in his charge to Timothy: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead. . . his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2. This kingdom Christ receives before he returns to earth; for he himself compared himself and kingdom to a certain nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Luke 19:11, 12. See the account of his receiving this kingdom, in Dan. 7:13, 14. So it is, that when Christ comes in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, he will be sitting upon the throne of his glory, and to the righteous he will say: "Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:31-34. This again shows that the kingdom which the saints are to inherit is the dominion of the earth.

In this kingdom righteousness, and that alone shall dwell. 2 Pet. 3:13. The prophet says of that time: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." Isa. 60:21. Read the verses preceding this one, and then read the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, the last verse of which says: "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life."

This state of righteousness will not be brought about by the conversion of all men, for we read that as the end approaches "iniquity shall abound" (Matt. 25:12) and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse" (2 Tim. 3:13); and that in the days when the Son of man shall be revealed, it shall be as it was in the days of Noah and of Lot. Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30. So when God gives to Christ the heathen for this inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth, for a possession, the first thing he does is to rule them with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. See Ps. 2:8, 9. Says the prophet: "Behold,

the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it." Isa. 13:9. And we also read that when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, it will be "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." 2 Thess. 1:7-10.

Thus we learn that to pray, "Thy kingdom come," is to pray for the coming of the Lord to destroy the wicked, and to cleanse the earth of everything that defiles, and to give immortality to his people. God is no respecter of persons. Whosoever shall not be found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire. Rev. 20:15. It will avail nothing that men have said, Lord, Lord,-that they have prayed earnestly, even praying for the kingdom of God to come, if in that day any defilement is found in them, they will be cast into the lake of fire. Who is there, then, that realizing what the kingdom of God is, who alone can inherit it, and what will be the fate of those who are unfit,-can pray, "Thy kingdom come," and still cherish sin in his heart? How carefully and unblamably we must live if we are able to unite, in saying, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Bradstreet's says that the grand total of wages sacrificed by strikes since January 1, is \$3,000,000.

In this session of Congress, which is just closed, appropriations for coast and naval defenses have been made to the following amounts: Steel for ordnance and armor, and a gun factory, \$8,000,000; coast fortifications, \$5,000,000; ordnance for naval purposes, \$8,000,000; ten steel cruisers, \$21,800,000; floating batteries for Coast defense, and torpedoes, \$15,000,000.

Elder J. M. Reese, president of the Tennessee Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, writes us from Nashville that he has good prospect of success in securing the passage of a bill which will relieve Sabbath-keepers of the persecution to which they are subject because of the present unjust Sunday law. We believe that the bill will pass it this time, and that those in Tennessee who keep the commandments, will yet have a little season for unmolested work.

Immediately after the Sunday law meeting of which we gave a brief review in the SIGNS last week, we published a somewhat extended review of the main points considered, under the heading, "The Sunday law.-An Address to Thinking People." In the address we quoted Senator Crocketts speech as it appeared in the SIGNS last week. This little document was gotten out principally for circulation here in Oakland, where the meeting was held; but friends of the truth and other places have called for it, so that although it has been printed less than two weeks, more than thirty thousand copies have been distributed. Thus the matter of the Sunday law is being agitated.

"Is its right for a Seventh-day Adventist, who is the owner of a house, to let it for a grocery store where liquors are sold and cards are played in open day? V. S. N."

A person undoubtedly does wrong to let a building with the knowledge that it will be used for immoral purposes, such as our questioner describes; but if the person hiring the building gave the order to understand that it was to be used for legitimate business purposes, and after getting possession went to selling liquor, the owner cannot be held responsible for the deception, neither has the power over the building until the time expires for which the building was rented. Then of course the owner can and should refuse to let his house any longer for such purposes. We would add, also, that liquor-selling and card-playing are no worse in open day than under cover of darkness.

Two weeks ago, in a note with the heading, "A Sign of the Times," we quoted an indorsement of Catholicism, by the late Dr. Hodge, of Princeton. In the *Independent* of February 17, 1887, we find the following editorial utterance, which confirms our statement that Protestantism is fast turning Catholic. It is this:-

"Our readers well know that we have our eyes open to see the good in the Roman Catholic Church, and that we welcome it as an ally against atheism in religion, and socialism in the State. The religion of Catholicism is that of the Bible, and considerable more; but it is a religion of God and the Bible."

After such an utterance, the statement that there is no fear that Catholicism will become a controlling factor in this country, is only an evidence of the blindness of the writer. If Protestants accept and welcome the Catholic Church as an ally, they may rest assured that they will have the controlling influence; for Rome never enters into an alliance as second to any other power. In this country, the power that controls may not be *called* Catholic, but whatever the name, the thing will be the same. Protestantism which has repudiated the principles of the Reformation will be no better than Catholicism.

The hope that was expressed by some that the Dr. McGlynn affair in New York would result in a considerable defection among Catholics in that city, has proved to be vain. The rebellious priest has refused to go to Rome, but he has not, and probably will not, be excommunicated for his disobedience. And now we are told that the Pope has sent him his blessing, and that the Doctor was very much pleased and affected to be thus noticed by "his holiness." All of which indicates very clearly that McGlynn will not withdraw from the communion of "the church." If he did, it is by no means certain that he could take with him a single follower. About the only way to rescue a Roman Catholic from the chains of error which the Papacy has cast about him, is to get him converted; and that is not accomplished by partisan fends or socialistic theories. Those who expect to see the Catholic Church, even in a single city, wrecked upon such a rock as the McGlynn trouble, read history and prophecy to very little purpose.

An error which is clung to most persistently by a great many people, is that the coming of the Lord will overtake all "as a thief in the night." It is true that the apostle does say (1 Thess. 5:2) "that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;" but he immediately adds (verse 4): "But ye, brethren, are not in

darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the days; we are not of the night, nor of darkness." So it is only those were in darkness that will be overtaken as a thief; and of them the apostle says (verse 3), that "sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape."

In his description of the recent revival in Boston, the Rev. M. C. Ayers says:-

"At any meeting one might see silk hats and silk dresses in close contact with homespun and overalls; and the wearers of the different grades of apparel manifested absolute consciousness of equality in the one great fact that they were sinners, and thus they were heartily ashamed of their sins."

"The rich and poor meet together; the Lord is the maker of them all." Prov. 22:2. The rich are no better than the poor, and there is no reason why they should not meet on common ground, when they are common sinners. But if they are simply "*ashamed* of their sins," they will not long keep on that common ground. The frequent use of similar expressions of late, in connection with great revivals, convinces us that we need not hope for any real religious awakening. The man who has no deeper feeling than shame for his sins, and either covers them up and hides them from even his own sight, or he may become lost to shame for them. When Michael stands up, and "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," some of them will awake to shame, and everlasting contempt; all those only who have felt godly sorrow for sin, because they have violated God's holy law, will awake to everlasting life. Genuine revivals are always connected with something else than shame because of the meanness.

The *Interior* tells of a Protestant lady who "not long since called upon her pastor, and said she had attended worship in a Catholic cathedral, and wished to say that she was favorably impressed. The priest, in his discourse, had quoted a text of Scripture, and he did it in a way to convey the impression that he was quoting final authority-the truth, having been found in Scripture, was indisputable. That, she thought, was the secret of the priest's power over the people. He did not doubt, and therefore they did not."

Of course we are not to understand that Catholics as a rule follow the Bible any more closely than do Protestants, but upon this occasion when the priest did refer to the Scripture his manner was such as to impress this woman, who was evidently not accustomed to hearing texts of Scripture quoted as "final authority." The principal business of many of the pulpits of to-day is to "explain away" the plain words of Scripture, and to tone down the more plain and cutting truths, so that they may not be offensive to "ears polite." The *Interior* well says: "Making apologies for the Bible is about the weakest and poorest talk a man can indulge in."

While reading the article from the *Christian Union*, extracts from which are made in the article in this number of the SIGNS, entitled "unconcealed infidelity," one thought forced itself upon our mind. It was, Why is the Bible used at all by those who so utterly ignore its plain statements? When a writer will take the simple narrative that of the call of Abraham, and will say that in dealing with the subject he is almost wholly in the field of conjecture, and will then add, out of his

own fancy, things directly subversive of the Bible narrative, we cannot see why he might not as well make up an entire story, and comment upon that. Indeed it would be far better, for then those who want the original Bible could have it unadulterated by theological fancy, and those who want the conjectural Bible could take it. But this will not be done; no man could get up anything that would compete with the Bible, and they would soon lose their prestige; so they keep close enough to the Bible to lean upon it when their imagination fails,-close enough to seduce our unthinking people into the unconscious infidelity.

In a late number of the *Occident*, there is a good, homely article by "Rusticus," about hearing. The closing paragraphs speak of so crying an evil of this time, and contain so much wholesome truth in relation to it, that we give them here:-

"There are a great many new things in this world and a great many true things. But it must not be taken for granted that all the new things are true things, and that all the true things are new things. There is a good deal of old-fashion truth-of truth that will never become obsolete. This truth is like daily bread. It is revealed for the permanent nourishment of our souls. We eat it with our ears. And if we refuse to seek it, and prefer unhealthy condiments and stimulants, we must expect to be feeble in faith.

"If any of my readers are troubled with itching years, I advise them to go at once to the Great Physician and ask him to heal them. I have known the disease to prove fatal in some cases. I do not believe that anyone who is afflicted with it can be happy in the Lord. But alas, in these days it is a fearful epidemic. There are whole churches that suffer from it, and yet don't seem to know why they have no revivals of religion."

At the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Governor Hoadly of Ohio, related the following, the truth of which he vouched for, having himself inspected the letter referred to: "There is in a certain governor's office, I shall not say where, the letter press, books, and correspondence of a certain governor, I shall not say who. A friend sought from this governor the pardon of two criminals. The governor gave his correspondent the choice, but refused to pardon both, because, as he said, that county's quota was exhausted! This was no joke, but the reason seriously given by an earnest governor who distributed pardons by geography." Such a travesty on justice needs no comment; we note it as a sign of the times.

**March 17, 1887**

**"The Law and the Gospel" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

The law of the Father and the gospel of the Son are not antagonistic elements. Instead of the former being superseded by the latter, it is honored, magnified, and established by it. The plan of salvation was devised not to abolish the law, but that God "might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

We know that man is a moral being, under the domain of law and directly responsible to his Creator for all his acts. John tells us that in prophetic vision he "saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." And again, we are told that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Nor are we left it in any uncertainty as to the standard of the judgment to which we are all hastening; the wise man says: "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." While the master himself said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."

But "who then can be saved?" How can any escape death, the wages of sin, "for all have sinned"? And because of what the law says every mouth is stopped and all the world is guilty before God. The question is answered in those matchless words of our Saviour: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And with Paul every humble, trusting soul may exclaim, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." And this because there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." "For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; *that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*" 2 Cor. 5:21. Or, as the apostle expresses it elsewhere, God sent his "Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin [margin, "by a sacrifice for sin"], condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." And all this agrees perfectly with the words of our Saviour:-

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven [Campbell's translation, "of no esteem in the sight of Heaven"]; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matt. 5:17-19.

But let every soul that has named the name of Christ remember "that no flesh should glory in his [God] presence. But of them are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." 1 Cor. 1:29-31; Phil. 2:13.

**"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

## THE FATHERS AND THE EARLY CHURCH

Justin Martyr is next quoted as follows:-

"On Sunday we all assemble in common, since that is the first day which God, and on the same day of our savior Jesus Christ rose from the dead."

This is an incorrect quotation, inasmuch as it makes Justin speak of the resurrection of Christ as a reason for worshiping on Sunday, when he made no mention of that event. What he really says is this:-

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gathered together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits."-*First Apology of Justin, chap. 6.*

This is a minor difference, but it serves to show how even the trashy stuff which the so-called Fathers wrote is garbled in order to bolster up the Sunday. But it may be said that we have here evidence in favor of Sunday observance, since Justin really says that they met on the day called Sunday. To that we reply that we shall not attempt to deny that Sunday was observed to some extent at quite an early period, but the fact that a thing was done, is no evidence it ought to have been done. Within three hundred years after the crucifixion of Christ we can find every abomination of the Papacy in the Christian church. In the preface to the "Ancient Church" Dr. Killen says:-

"In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome-a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament-while he rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions. Officers for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic."

Justin then was a Greek who lived in the second century; and concerning the condition of the church in that century has the following:-

"Among the Greeks and the people of the East nothing was held more sacred than what were called the Mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms. This practice originated in the eastern provinces; and thence, after the times of Adrian (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins), it spread among the Christians of the West. A large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries."-*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, chap. 4, sections 1-5.*

If antiquity were to be allowed as evidence of the correctness of the practice, nearly all error would be classed as truth. The question with the us is not what

people have done, but what ought they to have done, and the Bible alone can answer the question satisfactorily.

The next "evidence" that is brought to the support of Sunday is the following:-

"Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about the year 162 says: 'Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the *Lord's day*, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead.' (Edwards's Manual, p. 114.)"

It may strike the reader as strange that these testimonies are quoted from Dr. Edwards's "Sabbath Manual," and not directly from the Fathers themselves. But this means the responsibility for any wrong quotation is all thrown upon Dr. Edwards's. On this quotation from Theophilus, all that we have to say is that *it is entirely manufactured*. Not a line of it appears in his writings. He does not use the term "Lord's day," and nowhere even mentions the first day of the week. It is evident that Dr. Edwards, who is primarily responsible for this forged testimony, was no novice in the use of the Fathers, and did not stand in need of any instructions from the Rev. Philetus Dobbs. We will say this, however, for the forged testimony from Theophilus, that it is just as good evidence for Sunday-keeping as any that can be found in any of the Fathers; and it is entitled to just as much weight as though Theophilus had actually written it. But the advocates of Sunday have the lack of testimony in its support, and the next quotation given is "equally conclusive" with that from Theophilus. Dr. Bailey says:-

"Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, and the disciple of Polycarp, in the year 167, says that the Lord's day was the Christian Sabbath. 'On the Lord's day everyone of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.' (Edwards's Manual , p. 114.)"

Of the lesson we have simply to say that the term "Lord's day" nowhere occurs in the writings of Irenaeus. Our readers, though, have doubtless found out by this time that even if one of the Fathers did not happen to speak about a certain thing, it does not in the least invalidate the testimony quoted from him in favor of it. If he had only realized what straits the advocates of Sunday would be in for argument in the nineteenth century, he might possibly have said what they want him to say, and so it is just the same as though he had said it. This seems to be the plan adopted by those who quote the Fathers.

There is one little thing about the writings of Irenaeus which we never remember to have seen quoted, and while we are on this subject we will mention it here, that our readers may see the straightforwardness of the Fathers in general, and of Irenaeus in a particular area. In the introductory notice of the writings of Irenaeus, we find the following statement by the translators:-

"The great works of Irenaeus, and now for the first time translated into English, is unfortunately no longer extant in the original. It has come down to us only in an ancient version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius. The text both Latin and Greek, is often most uncertain. Only three MSS. of the work 'Against Heresies' are at present known to exist. Others, however, were used in the earliest printed editions put forth by Erasmus. And as these codices or more ancient than any



available, it is greatly to be regretted that they have disappeared or perished. One of our difficulties throughout, has been to fix the readings we should adopt, especially in the first book. Varieties of reading, actual or conjectural, have been noted only when some point of special importance seemed to be involved.

"After the text has been settled, according to the best judgment which can be formed, the work of translation remains; and that is, in this case, a matter of no small difficulty. Irenaeus even in the original Greek, is often a very obscure writer. At times he expresses himself with remarkable clearness and terseness; but, upon the whole, his style is very involved and prolix. And the Latin version adds to these difficulties of the original, by being itself of the most barbarous character. In fact, it is often necessary to make a conjectural re-translation of it into Greek, in order to obtain some inkling of what the author wrote. Dodwell supposes this Latin version to have been made about the end of the fourth century; but as Tertullian seems to have used it, we must rather place it in the beginning of the third. Its author is unknown, but he was certainly little qualified for this task. We have endeavored to give as close and accurate a translation of the work as possible, but there are not a few passages in which a guess can only be made as to the probable meaning."

This assurance must be a great comfort to those who dote on Irenaeus. It must be a great satisfaction to his admirers to know that they have his exact language just as clearly as can be *guessed at* by people living 1,000 years after he died. The plan adopted by the translators is very much like trying to arrive at an exact amount of a certain sum of money by guessing at half of this and multiplying that by two. And this is a specimen of the volume of all the writings of the so-called Fathers. Many of them are wholly forged, and the others have been altered and interpolated and garbled so that the ones who wrote them would not recognize them, if they were alive. As Dr. Mosheim says, it is of no importance that much of the writings of the Fathers has been lost, since they are utterly unreliable. We do not know that they are ever quoted except in support of a cause which cannot be sustained by the Bible. They are simply blind leaders of the blind. To go to them for light on the Bible is like taking the shades of midnight to illuminate the face of the sun.

We have followed Dr. Bailey thus far in his proofs from the Fathers, not because we thought it necessary to try to refute the so-called argument, but that our readers might see clearly the broken reed upon which the Sunday institution rests for support. We think enough has been said to demonstrate this point, and we will not follow it any further.

Dr. Bailey says: "How silly and shallow is a falsehood that Constantine changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. "So we say; and we have never heard of a Sabbath keeper who was foolish enough to make such a claim. There was no man who could change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week as Doctor Scott says, the truth is that the change was made gradually. All deviations from the right are made in the same way. But it is true that the change from the seventh to the first day was made by "the man of sin," "that Wicked," the mystery of whose iniquity was working even

in the days of the apostles; and it was just such perversions of truth as this that made the Papacy the "mystery of iniquity," "the abomination of desolation."

But while Constantine did not change the Sabbath, he did have a hand in perpetuating the wicked change that had already been made, and in establishing the Papacy on a firm basis. "Chambers's Encyclopedia," speaking of the custom of the early church, says:-

"Whatever may have been the opinion or practice of the early Christians in regard to the cessation from labor on the Sunday, unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that date is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine 321 A.D."

We have seen this statement denied by those who asserted that Christ and the apostles changed the Sabbath, but we have never known anyone to quote a commandment for Sunday-keeping earlier than that of Constantine. It is very easy to say that Christ changed the Sabbath, but it is impossible to find a commandment to that effect. W.

*(Concluded next week.)*

### **"Why We Keep the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to a request in the SIGNS for someone to send one direct Bible text showing Sunday to be the Sabbath, the gentleman writes: "I do not propose to discuss the subject, for I am not sufficiently versed; but, Yankee-like, I can turn the question by asking you the same in regard to Saturday. Please give chapter and verse to sustain you in Sabbath or Saturday worship."

This we are very happy to do. "And God said all these words, saying. . . . Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all the work; but this seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt if not to do any work, thou, nor thy daughter, the manservant nor maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor a stranger that is within guide takes; for in his six days of the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea at all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; where for the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:1, 8- 11. This is correct, simple, easily understood, and comes direct from Heaven.

167

It is the foundation of all Sabbath observance. It is sufficient of itself. And the Bible contains abundance of corroborative testimony, but not a word for first-day observance.

### **"Saturday or Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the title of a fourth-page leaflet having a subtitle, "A letter to Seventh-Day believers." It was written by Mrs. J. C. Bateham, "Supt. Sabbath Observance Department, N. W. C. T." We give it a place in the SIGNS in compliance with the request which accompanied it, to "please publish." The letter is as follows:-

DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIENDS: Many of you I know and love as conscientious Christian workers in our Women's Christian Temperance Union and elsewhere, and greatly respect your self sacrificing devotion to principle. I desire your earnest cooperation in efforts to save a weekly Sabbath for our beloved country, that without it must sink to heathenism and ruin. One your own writers, N. V. Hull says: "By common consent, the weekly Sabbath is a necessary institution. It is in the interest of both civilization and religion, and the world without it would be in darkness and confusion. The loss of a Sabbath would be irreparable." Yet to-day, so strong is the tide of Sabbath desecration, so determined, and successful the opposition from the liquor traffic and other Sabbath foes, that apparently only the united and earnest efforts of Christians can preserve it.

Surely no Christian should be found on the side of its enemies. Would that we might see eye to eye on the question that divides us, for it is a simple one: *Does the Sabbath day of the Bible necessarily fall on Saturday?* We think not.

In Eden, God set apart and blessed a day, not the seventh of time, but the seventh day, as the Holy Sabbath, we claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week that first Sabbath fell, since their names are not revealed. God's days were doubtless long ages-*aeons*, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath in which he rests from creative work. The Sabbath was instituted after Eve was created. Time is reckoned from Adam's first day, but how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve's creation, there is no record. His creation was apparently toward the close, yet he lived single long enough to make the acquaintance of every living thing and give to each a name expressive of its peculiarities, and to find that not one was a suitable companion. Then he slept and Eve was created.

The next day was the Sabbath. It was Eve's first day, not seventh. Who shall tell how many days or weeks of Adam had lived? If the particular day on which that Sabbath fell was important, God surely would have made it plain. The fair inference is that the particular day is immaterial. God worked in six of his days, then rested one. Man too was to labor six days then rest one. First-day Christians as literally

168

follow Genesis as do seventh-day believers, not accepting the hour of beginning the day, for our revised version says simply of each day, "there was evening and there was morning." These days being *aeons* the phrase is figurative. A day's work is ended, a rest as of night follows. Then with the light a new day begins. Nature's division of time was followed. The phrase is not repeated for the seventh day, since the morning of verse 21 [31] is the dawning of the seventh, showing this sixth complete.

Later in Israelitish history, the observance of Sabbath was apparently and of necessity lost during the 400 years of bitter Egyptian bondage among a people who measure time by tens instead of sevens; and Moses apparently re-instituted it by God's commandment, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God's command. Ex. 14. Perhaps God designed thus to show that the particular day was immaterial.

The fourth commandment at Sinai again enjoins the holy keeping of the seventh day as Sabbath, without telling on what day by name that seventh day fell, and as it had been changed once and may have been changed, or lost, at other times before or after the flood, we can only infer that God commands a day-a whole day-kept holy, and this day itself follows six of work, and thus be the seventh day. The Jewish nation as such had its beginning at the exodus, when God re-instituted the Sabbath and on a new day partly in memory of their birth as a nation. Deut. 5:15.

The Eden Sabbath was for all mankind to the end of time. Day not known. The Jews since the exodus, so far as we know, have observed Saturday as their Sabbath. Christian nations observe Sunday. When was the change made? No one knows positively, nor is it at all important, as we believe. Had it been of consequence we should have definite information. Proof is abundant that Sunday was observed long before Emperor Constantine, and before the papal church had a beginning, with strong evidence that during the first few centuries both Saturday and Sunday were observed by believers, presumptive evidence that the change must have required high if not the highest authority, and to my mind satisfactory proof of apostolic usage.

Again, we know it is a geographical impossibility for persons living in different parts of the world to observe the same hour as a holy time. There is a gradual change extending over twenty-four hours, till on the adjacent Alaskan islands the Sunday of one is a Saturday of the other. Which, if either, is the Sabbath of Eden or the exodus, who can tell? More than nine-tenths of the Christian world insist that it is contrary to the spirit of Christianity to be thus bound by the letter (the Jewish usage of the seventh day) when every requirement of the Eden Sabbath for the fourth commandment is as fully met by those who keep their seventh day on Sunday as Saturday.

The tendency of all Christian growth is toward dropping nonessential and toward fellowship. The essentials to salvation are the atonement, repentance, and faith. The form of baptism or church and government, or the day we celebrate, is certainly not essential to salvation. Success in saving souls and doing Christ's work, shows God's hearty co-operation with all. Let us be like-minded. "That they all may be one," is our Saviour's prayer, if not all Baptists or Methodists, but one in love and devotion. To this end, agreement in essentials-charity in non-essentials. Is there hope that Saturday will be generally adopted as the Christian Sabbath? Apparently not. Then if the day is a nonessential, but the *Sabbath* of vast importance, there should be hearty co-operation to secure it.

But you say, How can we support Sabbath laws that oppress us? Exceptions should be made for certain classes. It should be sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor the first day of the week, that "the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a holy time and does not labor upon that day, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other people in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest and religious worship. "With this exception for our present laws are, if well enforced, usually satisfactory. In some States they need revision.

Law cannot control of religious belief or give us a religious Sabbath. It should give us a civil Sabbath, that is, a non-legal one, wherein governmental and public business shall be suspended, and all labor and recreation so far suspended as not to interfere with the enjoyment of a religious Sabbath off by those who wish it. This is all we ask and less would not protect the Sabbath. Such a law would be burdensome to those who have already abstained from labor one day, but could not violate their conscience, and with the above proviso the burden would be light as possible.

This burden we ask you to bear from love to God and religion and from motives of patriotism. The irreligious with false notions of personal liberty, object to having their rights infringed upon on any day of the week, but we answer, law must consult the greatest good of the greatest number, and the same rule applies to us all. If we cannot see alike, let us credit each other with candor, honesty, and a desire to obey the Lord of the Sabbath, and may none of us be found shrinking from any self-denial by which we may help preserve the Sabbath, and thus help save a world that Christ loved even unto death.

### **COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE**

The sum of the above letter is this: Nine-tenths of the Christian world insists that it is wrong to rest upon the seventh day of the week, therefore those who believe that it is right so to do ought to throw aside their conscientious convictions and join with the nine-tenths of the Christian world in forcing the non-Christian world to adopt a certain form of religion. The appeal for help from the seventh-day observers is based on the attempted argument to show that Saturday is not the Sabbath, and therefore we will briefly notice the positions taken by Mrs. Bateham.

1. The claim is made that in Eden God set apart and blessed the Sabbath day, which was no day in particular. Says the writer:-

"God's days were doubtless long ages, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath, in which he rests from creative work."

The word "doubtless" means, "without doubt or question; unquestionable." A thing that is so well established that there is no chance for question in regard to it, must be able to present a long array of positive proof. We look around for the proof that the days of creation were long ages, but we find none at all. All that we have ever heard offered is the vain imaginations of skeptical devotees of science falsely so-called, who ignore the agency of an almighty God in creation, and assert that it is impossible that the world should have been created in six literal days. The great body of professed Christians, fearing lest they should be thought ignorant of the "latest deductions of modern science," have hastened to accept this baseless theory of infidel geologists and evolutionists, forgetting that by so doing they were either limiting the power of God, or else ignoring him as Creator. The idea that the world was formed during long ages of time, is a modern device gotten up expressly for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of admitting the power of God. To be sure, some who hold to this theory admit that God had

something to do with creation, that is, that he started it, and that after he had brought protoplasm into existence, the rest of the work did itself. But the logical result of the whole theory is to deny that God had anything to do with the creation of the world.

One thing is certain, and that is, that it is no greater tax of faith to believe that God created the world in six literal days, than to suppose that he took six thousand or six million years. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth, and we believe it. The first chapter of Genesis informs us plainly what kind of days these days were. They were days composed of an evening and a morning, that is, a dark part and a light part. This succession of light and darkness is caused only by the revolution of the earth on its axis. Those who hold to the *aeon* theory, would confer a favor by telling us what there is besides the revolution of the earth on its axis which causes the succession of light and darkness on the earth, and also how much of each long period was dark and how much was light. Moreover, those days were such days as the sun and moon were made to rule over. See Gen. 1:14-19. Will Mrs. Bateham kindly inform us whether the sun and moon here referred to are the same bodies with which we are so familiar? And if they are, how does it happen that now they rule over days of just twenty-four hours' length, instead of long periods of time?

We are told that "all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath in which he rests from creative work? That is to say, that the present time is God's Sabbath-day. Let us see how well this agrees with the Scripture. In Gen. 2:2, 3 we read that God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, "because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." This brings to view a Sabbath rest completed before the blessing was pronounced upon it. God blessed the seventh day because that in it he had rested. This simple statement of the Bible brushes away all the speculations of men, as an elephant would brush away a cobweb from his path. When the Bible says that God's rest upon the seventh day was in the past, and that he blessed it and sanctified it because he had rested, we care nothing for the human conjecture that God's Sabbath-day is all earthly time.

Once more, the fourth commandment refers to the work of creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, and repeats the statements found in Gen. 2:2, 3. There we learn that we are commanded to rest upon the seventh day because God did so. To sanctify means "to appoint," as in Joel 1:14. And thus we understand the fourth commandment and Gen. 2:3 to read that God blessed the seventh day and appointed it for man's observance, because that in it he had rested from all his work. And this allows no other conclusion but that the seventh day which man is commanded to observe, is of the same length as that upon which God rested.

It seems that Mrs. Bateham is a little confused in her own mind as to this matter, for in the same paragraph in which she says that all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath, she also says, "We claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week "the whole period of earthly time" falls. The less cannot include the greater; and if "the whole period of earthly time" should fall on one day of the

week, it would crush it to almost as attenuated proportions as Mrs. Bateham's Sabbath argument. She says also that time is reckoned from Adam's first day, but of how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve's creation, there is no record. Then she says: "The next day was the Sabbath; it was Eve's first day, not seventh day." She has already told us that that Sabbath-day is all earthly time, yet she says, "If the particular day upon which that Sabbath fell is important, God would surely have made it plain." So we have two views offered us: One is that Adam and Eve died sometime in that seventh day, and that Adam did not live 930 years, but only a part of two days; also that Eve was created and died within the compass of that seventh day, but her last day. And then coming down to the literal reckoning of time, we are told that the seventh day was Eve's first day. Thus it is implied that each individual must begin to reckon time for the observance of the Sabbath from the day following his birth. And yet we are requested to join in a movement compelling all people to rest on Sunday, because it is claimed that that is the true Sabbath day. Does Mrs. Bateham believe that everyone was born on Saturday?

### THE SABBATH NOT LOST

2. Then we are told that the observance of the Sabbath was of necessity lost during the Egyptian bondage, because the Egyptians measured their time by tens instead of by sevens. That is as much as to say that if nine-tenths of the people should reckon their time by tens it would be impossible for the other tenth to reckon by sevens. There is not the slightest evidence that the Sabbath was ever lost. It is very probable, however, that the Jews were compelled to labor on the Sabbath during a part, at least, of their Egyptian bondage; but God delivered them from that bondage in order that they might keep his Sabbath; and even allowing that they had lost all knowledge of the day, they certainly had full knowledge of it after God made it known to them in the wilderness. Moses did not re-enact the Sabbath, but he himself said, "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Ex. 16:29. Mrs. Bateham says that "Moses apparently re-instituted it by God's command, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God's command. Ex. 14." It is quite evident to our mind that Mrs. Bateham has not studied the Sabbath question very extensively; for Ex. 14 says nothing about any long march made by the Israelites,

169

except their passage of the Red Sea, which was made in the night, and it says nothing about the Sabbath; neither does that chapter nor any other say anything about the Sabbath being re-instituted by Moses. With these three exceptions, her statement is correct.

Mrs. Bateham says that although the fourth commandment enjoins the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath, we cannot tell when it comes, because that day is not mentioned by name; and that "it had been changed once, and must have been changed or lost at other times before or after the flood;" and that consequently "we can only infer," etc. What a delightfully indefinite foundation she has laid upon which to build and enforce the observance of a

definite Sunday. But the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the same as that of creation; so it was not changed, and although the Sabbath "might have been lost," we know full well that it never was lost. It was kept constantly before the Israelites. Dire calamities were threatened them in case they should neglect its observance, and they were finally carried into captivity as a punishment for breaking the Sabbath. No one who believes in the justice of God can claim that he would punish his people for neglecting to observe a day which had been lost. After the Babylonian captivity the Jews never again relapsed into idolatry, and when Christ came he recognized the day which they were observing as the Sabbath. Mrs. Bateham herself allows that the Sabbath has not been lost since that time, because she makes a claim for uninterrupted Sunday observance from that time to this. And so we are sure that the seventh day which we observe is the day which God sanctified in Eden. Neither is it true that when the seventh day was set apart it was not named. God said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." That is the name,—"seventh day."

### **SUNDAY AND THE "MAN OF SIN"**

3. A feeble attempt is made to rescue Sunday from its papal parentage, the only argument against its being a Papal institution being that it was observed before the Emperor Constantine, and before the Catholic Church had a beginning. The same argument would prove that purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the sign of the cross, are not Papal institutions, because they were in the Christian church long before the time of Constantine. The fact that Sunday was observed from a comparatively early period, is no more evidence of divine authority for it, than is the fact that the sign of the cross was practiced by Christians in the second century, and that images were worshiped by Christians as early as the third century, any evidence that the apostles enjoined these ceremonies. It may not take much evidence to satisfy Mrs. Bateham, but if she wishes to convince seventh-day believers that Sunday is the Sabbath, she will have to give direct and positive statements of Scripture and not "presumptive evidence." In a matter of this kind, we dare not presume.

But we will leave the Sabbath argument and notice briefly the plea for a civil law. On this we will say first, that Sunday legislation has not the slightest connection with the temperance cause, even though the Women's Christian Temperance Union has gone aside from its legitimate work to form a "Sabbath Observance Department." A man may observe Sunday strictly and be an intemperate man still. He may be a strict temperance man and not regard any day as the Sabbath. Sunday legislation is in the interest of Sunday alone, and not of temperance. Those who observe the seventh day of the week are uniformly temperance people, but they do not believe that shutting up liquor saloons one day in the week would make any diminution of the cursed liquor traffic. Whenever it is proposed to submit to the people a constitutional amendment entirely prohibiting the sale of liquor, we promise that seventh-day observers will, to a man, work with them. We believe it is a crime to sell intoxicating liquors, and we would have it prohibited just as the promiscuous sale of other poisons is



prohibited. And if it is only in the interests of temperance that Sunday legislation is asked for, then entire prohibition would secure that end.

Second. It is idle to talk of the enforcement of Sunday as a civil institution. Sunday, although not a divine institution, is a religious institution. Its religious character was given to it by human authority; nevertheless, since it was appointed by "the church," it is primarily and wholly a religious institution. Now under whatever pretext Sunday observance is enforced, it will be a fact that the State is enforcing the observance of a religious custom. The day cannot be separated from its churchly connection any more than a man can be separated from his character. So that to ask us to unite with them in securing laws in favor of Sunday, is simply asking us to help make laws to enforce the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, when it has no shadow of claim to be regarded as the Sabbath.

Third. Sunday legislation is not Sabbath legislation. We believe in working for the upbuilding of the Sabbath, but we cannot do it by working for Sunday. It does not matter if the majority do regard Sunday as the Sabbath, that does not make it the Sabbath. As well might the Chinese say to the few missionaries who are in that empire, "There is no hope that Jehovah will ever be generally accepted in this empire as God, then why not join with us in enforcing the worship of Joss, that thus we may work together in unison for the universal worship of deity?" The missionaries would just say, "There is no God but one, and it is not enough that people should worship some being, but if they would offer true worship they must recognize God who made the heaven and the earth." They would readily recognize the fact that they would not be working in the interest of morality if they should attempt simply to secure the worship of some deity whom the majority would recognize, and not worship God. And so we say if we should engage with our sisters of the National Temperance Union in attempting to secure Sunday laws, we should not be working for the Sabbath.

It is not enough to be told that we will be allowed to rest upon the seventh day; the question is, Would we be allowed our God-given privilege of laboring on the first day? The answer is that they would allow us to work a little. They purpose to make the burden upon us "as light as possible." This in itself is an admission that they know that the enforcement of a Sunday law will work injustice to some. Now the law is not simply for the greatest good to the greatest number, but it is for equal justice to all. A law that works injustice to a single individual is an unjust law. A law that cannot be observed by every individual of the commonwealth, without someone being deprived of the privileges which God allows him to enjoy, has no business to be enacted.

We are willing to give Mrs. Bateham and all her sisters of the Temperance Union, credit for honesty of purpose. We are willing to grant that as an association they would not desire to see a single individual oppressed for the observance of the seventh day. But no matter how kind their intentions may be, when their law is once enacted, their power over it ceases. Then the most bigoted and benighted individual in the country has the power to secure its enforcement, and while they would not wish to injure anyone who observes the Sabbath of the Lord, and might wish to enforce it simply upon non-professors,

they could not hinder the bigot from securing its enforcement upon all, thus making it a means of wreaking his spite upon those who differ with him in religious belief.

More than this, we would not work with them for the enactment of a Sunday law, if we could have a bond given by them collectively and individually, assuring us that they would not only grant us immunity from punishment for laboring on Sunday, but would secure us against all possible molestation. The reason why is this: Sunday is not the Sabbath; it has no claim to be so regarded; the seventh day (Saturday) is the Sabbath of the Lord; God has given a solemn and emphatic command that it should be kept; and we regard it as our imperative duty to enlighten people concerning the nature and obligation of the Sabbath. Now if we should join in a movement to secure the civil recognition of Sunday, we should be only nullifying our efforts to induce men to regard the seventh day and that only as the Sabbath. It would be an agreement on our part to assist in forging chains for others, providing we could be allowed to go free, and would be an announcement to the world that while we ourselves purposed to keep the seventh day, we did not regard it as necessary that other people should do so. But we do regard it as of vital importance to keep the seventh day according to the commandment of God, and although but few may listen to the teaching of the Bible on this subject, that does not absolve us from our duty to teach the truth, not alone by our words, but by our acts.

We repeat: We are willing and even anxious to join in any purely temperance work, but even the so-called "Sabbath Observance Department of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union" cannot make us believe that Sunday is the Sabbath, nor beguile us into working for a Sunday law under the guise of temperance. "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird." Prov. 1:17. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

Our friends who are so zealous for the civil Sunday Law, tell us that the law ought to be enacted to meet the minds of the majority. How would they like it if they were in China, and a law should be enacted compelling all men to pay homage to heathen gods? They would speedily complain of the intolerance of laws of China. But if their theory of the rights of majorities is correct in one place it must be correct everywhere; and therefore heathen countries actually ought to compel all people within their jurisdiction to worship heathen gods! In Turkey a law enforcing Mohammedanism would meet the minds of the majority, and so, according to the reasoning of our Sunday friends, such laws ought, of right, to prevail in Turkey. But no; they would not suit them. They don't believe in the rule of the majority unless they form part of the majority.

At the last session of the California Methodist Episcopal Conference, the establishment of a "summer school of theology" was recommended, and a committee was appointed to carry out the design. This committee has received the co-operation of the University of the Pacific, and the school will be held from

May 23 to June 2. In their prospectus a committee say that "the numerous theological vagaries afloat, and the misleading tendency of some literature on the subject, emanating from respectable sources, render this a favorable opportunity to restate and emphasize the great doctrines of our common Christianity, as held by the Methodist Episcopal Church. "We have seen of late so many vague and contradictory theories put forth by prominent members of the Methodist Church, that we shall be glad to have an authoritative declaration of just what that church does believe. And we are anxious to see how far they will indorse the position of Wesley and Fletcher on the law of God.

Mrs. Bateham says that the day that is observed as the Sabbath is one of the non-essentials. If that is so, we should like to know why she and her brethren and sisters of the National Reform Party are making such frantic efforts to have the observance of Sunday established by law. If they believe the particular day to be observed is a matter of no importance, why don't they let people do as they please in the matter. We can see in the movement nothing but a stubborn purpose on the part of the leaders to compel everybody to do just as they do. Because with them it is not a matter of *conscience*, but only of *will*, they are determined to believe that it is not a matter of conscience with others; or that if it is with any a matter of conscience, the conscience of the minority must submit to the will of the majority. Thus it was in the days of the Inquisition; and then, as now, all was done in the name of the Lord, and for his glory.

Under the heading of "Satanic Omnipresence," the *Golden Gate* attempts to ridicule our statement of the true theory of spiritual phenomena, by saying that there are thousands of persons being influenced at the same time, in different phases of mediumship, and that if there is a personal devil "he must be in thousands of places at once in the same instant of time; hence he must be omnipresent. There is no escaping this conclusion."

Those who are familiar with the Bible will readily see that there is no chance for any such conclusion. Says the Revelator, when speaking of the phenomenon of spiritualism: "They are the spirits of *devils*, working miracles." Rev. 16:14. These devils are "the angels that sinned," and that "kept not their first estate;" and their name is "legion," for they "are many." Mark 5:9-13.

In our reference to Spiritualism we write with no great expectation that those who have been ensnared by it will see their error, although there is hope even that those who had been taken captive by the devil of and his will, may be recovered from his snare (2 Tim. 2:25, 26); but we write for the purpose of putting the unwary on their guard against this most novel and dangerous delusion of the arch-enemy of mankind. The Bible, and the Bible alone, forewarns and forearms us against it.

### **"A Seasonable Warning" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

"As a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, Am not I in sport?" Prov. 26:18, 19. This applies to children as well as to men, and it has special application at the present

day. We do not know whether or not the custom of perpetrating "April fool jokes" was in vogue in the days of Solomon; but if it was not, there were people who told lies in sport, and against all such this language is directed. What are called "April fool jokes" are nothing else but lies, and the one who indulges in them proclaims himself a fool. We have seen people professing confidence, who countenance their children in such practices, in doubtless thinking that it was "innocence sport." If a madman should come into a crowded assembly and begin to scatter firebrands, and shoot poisonous arrows, it would not be called innocent sport; but Solomon says he is just like one who deceives his neighbor, and says, "Am not I in sport?"

The first of April is just before us, and we write this in hope that the eyes of some thoughtless ones may be open to see that a lie on the first day of April is just as sinful as one on any other day of the year; and that to tell a lie in sport is worse if possible than telling one in anger, because it indicates that the person's moral sensibilities are so blunted that he can deliberately lie without having a thought of its sinfulness.

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor; for we are members one of another." Eph. 4:25. Let parents see that they themselves are not blameworthy in this matter, and let them beware lest their children acquire, in sport, a disregard for truth, which will be difficult to overcome.

### **"Sabbath Observance by Law" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend in San Francisco, who has read with interest our appeal on the Sunday Law, writes to us:-

"The seventh day being the day that God *did* command to be kept holy, what are the objections to making it the universal day of rest?"

We reply that there are no objections at all, provided all people are willing to regard it as a day of rest. On the contrary, it ought by all means to be universally regarded as the day of rest, because God has said, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;" and this commandment is addressed to all the inhabitants of the earth.

But, sad to say, all people do not regard the word of the Lord as of final authority, and they ignore his commandment for a way of their own devising. Someone will say, "Then why not pass a law compelling people to obey the commandment of the Lord?" That would not solve the difficulty, for it would be forced service, and there would be in it no love for God, nor regard for his word. So that if we once started out on the *legal plan*, we should have to pass another law compelling men to love the Lord! But though such a law might be passed, it would amount to nothing, for love is not love unless it comes spontaneously from the heart.

The obvious conclusion is that the keeping of the Sabbath is purely an act of religious worship of God, and is not within human jurisdiction. God wants all men to repent and come to the knowledge of the truth; and he has commissioned men

as ambassadors to beg their fellow-men to be reconciled to God; but he has given no one the authority to attempt the impossibility of forcing men to repent. So he wants all men to acknowledge him, and to show their homage by keeping his Sabbath; and he has committed to men the preaching of the word; but he has given no one authority to try to compel men hypocritically to acknowledge him by a *form* of service. It would indeed be a glorious thing if all men would obey the Lord; but all will not. Our duty is simply to obey him for ourselves, and to use our influence to persuade others to do likewise. Those who will not obey are answerable alone to God, from whom they will at the Judgment receive the punishment which their rebellion merits.

**March 24, 1887**

**"Object of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Rev. F. N. Zabriskie, D. D., wrote a series of articles for the *Congregationalist*, on "The Bible the Workingmen's Book," in one of which he said:-

"The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of workingmen, that they should not be deprived of a weekly rest. The Mosaic law of the Sabbath is often misrepresented, and is apt to be misunderstood by those for whom it is specially intended. The Sabbath as our Lord Jesus Christ said, 'was made for man,' and being a day of rest, it was, of course, pre-eminently made for the workingman. The essential object which the commandment seeks is rest from unnecessary labor."

This is an idea which is fast gaining ground, and which cannot be too strongly combated. It is the prevalence of this idea which gives a great impetus to the movement in favor of a Sunday law. Because of this idea, many irreligious persons will vote for a law enforcing Sunday observance, when they would not do so if it were set before them on a purely religious basis. Of course the result is the same, no matter what motives prompt those who work for the law. Sunday being essentially an institution of the church, if observance of it is enforced by civil law we shall have to that extent a union of Church and State, even though infidels may have voted for the law. The idea that God's design in appointing a day of rest for man was simply for the wants of the physical nature, is a modern device gotten up by the zealous adherents of Sunday observance, with the design of accomplishing a two-fold purpose with respect to the Sunday. If this theory be accepted, its first result is to make men think that the particular day of the week which shall be observed is of no importance, and that the only object is uniformity for the sake of convenience. And the second result is the enforcement of Sunday, the day which has the most adherents, on the basis that the State has a right to legislate for the physical well-being of its citizens.

The Sabbath was made for man; not for one man simply but for all mankind. The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of the workingmen, only in the sense that God designed that all men should be workingmen. It is true that the

Sabbath rest furnishes opportunity for the repair of physical waste, so that man is better able to perform the duties of the week following. But this is incidental; we cannot say that it is even a secondary reason for the giving of the fourth commandment, because it does not enter into the matter at all. The keeping of the Sabbath is primarily an act of worship. The Sabbath was given as a memorial of God's creative power. It was given that man might ever keep in mind the one true God, whose distinguishing characteristic is that he created the heavens and the earth. It was given to guard men against idolatry; for those who keep the Sabbath according to God's appointment, and for the reason for which he appointed it, can never worship false gods. Every man will worship the object which to him seems greatest. Some men think there is nothing greater in creation than themselves, and so they worship themselves. They are called atheists, because the god that they worship is so insignificant that they are considered as not recognizing any God. But the man whose mind is drawn out to meditate upon the wonders of creation, and who realizes that the things that are made reveal the existence of the one only true God, will never worship any inferior being. The Sabbath was appointed for the express purpose of giving man an opportunity to meditate upon God and his works, and thus to keep alive the sentiment of real religion. Those keeping the Sabbath have the first principle of worship to God. The man who thinks that it was given for the purpose of securing proper physical rest to man, has no just conception of the nature of the Sabbath.

But since the Sabbath was appointed by the Creator, that man might recognize him as Creator, and since it is purely a matter of worship and of recognition of the true God, it follows as a matter of course that the rest must be upon the particular day which God has designated as the Sabbath. Otherwise God is in reality ignored. Worship implies submission. Submission is indicated by obedience. When a man refuses to obey another, it is because he considers himself equal to, or superior to that other, and of course there would be no thought in his mind of worshiping such an one. So if men really worship God, they will submit to his will in all respects. If they willfully disobey him, they show that their worship is only a form, and that they think more of themselves than they do of him.

The Sabbath, as we have shown, is the most simple and direct act of worship to God, and since God has specified the seventh day as the Sabbath, it follows that the keeping of any other day as the Sabbath, is not an act of worship to God. It was the seventh day alone upon which God rested from his work of creation. The seventh day alone was blest by him because he had rested upon it, and it was the seventh day and no other, which God appointed for man's observance, with the design that as God upon that day had viewed all his works and pronounced them very good, so man should upon that day consider the works of God and should glorify the Creator. W.

**"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

Dr. Bailey closes up his Sunday argument thus:-

"I present but one additional argument; and this I address to those who read the Greek language. If we translate literally the Greek Testament in all four of the evangelists, when speaking of the resurrection of Christ, it would show that a new order of Sabbaths began at that time. In Matt. 28:1 it reads literally, 'In the *end of Sabbaths* as it began to dawn towards the *first of Sabbaths*, came Mary Magdalene.' The word *Sabbath* is *sabbatoon*, genitive plural, with no article preceding; so it is in *end of Sabbaths*; and the word translated *week* is also *sabbatoon*, genitive plural with no article. It reads *eis mian sabbatoon*, towards the *first of Sabbaths*, as if the old order of Sabbaths had passed away, and a new order of Sabbaths had begun. In Mark 16:1 it reads literally, 'And when the *Sabbath* (singular number) was past, Mary Magdalene,' etc. Verse 2, 'Now upon the *first of Sabbaths* they came to the sepulcher.' The same transition is here marked from the old to the new Sabbaths. In Luke 24:1 it reads: 'Now upon the *first of Sabbath*, very early in the morning they came unto the sepulcher.' Luke uses the article, *the first of the Sabbaths*, but his language, like that of Matthew and Mark, indicates a new order of things. John 20:1 reads, literally: 'The *first of the Sabbaths* cometh Mary Magdalene while it was yet dark unto the sepulcher.'"

The only mistake in the above, from the Sunday point of view, is in addressing the "argument" to those who read the Greek language. The writer evidently gave it for the effect it would have on those who know nothing of the Greek, for no one who has even a little knowledge of that language would be deceived by statements so palpably absurd. The translation of the passages to which he refers is literally exact in the Authorized Version, and no one having a reputation as a scholar to maintain, would dare attempt to translate them differently. We dislike to refer to the Greek, when writing for the general reader, because those who do not read that language have not the power to verify what we say. But we must notice this perversion of the Scripture, and will try to do it in such a way as to be understood by all. It is true that in Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, Luke 24:1 and John 20:1, the word rendered "week" is *sabbaton*. On this word Dr. Robinson, who by the way was a Baptist, in his Lexicon of the New Testament said:-

"Meton., *a sabbath*, put for the interval 'from Sabbath to Sabbath;' hence a *se'unight, week*; so especially Luke 18:12, *nesteuo dis tou sabbatou*. Elsewhere only after numerals marking the days of the week; Mark 16:9, *prote (hemera) sabbatou*. Plur., Matt. 28:1, 1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2.-So Heb. *shabbathoth, Scpt., hebdomas*, Lev. 23:15. Comp. Deut. 16:9; also the Syriac version Luke 18:12. In the Talmudists the days of the week are written, *chadh beshabboth, sheni besh, shelisha besh'*, *i.e.*, the first, second, third day in the Sabbath (week). See Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in Matt. 28:1."

The reader will notice that Dr. Robinson refers to several other texts where the same word occurs, and where it is properly rendered "week." Let us try Mr. Bailey's translation on these passages. Take Luke 18:12: "I fast twice in the *week*; I give tithes of all I possess." The word rendered "week" is *sabbaton*. Dr. Bailey would translate the passage "I fast twice in the Sabbath," and would

explain it that the Pharisee was priding himself because he fasted twice every Sunday!

Mr. Bailey claims that in the texts to which he refers, the word *sabbaton* should be rendered "Sabbath," so as to read, "the first of Sabbaths," thus indicating, he says, that "the old order of Sabbaths had passed away and a new order of Sabbaths had begun." But in Acts 20:7 we have the same expression again, in the narration of an event which took place thirty years after the crucifixion. Was this the first of a new order of Sabbaths? If so, what order was it? Mr. Bailey's rendering would make a new order of Sabbaths to begin at the resurrection, and another order thirty years after, when Paul was at Troas. Still further, the same expression occurs in 1 Cor. 16:2, where Paul directs the brethren to lay aside money "on the first day of the week." Mr. Bailey's rendering of the passage would make Paul direct the churches to lay by them in store on the first of every new order of Sabbaths! Unless a new order of Sabbaths was instituted frequently, their liberality would not be greatly taxed. It might be noted further that Mr. Bailey in his rendering of the expression entirely ignores the word *hemera* (day), which occurs in the text. But it is unnecessary to carry this point further, for anyone can see from the texts cited the absurdity of his so-called argument. Mr. Bailey himself seems to have enough knowledge of the Greek to have some sense of the absurdity of his own position, for he concludes:-

"Thus there is wonderful agreement of the four evangelists in using this singular expression. It seems to me to convey the idea of a grand change from one order of Sabbaths on the seventh day of the week, to another and new order of Sabbaths on the first day of the week. That such a change then and there actually occurred, I have abundantly shown from various other proofs, even if these passages be not literally translated as suggested above."

Said the Irish barrister: "May it please the Court, if I am wrong on this point I have another that is equally conclusive." In all Sunday argument the idea seems to be that a good many weak points will make one strong one; that although a dozen statements may be individually fallacious, they will when combined make a true one. That is on the principle that if you add enough ciphers together you will get something of value. The three lines of argument which Mr. Bailey gives from Scripture, from history, and from the Fathers, remind us of the plea in the famous kettle suit. The man who was charged with breaking his neighbor's kettle, made his defense under three heads, thus: "First, the kettle was cracked when I borrowed it. Second, it was whole when I carried it back. Thus, I never borrowed it." If one of these points was disproved, he had two others to fall back on. It made no difference if they did contradict each other, it was proof.

We have now followed Mr. Bailey through all the windings of his "weighty and timely utterance" in behalf of Sunday. We have done it not with any desire to depreciate Mr. Bailey, but in order to show the inherent weakness of the Sunday cause. We have no doubt that he did the best he could, and that his utterances are just as weighty as any that could be made. In contrast with the vain attempts to put the first day in the place of the seventh as



the Sabbath, we present the simple argument for the true Sabbath in the following words:-

"And God spake all these words," saying, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:1, 8-11.

"The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111:7, 8.

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. W.

### **"The Seventh Day of the Week" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Bible Banner* a man who is attempting to *settle* the Sabbath question, says: "This fourth commandment, in itself, says nothing about the 'day of the week,' any more than it does of the month or year." Very well, let us suppose that it refers to the year. Then the words, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," would mean that we are to work six days of the year, and rest on the seventh. That would give us only one Sabbath in the year, which might be very agreeable to some; but it would also give us only six days in the year for work! What about the remaining three hundred and fifty-eight days? On them, according to the year theory, no one can either work or rest! We think no one will be foolish enough to deliberately take the position that "the seventh day" of the fourth commandment means the seventh day of the year.

Well, then, let us suppose that the commandment refers to the month. Thus "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," would mean that work may be done six days in the month, but that the seventh day of the month is the Sabbath, when no work may be done. In this case we should have twelve Sabbaths in the year, and seventy-two days for work. Many people would be hard pressed to know how to earn a living in those seventy-two days; but they would be much more troubled to know how to employ the remaining two hundred and eighty-one days of the year, in which they could neither work nor rest. We believe that no one, even of those who most hate the Sabbath, will claim that "the seventh day" of the fourth commandment applies to the month any more than to the year.

Well, it must refer to something. Certainly; it applies to a period of time which consists of exactly seven days, six of which are to be used for labor, and the seventh for rest. Now the only period of seven days that is known to man, is the week, and this division of time has been known from the most ancient times.

"Seven days make one week," is one of the first things learned by the school-boy. Therefore when the Lord said, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," it is evident that he meant that we may work six days in the week, but that we must rest on the seventh day of the week. And the child of ten years who should profess ignorance of the fact that the first day of the week is Sunday, and that the seventh or last day of the week is Saturday, would be regarded in this age of schools and schoolmasters as a much neglected youth.

One stock argument of our Sunday friends is that it is very essential that all people should keep the same day, so that there may be no clashing. No one will deny this. Certainly people ought all to keep the same day. And if this is so, it is very evident that God knew it when he gave the commandment. Then he must have commanded all the people to keep the same day. As a matter of fact, all the Jews did regard the same day as the Sabbath. No one will deny this. All will admit that when the Lord gave the commandment, he expected all to whom it was spoken to keep the same day. Then the commandment must refer to a definite day, and to one which all understood. That is, all must have understood "the seventh day" to refer to some specific day; for if they had had the idea that the Lord meant simply that they could rest on any day after six days of labor, and that there was no specific point from which to begin their count, there would have been no uniformity. But there was uniformity among those who regarded the commandment, because the commandment is definite. Two things being granted, the third must follow. Let it be granted that uniformity in the day of rest is essential, and that God knew this when he gave the commandment, and it must be admitted that the fourth commandment specifies a definite day as the Sabbath, and that that day is the seventh day of the week.

So we find that the fourth commandment does in itself tell what day of the week is the Sabbath. For corroborative proof, we turn to the account of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. He was crucified on the preparation day, "and the Sabbath drew on." Luke 23:54. And the women who followed, and saw where he was laid, "returned, and prepared spices and ointment; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.*" Verse 56. That means that they did exactly as the commandment enjoins. Now the next day after that Sabbath day which they kept "according to the commandment," was "the first day of the week" (Luke 24:1) and on it they resumed their work. Now since there are but seven days in the week, it inevitably follows that "the Sabbath day" which the fourth commandment enjoins is the seventh day *of the week*. No man on earth can prove anything to the contrary; and no sane man would think of denying so plain a conclusion, if it were not that he wished to turn aside from the simple commandment of the Lord, for a way of his own choosing. W.

### **"The Lord's Prayer. Thy Will Be Done" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that this part of the Lord's prayer is the least understood of any. The sentence, "thy will be done," is thought by most people to be applicable only

in cases of sickness or other trial, to indicate that the sufferer is willing to endure patiently. But this is but a very limited view of the expression. As a matter of fact there is no more comprehensive sentence in the Bible, or that can be uttered by man, than the simple words, "thy will be done." It all depends on what the will of the Lord is, which point we must investigate.

The second chapter of Romans has reference especially to the Jews, to show that they, as well as the Gentiles, are sinners, and in verses 17, 18 the apostle speaks to them directly, in these words: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest[his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." How does Paul say the Jew knew the will of God? Because he was instructed out of the law. The obvious conclusion, then, is that the will of God may be known only by a study of the law, which makes necessary the further conclusion that the law of God is his will.

This conclusion is verified most plainly by the words which the psalmist utters prophetically in behalf of Christ. In Ps. 40:7, 8, we read: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." It is first stated that Christ delighted to do the will of the Father; and then to make this statement emphatic, it is added, "Yea, thy law is within my heart." Out of the heart are the issues of life (Prov. 4:23); as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he (Prov. 23:7); that is, a man's actions correspond to that which is in his heart; he does just what is in his heart. Therefore if the law of God being in a man's heart, leads him to delight to do the will of God, it follows that the law of God is the will of God.

In Rev. 22:14 we read that they who keep the commandments shall have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city; and in Matt. 7:21 we read that only those who do the will of God, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Here again we see the identity of the will of God and the commandments. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind as to what law it is that is the will of God, it may be settled by reading Rom. 2:21, 22 in connection with verses 17-20, the first two of which have been quoted. The ten commandments are the will of God.

Therefore when we pray, "Thy will be done," we in reality pray that the commandments of God may be kept by us and by all others who dwell on the earth. We pray that they may be kept even as they are kept in Heaven, where the angels "do his commandment, hearkening unto the voice of his word." Ps. 103:20. It follows, therefore, that whoever utters the Lord's prayer or a prayer modeled after it, and does not in his heart "consent unto the law that it is good," and honestly desires to conform to all its requirements, is guilty of mockery before God. Such an one cannot hope to have his petition regarded; and so we may understand the words of the psalmist: "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Ps. 66:18); and of Solomon: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9.

When will this petition be granted? When shall the will of God be done in earth as it is now done in Heaven? The preceding clause, upon which we commented in our last article, answers this question. It is when the kingdom of

God is established upon the earth; for in the new heavens and the new earth, righteousness alone shall dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever." Isa. 60:21. The law of God, his holy will, is righteousness (Ps. 119:172), and the keeping of it constitutes the righteousness of God's people. Deut. 6:25. The Lord's prayer, therefore teaches us to long for the coming and kingdom of our Lord, when the law of God shall be in the hearts of all men, even as it was in the heart of the Son of God when he was on earth.

But the coming of the Lord, and the establishment of his kingdom, will not bring about this state of things. When Christ comes, the only change which is wrought in men is the change from mortality to immortality. He does not change men's characters from sinfulness to righteousness, for just before he comes the decree goes forth: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. 22:11. Men will be ushered into eternity with just the same characters that they have when probation closes. Those who inhabit the new earth will all be righteous, simply because the transgressors will have been rooted out of it (Prov. 2:22), and the perfect will be permitted to remain in it, just because they are perfect in the midst of unrighteousness, even as Noah was.

This being the case, it follows that to utter the Lord's prayer with honesty of heart, is to pray that God will work in us that which is good; it indicates a willingness to submit ourselves in all things to the will of God, that we may become like him. Certainly no one who knows what the will of God is, and who knows how it will come to pass that the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in Heaven, could utter that prayer and not really desire to have that law written in his heart.

Although God's ways are as much higher than our ways as the heavens are higher than the earth, we have the assurance that every petition offered in humility and sincerity will be answered, and as we may attain to this high

187

standard. They that hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:21. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have lately received requests from various quarters for an explanation of 2 Cor. 3:6-11. We have had an article on that subject in waiting for some time, and it will soon appear in the SIGNS.

All persons having any business with the Kentucky Tract and Missionary Society will please take notice that Sister Alice C. Scott, of Cecillian, Hardin County, Ky., has been appointed State Secretary, *rice* Brother Harry Rupert resigned.

People who expect to have their communications attended to, should sign their full name and address. Even though the communication is only a question

that does not require a personal answer, but may be answered through the paper, we must know who sends the question before we answer it. Anonymous letters and questions always go direct to the waste basket. No one should ever write anything to which he is ashamed or afraid to sign his name.

Says the *Golden Gate* of March 12: "That powerful bands of spirits, embracing the wisest and best of the children of men of all past ages, are now organizing for the spiritual unfoldment of humanity, is the uniform testimony of all our mediums." This is in direct fulfillment of the prophecy: "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Rev. 12:12.

On the 17th of February, Rev. J. H. Pettengell died, in New Haven, Conn., aged seventy-two. Professor Pettengell was quite widely known as a vigorous writer in behalf of the doctrine of conditional immortality, or eternal life only through Christ. Many extracts from his pen have appeared in the SIGNS, of which he was a constant reader. He retained his connection with the Congregationalist Church until his death, although his pronounced views in regard to conditional immortality, shut him out, years ago, from any pulpit of that denomination.

Mrs. Bateham, superintendent of the "Sabbath Observance Department" of the National W. C. T. U., has issued a circular to Christian ministers, begging them to preach a sermon on Sabbath observance, "on the first Sabbath of April next." We have no doubt but this request will be quite largely complied with; we hope it will. For the benefit of those who may be in doubt, we will here state that "the first Sabbath in April" falls this year on the second day of the month. Remember the time appointed for the preaching of the sermon-Sabbath, April 2, 1887.

Speaking of the probable union of the National W. C. T. U. and the Knights of Labor, Joseph Cook said: "Powderly is a Catholic, Miss Willard a Methodist; if they can join hands, they may, as she says, 'lift civilization to a table-land across which Christ may walk.'" It is strange how Christ is ignored by so many who profess to revere his name and who desire the advancement of his cause. How ignored? Just in this way: They have the idea of a temporal kingdom of Christ, and they think that upon them devolves the work of bringing the world to such a state of godliness that Christ will come and take possession. This is National Reform doctrine pure and simple, and it is just what is implied in the above-quoted remark. And so the work of Christ by his Spirit, the only means by which people can be made better, is ignored by those who blindly think that they are honoring him. Why will professed Christian workers imagine that they can do what the Spirit of the Lord cannot, namely, make all people Christians? While they are thus employing impotent human agencies, the world is steadily going to destruction.

At the request of the California Conference Committee, we publish the following sections from the State constitution, which they would like to have well considered by the churches within the Conference, and by those desiring to labor in any part of it:-

"When any church, or scattered brethren, wish ministerial labor in their vicinity, they all should be made to the Executive Committee."

"Those who may feel it their duty to exercise their gifts as preachers or colporteurs, shall lay their exercises of mind before the Conference Committee, and the committee may license them if they consider them qualified."

### **"The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to the question, "Should the Sabbath be kept absolutely holy?" the editor of the *Christian Standard* (March 12, 1887) says:-

"The first day of the week, which is called the Lord's day, is not the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the seventh day, or Saturday. This day, as is well known, is observed by the Jews, under the teaching of the law of Moses. They do not, and never did, keep it absolutely holy. The first day of the week is made a day of rest for man and beast by the law of the land. . . . While the first day of the week is not hedged about with the restrictions that pertained to the Sabbath of the law, it is meant that it be especially devoted to religious services-and not to business or pleasure."

Truly, "their rock is not as our rock." The Lord says, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy;" but the *Standard* says that the Sabbath-day is not to be remembered at all, but that another day, which is not the Sabbath, is to be kept in its place. Let all who read this remember the following truths, which are admitted by this champion of the first-day observance:-

1. Saturday is the seventh day.
2. The seventh day is the Sabbath.
3. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath.
4. The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined by the law of God.
5. The observance of the first day, which is not the Sabbath, is enjoined by the law of the land.

There is the whole case in a nut-shell. Reader, can you have any doubt as to your duty?

### **"Training Up Criminals" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

The trial of a young man in San Francisco, for the murder of a girl, has just been completed. The fact that the murder was committed being well known, there was no attempt to conceal it, and the usual defense, insanity, was resorted to. In proof of his insanity his mother testified that from the time the defendant was a baby he had "spells." "When two or three years of age he would lie down on his back on the floor or on the sidewalk and, without any provocation whatever, would kick, and scream, and cry. He could not be quieted; candy would have no effect on him. As he grew older, these spells would increase." It was also in evidence that on his way home from school one day, he threw a stone, without any provocation, and broke a window.

Very natural that these spells should increase. But if, in the place of candy, some of Solomon's remedy had been judiciously and vigorously administered, there is no doubt that it would have been effectual in stopping that incipient insanity. We have seen scores of children who were subject to just such "spells." And too often their mothers were training them in it, and preparing the way for their future career as criminals. Everybody is born with greater or less inclination to evil; it is the duty of the parent to counteract this tendency, and by insisting on prompt obedience, to lay the foundation for a law-abiding citizen. But what hope is there for the future, when natural depravity is fostered by parents, and when the very fact that a person is depraved enough to commit a barbarous act is considered evidence that he should not be punished?

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce." 2 Tim. 3:1-3.

### **"Beginning of the Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Not being clear upon the division of time, I appeal to you for help. It seems to me from some scriptures that the day should begin in the morning. It seems to be more consistent in beginning the day in the morning at the creation. At the resurrection of Christ it says, "As it began to *dawn* toward the first day of the week," etc. And again it speaks of darkness lasting from the sixth to the ninth hour. Now if the day began in the evening it would be dark all the time, and then it would make the crucifixion of Christ in the night. Please answer through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. C. H. E."

If our correspondent will read carefully the first chapter of Genesis he will see that it would not be consistent to begin the day in the morning. Time as distinguished from eternity, is reckoned from the first act of creation. The second verse of the Bible tells us that darkness was upon the face of the deep, that is, upon the chaotic mass which had been spoken into existence. The next act of creation is recorded in the third verse: "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." This constituted the first day's work. The evening, the darkness, and the morning, the light, were the first day. Here it is seen that in the first day the dark preceded the light part, and consequently the same order must necessarily follow in all succeeding days. The record of creation is alone sufficient to show that the day begins with the evening. Where our correspondent falls into difficulty is in forgetting that while each day is twenty-four hours long, and is composed of a period of darkness and a period of light, the dark part of the day is called night, and the light part is also called day; so we use the word "day" in two senses: (1) as applying to the whole period of twenty-four hours, and (2) as applying to the part of the day when the sun shines.

The Hebrews always began their day at the going down of the sun, but they had a separate reckoning for the hours of the night and for those of the day. The night was divided into four watches of about three hours each; the day was

divided into twelve hours. To be sure, at some seasons of the year, there are less than twelve hours of daylight, and at other seasons more, but throughout the year there is an average of just twelve hours of darkness and twelve hours of light in each day. Therefore they reckoned the period of daylight uniformly from six o'clock. Then the first hour of the day would be seven o'clock, the third hour nine o'clock, the sixth hour twelve, the ninth hour three o'clock, and the twelfth hour six o'clock. So at the crucifixion of Christ darkness was from noon until three o'clock. This mode of reckoning is everywhere used in the Bible and yet it is well understood that the day properly began at evening, as we read in Lev. 23:32, "From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath."

**March 31, 1887**

**"Fearing the Lord and Serving Idols" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS asks an answer to the following questions:-

"If a person hears 'present truth,' and, feeling anxious about it, goes to the Lord for guidance, and receives the answer in a dream that he is to keep both days [*i.e.* Sabbath and Sunday], is it sure to be from God?

"Would it be keeping the commandments of God to keep both days?"

To both the above questions we can say emphatically, No. For what reason? This:-

1. The Lord has plainly declared that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." That is his "holy day." Six days of the week he has given to man in which to work, but the seventh day he demands shall be devoted to his service. Now when the Lord has declared one thing in his word, he will not reveal something directly contrary by means of a dream. But if it be urged that if the answer by dream is that both days shall be kept, *that* is not in opposition to the word of God, we answer,

2. To do what God has not required, is to do directly contrary to his word. The truth of this will appear when we consider that in his word God has required everything that is right, everything that is duty. There is not a thing which man ought to do, that is not commanded in the Bible. Then if a person does something which the Bible does not require, he evidently must be doing something that is not right, or that is wrong. We repeat: if the Bible requires *everything* that is right, there can be nothing right which is not required in the Bible; but everything that is not right is wrong; therefore everything that is not required in the Bible is wrong.

The same truth may be stated thus: The fact that a certain thing is required as a duty, shows that something entirely different, and opposed, is not a duty. If God is so careful lest we should do wrong, that he tells us just what he wants us to do, it is evident that if there is something that he does not tell us to do, it is because he does not want us to do it; and to do what the Lord does not want us to do, is just as surely a sin as it is to fail to do what he wants us to do. The man to whom the Lord should sternly ask, "Who hath required this at your hand?" would be as



much at a loss for an answer as the one to whom he should say, "Why hast thou not done this?"

Now just as surely as the Lord does require the observance of the seventh day of the week, he does *not* require the observance of the first day of the week. The commandment says, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." While it is doubtless true that this is not an imperative order that every man must work during the whole of the six days, it is a permission to work on any part or the whole of the six days. The six days are given to man; they are termed "the six working days" (Eze. 46:1), in distinction from the Sabbath, which is a rest day. God has laid no more claim to Sunday than he has to Monday or Wednesday; and to do service which the Lord has not commanded, is to follow the commandments of men, "which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; and not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." Col. 2:23.

More than this, the Sabbath is the great sign of which we are to indicate our allegiance to the true God. Sunday, "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," has been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church as the badge of its power, and as the sign by which men may indicate their allegiance to the Papacy. As a Catholic writer says, in keeping Sunday Protestants do homage, in spite of themselves, to the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore if a man observes both Sabbath and Sunday, he thereby professes allegiance both to God and to the Pope. But Christ says, "No man can serve two masters." God requires undivided service. Such worship as was rendered by the Assyrians who were placed in Samaria, is not acceptable to God. They "feared the Lord and served their graven images." Such ones need an Elijah to say to them as he did to the Jews who were running after Baal, the sun-god: "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." 1 Kings 18:21.

A few words about going to the Lord for "guidance" in regard to the commandments. We cannot regard it as anything else than an insult to the Lord. When God has plainly revealed his will, it is certainly, to speak plainly, impudent to turn right around and ask him if he means what he says, and if he will not make an exception in the case of the petitioner. Balaam tried that once. The Lord told him not to do a certain thing; but Balaam went to the Lord again and again until at last he actually received permission to go. The end, however, to which Balaam came should serve as a warning to others who feel inclined to ask the Lord to give up his way for theirs. When God has spoken, let man hold his peace. W.

### **"Creation and Redemption" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following extract represents a view of these great events which is exceedingly common:-

"The work of creation cost but a word. 'He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.' The work of redemption cost infinitely more than creation. It cost the *death of Christ*. As the work of redemption is grander than

that of creation, so the *Lord's day*, which commemorates its completion, is higher, *holier, grander* than the Jewish Sabbath, that commemorates the completion of the creation."

We never read such a statement without a feeling of sadness at the thought that it represents the limited ideas of the work of God, which are entertained by the great majority of people. Such statements do not indicate that the ones making them have exalted ideas of the work of redemption, but that their ideas of the work of creation are extremely narrow.

It is the height of presumption for anybody to compare creation and redemption; for both are infinite, and far beyond human comprehension. Suppose you take a person who is unacquainted with geography, and place him in an elevated position on the Isthmus of Panama, where he can view at the same time the two oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. Now ask him which is the larger; if he expresses an opinion, it will be only a conjecture based on no foundation whatever; for he cannot see any difference. His eye can take in just as much of one as of the other, and for aught that his observation teaches to the contrary, they both stretch away into infinite space.

Stand at the base of two mountains, whose peaks towering up into the sky, are lost in the clouds. Now tell, if you can, which is the higher. You say that you cannot, because you cannot see to the top of either one; and even if you could, your eye could not measure the difference between them, if there should be any. So it is with creation and redemption. Both works are the product of infinite power combined with infinite love, and could have been accomplished by nothing less. But if nothing but infinite power and infinite love could create or redeem the world, certainly nothing less than infinite wisdom can comprehend either one, must less grasp both in one thought, so as to compare them. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3. Does that text say that we understand creation? Not at all; it says that we understand that the worlds were formed out of nothing, by the word of God. How do we understand this? Through faith; we know it simply because we believe the word of God, which declares it.

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth," "for he spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast." Ps. 33:6, 9. Here we have the statement of the fact which we understand only by faith. God spoke, and the worlds came into existence. How easily it was done! says one. Easily done? Yes, easily done by infinite power; but who can conceive of power that could by a word cause that to exist, which previously had no existence? Because God so easily accomplished the work of creation, are we therefore to esteem it a light thing? Far from it. Says the psalmist: "Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him." Why? "For he spake, and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." The power of God as manifested in creation is a most stupendous thing, calling for wonder and awe.

Let the one who thinks that the work of the creation was a comparatively small affair, try to create something. Let him attend to make a grain of sand. Let

him attempt to make something out of nothing. Attempt! How can he attempt? What would be the first step? All the power of all the created intelligence in the universe is not equal to the creation of the smallest atom of matter. All the combined intelligence of men and angels cannot approach to the shadow of an imagination of how such a thing could be done. Yet God did it with a word. Does that statement depreciate the work of creation? Not by any means. It simply shows the inconceivable power of God.

The Sabbath was given to men in order that he might contemplate the power of God, and so lead to greater reverence for him. But someone may say that it would be monotonous to meditate week after week upon one thing. Not unless the man is in one of the classes mentioned in Ps. 92:6. The creation of God, like himself, is infinite; and as men by searching cannot find out God, so as to know the Almighty to perfection (Job 11:7); so no man can ever fathom God's creation. Only when we rightly understand the object of the Sabbath, can we appreciate the psalm for the Sabbath day:-

"It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most High; to show forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night, upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery; upon the harp with a solemn sound. For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands. O Lord, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep. A brutish man knoweth not; neither doth a fool understand this." Ps. 92:1-6.

It would be folly to attempt to convey to anyone, by words, any sense of the work of creation. All that we can do is to tell the reader to meditate upon it. But let no one think that the work of creation was simply a manifestation of power. In the creation, God's love is also manifested. Was it not unselfish love that caused God to create beings in his own image, capable of the highest pleasures, and setting before them an eternity of life, in which their mental and spiritual natures could continually develop, so as to make them capable of still higher enjoyment? Those who fail to see the love of God in creation, should remember that the great work of redemption is only for the purpose of bringing men to the enjoyment of that for which he has created. We are not comparing redemption with creation, for that is impossible; but we are showing that in the creation God manifested love as well as power. But if it is admitted that the love of God combined with his power, in creation, it must be admitted that the creation was the result of infinite love as well as of infinite power; for God, the infinite, must love to an infinite degree.

The Sabbath,-the seventh day,-was instituted as a memorial of creation. This is necessarily admitted in the claim that Sunday should be kept instead of Saturday because redemption is greater than creation. Now the man who says that the Sabbath ought no longer to be kept, thereby says that God's power and love should be no longer remembered. And that is equivalent to saying that God himself ought to no longer be remembered! And that is still further equivalent to saying that the work of redemption ought not to be considered; for God is Redeemer as well as Creator. In other words, no one can speak slightly of the Sabbath as the memorial of creation, without disparaging the work of creation;

but he who has narrow views of the love and power of God in creation, necessarily has narrow views of God himself; and he who has narrow views of God, cannot place a high estimate upon the work of redemption. And now we can better understand these words: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctifieth them." Eze. 20:12.

Of the greatness of redemption it is not necessary to speak here particularly. They who affect to compare creation and redemption, profess to adore the infinite love and power manifested in the gospel; although, as we have shown, they can have exalted ideas of this only in proportion as they entertain exalted views of God's love and power in creation. Enough to say that the redemption of man is accomplished at an infinite cost. Says Paul: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Christ*." Eph. 3:8. And Peter says that even the angels desire (but in vain) to comprehend the love of God as manifest in the gospel.

Should not so great a work as this be commemorated? Should not men leave something to keep the great work of redemption in mind? Most assuredly, but not at the expense of the memorial of creation. The idea that men cannot show their appreciation of the plan of salvation without despising the work of God in the creation, is as monstrous as the idea that is sometimes advanced, that men cannot worship Christ without turning away from their allegiance to God! On this matter of recognizing the work of redemption, by some act, we have the following points to offer:-

1. The work of redemption, instead of having been completed at the resurrection, is not yet completed. Redemption is complete only when all the effects of the curse have been obliterated. When redemption is completed, there will be no further work to be done for man. That is the crowning act in the great plan of salvation. Christ is made unto us, "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Redemption is the last of all. It includes not only salvation from sin, but from death and the possibility of it. It includes also the renovation of the earth. Read a few texts:-

Eph. 1:13, 14: "In whom [*i.e.*, in Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." Here we see that the Spirit is given to those who believe, not because they are redeemed, but only as a pledge of their future redemption. Now read a still more direct statement concerning those who have this witnessing Spirit.

Rom. 8:22, 23: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also,

200

which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for* the adoption, to wit, *the redemption* of our body." What this redemption of the body is, Paul shows in Phil. 3:20, 21:-

"For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned

like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

Then it is utterly impossible to commemorate completed redemption, because we are yet waiting for redemption.

2. The work of redemption must be kept in mind, but by the appropriate ceremonies. There is not an intimation in the entire Bible, that God would have us keep Sunday or any other day in commemoration of the work of redemption either partial or complete. When people do what the Bible does not tell them to do, they always make mistakes.

In Eph. 1:7 and Col. 1:14 we are told that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. But his blood was shed upon Friday; must we therefore conclude that we must keep Friday? By no means. After giving the manner of celebrating the Lord's supper, Paul says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do the show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. There is a divinely appointed ordinance by which we can commemorate so much of the work of redemption as has been completed.

But is there nothing as a memorial of the glorious resurrection of Christ? Indeed there is. Says Paul: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. 6:3, 4.

In baptism we have a memorial both of the death and the resurrection of Christ. "Oh, but," says one, "that is only a single act; we want a constantly recurring memorial of the resurrection." We submit that the Lord knows what we want, far better than we do; but it is a mistake to say that the remembrance of the resurrection lies only at the beginning of the Christian life. Read again: "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk [every day] in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also [all our lives] in the likeness of his resurrection." So the whole Christian life, if it is indeed a Christian life, is a constant likeness of the resurrection of Christ.

We have only touched upon this great theme, but we have indicated the proper lines for thought upon it. We find that we do not have to belittle one part of God's work, in order to greatly appreciate another part. On the contrary, we cannot properly appreciate one part of his work without exalting every other part, for all are related. Both creation and redemption are to be ever kept in mind. By the Lord's Supper we show the Lord's death till he come, to redeem us; and then we will "sing the song of Moses the servant of God [Ex. 15:1-19,] and the song of the Lamb." (Rev. 15:2, 3)-celebrating redemption completed. And then will creation itself be commemorated as it should be, for then will men properly appreciate the love and power of God; therefore "it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:23. W.

**"The Lord's Prayer. Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

**"GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD"**

Nothing less than divine wisdom could have framed this petition, so simple and so reasonable is it. Human greed would ask for enough to-day to supply all possible wants for the future; but if that were granted, the person could use no more of it to-day than he would use if he had only enough for to-day's needs. Not only so, but human greed would overreach itself. Thus, if the man should to-day receive enough for all time, he would have no occasion to ask for anything to-morrow. He would trust in his possession instead of God, and would soon forget God. Thus cutting himself off from the only power that can bestow and preserve, he would soon lose what he has, and then have nothing either for to-day or to-morrow. Riches make to themselves wings and fly away. But the man who every day asks for provision sufficient for that day, with the assurance that he will receive it, is far better off. He has enough for to-day, and that is all he could use anyway. And then he does not wear himself out in the vain effort to take care of property that he has stored up for the future. His future supply is in the hands of God, who thus becomes his banker. Surely the man who has all he needs, just when he needs it, while someone else takes care of that which he does not actually need, is far better off than the man who has only what he needs to-day, but who is burdened with the care of a lot of stuff that he may never need.

This petition teaches contentment. The conclusions in the preceding paragraph are in harmony with the teaching of the apostle Paul. Said he: "But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6:6-10.

Here the apostle brings out an additional danger from not trusting God for our daily bread. It is that the man having more than he needs for to-day, is tempted to use more than he needs. Thus his thoughts become centered entirely on self and the gratification of his own desires and lusts, which increase and multiply with the gratification, until he is finally drowned in perdition.

The apostle continues: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." This is in harmony with the petition which the Lord has taught us. We are not taught that to have riches is sin, for the Lord gives some men power to get wealth, but that the sin comes in setting one's heart upon them. The possession of riches is a great danger for Christ says: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" This is because it is next to

impossible for one who has riches to keep from setting his heart upon them, and so neglecting to trust in the living God, and forgetting that it is God who gives us all things richly to enjoy.

This is taught by the parable in Luke 12:15-21. "The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully." Here we see that it was not the man's superior skill that brought him his wealth, but the providence of God in giving "rain and fruitful seasons." And the man thought: "What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, 'This will I do. I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits, and my goods, and I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry.'" If he had listened to the Lord, he might have known what to do with his goods. Says the inspired word: "Charge them that are rich. . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:17-19. Instead of this, the man trusted in his riches, and had nothing.

"But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Why is the man called a fool? Because the fool, according to the Bible, is one who says in his heart, "There is no God." This man acted as though there were no God, because he assumed that he must take care of himself, and left God out of the account altogether. He may have been a professor of religion, but he was practically an atheist. There are thousands of such men in the world to-day. But no matter how much they exalt themselves (for the man who by his actions assumes that his prosperity depends upon himself alone, virtually puts himself in the place of God), they will in the end be put in fear, and be made to know that they are but men.

"So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." We have already read from Paul the injunction to rich men to lay up store for themselves "a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." In the Sermon on the Mount Christ said: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Matt. 6:19-21. Neither of these texts implies that the kingdom of God can be bought with money. But they both teach that no man can reach Heaven unless he has his treasure there. It

206

is not that his wealth buys him a place in the kingdom of God, but that his thoughts are of God and Heaven, and thus he prepares for Heaven. In all his ways he acknowledges God, and thus God directs his paths.

At the present time the principle contained in the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," needs to be taught; because the tendency of the last days is all against it. We read: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth

eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days." James 5:1-3. This does not apply to the millionaires alone, but to all who are heaping treasure. That is, to all who allow their treasures to "heap" up or accumulate. Some time ago we saw a gold piece that was discolored by rust. We asked what caused it, and learned that it had been paid out by a woman who, having a little more money than she needed, had buried the surplus in the ground. She was not a rich woman, but we could not help thinking of the words of James. But the principle of heaping up treasure was there, which showed distrust of God. And what made it worse was that the woman professed to believe in the soon coming of the Lord. Whether we are poor or rich, let us "beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth;" and let us not fear to trust the Lord, knowing that if God clothes the grass and the lilies of the field in beauty, and provides for the sustenance of the birds of the air, he will much more care for those whom he has bought with the blood of his own dear Son. The sacrifice of Christ is the pledge of God's care for us. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Rom. 8:32. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Knights of Labor are beginning to join the clamor for enforced Sunday observance. At the meeting which they recently held in Chicago, to consider this matter, "Mr. McFadden, of District 57, representing 10,000 men, said that his assembly had passed resolutions forbidding any member to buy or sell on Sunday." The Knights will be a valuable reinforcement to the "National Reform" cause. We shall now have a chance to see whether the devotion of the National Reformers to anti-secret society principles is strong enough to lead them to refuse to cooperate with the Knights in working for a Sunday law.

We learn that the Massachusetts Legislature has been discussing a local option Sunday Law, the idea being that a uniform law cannot be enforced, and that each town should in this matter legislate for itself. We suggest as a better plan, an individual option law. Let Sunday be kept by each individual who wants to keep it. Then if there is a community where all want to keep Sunday, they will have a Sunday law. But don't compel a few people to keep Sunday, against their conscience, because the majority have not conscience enough in the matter to keep it without making a law to compel themselves to keep it.

Newspapers that deal largely in gossip and sporting news usually make that work when they venture to make a statement on a subject connected with the Bible. The S. F. *Chronicle*, speaking of the liberation of Freeman, the Pocasset child murderer, says: "A head of a family who adopts the Mosaic doctrine that he has the right of life for death over his offspring, is better behind bars." We fully agree, that a man who thinks he has a right to kill his children, is a dangerous man to be at large; but we would like to know the whereabouts and the writings



of Moses there is any such doctrine as that a father has the right of life or death over his offspring. People hold the Bible accountable for a good many things that exist only in their own brain.

In answer to the question, "Do we get our immortality through belief in and acceptance of Christ, or is it inherent in the entire race?" The *Christian Union* recently said: "We are not prepared to answer this question dogmatically; neither opinion has some support from Scripture. Belief in what is called a conditional immortality is comparatively modern, we believe, but has certainly grown within the last quarter-century."

The answer (?) is correct with the exception of two points: Inherent immortality finds no support whatever in the Scriptures; and the belief in conditional immortality is by no means modern; it is as old as the knowledge of gospel truth among men, and is taught all through the Bible.

The San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* has an editorial entitled, "The Reign of Peace." The second sentence of which reads thus: "It is now evident that there will be no war in Europe for a least a few months." And then the writer adds: "It will be happy circumstance of the duration of peace can be measured by years." Here is a good text for those who preach a temporal millennium of peace and safety. It is actually certain that, if something unexpected does not happen, there will be no war in Europe for a few months! It is quite probable that there will be no fighting until the weather becomes more favorable for the movement of troops. And this is "the reign of peace."

Religious liberty has had a narrow escape in Texas. A rigid Sunday law bill had passed the Assembly and had been favorably reported upon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, before those who would be most affected by it—the Sabbath-keepers—were aware that there was any effort on foot to secure a Sunday law. By prompt action the insertion of a section making an exception in favor of observers of the seventh day was secured, and at last reports it was thought that this amendment would be accepted by both Houses. The principal opposition to making this provision for Sabbath-keepers came from a member who is a clergyman. Yet some people will persist in declaring that there is not the slightest possibility of religious persecution in this country.

### **"The Arbiter of Europe" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is stated upon the authority of the *Journal des Debats* that the Prussian minister at the Vatican has suggested that the Pope convene a European Congress to settle the Eastern and Egyptian questions. "This," says the *Catholic Mirror*, "would be 'a consummation devoutly to be wished.'" Certainly all Catholics do devoutly wish for everything that will in any way intend to the restoration of the temporal power of the Papacy, and a congress of the kind proposed with a long step in that direction.

There is certainly a growing disposition among the great powers of the earth to confer honor upon the Pope; and while there is not the slightest chance that the peace of Europe can be permanently preserved, stranger things have

happened than that an effort be made to close forever the temple of Janus by making the Bishop of Rome arbitrator, not only of Europe, but of the world.

It was only a few months ago that "his holiness" was called upon to decide the dispute between Germany and Spain relative to the Caroline Islands, and within a few weeks past he has meddled in German politics to the immense satisfaction not only of Prince Bismarck and Emperor William but of President Grevy as well. In close connection with this comes the proposition of Austria that the "holy father" should act as referee in the Bulgarian difficulty; and now to cap it all comes this proposition from Germany that he shall be acknowledged as the arbiter of Europe. Is not the world about to fall down at the feet of the Papacy and worship "the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live"?

**April 7, 1887**

**"The Day of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Language could not be framed so as to express more clearly the fact that the Sabbath of the Lord was permanently fixed upon a definite, specified day. The last charge to be brought against the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is that of indefiniteness. If it is not definite, then language cannot be made to convey ideas.

But among the "inventions" that men have "sought out" is the theory that the commandment does not prescribe the observance of a certain day recurring at regular intervals, but that it enjoins the observance of one-seventh part of our time. The term "sought out" is fitly applied to this invention, for no trace of this theory appears in the commandment. It was brought to light about two hundred years ago as the only alternative of those who wished to persuade themselves and others that they were keeping the commandment, while at the same time they were observing a day of their own choosing. But this is one of the thinnest disguises ever invented. It is a very easy matter to show its absurdity, as we will demonstrate. Notice carefully the following argument:-

If God sanctified an indefinite seventh part of time, he must of necessity have left it optional with man to choose which day he would keep; the only thing commanded would be rest; man could suit his own convenience as to time. It would then follow that whatever day man should choose to rest upon, *that* would be the portion of time sanctified; and thus the act of the Creator would be dependent on the fact of the creature. But it is not at all consistent with the dignity of even a human lawgiver to make the meaning of his enactments contingent on the caprice of the people; much less would such a course reflect honor upon the Government of God.

But this is not the worst result that would naturally follow. If an indefinite seventh part of time were sanctified, then not only would it be left to man to choose the day for rest, but each individual would be at liberty to rest upon the day which might please his fancy. One man might take the seventh day, and another might take the fourth, and then, according to this theory, not one-seventh but two-sevenths of the time would be sanctified. Or, to suppose a case which would be very likely to happen if men should actually try to put their theory into practice, every day in the week might be kept by different individuals, and then it would appear that in the beginning God had sanctified or set apart *all* the time! But in that case what would become of the theory that he sanctified only a seventh? We submit to anyone that this is not a forced conclusion; if the conclusion is absurd, it simply proves that the theory in question is absurd.

But before men reach this point in their endeavors to evade the law of God, they usually recover their reasoning faculties to some extent, and say that it is necessary for all men to keep one and the same day. The exigencies of business require it. Then we ask, Who shall appoint the day? What man is there whose judgment all will follow? There is no man or class of men whose authority even a majority of persons will acknowledge, so as to defer to it. In a case that is left open, every man is on an equality with every other. There is positively no way out of this dilemma but to admit what the commandment plainly declares,—that God, in the beginning, decided definitely which day of the week should be observed. So we see that the one-seventh-part-of-time theory is an impossibility when reduced to practice. And even if it were possible for all men to agree upon some day of their own choosing, that day would be *their* Sabbath, and not the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment enjoins.

But some will still say, "Granting that a definite day was set apart, how can we tell which one it was?" This must be an easy question to answer, else it were useless to have a definite day appointed. The commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Mark, *the* seventh day, not *a* seventh day. The seventh day of what? Not of the month, for that would not meet the demand for a rest after six days of labor. For the same reason it cannot mean the seventh day of the year. It must mean the seventh day of a period of time of which seven days is the sum. But this is the week; and we therefore are shut up to the conclusion that the commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. A really candid, thoughtful person could not decide otherwise.

For further proof that the seventh day of the week is meant, read Luke 23:54-56; 24:1. The sacred historian after describing the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.*" Now if we can find what day it was on which they rested, we shall know beyond all doubt which day is "the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." The next verse says: "Now upon *the first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared." To avoid any possibility of cavil, we turn to Mark 16:1, and

there read that this visit took place "when the Sabbath was past." Luke, then, has given us in consecutive order the record of three days, as follows: Christ was crucified on "the preparation day;" the day following was the Sabbath, upon which the women rested "according to the commandment;" and the next day was the *first day of the week*. This proves unmistakably that the Sabbath of the commandment is the seventh day of the week. W.

### **"Questions and Answers" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

"While conversing recently on the subject of Immortality, this idea was presented to me: If Christ, when crucified, died, body and spirit, the world was without a Saviour for three days, and anyone who died during that period could not be saved.

"Although the idea presents nothing conclusive to my mind, yet I would like to have your idea of it through the SIGNS. J. H. A."

It is astonishing to see the ingenuity displayed in inventing objections to the truth. If half as much time as is spent in trying to evade the truth, were spent in studying it, the number of believers would be increased many fold. In the above objection the ingenuity of unbelief is manifested to a marked degree.

The answer to this cavil is found in John 3:16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And this: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. And this also: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Rom. 8:32, 33.

The objection which was presented to our correspondent was based upon the impious idea that God is a stern, unrelenting Judge, whose only emotion toward the human race is that of hatred, and that he is prevented from spitefully tearing men in pieces only because of the watchfulness and interference of the Son, who is all love and pity. But God himself is love, and the texts just quoted show that the plan of salvation is from the Father as well as from the Son. Christ died for sinners; but God's love for the world is manifested in giving his only begotten Son to die. We cannot make comparisons, so as to say whether the love of the Father was greater than that of the Son; but we can say this: God is love; he is also infinite; therefore his love is infinite love; consequently his love for the world was infinite love, and the sacrifice which he made for the world, in giving his dear Son to die for them, was an infinite sacrifice. In view of these facts, knowing that the plan of salvation is "the gospel of God" (Rom. 1:1), it is the height, or rather the depth, of folly, yea, of unreasoning blasphemy, for anyone to intimate that mankind could not be trusted in the hands of the Father alone, during the brief space in which he, together with the Son, was making the sacrifice for their redemption. God the Father is not only our Judge, but he is also our Saviour. See 1 Tim. 2:3; Jude 25.

One word more: The objector says that if Christ did actually and entirely die, then the world was for three days without a Saviour. We have shown the falsity of that, and now make a simple counter-statement: If Christ did not actually die, then the world has not now, and never had, a Saviour for all the blessings which God has for men, are secured to us only through the death of Christ. Rom. 8:32; 1 Cor. 15:16-18.

### **CHRIST SOON TO RETURN**

"You would be conferring a great favor on me and many that I know, by explaining how Adventists can believe Christ is soon to return, when none of the signs mentioned in Matt. 24:29; Luke 20:11, 12, 25, and other passages, have to come to pass. "E. A. G."

Our questioner makes a very broad assumption. It is possible that he is unaware of the fulfillment of any of the signs referred to, but he is not warranted in saying that they have never come to pass, simply because he has not heard of them. For his benefit, and that of others who are in the same condition, we will briefly note the fulfillment of these signs. This we are always glad to do. Matt. 24:29 reads thus:-

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." Verse 30 continues: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

The "days" referred to in the first part of verse 29, and the days of tribulation referred to in verses 21 and 22. We do not think it necessary to take space here to prove that "the elect" have never suffered tribulation greater than that suffered by them in the dark ages of Papal persecution. This one period ended with the captivity of the Pope, in A.D. 1798, a few years after the violence of the persecution ceased, and serves as a guide in our search for the signs; for the first of these signs was to take place "immediately after the tribulation of those days," or, as Mark still more definitely records, "in those days, after that tribulation." Concerning the first sign, the darkening of the sun, we need to do more than quote what is said in "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary," in the explanatory and pronouncing vocabulary of noted names of fiction, events, etc.:-

"DARK DAY, THE, May 19, 1780;-so called on account of a remarkable darkness on that day, extending over all New England. In some places persons could not see to read common print in the open air for several hours together. Birds sang their evening song, disappeared, and became silent; fowls went to roost; cattle sought the barn-yard; and candles were lighted in the houses. The obscuration began about ten o'clock in the morning, and continued till the middle of the next night, but with differences of degree and duration in different places. For several

days previous the wind had been variable but chiefly from the southwest and the northeast. The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is now known."

It would not make a particle of difference if the true cause of the phenomenon were known. Its value as a sign consists in the fact that it was just what our Saviour said should take place, and that it occurred in the exact time specified,- just before the close of the period of Papal supremacy, and just after the great tribulation. There is one sign fulfilled.

The next sign is the falling of the stars. On this it will be sufficient to quote the following statement by Professor Olmstead, of Yale College:-

"Those who were so fortunate as to witness the exhibition of shooting stars on the morning of Nov. 13, 1833, probably saw the greatest display of celestial fireworks that has ever been since the creation of the world, or at least within the annals covered by the pages of history."

Those who witnessed this remarkable event, say that it was a literal fulfillment of Rev. 6:13: "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." The stars appeared as if violently hurled in every direction, just as would be the case with unripe fruit, if it were forced from the limbs by a strong wind. And it was not simply a few shooting stars, but the flying meteors could be likened only to flakes of snow in a furious snowstorm. So much for the fulfillment of the second sign.

"And upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity," is the next thing recorded by Luke. He who says that this is not even now fulfilled and fulfilling, must have studiously refrained from reading any of the newspapers. Organized bands of Socialists and Anarchists are not only caused by poverty and oppression, but are themselves, in turn, causes of still greater distress and perplexity. The nations of Europe are spending all their capital and credit in arming themselves against possible attacks from one another, yet, as in the case of Russia, are so fearful of the enemy within their own borders, that they often contemplate even the dreaded war with foreign powers, as a possible means of uniting their subjects, and averting the still more dreaded disruption. These things literally cause men's hearts to fail them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.

Only one of the signs which are Saviour mentioned yet remains to be fulfilled, and that is the shaking of the powers of the heavens. But this takes place immediately in connection with the coming of the Lord, so that when it is seen, it will be too late to warn people to prepare for the coming of the Lord. The shaking of the powers of the heavens accomplished by the voice of God (Heb. 12:26), when he shall "roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem" (Joel 3:16); when the heavens shall depart as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island shall be moved out of their places; when "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man" shall hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and shall say to the mountains and the rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Rev. 6:14-17.

Let no one, then, comfort himself with the thought that the Lord's coming is not near, because the powers of the heavens have not been shaken. Rather let him discern the signs of the times, and make haste to be ready to greet our soon-coming Lord with the words, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Isa. 25:9. W.

### **"Union for the Sake of Peace" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are urged to cease our opposition to Sunday, and to the securing of Sunday laws, for the sake of peace. Christ prayed that his disciples might all be one, and so we are admonished that we ought to unite with those Christians who keep Sunday, that the world may have an example of Christian unity. But why should we join with them rather than they with us? Oh, because they are in the majority, and they say that the majority ought to rule. But when it is well known that it is a matter of conscience with the minority, to say that the majority should rule is simply to say that the minority have no business to have a conscience of their own; that they must allow the majority to be conscience for them. We are fond of peace and harmony, but we do not believe in peace and harmony which is gained by compromising truth. Luther was a man who loved peace and deprecated strife; but if he had not loved truth still more, he could not have been the leader in the Reformation. Truth and error must ever be antagonistic, and as long as there is error in the world, there cannot be peace.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Chronicle* says: "By and by the criminal lawyer will rank, in the public esteem, about on a par with the criminal." But why say "by and by"? Within a week we have had the spectacle presented to us of a "criminal" lawyer making a pathetic plea for a brutal murderer on the ground that the culprit "could not control his impulses," and was "morally insane." That is to say, he pleaded for acquittal on the ground that the prisoner was a vile reprobate! Can "criminal" practice to send to any Lord depth of infamy?

We have before us the Year Book of the California Y.M.C.A. In it we find the report of an address delivered at the last day convention, on "how to awaken a greater interest in Bible study among our active members." It was by Rev. W. J. Chichester, who said, among other things: "Don't confine yourself too much to favorite passages. The Old Testament as well as the New is the word of God. All is not equally given by inspiration, but all is worthy of consideration." Perhaps we ought to feel thankful for the reverend gentleman's admission that all of the Bible is "worthy of consideration."

The *Occident*, of San Francisco, has a notice of the "Address to Thinking People," on the Sunday Law, and finds that the entire argument is fallacious, because a little quotation from the *Christian at Work* was, by a typographical error, redited to Jan. 3, 1885, instead of Jan. 8, 1885. The argument would not be

affected in the least if the entire quotation were omitted be officially as it appeared in the *Christian at Work*. It is worthy of note that the only flaw which the *Occident* could find in the entire argument was in the accidental substitution of 3 for 8.

By the way, now that we have referred to the *Occident*, we wish to say that it is doing some good work in the matter of unfermented wine at communion. Its correspondent, "Rusticus," has thoroughly exploded the idea that there is no such thing as unfermented wine, and that our Saviour used intoxicating wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper. We are glad to see that there is quite a general movement, "among the churches to return to the scriptural method of celebrating this ordinance.

### **"Chart of the Week" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

The "Chart of the Week," which we noticed when we received a specimen section of it some months ago, is now completed, and is ready for those who have long awaited for it. For the benefit of those who may not have read the previous notice, we will say that the chart shows "the unchanged order of the days, and the true position of the Sabbath, as proved by the combined testimony of ancient and modern languages." The names of the week and of each day in the week are given in one hundred and sixty languages and dialects, presenting most overwhelming proof that the division of the week has remained unchanged in all ages and in all lands. The chart has nine columns. The first gives the language and the extent of territory where it is, or was, "spoken, read, or otherwise used." The second column gives the word for week, in the original characters of the language named in the preceding column, together with the transmitter, showing the pronunciation, and the corresponding English word. The seven remaining columns to the same for each of the days of the week.

The chart is a most interesting object for study, and shows how universal was the knowledge, in ancient times, of the memorial of creation, thus emphasizing Paul's declaration that they who forgot God are without excuse. As a single instance, we note the very ancient Arabic. The name for week signifies "seven;" the first day of the week is "business day;" the fourth day of the week, Wednesday, is "turning day, or mid-week;" the sixth day, Friday, is "Eve Sabbath)," while the seventh day is "Chief or Rejoicing day." Many similar instances might be noted. The chart is thus in itself a strong argument for the universality and perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and should be in the hands of every lover of the Lord's own day.

Rev. W. M. Jones, 56 Mildmay Park, London, N., author of this chart, and he has put upon it untold amount of conscientious, painstaking labor. The section of the chart showing the days of the week and all the European languages (fifty-three in number) was prepared by Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte.

Considering the importance of the chart, and the immense amount of labor devoted to its preparation, we think the price \$.75 for the paper, and \$1.25 when mounted on Imen, with roller, is very reasonable. Orders may be sent to the



Pacific Press. If the chart is ordered from the author, post-office orders should be made payable at Newington, Green Road, N., London.

### **"Signs of the Times" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

Though late reports from Europe tell us that peace is assured, at least for a few months, the conviction is irresistible that the condition of affairs there resembles more nearly a smothered volcano than anything else to which it can be compared. It is true that there is now no immediate prospect of war between France and Germany, but the Eastern question remains practically unchanged. There is no sign that Russia has any intention on Constantinople; and the Bulgarian difficulty is no nearer a settlement than it was three months ago.

Weather unfavorable to military operations has temporarily checked Russian aggression; but Russian intrigue and diplomacy are as active as ever; and he who does not recognise the fact the ere long the Turk is to be driven from Europe to "plant his tabernacle between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain" (Jerusalem), is alike deaf to the language of prophecy, and blind to the signs of the times.

But the Eastern question is not the only menace to the peace of Europe; there is not a nation in the Old World, if indeed there be one anywhere, that does not contain within itself elements which imperil its very existence. Within a month three attempts have been made upon the life of the Czar; and there cannot be a doubt that the whole social, religious, and political fabric of the empire is rotten to the core, being completely honeybombed with Nihilism. Though the absolute ruler of millions of people, Alexander III. is a fugitive from the wrath of his own subjects, and dare not enter his own capital, or, as the Nihilists say, "The Czar has been banished to Gatschina, which is now his prison, and a prison so large that he cannot escape."

England, too, is convulsed with internal feuds, and there is every prospect that a new era of dynamite outrages is about to be inaugurated there by Irish agitators, who despair of ever getting justice for their country by parliamentary methods; and who believe that it is only by blowing up public buildings in English cities and making it costly to continue governing Ireland, that their demands will ever be listened to and home rule granted. Should the Coercion Act now before Parliament be passed, we may expect a reign of terror and bloodshed in England unequalled in any country since the French Revolution.

The same spirit of lawlessness and unrest that prevails in Russia and England, characterizes, though possibly in a less degree, the rest of the world. Only a few days since, Mayor Harrison, of Chicago, in declining a re-nomination said that he feared serious trouble in that city within the next two years; and that if he were mayor he should not dare to leave the city more than half a day's journey. And Chicago is not in very much worse case than the rest of our great cities. Altogether the outlook is far from reassuring, and instead of the much-talked-of temporal millennium being about to be ushered in, the earth is filled with

violence, and in many quarters we see "men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth."

**April 14, 1887**

**"The Unpardonable Sin" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. 12:31, 32.

Probably no other text in the Bible has been the subject of more speculation, or has been more misunderstood, than this one. Many honest, conscientious people have gone well-nigh into despair over the thought that they were guilty of the sin here mentioned, and that simply because they had received erroneous ideas as to what that sin is. Although there is so much misunderstanding in regard to it, we think that an understanding of it may be gained quite readily by a consideration of the connection and of parallel texts. Every word which our Saviour uttered was timely, and applied to the circumstances then present; it is this feature which makes them practical in all ages. Therefore if we would get a full understanding of any of his words, we must consider the occasion which called them out.

If we notice the context, we shall find that the words which we have quoted were called out by the position which the Pharisees took concerning a notable miracle which Jesus had performed. He had healed a demoniac who was both blind and dumb, so that the man was not only in his right mind, but "both spake and saw." The people were amazed, but the Pharisees contemptuously and blasphemously said: "This fellow does not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." Matt. 12:24. Instead of glorifying God, by whose Spirit this wonderful thing was done, they accused Christ of having a devil, by whose aid he performed miracles.

That this accusation constituted, in that instance, the unpardonable sin, is evident from the parallel text in Mark. This evangelist gives our Saviour's words concerning the unpardonable nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit, and adds, "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." Mark 3:30. Thus we find, without any further investigation, that this sin consists in attributing the work of the Holy Spirit to the devil.

But it is not by words alone that men may commit this, any more than any other sin. Paul speaks of some who "profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate." Titus 1:16. A reprobate is one who is rejected, who has sinned beyond recovery; one who has rejected the Spirit of God by sinning until he is so corrupt that there is no good thing in him for the Spirit to work upon. This is indicated in the preceding verse, which says of those who are "unto every good

work reprobate," that "even their mind and conscience is defiled." So Paul writes to Timothy concerning men in the last days, who are "men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." 2 Tim. 3:8.

This was the condition of the antediluvian world. The record says: "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6:3, 5. There was a time when the antediluvians were not wholly bad; there was some trace of the law in their hearts (Rom. 2:15), and therefore there was something in them upon which the Spirit could work to convince them of sin; for the Spirit's sword is the word of God, and it can produce an impression upon men only when they possess some knowledge of truth and right. But the antediluvians resisted the strivings of the Spirit. The tendency of sin is to multiply itself and to choke out any sense of good; and so by repeated stiflings of every good impulse, those people become so corrupt that they had not a single good thought. They were cumberers of the ground; there was no possibility of their reformation, and so they were cut off.

In every case where the judgments of God have been brought upon people, it was because there was no possibility of their reformation; they had, in short, committed the unpardonable sin. This was the case with the antediluvians, the Sodomites, the wicked inhabitants of Canaan (see Gen. 15:16), who were destroyed to make room for the Israelites, and finally with many of the people of Israel. Says the sacred historian:-

"Moreover all the chief of the priests, and the people, transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen; and polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till *there was no remedy*." 2 Chron. 36:14-16.

"There was no remedy;" that is, their sin was unpardonable. Now since God's object in giving men this existence is solely that they may prepare for a better, and an eternal existence, it follows that when they utterly refuse to accept of God's plan for them, and devote themselves wholly to evil, there is no use to continue their existence longer. They are of no use to themselves or to anybody else. Like trees that bear only thorns instead of fruit, they are cut off as cumberers of the ground. Their continued existence would be only detrimental to the soil which might be yielding something useful. Here then is another way in which men may commit the unpardonable sin.

Still another way is brought to view by Paul to the Hebrews. This pertains especially to those who have once made a profession. Says the apostle:-

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall

away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Heb. 6:4-6.

We have not space to enter into details, and to specify just how men crucify Christ afresh; but it is sufficient to know that the unpardonable sin is here brought to view, for it is a sin which cannot be repented of. We say "*the* unpardonable sin," for we understand that there is but one such although there may be many different ways of committing it. John says: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and God shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it." 1 John 5:16. All sin, if not repented of, brings death; but there is one sin which cannot be repented of, and therefore there is no necessity to pray about it as about other sins.

Now we may understand what the apostle means when he says to the Hebrews that it is impossible if certain ones fall away, to renew them unto repentance. What does he mean by, "If they fall away"? Does he mean that if a Christian shall fall into sin he cannot be forgiven? No; for the verse just quoted from John teaches us that if a brother sins a sin not unto death we must pray for him. 1 John 2:1, 2; Gal. 6:1; Rev. 2:5, and scores of other texts show that men are not necessarily beyond hope, even though they be overtaken in faults after they have accepted Christ and have been pardoned. We must understand, then, that the "falling away" here brought to view means not simply the commission of a wrong act, or even a backslidden state, but a turning away from the gospel of Christ,-a rejection of Christ. Since the name of Christ is the only one under Heaven whereby men may be saved, it follows that if a man deliberately rejects that there is no hope for him. It was this fact which led Paul to use such vehement language in his epistle to the Galatians. See Gal. 1:8, 9. Any man who should preach a gospel which led the hearers to trust in something else besides Christ, would be deliberately leading them to eternal ruin, and so would be worthy of a curse. There is but one way of salvation; if a man deliberately rejects that, he cannot by any possibility be saved. W.  
(*Concluded next week.*)

### **"The Old Is Better" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

1. "Please explain how you harmonize the 14th verse of Rev. 22, and the comments upon it, found in SIGNS, March 24, p. 186, with the same verse as given in the New Version, which reads, 'Blessed are they that wash their robes,' etc."

There are some things that we don't try to harmonize; we try to follow the simple truth, and if anything differs from it, that is not a matter that troubles us. In this case we accept the reading of the Authorized Version as preferable to that of the New, and let the matter rest there.

It may seem strange, however, that the two versions, each the work of men skilled in the languages, should have such widely different renderings of the same text. A little explanation will make the matter clear. The Greek of the text as

rendered in the Authorized Version is, *poiountes tas entolas autou*. As given in the Revised Version it is, *pluoutes, tas stolas auton*. It will be seen that the difference in the words is very slight, so that a copyist might easily make the substitution of one for the other. If the reader has ever seen *fac similes* of some of the ancient manuscripts, he will the more readily understand how such a change might have taken place. As the result, some of the ancient manuscripts have it one way, and some another. The similar expression in Rev. 7:14 may have been in the mind of the ancient copyist, thus causing him unconsciously and mechanically to make the substitution. Griesbach regards the reading followed by the New Version as "not to be despised," but worthy of further examination, "though inferior to the received text."

But while following the Authorized Version, we do not find, in this instance, the slightest lack of harmony between the two renderings. It is a fact that only those who keep the commandments of God, will be permitted to partake of the tree of life. Matt. 7:21; 19:17, and many other texts, settle this matter positively. It is also true that none will be saved, except those who wash their robes of character in the blood of the Lamb; for "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7); and Christ "was manifested to take away our sin." Now (1) no one can keep the commandments without the help of Christ, whose blood cleanses from sin; and (2) no one can stand, having his robes white, without being a doer of the commandments; for it is sin that defiles, and if one should break the commandments his robes would not be white. Thus they who have kept the commandments of God, and they whose robes are made white, are the same. A blessing pronounced upon those who have kept the commandments of God, is at the same time a blessing pronounced upon those who have washed their robes white. So there is harmony in the two renderings, after all.

2. "Also please state whether the New Version is correct in giving the word 'probation' where the Old Version has 'experience,' in Rom. 5:4."

We think it is not, for the following reasons: The Greek word signifies both a test, a trial, and also that which results from such a test. Therefore "experience" is an allowable rendering. Now to render it "experience," as in the Authorized Version, makes good sense, for it comports with the facts in the case:

231

patient endurance of tribulation does work out rich experience. But "patience" indicates that the individual is undergoing a testing, a probation and therefore it does not seem consistent to say that this tribulation and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts."

The revisers have given us a good commentary, but they seem often to have been more intent on getting something new than on retaining the simplicity and directness of the sacred text. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

A large attendance is expected at the meetings to be held in Oakland, April 22-27. This will be a very important meeting, the most important, in some

respects, of any annual meeting that has been held here, and we hope that those who come will come with the determination of staying to the close. The church in Oakland extends a hearty invitation to the friends of the cause in the State, to be present.

Bishop Warren of the M. E. church says that many preachers are so gentle of the feelings of sinners, especially if the sinners are rich, that they preach the gospel something after this style: "Brethren, you must repent, as it were; and be converted, in a measure; or you will be damned, to some extent." It is too true that modern preachers very seldom repeat Christ's unequivocal and emphatic statements, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

The reports from the prohibition amendment contest in Michigan are very conflicting. Some say that the amendment is carried, and others that it has been defeated by a majority of 1,500 to 4,000. We understand that Kentucky distillers sent many thousands of dollars into Michigan before the election; and if the fraudulent votes which this money created as counted out, there is little doubt but that the amendment will stand by a handsome majority. If prohibition is a failure, it is passing strange that whisky men should spend so much money in trying to defeat it.

By a private letter from Elder E. E. Marvin, of Tennessee, we learn that the effort to secure the passage of a bill granting humanity from the penalties of the Sunday law, to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, resulted in failure. We are very sorry to be obliged to chronicle this fact. We had strong hope that Tennessee would follow the example of Arkansas, and put a stop to persecution for conscience' sake. Next week we shall give our readers some of the arguments which were used to defeat the bill; they did not come in time for publication this week.

We have received several hypothetical questions in regard to certain acts performed on the Sabbath, the questioners desiring us to state positively whether or not such acts would be a violation of the Sabbath. We cannot answer them. When anyone wants to know the principles which the Bible lays down to govern our actions, we will give a Bible answer, so far as our knowledge extends; but we have not enough conscience to supply ourselves and other people too. The Lord gives plain commandments and designs that every person shall be conscience for himself. The only safe rule that we can give is this: If you are in doubt about the correctness of any act, abstain from it.

Someone asks us to tell him which is the longest verse in the Bible. We don't know. More than that, we haven't any special curiosity in the matter. There are some lottery schemes gotten up in different parts of the country, usually connected with some so called literary journal whose proprietors offer prizes to the ones who will send correct answers to certain simple questions concerning the Bible. Thus they make a pretense of stimulating Bible investigation. We suspect that our questioner has got hold of one of their offers. We would therefore say here (1) that all such schemes are unmitigated swindles, and (2) that hunting for the longest or the shortest verse in the Bible is not studying the Bible at all. It is no more profitable than it would be to hunt for the largest or the

smallest Bible in the world. The way to study the Bible is to *study* it, and any part of it, even the shortest verse, will be found to contain abundant matter for *thought*, without which there can be no study.

The following utterance is ascribed to Prince Bismarck:-

"I regard peace with the Pope as important as peace with any other foreign power. How long this peace may last-if, indeed, peace is attained with the Roman Church-none can foresee. For its continuance I assume no responsibility."

In commenting upon this statement, the *Christian Standard* lays bare the real state of affairs as follows:-

"He 'assumes no responsibility,' and would find any pretext to break the unpleasant alliance, and again banish the hated Orders and Jesuitical Seminaries, at any time when he saw it was safe to do it. Nor does Leo like the Protestant Bismarck with unfeigned love, but simply has an ax to grind-and it is the blood-rusted ax which has always found service in hewing down every plant of liberty it could get a stroke at. There is no good faith on either side of this compact, but only an interested conspiracy against human rights."

We learn from an Eastern paper that "Michigan has a law which provides that no sign, picture, painting, or other representation of murder, assassination, stabbing, fighting, or any personal violence or of the commission of any crime, shall be posted, under penalty of fine or imprisonment." If California had a similar law the occupation of a considerable number of sensational artists and bill-posters would be gone; and theaters would have to resort to some other means of corrupting the morals of the young and inexperienced, than with their demoralizing pictures and worse plays. The advertising of legitimate business is all right, but when theaters, houses of ill repute and saloons flaunt in the faces of the public pictures which can but bring a blush to the cheek of modesty, public policy demands that their greed be restrained by law.

### **"Spiritualism a Delusion" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Bible plainly teaches the existence of good and bad angels, and that they have a great deal of influence upon our lives; so much so, indeed, that if we are not ministered unto in spiritual things by good angels, we are by evil ones. Of the good angels we read: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. 1:14) while the fallen angels are, we are told, "the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. 16:14.

This last scripture we understand refers to the delusion of Spiritualism, which to-day numbers its votaries by millions both in this country and in Europe. Kings and queens have become its devotees, and multitudes are everywhere being led captive by Satan at his will. And why? Simply because the professed church of Christ, both Protestant and Catholic, is almost a unit in teaching those twin errors, the immortality of the soul and the conscious state of the dead. Faith in these errors makes it well nigh impossible for people even now to resist the

delusions of Spiritualism, and the time will come when Satan works "with *all* power, and signs, and lying wonders," that all who are not rooted and grounded on Bible truth will be swept into the whirlpool of this monster delusion.

When good angels have appeared to men and have communicated with them as spiritual beings, they have declared themselves to be angels: Said the angel that appeared to Zacharias, "I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God," but when the spirits of devils come they come professing to be the spirits of the dead. And it is to this fact that the prophet alludes when he says:-

"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:19, 20.

Let us heed the admonition, that we "may be accounted worthy to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of man."

### **"A Critical Period" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, in a letter to the New York *Independent*, says of the European outlook: "On the whole, there are at least *six* chances out of *ten* that we shall have an outbreak of war within two months." "Bismarck was undoubtedly right when he asserted in his great speech before the Germany Parliament that another war between France and Germany was inevitable. France has never accepted the loss of her provinces, and the one thing that the Republic has steadily adhered to has been the policy of developing the army. It is now larger than that of Germany, and is rapidly reducing the Government to bankruptcy." He continues:-

Russia will have to decide within a few weeks whether to strike now or to compromise with the Bulgarians and postpone her advance to a more favorable opportunity. It is hard to see how she can hope for amore promising chance than the present one. Germany and France are engaged in their own conflict. Austria is totally unprepared for war, and cannot possibly complete her preparations this spring. Turkey is bankrupt. England is absorbed in the Irish question, and her now democracy cares no more for Constantinople than for the man in the moon. Her Government is liable to be overturned any day, and cannot act with vigor on its own convictions. Italy is in the midst of a great political crisis. If war really breaks out between France and Germany, or if the present state of expectation of war continues, it would seem probable that the Czar will either attack Austria directly or occupy Bulgaria and put Montenegro forward to raise an insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It is undoubtedly the most critical moment that Europe has seen since 1815. It is not simply the fate of empires or the liberty of the Balkan Peninsular which is involved, but the civilization of the world. It is the crisis of that struggle to which Napoleon looked forward when he predicted that Europe would one day be either Cossack or Republican. Russia to-day makes no secret of her determination to



overthrow "the rotten civilization of Western Europe" and to replace it by a new civilization of her own.

**April 21, 1887**

**"Sunday Laws in Tennessee" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

As some of our readers may wish to know more about the defeat in the Tennessee Legislature, of the bill exempting conscientious observers of the seventh day, from certain provisions of the Sunday law, we submit a few facts gleaned from a recent letter from one of our brethren in that State:-

Senator Green, who only a few days before had made a speech against a bill which provided that railroad trains should not be allowed to run after 8 o'clock A.M. on Sunday, was asked to support the exemption bill, but refused, saying:-

"I think the majority should rule in regard to the Sabbath." He also said of the bill pending in the Senate: "Should it pass, it would be a prolific and continual source of disturbance, for there would be in the same towns or neighborhoods some assembled on Sunday worshiping God, while just outside in the fields others would be plowing or doing other labor, and it could not but greatly disturb the consciences of the worshippers."

Mr. Green was then reminded of his speech of a few days previous, and he was asked to reconcile his opposition to the bill exempting Sabbath-keepers from the provisions of the Sunday law with his plea in favor of Sunday railroading. To this he replied:-

"I am a stock-dealer, and know that should a train load of cattle be side-tracked all day Sunday the stock would suffer for food and water."

The brethren then appealed to him in behalf of their families, stating that their conscientious convictions compelled them to keep the seventh day, and that if they were compelled by law to keep Sunday also, their families must suffer, for they could not support them properly on the proceeds of five days labor. "Now," said they to the Senator, "is it more important that your cattle have relief, than that our families should have similar relief? All we ask is that we be allowed to work on Sunday for the support of our families, just as you allow the railroads to work for the relief of the cattle." But their appeal fell on ears deaf to everything but self-interest, and the only reply was, "You can labor six days now if you will do it when other Christians do;" adding that he was in favor of the rights of conscience! Which evidently meant that he was in favor of very man enjoying liberty of conscience, always provided, however, that his conscience was just like the Senator's conscience-a little elastic when powerful corporations and rich stock-dealers are concerned, but very rigid when only the just and natural rights of a conscientious Sabbath-keepers are at stake.

The chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Dr. Barbee, used his influence against the bill, urging that everybody ought to keep Sunday, because it is the law of the land, and the custom of the church. He thought that no one should set up his

conscience against the law and custom. Such were some of the sophistries which were potent for the defeat of a bill granting religious liberty in Tennessee.

### **"The Unpardonable Sin. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

The same thing is brought to view in Heb. 10:26-29: "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

Here we have presumptuous sin. The case recorded in Num. 15 is in point. The Lord had said that the soul which should do aught presumptuously, should be cut off, because he had "despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment." Verse 30, 31. Then follows an instance of such a sin. A man went out to gather sticks on the Sabbath-day. He was not driven to do this by want, but he did it in willful violation of the commandment of the Lord, that everyone should abide in his place. He presumed on the mercy of the Lord. He knew the commandment, yet he deliberately tried the Lord, to see if he meant what he said. He found out to his cost that the Lord meant just what he said. He found out that the Lord cannot be trifled with. That was a case of willful sin, after having received the knowledge of the truth. It was not simply the fact that the man violated a commandment, for every error is a violation of some commandment, but the man violated the commandment deliberately and intentionally, knowing that his act was a violation of the commandment. In other words, he "despised the word of the Lord."

Now, says Paul, if a man who deliberately violated a commandment had to die without mercy, and could have no atonement made for his sin, how much worse off must the man be who not only violates the commandments (for all have sinned), but who deliberately rejects the only means by which an atonement for sins can be made. Certainly his case is doubly hopeless.

Sinning against light always brings darkness. This is a self-evident truth. If a man rejects light, nothing but darkness remains. So our Saviour says to us, as . . . to the Jews: "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." John 12:35. And in like manner Paul says that Satan will, just before the coming of the Lord, work "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:9-12. It will be just as it was with the heathen. Because when they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, therefore God gave them up to

uncleanness; and "even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and God gave them over to a mind void of judgment." See Rom. 1:27-28, margin.

Thus when one knows what is right, and deliberately chooses error, he soon loses the knowledge of what is right; it soon becomes impossible for sacred things to make any impression upon him; and if he does not know the right way, of course he cannot follow it.

The same idea that we have found in the two passages quoted from the book of Hebrews, is carried out in Heb. 12:15-17, which reads thus: "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears."

In Gen. 25:29-34 we find an account of the transaction to which the apostle refers. Esau bartered away his birthright for a mess of pottage. It was a deliberate transaction, and when the bargain was concluded it could not be altered. If a man makes a deliberate bargain, and sells a piece of property, he cannot back out. Esau sold his birthright for a paltry meal of victuals, thus showing that he despised, or did not appreciate, his birthright. Afterward he would have inherited a blessing, but he had sold it, and could not.

Thousands of men have repeated Esau's course. Paul says of one of his co-laborers: "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." 2 Tim. 4:10. Here we have the case of Esau repeated. Esau sold his birthright, to satisfy a present need; Demas sold his interest in the cause of God and in eternal life, for this present world. Thousands of people acknowledge their duty to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, yet say, "If I should keep the Sabbath I couldn't make a living," and so for a mess of pottage,-a few meals of victuals,-they sell their heavenly inheritance. We have known people who felt that they couldn't make a living if they kept the Sabbath, and who made up their minds that when they had secured a competency they would obey; but they never obeyed; they never afterwards could find a convenient time, and although they gained a competency, they never again could feel any special interest in the Sabbath. They had disbelieved God, and showed that they thought more of present enjoyment than of the enduring riches, and God gave them that which they prized most.

It is not necessary to pursue this subject further. Let the reader note that we have found at least four ways in which men may commit the unpardonable sin: 1. By deliberately attributing the work of the Spirit of God to the devil. 2. By refusing to yield to the strivings of the Spirit, until by continual sinning the heart becomes so hard that the Spirit can make no impression upon it, and a sense of sin is lost. Then it is said, "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone." 3. By falling from the grace of God, and deliberately rejecting Christ's sacrifice. 4. By presuming upon God's mercy, and deliberately transgressing his commandments, with our eyes open to the consequences, and a determination to see if God will bring them upon us.

Many people who have thought themselves guilty of the unpardonable sin, were not. For the encouragement of such we write. The man whose heart is

broken at the thought of his sin against God, and who is tender and repentant, may find pardon, for "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit;" a broken and a contrite heart the Lord will not despise. Ps. 51:17. Although a man's sense of his sins may be so great that they seem to him unpardonable, he may rest assured that where sin abounds (that is, a sense of sin), grace does much more abound. Rom. 5:20.

But it is also true that thousands are in danger of the unpardonable sin, who think themselves secure, and for the warning of such we also write. The man who thinks that he may indulge *just once more* in some known sin which is very dear to him, may find that that was just once too often for pardon. No one can tell how weary the Spirit may be of striving with him, or how near he may be to the close of probation. Many men who were "going to reform," never did reform, because death came before they had gotten ready to reform. So there will doubtless be many well-intentioned persons lost, because they will weary the Spirit with their lukewarm dilatoriness, and probation will close before they have made up their minds to be wholly on the Lord's side. When it is too late, they will arouse, and will seek for the word of the Lord, but will not able to find it. Amos 8:11, 12.

It is dangerous to sin at all. Our only hope of safety from falling into the unpardonable sin is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and to "walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God."

"To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near; let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." W.

### **"Present and Future Probation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

In our comment on Matt. 12:31, 32 in last week's SIGNS, we had designed to make a few remarks upon the last clause of the passage, but we could not do so without too much of a diversion from the subject under consideration. The part referred to reads thus: "But whosoever speaketh against against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." This especially of late years has been perverted to the support of a rapidly-growing theory which is subversive of the very foundation principles of the gospel of Christ. We refer to the theory of a probation after death. It is claimed that the clause, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," teaches a probation after death; "for," say the advocates of this theory, "Christ would not say that a certain sin shall not be forgiven in the world to come, unless it is possible for some sins to be then forgiven."

So far as the passage in question is concerned, this matter may quickly be settled. The same thing is recorded by two other evangelists, and these parallel passages must determine the meaning of the expression in Matthew. Mark recorded it thus: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost *hath never*

*forgiveness*, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Mark 3:29. The words "hath never forgiveness," express the meaning exactly. Someone may say that this does not disprove the theory of future probation; but the clause, "is in danger of eternal damnation," when rightly understood, shows that no thought of future probation is connected with the text. For all sin there is condemnation; whoever sins is condemned already. But this condemnation may not be lasting; if the guilty one accepts Christ, his condemnation may come to an end; for there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." If, however, the sinner has committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, his condemnation is eternal; from it there is no possibility of escape. This is all that can be found in the text.

In further proof of this, we have the simple statement made by Luke. He says, "But unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost *it shall not be forgiven* him." Luke 12:10. This is just what the Saviour meant and all that he meant. He made an emphatic statement that the sin against the Holy Ghost should have no forgiveness; any attempt to make more out of his words is adding to the words of Inspiration. "Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30:6.

There are just two other texts in the Bible, which are quoted to uphold the future probation theory. These are 1 Peter 3:18-20; 4:6. These texts should receive careful consideration, especially the first, for, as perverted, it is made the foundation of many unscriptural theories. We will quote the text in full:-

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God,

247

being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

The simplest way to show what the text does not mean, is to show what it does mean. This we may do by a series of questions which will enable the reader himself to explain its meaning. Thus:-

1. Who once suffered? *Answer*-"Christ also hath once suffered."
2. For what did Christ suffer? *Ans*-"For sins."
3. Why did he thus suffer? *Ans*-"That he might bring us to God."
4. How did he suffer? *Ans*-"Being put to death in the flesh."
5. By what was he quickened, or made alive? *Ans*-"Quickened [made alive] by the Spirit."
6. What else did he do by the Spirit? *Ans*-"He went and preached unto the spirits in prison."
7. Why were they in prison? *Ans*-"They "sometime [once] were disobedient."
8. When were they disobedient and in prison? *Ans*-"When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah."

There is the whole matter stated in the words of Scripture, so plainly that the most obtuse could not fail to see it. These disobedient spirits were in prison in the days of Noah, and therefore it was at that time that the preaching was done to them.

Note the harmony between this text and Gen. 6:3. This text says, that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison, "When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah." This would imply that in the days of Noah, God had waited a long time for something. Now read Gen. 6:3: "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Here we find that God's longsuffering waited one hundred and twenty years, to give those wicked people a chance to repent. All that time Christ, by the Spirit, was preaching to them. Noah was the visible agent, but he was simply the mouthpiece, just as Paul says of all true preachers, they are "ambassadors for Christ," saying to sinners, "We pay you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. 5:20.

Here we might leave this subject, but someone will probably be questioning about the prison, and we may as well forestall the queries. By gross perversion of Scripture, it is assumed that this prison was *hades*, and that the preaching was done there. Indeed, many would-be expositors write as though this were expressly stated in the text. In the next number we shall show clearly why such an assumption is absurd, and how it would have been impossible for Christ, or anybody else, to preach in *hades*, for that subject is worthy of an article by itself. We shall now be content to show what the imprisonment was, which is mentioned in the text.

The reader will bear in mind that these "spirits in prison" were disobedient. Now disobedience brings condemnation to death (Rom. 6:23), and a man under sentence of death is always kept in prison. This is the idea conveyed by the psalmist when he says: "From Heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoners; to loose those that are appointed to death." Ps. 102, 19, 20. And the idea is still more forcibly expressed by the apostle, when he says that Christ took part of flesh and blood, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who *through fear of death* were all their lifetime *subject to bondage*." Heb. 2:14, 15.

Nothing but sin causes fear of death; hence the text teaches emphatically that sin makes men "subject to bondage." It is the especial mission of Christ to save people from sin (Matt. 1:21), and consequently to release them from prison. For proof of this read the following texts:-

Isa. 61:1: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

Isa. 42:1-7: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; . . . to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison."

Notice that Christ proclaims the opening of the prison to them that are bound, and brings out the prisoners from the prison, because the Spirit is upon him. This agrees with Peter's statement that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison.

Ps. 116:16: "O Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant, and the son of thine handmaid; thou hast loosed my bonds."

Ps. 142:7: "Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name."

Ps. 79:11: "Let the sighing of the prisoner come before thee; according to the greatness of thy power preserve thou those that are appointed to die." Compare Ps. 102:19, 20; Heb. 2:16.

To this might be added our Saviour's talk to the Jews, recorded in the eighth of John. He told them how they might be made free. Verse 32. They denied that they were in bondage. Verse 33. He told them that "whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (verse 34), and therefore in bondage. Compare Rom. 6:16-18; 7:14; 2 Peter 2:19. He then told them that the Son alone could make them free indeed. Verse 36. Yet although Christ was there, filled with the same Spirit by which he preached to the wicked antediluvians, these Jews, like them, refused to be set free, and died in their sins. Verse 21.

With this we leave the text, 1 Peter 3:18-20, believing that anyone with whom simple Bible statements are all-sufficient evidence, will have no difficulty in seeing that it teaches this; that by the same Spirit by which Christ was raised from the dead, he went in the days of Noah, and through him, preached unto the antediluvians, who were in the bondage of sin; and that in so doing he was simply doing what he is doing to-day, and has been doing ever since the fall.

This work of Christ, of preaching deliverance to the captives, is limited to this present life, for when he comes the second time he comes "without sin unto salvation," to take the released prisoners home.

Therefore, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts;" for, "behold now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." W.

### **"Christian Science" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is a very innocent name, and one well calculated to impress many people favorably. The word "science" is in itself sufficient to overawe the multitude, for so great is the reverence for science that a bundle of the veriest nonsense will pass current, if it is only labeled "scientific;" and when to this is prefixed the word "Christian," to say anything derogatory would be thought sacrilegious. The term is used to designate "the greatest remedial system ever employed to eradicate pain and disease." As a matter of fact, it is the name of the most unchristian and antichristian nonsense that has lately been invented to deceive people.

According to one of its most intelligent advocates, "It is very necessary to impress upon the novice in the science that we are created spiritually as well as physically, and that the body is not the real self." After this Spiritualistic utterance, we are prepared to learn that, "There is no death. You are created as a spiritual being, and you cannot get away. What we call death is merely a cessation of the action of the mind on the body. The body is now dead, and it is merely animated by the action of the mind."

Of course if there is no death, there is no disease, and this "Christian Science" consists in deluding people with this idea. If a man has a broken leg, these "Scientists" will not heal it, but will argue something like this: "Your body is

no part of yourself. You are a spiritual being, and a spiritual leg cannot be broken, consequently your leg is not broken. That which you call your leg, and which is broken, has nothing more to do with you than though it was a stick that was broken." But with all this "reasoning," they would not be able to induce the man to so ignore his real broken leg as to walk upon his spiritual leg.

As an evidence of the anti-Christian character of this so-called "science," we need only state that the president of a "Christian Science College" in Chicago, says that the works of Christ and his disciples "were not supernatural, nor miracles, as is generally supposed, but could be performed by anyone whose knowledge and faith in Christian Science would enable him to do it."

This "Christian Science," or Mind Cure, is simply a phase of Spiritualism. That it will ere long have many followers, there can be no question, for it is based solely on the pagan notion of the immortality of the soul, and that the body is no part of the real man; and a belief of this is nowadays quite generally considered as evidence that one is a Christian. And it is for this reason that Spiritualism is arrogating to itself the name Christian, with good prospects that it will not be long before its claims are recognized by the remainder of the "Christian world."

### **"Where Are They?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Where are the saints that rose from the dead at the time of Christ's resurrection? Did they return to their graves, or are they in Heaven? Where are Enoch and Elijah? O. B. H."

The Bible tells us that "Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven." 2 Kings 2:11. Of Enoch it says that he "was translated that he should not see death" (Heb. 11:5), and that "God took him." Gen. 5:24. So there can be no question but that he too is in Heaven. We are not told positively what became of those whose graves were opened at the death of Christ, and who came out of the graves after his resurrection (Matt. 27:50-53), but the evidence seems to indicate quite clearly that they, too, are now in Heaven. Thus Paul says of Christ (Eph. 4:8, margin) that "when he ascended upon high, he led a multitude of captives, and gave gifts unto men." Since Christ himself is in Heaven (1 Peter 3:22), it is evident that those whom he led with him from captivity are there too.

If we turn to Rev. 5:9, 10 we shall find a company brought to view who have been redeemed from among men, by the blood of Christ, who are around the throne of God. That this is not a prophetic view of what shall take place after the coming of the Lord, is proved by the fact that at the same time there stood in the midst the "Lamb as it had been slain." Now since men can get to Heaven before the coming of the Lord only by a special resurrection or translation, we are warranted in concluding that these saints who were raised at the resurrection of Christ, are identical with those whom John saw in Heaven.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner



The steamer *Mariposa*, which arrived April 16, from Australia, brought Elder J. O. Corliss and family. Elder Corliss is quite feeble in health, and was obliged to cease labor in the midst of the best interest there has been in that field. He will go to the health retreat at St. Helena for treatment.

Since fifty numbers of the SIGNS constitutes a volume, there are necessarily two weeks in the year in which no paper is printed, and our custom has always been to have one of these weeks the week of the annual meetings. Accordingly, the next number of the SIGNS-No. 17-will be issued May 5, instead of April 28.

The article on this page, entitled "Sunday Legislation in Massachusetts," although none too long, is no longer than we usually put on this page; but it arrived after the body of the paper had been made up, and we could not let matter of so great interest and importance, lay over for two weeks. We expect that our correspondent will give us, in our next issue, the outcome of the matter in the Senate.

A man in Kansas takes exceptions to our teaching that the Sabbath should still be kept holy, and says: "How a man lives is the only possible criterion to judge by. Right conduct is the only orthodoxy." We agree, and would inform our critic that whether or not a man keeps the Sabbath, has a good deal to do with his life. It is quite essential to right conduct that he keep the Sabbath, for so the Lord commands.

One of our exchanges remarks that in view of the political influence which recent events in Germany have demonstrated that the Pope can exercise the question of who will be the next Pope is invested with an additional interest. That may be; but as a matter of fact, it makes very little difference who is Pope; for whoever he may be he represents the Papacy; and as has been said: "It often happens that the man who goes into the Vatican with progressive ideas, falls under the almost irresistible traditions of the place, and becomes the exponent of Catholic ideas of the irreconcilable type." The Papacy always has meddled and always will meddle in politics; and the influence of the Pope, whoever he may be, will always be exerted in the interests of Romanism first, last, and all the time.

The *Christian Nation*, one of the organs of the National Reform Association, whose chief aim is to have the United States Constitution so amended that Sunday observance can be enforced upon all people, regardless of their position or religious belief, quotes with approval from Dr. Talmage's recent discourse on the "Abolition of the Sabbath," in which he says:-

"Oh! say some, 'haven't you any regard for the people's rights?' I believe in the people having their rights; but has not the Lord any rights? You govern your family, and the Governor rules the State, and the President rules the United States. Do you really think the Lord Almighty, who made the heavens and the earth, has a right to rule the universe?"

Indeed we do; but we don't believe that any man or any body of men has that right. What we object to in the National Reform Association is that it proposes, in reality to take the reins of Government out of the Lord's hands. We prefer to fall into the hands of the Lord than into the hands of man.

A man in Kansas has written a pamphlet of 104 pages, expressly for the purpose of proving that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment should not be

kept. Having exhausted all the arguments that he could think of, against the Sabbath, he turns his attention to those who keep the day, affirming that everything that none are induced to keep it, except those who grasp everything that is new, and who "will change that for something else as soon as the tide shall run some other way." He says that "they are white clouds having no rain, and are, therefore, carried about with every wind of doctrine." The query with us is why he should spend so much time and strength arguing against a practice which is adopted only by those who he says cannot be influenced by argument.

**May 5, 1887**

**"Something Not Commanded" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Cambridge News*, published at Cambridgeboro, Penn., which contains the synopsis of a discourse on the Sabbath, preached by Rev. Wm. Grassic, of that place. After showing the origin of the Sabbath, its place in the decalogue, its sacredness, and the fact that Christ did not abolish it, but that "Jesus left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it," he proceeds as follows:-

"Come now to the apostles. While under the special influence of the Holy Ghost, planting churches, carrying on revivals, starting missionary enterprises, they changed the time of observance from the seventh to the first day of the week. We believe they were divinely inspired to make the change, and yet wisely directed to make no public decree about it!"

Well, now, here's a conundrum. If the apostles were inspired to make the change in the Sabbath, and yet were "wisely directed" to keep the fact from the public, how did the Rev. Wm. Grassic find it out? We take it for granted that he was not there to see for himself, since what he tells about must have happened fully eighteen hundred years ago. How did he learn of this change? How did the fact leak out? As Mr. Grassic admits, the Scriptures are utterly silent respecting the change.

Just think of it! The apostle divinely directed to make a change in that institution which God had made and sanctified at creation, and which he had made known at Sinai in thunder tones which shook the earth, and yet cautioned to tell nobody of the change! The statement is so absurd that it refutes itself. The fact that ministers of the gospel are driven to such shifts to account for the present Sunday observance, is sufficient evidence that such observance has not the slightest sanction of inspiration. The Lord does not work in so underhanded a manner. We are told that he will do nothing without revealing his secret unto his servants the prophets (Amos 3:7), and he makes known his will to the prophets in order that they may tell the people.

Notice also that Mr. Grassic claims expressly that the change of the Sabbath was not effected in the days of Christ, but that he "left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it." Then if, as he claims, the apostles had made the change, they would have gone directly contrary to the

teaching and practice of Christ. If this claim were true, whom should we follow? Should we follow Christ, or the apostles? He, of course, would have us follow the apostles, and thus we see that in order to find a basis for Sunday observance, men are willing to ignore Christ. We do not propose to ignore either Christ or his apostles, for all taught the same thing. They never presumed to do more than to follow their Master. "The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him."

One point more: Mr. Grassic tells us that the apostles were "wisely directed to make no public decree" about the change of the Sabbath. That is to say that there was no command given for the observance of Sunday. Now read Webster's definition of superstition: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious *rites not commanded*." Then according to the common usage of language, and Mr. Grassic's own admission, we must conclude that the observance of Sunday is nothing but superstition; and the more rigidly its observance is enforced, the more superstition is evinced. How much better it would be to follow the plain commandment of God, even though the world oppose, than to ignore Christ and the Bible in an attempt to find an excuse for following the custom of the multitude. It seems to us that thinking people should need no stronger proof of the falsity of the claims of Sunday, than the excuses which its devotees put forth in its behalf. W.

**"The Lord's Prayer. Forgive Us Our Debts" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Forgive Us Our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors."

This may be called the crowning petition in this wonderful prayer. In the beginning of these comments we said that this prayer is only for those who have given themselves to Christ,-who can truly say "Our Father." This proves that still more plainly. We do not mean that it is for none but those who are perfect, but that it is for those who have surrendered themselves to the Lord that he may work in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure. To be able always to pray understandingly and from the heart, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," is something that can be done by but comparatively few who profess to be Christians. The one who can do it is in possession of the greatest of all Christian graces-charity; for "charity suffereth long, and is kind," "is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil," and this is the way we would be to have the Lord deal with us.

A great many people think that they are of a forgiving disposition when they are not. When they have done wrong, and someone takes revenge on them, they think that they are deserving of considerable credit if they can take it patiently; but they think that they are perfectly justifiable in harboring harsh thoughts, at least, if they are injured without cause. This is indicated by the common saying, "If I had done anything to deserve this treatment, I would not say anything; but I have not done anything, and I won't stand it." That is as far from the forgiveness that our Saviour taught, as the east is from the west. "For what glory is it, if, when

ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." 1 Pet. 2:20.

It has been truly said that to forgive is divine. Certainly it is not human. Human nature knows nothing of forgiveness. Human nature stands upon its dignity, and says, "I'll have my rights; nobody shall trample on me with impunity." But the divine Son of God, who did no sin, and in whose mouth was found no guile, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." 1 Pet. 2:23. You who say, "All I ask is simple justice; I demand only my rights," how would you fare if you should go immediately after such an assertion and repeat the Lord's prayer, and the Lord should take you at your word? Who could stand if the Lord should mark iniquity? Suppose the Lord should give you simple justice,-just what you deserve, and nothing more,-what would be the result? Not only would you be deprived of eternal life, but your present life would not be continued for another moment; for there is not one of us who deserves a single blessing from the hand of God; "it is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not." Lam. 3:22. There is in us no good thing; we have all gone out of the way, and are unprofitable (Rom. 3:10-12); now when our rights have been invaded, and we cherish resentment, we cannot utter the Lord's prayer without asking the Lord not to forgive us. What a terrible thing it is not to have a forgiving spirit.

Nor can we avoid the consequence above indicated, by refusing to use our Saviour's prayer. Whether we ask or not, we shall be forgiven just as we forgive. Says the Saviour: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Matt. 6:14, 15.

We have said that forgiveness is not natural to the human heart. Only to the extent that one is partaker of the divine nature, can he exercise true forgiveness. God's forgiveness is the standard for us. Says Paul: "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Eph. 4:32. No one can know how to forgive, unless he knows how God forgives; and nobody can fully understand how God forgives, until he has felt in his own soul the fullness of divine pardon. It will be worth our while to note a few texts which show how God forgives, so that we may know what spirit we should have. Let us read a few texts:-

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." 1 Pet. 3:18. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "We love him, because he first loved us." 1 John 4:9, 10, 19.

We have heard it claimed that we are not required to forgive an offender unless he asks for forgiveness; that until he repents and begs for pardon, we are

warranted in holding him off. But the above texts convey a different idea. We are to forgive as God forgives. Now suppose that God had made no movement towards the salvation of rebellious men until they humbled themselves before him; there never would have been any salvation for men. It is only because of his love for us while we were rebels, that we are enabled to come to him. He was under no obligation to mankind; the obligation was all on the other side; yet he took the initiative. God loved the world. He harbored no malice or enmity in his heart, because he had been insulted, and his laws trampled upon, but was filled with love and pity for poor, erring mortals. It grieved him to think that man would pursue a course that would inevitably end in his ruin, and he made the way easy for him to return to his allegiance, and begged him to come and be forgiven. The same spirit should actuate us. No matter how much we may have been misused, we are not warranted in entertaining the slightest feeling of enmity toward the offender. On the contrary, we should have such love for him that our only feeling would be that of sorrow that he should pursue a course so detrimental to himself. The thought of the personal injury we have sustained should be lost sight of in the thought of the greater injury which the offender's course will bring upon himself. It is not natural for us to do this; we can do it only when we are partakers of the divine nature.

It may be said that God does not actually forgive men until they repent. This is true; but he desires that they shall receive his pardon, and therefore, so far as he is concerned, he has pardoned them. All that is lacking is for them to accept the pardon which he offers them; if they will not, he is clear, and the responsibility of their ruin rests upon themselves. God could not actually pardon an unrepentant sinner, for the reason that when he pardons it means far more than when we forgive. If a man has maliciously injured us, and we forgive him, it makes no difference with his guilt; but when God forgives the sinner, his guilt is by that pardon taken away; and it is evident that God cannot take away the guilt of a man who has no desire nor intention to abstain from his sins, but who is determined to retain his guilty practices.

This brings us to another feature of forgiveness. It is very common for people to say that they can forgive but they cannot forget. That is not true forgiveness. The man who does not forget the injury, will brood over it until the bitter feelings will come up again with more than their original force; the harsh feelings are not put away, but only smothered for a time. The man who does not forget an injury done him, has never really forgiven the offender; he has not allowed love for the erring one to eclipse all thought

of the injury done to himself, and without this there can be no forgiveness such as God exercises toward us. Divine pardon is justification; God pardons the believer in Christ, by imputing his righteousness "for the remission of sins that are past." The pardoned one is as though he had never sinned; where there was nothing but guilt before, God beholds nothing but righteousness,-righteousness put there through his own wonderful love. Then if we forgive as God forgives, we must regard the repentant offender as though he had done nothing against us.

We must forget that he ever injured us. We must treat him and regard him as though he had done us nothing but good instead of nothing but evil.

The man who forgives in this manner is a true disciple of Christ, because no one can do this unless he has experienced, and does at the time experience, the blessing of divine forgiveness. It is not enough that we have once been forgiven; we must have a vivid sense of the love of God toward us *now*, if we would not forgive as we ought. Under these circumstances the most difficult thing in the world to do, becomes the easiest. Because when we realize how sinful we are, and how much God has forgiven us, it seems a small matter in comparison to forgive the petty wrong done us by a fellow-man. When we contemplate the magnitude of our sin against God, all the wrongs that all men may have done to us, sink into insignificance. We think that the servant who had received a free gift of ten thousand talents from his lord was mean and ungrateful because he would not give his fellow-servant one hundred pence. If he had any sense of what had been done for him, he would have told his fellow-servant to keep the paltry sum, and would have thought no more about it. So if we have any just sense of God's love to us, we cannot fail to exhibit corresponding love to our fellows. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

We call the attention of our readers to the above list of camp-meetings. These are but the beginning of the many that will be held this year. Others will be added to this list, as soon as the time and place of holding them are determined. There is considerable prejudice in many quarters against camp meetings, but all who are situated so that they can attend any one of these meetings, will find it to their interest and profit to do so. At all of them visitors will be welcomed and provided for.

Of the meetings just held in Oakland, we have space for but few words. It was more largely attended, and was in many respects the most interesting, of any ever held here. The Spirit of the Lord was present, as many can testify. That much good was done there cannot be the slightest doubt; we pray that its effects may be permanent. Important steps were proposed and voted, looking to the advancement of the work. These will be set forth next week in the reports, which, owing to the shortness of the time, could not be furnished for this week's paper.

The friends of the cause in the North Pacific and Upper Columbia Conferences, should not fail to attend camp-meeting this spring. In addition to the strong preaching force sent by the General Conference, Brother F. M. Morrison, of the Pacific Press, will attend both these meetings for the purpose of giving instruction to those who wish to engage in the work of canvassing. He is a practical canvasser and teacher, and will render efficient service in this branch. We shall be greatly disappointed if some who think themselves incapable of work, do not at these meetings resolve to give their entire time to it.

In the *Independent* of April 7, President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, said of the situation in Bulgaria:-

"There seems to be a general impression that we shall have no war this year. . . . But thus far, from the standpoint of Constantinople, I can see no evidence that the danger has passed. Nothing has been settled. Every cause of war which existed two months ago exists still. Preparations for war are still going on as vigorously as ever, and the relations of Russia with Austria, Turkey, and England are no more friendly. In some directions they are more strained. If the Czar feels that he is ready for war this spring, it will come."

In his report to the Roman Propaganda, concerning the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Gibbons contrasts the religious devotion of the working classes of this country with the religious hostility of the same class in foreign countries, and says that the Catholic workmen of America "are intelligent, instructed, devoted sons, ready to give their blood as they give their means," for the support of the church. As the *Observer* says, if this assertion means anything, it means that the Pope's minions in this country are ready to fight for him if need be; that they never become so devoted to any society, not even to their adopted country, that they would not fight at the call of one who blasphemously professes to be head of the church. When it is too late, some who are indifferent now, will realize that while Roman Catholicism is nominally a religious system, it is primarily a political power, bent on destroying everything that it cannot rule.

The *Christian at Work* tells us that "fasting is peculiarly an Old Testament institution, and as out of place as we are told new wine is in an old wineskin." Yet Christ, in the sermon on the mount, said: "Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father in secret shall reward thee openly." Matt. 6:16-18. And while this institution of the Bible-both Old and New Testaments-is summarily set aside, Papal holidays, such as "Holy Thursday," Good Friday, Easter, Christmas, Sundays, etc., are coming to be generally observed. Alas for the exchange of real Old and New Testament religion, for those things which are not commanded!

"Falsifying the balances by deceit," is one of the most common things nowadays. An experiment was recently made in Brooklyn, N. Y., with a view of ascertaining whether the coal dealers of that city were in the habit of defrauding their customers. Eighty-two tons of coal, bought of several dealers, were weighed after delivery, and only sixteen of them were of full weight. The remainder showed short weight, some to the amount of thirty pounds, and some as high as three hundred and twenty-six pounds. It is not to be supposed that Brooklyn coal dealers are very much worse than coal dealers in other cities, or that coal dealers are worse by nature than other men; but iniquity abounds, and it is with feelings of sadness only, that we recognize the fact that the great majority of men feel no compunctions of conscience against defrauding when they are reasonably sure that they will escape detection. Thank God that there are still many honest men in the world; and since we cannot judge the motives of any, we should labor in love for the salvation of all.

The following, which has just appeared in an Austrian paper, is very significant:-

"The Vatican favors the following conditions for a reconciliation with the Quiritual: 1. The Pope will advise the royal archducal and ducal families of Naples, Tuscany, and Nicodeaux to renounce all claims to sovereignty in favor of the Holy See. 2. The Pope will crown Humbert king, granting him and his Catholic descendants territory alone in Italy. 3. The king will govern the whole kingdom with full temporal rights, but will acknowledge the Pope as suzerain and pledge himself to rule according to the dictates of the church. 4. The king will reside at Rome. 5. Territory, including Leonine City and part of the Tiber shore, will be allotted permanently to the Pope, with absolute ruling and proprietary right. 6. A special convention will be concluded, fixing the amount Italy shall pay to maintain the Papal household."

That means the absolute supremacy of the Pope over all Italy, the king being nominal ruler, but really the Pope's vassal. Whether or not Humbert is really for peace on these terms, remains to be seen, but that he will sooner or later accede in order to get the Pope's assistance in some difficulty, as Bismarck has done, there can be no doubt.

A bill restricting railroad traffic on Sunday has been passed by the Connecticut Legislature, and has received the governor's signature. Hereafter no trains can be run for any purpose whatever between 10:30 A.M. and three P. M. Before and after these hours only mail trains, or those required for public necessity, for the preservation of freight, will be allowed to run. The law also prohibits the landing of freight from sunrise to sunset on Sunday. We have serious doubts as to its being enforced.

### **"The Pope in Politics" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope, though nominally without a vestige of temporal power, keeps up most assiduously the forms of civil sovereignty, and his influence is stronger to-day than it has ever been since his temporary overthrow in 1798. When he was elevated to the Pontificate, Leo XIII., was not supposed to be possessed of any great political ability; but he seems to have inherited all the instincts and traditions of the "holy office," and he has certainly shown himself to be a master in diplomacy; for, though without a foot of territory that he can call his own, or a single subject who rightfully owes him civil allegiance, he is recognized as a sovereign and treated with on terms of equality by almost all the powers of earth, not even excepting the Turks, the traditional enemies of Rome, and the Chinese, the disciples of Confucius.

But the end is not yet; for, if we may trust the newspaper reports, the crafty Leo will soon appoint a nuncio to the United States! At first thought this seems hardly credible; but stranger things have happened, and in view of the honors shown by this Government, some months since, to the Pope's delegates who came to Baltimore to confer upon a citizen of this country a princely title and a Papal decoration, it is to be feared that a nuncio would be received at



Washington. It is true that such an action would be most ill-advised and unfortunate; but as the Roman Catholic vote in this country is sufficiently large to at least render probable the defeat of any man or party particularly obnoxious to "the church," it is not likely that the President would have the moral courage to refuse to receive a Papal minister, should one be appointed.

But whether the nuncio comes just now or not, the Papacy is ere long to make its power felt as never before in American politics; and how easily this may be done is well exemplified by recent events in Germany. However, if Protestants were true to themselves and to their professed principles, we would have nothing to fear from the intrigues of Popery, but with Romanism on the one hand, and National Reform on the other, we may well tremble, for when the two unite, as they will ere long, for the destruction of our free institutions, religious liberty in this country will be a thing of the past.

**May 12, 1887**

**"Can Inanimate Objects Talk?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

"EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Sometime last year I asked you the following questions:-

"Would it not be wrong, in teaching by allegory or parable, to use one founded on a superstition or false conception of facts, without showing its falsity? Did our Saviour ever use such an allegory or parable?"

"You replied:-

"An answer to the second question would render the first unnecessary; for if Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong. We have no knowledge, however, that our Saviour ever based any of his teachings on superstitions or false theories. The story of the rich man and Lazarus is not strictly a parable, but an apologue, like that found in Judges 9:7-15. An apologue is the relation of supposed actions of brutes or inanimate objects, and does not convey any wrong impression, because the hearers, knowing that the things referred to cannot do or say the things credited to them, readily understand that some moral truth is intended to be impressed by it."

"To this I made a brief reply at the time, but as it failed to reach you, I will by request restate some of my objections to your answer.

"In the first place, you say: 'If Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong' as if it would be right under some circumstances to do wrong-for the teaching of false doctrine, if only by implication, is certainly wrong. This position is not a good one. But you say you have no knowledge he ever so taught. Neither have I. You call the story of the rich man and Lazarus an 'apologue.' Was it one to the Jews? Certainly not. They believed in the conscious existence of the soul (or spirit) after death, and this story, being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability-a parable-and would surely tend to confirm them in it. If this is an apologue it stands alone as such among all of Christ's teachings. Even an apologue should

have some foundation in fact as Jotham's did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble. W. M. B."

To the above we have to say: 1. We did not imply that it would ever be right to do wrong. What we did say was that Christ could not do wrong, and that therefore the fact that a certain thing was done by him, would be sufficient evidence that such act was not wrong. But in that case we should not be able to find anything in the word of God to condemn such action. In the case under consideration, however, we find no evidence that Christ ever used such a method of conveying instruction, and we do find that he could not have done such a thing, for it would have been a sort of deception.

2. Our correspondent begs the question entirely, when he says that the Jews "believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death, and this story [of the rich man and Lazarus], being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability." In order to show that the story of the rich man and Lazarus had to the Jews all the elements of probability, our friend ought to *prove* that they believed in the immortality of the soul, which he simply *assumes*. There is not the slightest evidence in the Bible to show that the Jews, as a people, believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death. Without doubt many of them had become so tinctured with Grecian philosophy, from their contact with the heathen world, that they had come to believe in the existence of the soul after death; but the sacred writings of the Jews-the Old Testament-give not the slightest warrant for such a belief, and as a people the Jews still clung, outwardly at least, to the religion of their fathers. Therefore it is entirely an assumption to say that the Jews would either gain wrong ideas, or have erroneous views strengthened, by Christ's teaching in Luke 16:19-31.

3. Our correspondent says: "Even an apologue should have some foundation in fact, as Jotham's did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble." What foundation in fact did Jotham's story of the olive, etc., have? Is it true that the trees ever went forth to anoint a king over them? and did anybody in the world ever hear an olive-tree, a fig-tree, a vine, or a bramble utter speech. No; Jotham's story had not the slightest foundation in fact. Was it therefore calculated to deceive, and to lead the people to think that trees do really talk. Not by any means; for his hearers well knew that it is contrary to nature that inanimate things should talk; they knew that he was using an imaginary instance to illustrate his case, and they saw the point at once.

So in the case of our Saviour. To illustrate a point he put words into the mouths of dead men. But the Jews knew, both from observation and from their acquaintance with the Scriptures, that it is impossible for dead men to talk or think. They understood the point intended to be conveyed, just as well as the men of Shechem did the words of Jotham; and they were no more likely to imagine from Christ's words that dead men can talk, than the men of Shechem were to conclude from Jotham's words that trees can talk. For a dead man to talk would be as contrary to nature as it would be for trees.

The only way we can understand our friend's statement that Jotham's apologue had a foundation in fact, is to suppose that he means to say that in Jotham's time there were such things as trees, vines, and brambles. Well, so

there were such things as dead men in Christ's time. And so the parallel between the two illustrations is perfect. Neither Jotham nor Christ taught that inanimate objects can talk, and nobody was deceived.

It is very common for people to read their own beliefs into the Bible. Because the majority of the people of the world believe that the soul of man exists after death, they take it for granted that the Jews always believed so, and that the Bible so teaches. Taken as it reads, and allowed to explain itself, the Bible bears very emphatic testimony against the pagan anomaly of a man being alive when he is dead. W.

### **"Women in the Church" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are asked by a subscriber in Washington Territory to explain how the usages of Seventh-day Adventists, and of many other religious bodies as well, can be harmonized with 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, and 1 Tim. 2:11, 12. He asks: "Were these commands transient? if so, when did they cease to be binding, and by what authority?" He also asks if 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, is correctly translated in Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul."

To the last question we would reply that the Authorized Version gives the sense of the text as well as can be done, and is more nearly literal than is Conybeare and Howson's rendering. The question on the text itself is worthy of consideration, for many good people think that the Bible forbids women to take part in public religious service. 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, reads as follows:-

"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."

It is worthy of mention that those who are most bitterly opposed to women's taking part in public service, are inconsistent with their own interpretation of this text. They interpret it to mean that women should never speak in public, either to preach, or to bear testimony in prayer-meeting; yet there is not a church in the land which does not have women singers, and in many of them the singing would greatly languish if it were not for the women. Now it is certain that those who sing do not "keep silence." We do not think that this is wrong, not a violation of Paul's injunction; we cite this instance merely for the purpose of showing the inconsistency of those who interpret Paul's words as prohibiting speaking in meeting, but allowing singing. Now if the injunction to "keep silence" does not prohibit singing, it is reasonable to suppose that it does not prohibit speaking at proper times and in a proper manner, for simple speaking is far more nearly an approach to silence than is ordinary singing.

And this we shall find to be the case, when we consider a few other texts; for we must always let scripture explain scripture. Read the other text to which our correspondent referred, 1 Tim. 2:11, 12: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." This must certainly be considered as parallel to, and

explanatory of, 1 Cor. 14:34, 35. But there is nothing in it which would stop a woman from bearing testimony in social meeting, or even from preaching. Notice that Paul says: "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man," the idea being of a woman's setting herself up as superior, and assuming authority which does not belong to her. But a simple testimony for Christ is the farthest removed from the assumption of authority, and even the preacher who usurps authority over his hearers, is out of place. The place of the preacher is not to be a lord over God's heritage, but to act the part of an ambassador for Christ. From the two texts quoted we must conclude that Paul did not mean to prohibit women from witnessing publicly for Christ, but only to have them act with becoming modesty.

This conclusion is made positive by other texts. In 1 Cor. 11:4, 5, 13, the same apostle says: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head; for that is even all one as if she were shaven." "Judge in yourselves; is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?"

In these verses, and the context, the apostle is giving directions for the proper conducting of public worship. Now if in chapter 14 he meant to teach that women should utter no sound in public service, why did he here give directions concerning their praying and speaking in public assemblies? Certainly no directions are needed for the performance of that which is forbidden, and the fact that Paul tells how women should pray and prophesy in public meeting, shows that such action was not forbidden.

To forbid women any of the *privileges* of the gospel would be utterly at variance with the spirit of the gospel. Says Paul: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:27, 28. That means that in the gospel plan there is no difference made for race, condition, or sex. A woman stands before God a sinner, just the same as a man; she is responsible for her own sins, and, if saved, must be saved in exactly the same way that a man is. No Christian would think of prohibiting a person from taking part in meeting, on the ground that he is a servant, or because he is of a different nationality from the majority of the members of the church; then no Christian should prevent a person from speaking to the praise of God, because that person is a woman.

To interpret Paul's language in 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, as meaning that women should bear no part in public worship is to do violence to the Scriptures which, being inspired, must always and everywhere be harmonious. Thus in Acts 21:8, 9, we read that Philip the evangelist "had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." Paul speaks of Phebe, "a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea" (Rom. 16:1), and in Phil. 4:3 bespeaks the care of the church for "those women which labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other fellow-laborers." And the mighty and eloquent Apollos was instructed in the way of God by Aquila and his wife Priscilla. Acts 18:2, 24-26.

In the Old Testament we read of "Miriam the prophetess" (Ex. 15:20) by whom the Lord spoke as well as by Moses and Aaron (Num. 12:1, 2). We read also (Judges 4) of "Deborah, a prophetess" who

279

judged Israel, and whose wisdom and prudence were esteemed so highly that Barak would not go to war without her counsel and her presence. Still later we read of "Huldah the prophetess" (2 Kings 22:14) to whom Josiah sent when he would inquire of the Lord concerning the book of the law which the priest had found. There is something remarkable about this case. At this time Jeremiah had been prophesying for five years, yet the king sent to Huldah instead of to him. Moreover the king's messengers to the prophetess were, among others, a scribe of the law, and the high priest, whose lips should keep knowledge, and at whose mouth men were accustomed to seek the law. Micah 2:7. Yet it seems that on this occasion no one had the word of the Lord except this woman.

We have considered this matter at this length not only for the satisfaction of our correspondent, but also to meet a very common infidel cavil. There are many men, and more women, of a class who seek to overthrow the divinely-established order of nature, who are accustomed to rail at the apostle Paul as a crusty old bachelor and a misogynist, because of his words to the Corinthians. Hastily assuming that he absolutely forbade women to take any part in public meetings, they think that the present liberty accorded to women is an evidence of the advance which people of the nineteenth century have made over Paul's antiquated notions. From railing at Paul they naturally come to despise all his writings, and as a natural consequence, they lightly esteem the entire Bible.

But Paul was not crusty, he was not a misogynist, and he was not a bachelor. He was a large-hearted, whole-souled, loving Christian, who treats of the family relation with a knowledge and tenderness not exceeded by any writer who ever lived. Instead of commanding women to say nothing in meetings for the worship of God, he encouraged them even to occupy responsible positions. What he did do was to give instruction that would keep them from being classed with the heathen women who, in their eagerness for notice, divested themselves of that modesty which always characterizes true woman, and which the gospel tends to heighten. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the way that prohibition was defeated in Michigan: The *Union Signal* states that one of the northern precincts which has a population of 1,200 men, women, and children, returned 1,800 votes against prohibition. One ward in Detroit returned sixteen prohibition votes, when sixty men stated upon oath that they had deposited prohibition ballots in the box. Such frauds alone would be sufficient to show that the liquor traffic is of the devil.

The *Independent's* report of the revival meetings in Cleveland says: "Solo singing will cease to be a feature in these meetings. Perhaps this feature, for a time so popular will be less popular in evangelistic meetings hereafter, and there will be a return to the earlier practice of the time of Finney, Nettleton, Kirke, and

Footnote. It has been noticeable here that the people have called for familiar congregational hymns. The effect of this congregational singing has been marked. No solo singing could compare with it for moving power." This will be found always to be the case. Solo singing has no rightful place in the worship of God. We love to hear a vocal artist, merely as an artist, but praise is a part of worship that cannot be done by proxy. "Praise Him, all ye people."

On the 28th of April, Elder A. T. Jones, of this office, accompanied by Brother M. J. Church, of Fresno, Cal., left Oakland to attend the annual National Reform Convention which was appointed to be held in Pittsburgh, Penn., May 11 and 12. The convention was first appointed to be held in Chicago, but the managers concluded that the atmosphere of Pittsburgh would be more congenial. The readers of the SIGNS will be favored with a report of the proceedings and temper of the convention; but the *American Sentinel*, which Elder Jones specially represents, will contain the fullest reports and also reviews of the subjects discussed. The *Sentinel*, true to its name, intends to closely watch the work of National Reform (false so called), and those who wish to keep informed as to the growth and character of the organization which, under the guise of Christianity, aims to overthrow religious freedom in this country, should take that paper. Send your address and fifty cents to *American Sentinel*, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal., and receive the paper for one year.

We often speak of Roman Catholicism in terms of condemnation. We cannot speak of it in any other terms, if we speak of it at all, because the Bible calls it "that Wicked," the "mystery of iniquity," the "man of sin," the "transgression of desolation," and has declared it to be "full of names of blasphemy," "BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." But while this is true, we would not for a moment be understood as speaking against individuals who are classed as members of that body. We speak against the system of iniquity, and not against those who are deceived by it. That God recognizes many of his people among the members of the Roman Catholic Church, and churches which are allied to her, is evident from his call, "Come out of her, my people." There are still souls in that body who are honest at heart as Luther was; and no one should despise anyone who, as was Luther, is a zealous devotee, for he may be one of God's people. Indeed, the servant of God is not warranted in despising any man; those who are willfully following error, are deserving of our pity. "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, and living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another."

And now comes "a new revelation" which is "vouchsafed to the saints through Joseph Smith the prophet," which settles the question of Sunday observance, for the present, at least. The "revelation" was given at Kirtland, Ohio, April 11, 1887, and the section to which we refer reads as follows:-

"And the Spirit sayeth further: Inasmuch as there has been much discussion in the past concerning the Sabbath of the Lord, the church is admonished that, until further revelation is received, or the quorums of the church are assembled to decide concerning the law in the church articles and covenants, the saints are to observe the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, as a day of

rest; as a day of worship, as given in the covenants and commandments. And on this day they should refrain from unnecessary work; nevertheless, nothing should be permitted to go to waste on that day nor should necessary work be neglected. Be not harsh in judgment but merciful in this, as in all other things. Be not hypocrites nor of those who make a man an offender for a word."

Now that is something tangible. We are inclined to the opinion that the Mormons are ahead of their Gentile neighbors who are still searching around in the Bible, for some "dark saying" which by ingenious manipulation may be made to serve as an "inference" that Sunday is the day that should be observed. Positive testimony, even from questionable authority, is so much more convenient than no testimony at all from reliable authority, that first-day observers as a class will doubtless ere long take points from the Mormons. Indeed they have long since taken steps in that direction, in the manufactured testimony from the Fathers.

The *Christian at Work* says:-

"Holy Thursday was observed by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of Brooklyn in a union service and a communion celebration in the evening. This shows that harmonious state of feeling among the non-episcopal denominations at least in this vicinity. This, we may add, is not the first service of the kind, as it is pretty sure not to be the last."

"Holy Thursday," indeed! What an expression to be found in a professed Protestant paper! and what a practice for Presbyterians to be engaged in! Whence came its holiness? Oh, "his holiness"-the usurper of Christ's place as head of the church, the representative of the "man of sin"-has at some time pronounced upon it his benediction, and since the professed Protestants have persistently clung to the Papal Sunday, they are beginning, like consistent persons, to recognize all other Popish festivals. Soon Catholicism and a dead Protestantism that has ceased to protest, will unite on a level (the Catholic level, every time), and then what "a harmonious state of feeling" there will be. No; we are sure that this will not be the last service of the kind. Professed Protestants who *will*, in spite of all reason, persist in observing a counterfeit Sabbath which has no authority but pagan and papal precept and practice, must sooner or later accept all other festivals appointed by the same authority. We rejoice to know that there are yet thousands who will really protest against the abominations of Rome.

The matter of unfermented wine at communion has been much agitated of late in California. We are confident that many oppose the use of unfermented wine at communions, because they either think there can be no such thing, or else they have seen only poor samples of it. For instance, Dr. Thompson, of Berkeley, stated in a recent discussion: Professor Rising of the University has analyzed several specimens of unfermented wine, and has found that they all contained salicylic acid. He told of a young man who had been poisoned nearly to death by using wine in which salicylic acid had been placed as a preservative. He is reported as saying sarcastically that "some churches preferred salicylic acid to alcohol as a preservative agent in their wines, and he was in favor of allowing them to take their choice." For our part we shall choose neither.

Notwithstanding the sarcastic insinuation that wine can be preserved only by alcohol or by some acid which is not much to be preferred, we know that good wine contains neither the one nor the other as a preservative agent, but consists solely of unfermented grape juice, without the addition of a particle of anything else. We can verify this statement to any who doubt it. There is no excuse whatever for churches putting temptation in the way of the work, or of mocking Christ by using decomposed grape juice to represent his precious blood.

**"Only an Echo" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the annual convention of the Baptist Churches of California, recently held in Oakland, there was considerable discussion over the "new theology." "Probation after Death" was the subject of a paper read by Dr. Frost, who styled that unscriptural theory the "great hypothesis," and said: "The great hypothesis was first in vogue among the nations of heathendom, and there is reason to believe that probation after death is the inspiration of the prince of the power of the air, of the power of darkness. It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, 'Thou shalt not surely die.'"

Nobody could have stated the case more forcibly and aptly. All talk of the "larger hope" of a probation after death is simply the devil's device to induce men to slight the gospel and become hardened in sin. It is not a new device, for, as Dr. Frost says, it was popular among the ancient heathen; it has been the strength of Roman Catholicism, but it remained for the present generation to attempt to make it appear to be a part of Protestant Christianity.

The question that agitates the minds of those who are not willing to see Protestantism wholly paganized is, "How shall we check this growing delusion?" The answer is not difficult, and should be suggested to everyone by the statement which Dr. Frost makes as to its origin. Says he: "It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, 'Thou shalt not surely die.'" Common sense would say, Stop the preaching from that text, and the echo will necessarily cease. There can be no echo without some noise preceding it; when the noise ceases, the echo will cease. And it is a truth that the theory of probation after death is the legitimate result of the doctrine of the indestructibility of the human soul, which doctrine was first preached by Satan, and which is being repeated by thousands of Christian ministers, who are astonished that there should be any echo. Abandon the unscriptural theory that the soul of man cannot die, and probation after death would need no one to combat it. On the other hand, so long as Christian preachers persistently hold that man is by nature immortal, the hypothesis of probation after death will find a hearing. The echo will not die out so long as that which causes it continues.

**May 19, 1887**

**"Words and Thoughts" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner



The psalmist prayed, "Give ear to my words, O Lord; and consider my meditation." Ps. 5:1. How few there are who could from the heart make that request? Who would like to have the Lord listen to all that they say? Certainly not they who blaspheme, or who use vulgar, idle, or foolish words, which they would not want even a good man to hear. Yet whether we wish God to hear our words, or not, we may rest assured that he does consider them, for, says the psalmist, "there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether." Ps. 124:1. And those words are recorded, for the Saviour says: "But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Matt. 12:36, 37.

Then there is our meditation. That is worse still, for every heart has cherished thoughts that have never been formed into words, because the individual would not betray his real character to his associates. It is the thoughts which mark the measure and character of the man. "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he." Many people who pass for upright Christians, would be seen to be wholly corrupt, if their thoughts were but laid open to public view. Well, whether we pray that God will consider our meditation or not, we may rest assured that he does do so, "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." Heb. 4:12, 13.

The heart of mind of man is to the Lord like a printed page. He knows all its imaginings. And the time is coming when not only the Lord, but all the world, will be able to read the secrets of the heart. The apostle says that when the Lord comes he will "bring to light the hidden thing of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart." 1 Cor. 4:5. That will be the time when he who now is lifted up shall be terribly abased.

Who is the one, then, who can ask the Lord to consider his meditation, and who will not be put to shame in the Judgment? It is he whose delight is in the law of the Lord, in which he meditates day and night. It is he whose works are committed to the Lord, and whose thoughts are consequently established. It is he who is pure of heart. What a blessed condition does that man occupy, who can rejoice in the thought that the pure and holy God knows all his thoughts and approves them. Our daily prayer should be: "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer." Ps. 19:14. W.

### **"He Descended into Hell"**

E. J. Waggoner

This is one clause of the so-called apostles' creed, which was formulated somewhere between the fourth and the ninth centuries, and which is now adopted by nearly the whole of Christendom. The sentiment was evidently based on the mistranslation of the Greek word *hades*, in Acts 2:27, and a misconception

of 1 Peter 3:18-20. In the last number but one of the SIGNS, we showed what this text really does mean, and now, according to promise, we propose to show what it does not mean; that it cannot by any possibility mean that in the interval between his crucifixion and his resurrection Christ went to some unknown region where wicked spirits were confined, and preached to them.

It cannot be possible that the thousands who are accustomed to interpret 1 Peter 3:18-20 as we have just indicated, as proof that what we call death is not really death, have any idea of all that such an interpretation involves. A few words, however, will suffice to show any candid, thinking person that those who use this text to prove the immortality of the soul, thereby open the door for the introduction of some grievous heresies. If it were true that the "spirits in prison," of whom Peter speaks, were preached to by Christ in person in the period between his crucifixion and his resurrection, then we should be forced to admit,-

1. That there is a probation after death. For preaching is for the purpose of saving those who will believe. 1 Cor. 1:21; Rom. 10:13, 14. It makes no difference whether the ones preached to will believe and repent or not; the fact that they are preached to, shows that there is a possibility of their repenting, and therefore they are still on probation.

2. We should also have to admit the Catholic dogma of purgatory, for that doctrine is based chiefly on this common perversion of this text. Purgatory and probation after death are practically synonymous.

3. Prayers for the dead would follow as a necessary consequence. For if souls are in a condition to be preached to, they are on probation; and if they are on probation, there is a possibility that they may be saved; and if there is a possibility that they may be saved, all good people ought to, and will, pray that they may be saved. It is not necessary here to show how unscriptural all these positions are, for nearly all Protestants are agreed that they are unscriptural; what we design is to show those who reject purgatory and prayers for the dead, that they cannot do so consistently without also rejecting the dogma of the natural immortality of the soul.

Another point: The same ones who use 1 Peter 3:18-20 as proving that the man does not wholly die, use Christ's reply to the thief on the cross (Luke 23:43) to prove the same thing. From the one they claim that Christ descended into some place where the wicked antediluvians were kept, and preached to them, and from the other they claim that immediately after his death he went to paradise. These two positions destroy each other, for if Christ spent the time between his death and his resurrection in preaching to wicked spirits in purgatory, he certainly did not go to the "paradise of God." Some people seeing the inconsistency of these two positions, both of which are wrong, have sought to evade it by taking another position equally erroneous, namely, that those wicked spirits were in paradise! As many people are in doubt over this point, we shall, ere long, show from the Bible what and where paradise is.

But does not the Bible say something about Christ being in hell? It does say that he was in a place which King James's translation incorrectly rendered "hell," but which the revisers have very properly left untranslated, namely, *hades*. In Acts 2:25-31 we read the following:-

"For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved; therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."

The words which Peter here quoted, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*," are found in Ps. 16:19 where the Hebrew word corresponding to *hades* in the New Testament is *sheol*. Let us now examine a few texts to ascertain the nature of this place, who go there, and their condition while there.

1. Good people go there. This is proved by the fact that Christ went there. Jacob said to his sons who thought to comfort him after Joseph was taken away, "I will go down into the grave [*sheol*] unto my son mourning." Gen. 37:35. He expected to go to *sheol*, and he knew that Joseph, if dead, was there. When Christ comes and calls the righteous from their graves, and the saying is brought to pass that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory," they will shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave [*hades*], where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. 15:51-55.

2. Wicked people also go there. David says of the wicked: "Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward. Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer." Ps. 19:11-14. We read also of the rebellious princes of Israel, that "the ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods. They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; and they perished from among the congregation." Num. 16:31-33.

3. All must go to this place. Says David: "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave [*sheol*]?" Ps. 89:48.

4. The souls as well as the bodies of men and likewise animals, go there. See Num. 16:31-33; Ps. 49:15; 89:48; Acts 2:31, etc.

5. The wicked who go there are silent. Says David: "Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave [*sheol*]." Ps. 31:17.

6. The righteous who go there do not call on the Lord. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave [*sheol*] who shall give thee thanks?" "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17.

7. Not only do the righteous not praise the Lord in *sheol* but no one who goes there can be converted to the truth. Said Hezekiah: "For the grave [*sheol*] cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Isa. 38:18.

8. It is a land of forgetfulness. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Ps. 88:10-12.

9. Finally, it is a place where there is absolutely no consciousness of anything. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave [*sheol*], whither thou goest." Eccl. 9:10.

10. Dead people cannot think. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 118:3, 4. See also John 11:21; Eccl. 9:5, 6, etc.

These texts show conclusively that it is absolutely impossible that at the time of Christ's crucifixion there could have been any of the antediluvian sinners, or any others who had died, capable of listening to preaching, or that Christ could have preached to them or to anybody else, between his crucifixion and his resurrection. In addition to these texts, we may note that Christ's soul was in *hades*, whence it was rescued only by his resurrection (Acts 2:31); that it was Christ's soul that was made an offering for sin (Isa. 53:10); and that his soul was poured out unto death (Isa. 53:12). Surely lovers of the Bible ought to accept the simple, consistent statements of that book, rather than a view which makes the Bible contradict itself, and brings in a train of pernicious heresies. W.

### **"The Lord's Prayer. Lead Us Not into Temptation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

This petition cannot well be considered apart from that which immediately follows it: "but deliver us from evil." Both together form a fitting climax to this wonderful prayer, for they indicate, if used understandingly, the soul's desire for purity of heart.

There are two senses in which the word tempted is used in the Bible. The apostle says: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations." James 1:2. Again he says: "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." Verse 14. Now it is evident that the apostle would not exhort men to count it a joyful thing to be drawn away of their own lust, and enticed into sin; therefore the temptation of the second verse is different from that of the fourteenth.

The temptation of the second verse is that which is successfully met, and which leaves the individual stronger than ever. It is the trying of faith. In Eph. 6:16 we learn that faith is the shield by which the darts of the wicked may be quenched. The office of a shield is to protect the person. If a missile is received

upon the shield, the person at whom it was aimed receives no injury; he does not feel it. The temptations, then, which work patience, and which strengthen, are those which meet with no response in our own hearts, but which are instantly repelled.

The other temptations are those which are entertained in the heart. The sin presents itself, and the mind goes out towards it, and longs for it. It may be that the overt act is never committed, but since "the thought of foolishness is sin" (Prov. 24:9), the one who only in imagination does the sinful act is in the sight of God accounted guilty. Such temptations as those are natural to every human being, "for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts."

The petition "*lead us not into temptation,*" must be understood as meaning, "suffer us not to fall into temptation;" and it must also be understood as referring to the second class of temptations,-those which proceed from within. The reason is (1) that we are not to ask freedom from trials, but rather to count them a blessing, and (2) that God cannot and does not lead people into sin. The prayer, then, is "suffer us not to fall into foolish and hurtful lust, but deliver us (keep us back) from evil."

This cannot mean that God will not allow a man to act out the evil that is in him, for that would be impossible; if evil is in the heart, it must show itself,

295

and we are expressly told that at one time God left a man to do what his heart prompted him to do. The man was Hezekiah. After he had been healed, the Babylonian ambassadors came to congratulate, and he showed them all the treasures of his kingdom. 2 Kings 20:12, 13. This action was prompted by pride. 2 Chron. 32:24, 25. The historian, speaking of this, says: "Howbeit in the business of the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon, who sent unto him to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land, God left him, to try him, that he might know all that was in his heart." 2 Chron. 32:31. We must therefore conclude that the petition "lead us not into temptation" does not mean that God is to interpose his mighty power to miraculously preserve us from the wickedness that is in our own hearts.

There can be, then, but one conclusion, and that is that the prayer implies a renunciation and hatred of sin, and a desire to have the heart cleansed from it, and to be strengthened again allowing it to pass the shield of faith, and gain access to the heart. This is the only way that temptations can be instantly repelled, since, as we have read, evil thoughts are natural to the human heart.

It was to effect this that Christ came into the earth. It is not enough that we be freed from the guilt of sin,-from past transgressions,-but we must be freed from the love of sin. Paul says that Christ "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." Gal. 1:1. This "present evil world" does not mean the physical creation, but "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." 1 John 2:16. Again we read that he "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus 2:14.

This is what God wants to do for us; it is what we are to ask him to do for us, for he will not do it against our will. What is there to hinder his doing it? Nothing, if we offer the prayer in all sincerity, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." We cannot cleanse ourselves from the defilement of sin, however much we may desire to be freed from it (Prov. 20:9); but if we do earnestly desire to be kept from sin, God will work in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure (Phil 2:13), and that will be to make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is good. Heb. 13:21.

But while this is in one sense a passive state, in that it is an entire yielding of self to God, it is by no means a state of inactivity. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." James 4:7. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." Luke 13:24. There is to be a constant watchfulness against the insidious assaults of the enemy. A reaching out after God implies a drawing away from sin.

This part of the Lord's prayer cannot be uttered from the heart, except of him who with the psalmist can say, "I hate vain thoughts, but thy law do I love." And this cannot be done until the individual realizes that fellowship with God is the only thing to be desired,-that the loving-kindness of God is better than life. Every man in the world will have just what he wants. If he loves the pleasures of sin, he will be left to its lusting enjoyment; but if his heart and his soul cry out after God, the promise is that he shall be filled. W.

### **"Liquor and the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

A case that recently occurred in New York, in connection with the enforcement of the Sunday law, is somewhat significant. Some liquor sellers were brought before the court, when their counsel contended that they had not violated the law, because it forbids selling liquor on *the Sabbath*, and that Sabbath means the seventh day of the week, while they had sold it on the first day. This puzzled the Judge, until he consulted Webster's Dictionary, where he learned that "the Sabbath of Christians is on Sunday." Accordingly the men were convicted. We have no sympathy with saloon men, but we note this as showing that in the enforcement of Sunday laws, custom, and not reason is the guide.

### **"Conditional Immortality—What Is It?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the Baptist Convention recently held in this city, one of the essays, written and read by a prominent clergyman, contained the following:-

"Two of the foremost nations of the world stand face to face with two great problems. Conditional immortality is leavening the Church of England, and probation after death is sapping the foundation of Congregationalism."

From the fact that the essayist connected conditional immortality with probation after death, which he regards as a dangerous heresy, we conclude that he regards conditional immortality in the same light. We know, indeed, that many people do regard that doctrine as a pernicious one, and we are forced to

conclude that, if they are honest, their aversion is due to ignorance of what conditional immortality is.

What *is* meant by conditional immortality? Simply this, that immortality, or eternal life, which is the same thing, is conditioned upon the individual's belief in Christ. It means that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:24. It is the doctrine which our Saviour himself taught, when he said: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36. Or as expressed by the apostle: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." 1 John 5:11.

It is the doctrine which Christ taught to Nicodemus in these words: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. It is the doctrine which gives Christ his rightful title of Life-giver, which he himself claimed, when he said: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10:10.

To hear the same men talk, one would get the idea that the doctrine of conditional immortality is rank infidelity, and utterly opposed to all true Christianity. As a matter of fact, it is based on the reception of the fact that in all things Christ has the preeminence; that man can have nothing except as he gets it through Christ.

As a matter of fact, a denial of the doctrine of conditional immortality is to that extent a denial of Christ. Indeed, we may truly say that it is wholly a denial of Christ, since it denies the very thing for which Christ came. He himself declares that his only object, by believing on him, have life. Now the man who says that eternal life is not conditioned upon his believing in Christ, virtually says that man has no need of Christ. This was just what so many of the ancient Jews did, to whom Christ sadly said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." They did not profess to be Christians; they rejected Christ unreservedly. Is it not strange that in these days Christ is rejected in exactly the same way by those who profess to love and honor him? Why should people refuse to acknowledge their indebtedness to Christ for all that they have or hope to have? W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last Sunday evening (May 15) a series of meetings was begun in a 60-foot tent on the corner of 8th and Myrtle Street, Oakland, with a good attendance. These meetings will continue several weeks during the entire week, and will be devoted to the consideration of the prophecies for this time, and practical Bible truth in general. Preaching will begin every evening and 7:45, except Sunday evenings, when the service will begin at 7:30. Services will be conducted by Elders J. O. Corliss and R. S. Owen.

The international convention of the Young Men's Christian Association was held in San Francisco last week. Delegates were present from every state and territory in the union, and from some foreign countries. This week there is a

Secretaries' Conference in Oakland, California is no longer regarded as outside the world, and societies and associations of all classes are holding general meetings here. We are glad to know that the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is going to fall into line and meet here next fall.

The *Christian Cyneour* says that it is "sorry to see in the *United Presbyterian* a strong apology for Good Friday and Easter, on the ground that the doctrine and fact of the resurrection deserve a prominent place in pulpit instruction, and if a certain time for this is not set apart by the authority of some pope, our pious and godly pastors will forget it." And in this connection the same paper indorses certain views of Dr. Howard Crosby, and says that he "reasons strongly and truly upon this Easter matter, showing that the popular celebration has no foundation in Scripture, and therefore should not be observed." Yet the *Cycamore* calls Sunday "the Sabbath" and "Lord's day," strangely losing sight of the fact that this festival stands upon precisely the same ground as Easter and Good Friday. The latter have just as much foundation in the Scriptures as the former, and they are vastly less potent for evil, for the reason that they do not displace a divinely ordained day, or render necessary the violation of the law of God, as does Sunday-keeping.

The *Christian Register* (Unitarian) has published a series of letters from prominent scientific men, in answer to questions as to whether or not the immortality of the soul is proved to any degree by science. The *Christian Union* says of these answers: "A considerable divergence of opinions is exhibited. On the whole, however, the letters are not encouraging reading to a Christian believer. The weight of authority, we should say, appears to be in support of the doctrine that the question lies wholly without the pale of science, properly so-called, though we judge that those who give this answer mean by science simply natural science. One or two of the writers take the position that the doctrine of immortality rests wholly on revelation."

And this is said to be discouraging reading for Christians. We can't see how it can concern Christians in the least. Christ brings "life and immortality to light through the gospel," and he is our life. The fact that science confesses itself ignorant of a future life, should not be at all discouraging to the Christian. The true Christian will not seek to "demonstrate" the immortality of the soul. They who claim inherent immortality for men, seek to rob Christ of his divine prerogative of Lifegiver. It certainly should cause no sorrow to a Christian to know that immortality is unknown outside of Christ.

The only day of the week which is named in the Bible is the seventh day. That is called the Sabbath. All other days of the week are invariably referred to by their number, but the last day of the week is most commonly known by its title, Sabbath. Since the time when the Bible was written, names have been given to all the days of the week. The first day is called Sunday, the second, Monday, the third, Tuesday, etc. A secular title, Saturday, has also been given to the seventh day, but its only true name is Sabbath. Knowing this, we can see the absurdity of the note in Webster's dictionary, which says that "the Sabbath of the Christians is on Sunday." But there is only one Sabbath, and how can that come on Sunday?



It would be just as reasonable to say that the Monday of the Chinese comes on Wednesday, or that the Sunday of the Mohammedans comes on Friday.

The Psalmist prayed: "The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; . . . . Grant thee according to thine own heart, and fulfil all thy counsel." Ps. 20:1, 4. That is a comprehensive request, and it would seem that it could not be granted; at any rate there are very few people who have all they want. Yet in the very next psalm we read, "Thou hast given him his heart's desire, and hast not withholden the request of his lips." Ps. 21:2. There was one, at least, who had everything he wished for, and we are assured that anyone may fare as well. The psalmist again says: "Delight thyself also in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart." Ps. 37:4. The condition is, delight thyself in the Lord. now we can understand it. He who delights himself in the Lord, will not delight himself in things which are contrary to the Lord and his righteousness, and if he does not delight in them he will not want them. If he delights in the Lord, he will desire only that which will tend to make his union with the Lord still closer, and the promise is that they who hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled.

The *Independent* says of the Sabbath-day during which Jesus lay in the tomb: "It was a day not to be recorded; a day to block out of the calendar of history. So none of the evangelists tell us anything of that ever-to-be-forgotten day." It must be that the editor of that paper has seldom, and possibly never, read Luke 23:55, 56: "And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." This is all that is recorded of that day, but it is enough; it is all there was to record. The disciples did not do any thing, they simply rested, and it takes but few words to state that simple fact. All the record we have of the first seventh day of time is that God rested upon it; we are told to remember every seventh day, to keep it holy; and we are also told that these humble disciples kept that one Sabbath "according to the commandment." What a shout would go up if only one recorded instance of a rest upon the first day, could be found in the Bible.

### **"A Significant Paragraph" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The "narrative" read at a recent session of the Presbytery of Oregon, contains the following significant paragraph:-

"From almost every part of the presbytery comes a bitter lamentation over the excessive worldliness which surrounds and which in too many cases exists in the church. No particular form of evil is spoken of-but simply a general encroachment of the world upon the church, or a kind of indifference upon the subject of religion."

This is significant, because we know from the Bible that it is characteristic of the last days. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold," said the Saviour, and on every hand we see his words fulfilled to-day. Thousands everywhere are in the condition described by the apostle, "having a form of

godliness but denying the power thereof;" and while it is probably true that no one form of evil is particularly prevalent, "the general encroachment of the world upon the church," and "indifference upon the subject of religion," indicate that we are in that time when iniquity abounds; but the Saviour added, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved;" and we should comfort our hearts with this thought and be assured that "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

### **"Antichrist" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

From an editorial in the last number of the *Catholic Mirror*, we take the following extracts reflecting the idolatry which the Papal Church imposes upon those who blindly accept its teachings:-

"Devotion to the blessed virgin is the best indication of the faith and sincerity that dwell in the Catholic heart." "Her office is that of protectress of the weak and faltering, and the dispenser of mercies and graces, flowing from the fountain of all good." "It is inconceivable that a Catholic who understands the position of Mary,-the attitude of powerful mediatrix in which she lovingly stands between him, in his ever-recurring lapses from the narrow path, and the justice of God,- should fail to be drawn towards her by the strongest and deepest feelings of reverence and devotion."

"Devotion to the blessed virgin, we are told by some of the greatest saints who illustrated the truth of this belief in their own lives, is the surest passport to eternal exaltation."

The Bible student will readily see that Christ is left altogether out of the account in this *dictum*, which denies such statements as that the name of Jesus is the only one under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved (Acts 4:12); and that "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth and things under the earth." Phil. 2:9, 10. And yet there are thousands of professed Protestants who are almost ready to stone anyone who says that the Papacy is antichrist!

**May 26, 1887**

### **"What and Where Is Paradise?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke 23:42, 43. This language will be recognized at once as the request of the penitent thief who was crucified with Jesus, and the reply of our Lord. It has been the subject of an unlimited amount of controversy, and doubtless will be, as long as men choose to interpret the Bible according to their system of theology, instead of deriving their system of theology wholly from the

Bible. We do not design at this time to give a detailed exposition of the text, but simply to note a few points concerning paradise.

From Christ's language to Mary, recorded in John 20:17, three days after the crucifixion, it is very evident that he did not go to Heaven on the day when he gave the thief the solemn assurance that they should meet in paradise. On account of this text, many who cling tenaciously to the idea that Jesus did not actually die, argue that Christ did go to paradise that day, but that paradise is not in Heaven. Then they connect this text with their erroneous reading of 1 Peter 3:18-20, and conclude that paradise is a sort of half-way house-an intermediate place between earth and heaven-where all souls, both good and bad, are retained until the Judgment. In short, paradise is made identical with hades. A very few texts will suffice to show that this is a most erroneous conclusion.

First, however, we wish to call attention to the fact that if this definition of paradise were true, the Saviour's promise to the thief would be made nonsense. If paradise were only a place where souls remain between death and the final judgment, then Christ's promise to the penitent thief would amount simply to this: To-day shalt thou be with me in the place of the dead! There would certainly be nothing very comforting about that, and nothing that would require the exercise of much faith, seeing both Jesus and the thief were at that time hanging on the cross; but this is what Christ's answer meant, if the theory be true that paradise and hades are identical. This fact alone should be sufficient to show the fallacy of such a view.

There are only three places in the Bible where the word "paradise" is used. One is in the text quoted at the beginning of this article. The second is in 2 Cor. 12:2-4, which we quote:-

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

This text proves conclusively that paradise is not an intermediate place between earth and Heaven, but that it is Heaven itself. In the first place, Paul says that he (for he speaks of himself) was caught up into the third Heaven, and then in repeating the statement for emphasis, he says that he was caught up into paradise. Then Christ's promise to the thief on the cross involved nothing less than that the thief should be with him in the third Heaven.

In Rev. 2:7 we find the following promise, given by the Spirit:-

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

From this text we learn that paradise contains the tree of life. Turn now to Rev. 22:1, 2, and read: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life." Here we learn that the tree of life is in the midst of the New Jerusalem, which contains the throne of God. But the tree of life is in the midst of the paradise of God (Rev. 2:7); therefore we must conclude that the paradise of God is in the midst of the city of

God, and that whoever goes to paradise goes into the immediate presence of God.

"Paradise" is an Anglicized Greek word meaning a park or a beautiful garden. Earthly cities have parks and pleasure gardens, and the heavenly Jerusalem has one also, but as much more beautiful than earthly gardens as the city whose builder and maker is God, is grander than cities built by man. Now compare this with Eze. 28:13: "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold." Read with this the description of the New Jerusalem, in the twenty-first of Revelation, and it will be seen at once that the Garden of Eden and paradise are the same.

When Adam sinned, he was driven from the Garden of Eden; nothing sinful could be allowed to remain there. So we read of the New Jerusalem which contains the paradise of God, that "there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Rev. 21:27. This, together with Rev. 2:7 and 22:14, teaches us that entrance into paradise, and enjoyment of its delights, is to be the reward of those who shall overcome through faith in Christ. But the righteous are rewarded only at the coming of the Lord in his kingdom and the resurrection of the just (Matt. 16:27; 25:31; Luke 14:14); and that was just what the thief asked for in the words, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." W.

### **"One Probation Enough" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Let favour be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness; in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord." Isa. 26:10. This text is of itself sufficient to show the folly of the claims that after death there will be another probation for those who have not accepted Christ in this life. Of course the text does not mean that the grace of God is entirely in vain, and that no wicked persons will turn from their wicked ways, for Paul says that the grace of God does bring salvation (Titus 2:11); and if it were not for the grace of God, as manifested in the gift of his Son, it would be impossible for anybody to repent. But it does mean that those who will not repent in consequence of the ordinary manifestations of God's favor, would only be hardened still more by greater manifestations of it.

The case of Pharaoh is right to the point. In the first place he had the same call that is extended to all the world: "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." This call is to all the world, and included Pharaoh. It cannot be said that he had no chance, for the chosen people of God were right in his own land.

Then Moses came to him with a message direct from the Lord, saying "Let my people go." And in order that he might know from whom the message came,

miracles were wrought, showing the power of God. Here he had additional opportunity to acknowledge God, but he refused.

Then God's judgments began to come, and when the agents of Satan, the magicians, could no longer counterfeit these wonders, the proud king was constrained to beg for the favor of God, whom he had despised. His request was granted, and the frogs were removed: "But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." Ex. 8:15.

Again the power of God was manifested in judgments, and again the king sent for the servants of the Lord, and begged that the plague of flies might be removed. "And Moses went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the Lord. And the Lord did according to the word of Moses; and he removed the swarms of flies from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people; there remained not one. And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go." Ex. 8:30-32.

Still closer and closer came the judgments, so that it was absolutely impossible for anyone to doubt the power and majesty of God. The cattle were destroyed, terrible boils broke out upon man and beast, and finally a fearful storm of thunder, hail, and fire, was sent, which destroyed everything in its path. "And Pharaoh sent, and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, I have sinned this time; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked. Entreat the Lord (for it is enough) that there be no more mighty thunderings and hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer." Ex. 9:27, 28. "And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands unto the Lord: and the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain was not poured upon the earth. And when Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunders were ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants. And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, neither would he let the children of Israel go; as the Lord had spoken by Moses." Verses 33-35.

Here we have a perfect illustration of the truth spoken by the prophet Isaiah: "Let favor be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness." The more favor was showed to Pharaoh, the more hardened he became. It was not until a plague was sent from which there could be no respite, that he relented long enough to let the people go as the Lord had commanded; and even then, when there seemed to be a prospect of no more judgments, he hardened his heart and rushed forth to his own destruction.

Thus it would be with the wicked if God should grant them a second probation. In this life they have had a chance to see the power of God manifested in both mercy and judgment. Sometimes they have trembled at the near approach of danger, but have hardened their hearts as soon as the danger was past. By and by the Lord will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. "A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. Then "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." Isa. 2:11. Everyone will then be willing to confess "that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Now what would be the result if after all this God should grant the wicked another probation? Both revelation and experience show that they would be worse than they ever were before. To give them another probation, would be worse than casting pearls before swine. The reason for this is, that God never cuts off any sinner while his heart is tender, and when his heart has ceased to be tender, nothing but terrible judgments can make any impression upon him, and the only impression they can make is that of cowardly fear.

It is true that many of the advocates of a second probation claim that it will be granted only to those who in this life have "not had a fair chance." That this is a direct charge against the justice of God, will be shown at another time; it is sufficient here to remind the reader that a "second probation" necessarily implies a first, and a probation is a trying, a testing. Therefore to say that any will have a second probation, is to admit that they have been tried once and found wanting. In other words, they have "had a fair chance," and having refused it, they would count any additional favor an evidence of weakness on the part of God, and would deride him for it. W.

### **"The Days of Creation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the notes on the current International Sunday-school Lesson, we find the following comment on the expression, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth," etc.:-

"Not in six periods of twenty-four hours; for during the first three, when the sun was not made, there were no such twenty-four-hour days. But divine days (doubtless long periods), beginning from the darkness, and going on with the dawn, or beginning, and to their full maturity."

The writer thinks that the only reason why the days of creation were not twenty-four-hour days was because (as he says) the sun was not created till after the third was passed. That would imply that after the sun was created the days might be literal days. But if the remaining days were literal days, the first then must have been literal also. Now it is a matter of fact that the sun was made to rule the day; and it would be doing gross violence to the language to say that the word day in Gen. 1:16 means anything different from what it does in every other place where it occurs in the same chapter. But the sun does not rule an indefinite period of time, but simply a twenty-four-hour day. Hence, the days of creation were literal days such as we are familiar with, of which it takes seven to make a week.

Moreover, the first three days were days of twenty-four hours, just the same as the last four, and every day since. The day is not made by the sun but by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and the earth could revolve if the sun and moon, it did not shine, the language indicates that this was the case. There was "the first day," "the second day," and "the third day." Each of these days was composed of a period of darkness succeeded by a period of light, but the sun did not shine. And the sun and moon were made to be light-bearers, to rule the day and night. The sun was made to rule the day. What day? The day which was

already formed by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and which could henceforth be more distinctly marked than before.

It is a mistaken idea that the sun was not created till the fourth day. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The sun and moon were created "in the beginning," on the first day, but were not made to be light-bearers until the fourth day. And probably they were not made to assume their present shape until that time.

There is not a single argument that can be deduced to show that the days of creation were not literal days. The obvious meaning of the text requires that they should be so considered. It is a forced and awkward assumption which makes them long periods,-an assumption which was devised by certain devotees of "science falsely so-called," in order to avoid excepting the simple truth of the Bible, and which is followed by certain professors of religion, and in order to avoid keeping the Sabbath of the Lord.

### **"Within Thy Gates" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The fourth commandment says of the Sabbath, "in it thou shalt not do any work. . . . nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." On this expression, Peloubet's "Select Notes on the International Lessons" says:-

"Those who come to live in your village or city. Gates are those of the town, not the doors of the house or yard. If heathen come to live in your cities, they must conform to the Sabbath laws; if strangers can do business on the Sabbath, they will soon lead others to do it."

This is a new interpretation of the commandment, and shows the influence of "National Reform" teachings. The only fault to be found with it is that it makes nonsense of the commandment, and is untrue. 1. The commandment is addressed to the heathen just as much as it is to anybody. They are under just as much obligation to keep the Sabbath in their own land as they are when in a so-called Christian land. 2. The commandment is addressed to individuals, not to committees or towns. Note the language: "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter," etc. This is addressed to the individual, not to the town; for the town does not have any son nor daughter. Then since the "thy" before son and daughter necessarily refers to an individual, and not to a collection of individuals, it follows that the "thy" before "gates" has reference to a single individual, for there is no change in the subject. Therefore, "the stranger that is within thy gates," means the stranger that is within the gates of any man's house or yard. 3. This language also applies to the heathen in his own land. He is not only commanded to keep the Sabbath, but to see that the Sabbath is not violated by the stranger who visits him. If he fails to do this, he is guilty. The Sabbath law is as binding in a heathen land as in any other.

By no legitimate interpretation can the commandments be made to have more than an individual application. It is not necessary that they should be applied to nations, as such, for if they are observed by all individuals, they will be observed

by nations, and if any individuals do not observe them, they are accountable to God alone for their sin.

**"Great Words" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The prophet Daniel, describing the little horn that came up among the ten horns of the great and terrible beast which symbolizes the Roman power, said: "And, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." Dan. 7:8. These "great words" were said by the angel who interpreted the vision, to be "great words against the Most High." Verse 25. The prophet John, in describing the same power under the symbol of a beast like a leopard, says: "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies." Rev. 13:5.

In no other thing have commentators been so fully agreed as they have in applying these words to the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope at its head. As the actual fulfillment of a prophecy is the best proof of whether or not any given interpretation is correct, we quote a few of the titles and appellations which have been given to the Pope at various times by his zealous followers, and which the so-called "Holy Father" has received with complacency as rightly belonging to him. The list from which we quote, contains sixty-two different titles; it was collected by S. Francis de Sales, and may be found in Monsignor Capel's book entitled, "The Pope: The Vicar of Christ; the Head of the Church."

"Most Divine of all Heads."

"Holy Father of Fathers, Pontiff Supreme over all Prelates."

"Overseer of the Christian Religion."

"The Chief Pastor; Pastor of Pastors."

"Christ by Unction." (That is, the Anointed Christ.)

"Abraham by Patriarchate."

"Melchisedec in Order."

"Moses in Authority."

"Samuel in the Judicial Office."

"High Priest, Supreme Bishop."

"Prince of Bishops."

"Heir of the Apostles; Peter in Power."

"Key-Bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven."

"Pontiff Appointed with Plenitude of Power."

"Vicar of Christ."

"Sovereign Bishop of Bishops."

"Sovereign Priest."

"Ruler of the House of the Lord."

"Apostolic Lord, and Father of Fathers."

"Chief Pastor and Teacher and Physician of Souls."

"Rock, against which the proud gates of Hell prevail not."

"Infallible Pope."

"Head of all the Holy Priests of God."



"Head of all the Holy Churches."

"Chief of the Universal Church."

"Bishops of Bishops, that is, Sovereign Pontiff."

In addition to the list of which the above is only a part, Mgr. Capel gives the following quotations from a letter which "the great S. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux," wrote to Pope Engenius III., A.D. 1150:-

"Who art thou? The High Priest, the Supreme Bishop. Thou art the Prince of Bishops, thou art the Heir of the Apostles. Thou art Abel in primacy, Noah in government, Abraham in the patriarchal rank, in order Melchisedec, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, Samuel in the judicial office, Peter in power, Christ in unction. Thou art he to whom the keys of Heaven are given, to whom the sheep are intrusted. There are, indeed, other doorkeepers of Heaven, and other shepherds of the flocks; but thou art the more glorious in proportion as thou hast also, in a different fashion, inherited before others both these names. The former have the flocks assigned to them each one his own; to thee all are intrusted, One Flock for the One. Not merely for the sheep, but for all the shepherds also thou art the One Shepherd. Whence do I prove this, thou askest? *From the word of the Lord.* For to whom-I say not among the Bishops, but among the Apostles-have the whole flock been committed in a manner so absolute and undistinguishing? *'If thou lovest Mr. Peter, feed my Sheep?* What sheep? The inhabitants of this or that city or country, those of a particular kingdom? 'My sheep,' He saith. Who does not see that He designates not some, but all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinguished. The power of others is limited by definite bounds; thine extends even over those who have received authority over others. Canst thou not, when a just reason occurs, shut up Heaven against a Bishop, oppose him from his Episcopal office, and deliver him over to Satan? Thus thy privilege is immutable, as well in the keys committed to thee as in the sheep intrusted to thy care."

It would seem as though men had exerted all their ingenuity to invent flattering titles for the Pope. This thing itself would be sufficient to condemn the whole system. Elihu said: "Neither let me give flattering titles unto man. For I know not to give flattering titles; in so doing my Maker would soon take me away." Job 32:21, 22. And we have no reason to suppose that the giving and receiving of flattering titles is not displeasing to God, for our Saviour himself said: "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" John 5:44. The giving and receiving of flattering titles is an evidence of departure from God, for the honor that comes from God only is given only to the humble. 1 Peter 5:5. In this case, however, the titles are not simply flattering, but are blasphemous, and show the one to whom they are applied, to be the "man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." W.

### **"Ten Commandments" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.  
NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(June 12.-Ex. 20:1-11.)

The lesson for this week covers the first four commandments. Our notes must be merely suggestive, as each one of the commandments furnishes ample material for an entire lesson. Before entering upon the lesson proper, the student should read carefully the 19th chapter of Exodus, where we have an account of the circumstances attending the giving of the law. These were of the utmost grandeur and impressiveness. The Lord came down upon Sinai amid fire and smoke (Ex. 19:18; Deut. 4:11, 12), accompanied by his angels (Deut. 33:2; Ps. 68:17), and not only the mountain but the earth shook when God spoke. Ex. 19:18; Ps. 68:7, 8; Heb. 12:25, 26. The circumstances attending the giving of the law were calculated to impress the people with a sense of the power and majesty of God, and, consequently, of the sacredness of his law.

### THE INTRODUCTION

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex. 20:1, 2. Here God identifies himself. He is the God that brought them forth from bondage. In giving his law, he makes himself known as their Redeemer. When he sent Moses to call them from bondage, he made himself known to them as "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Ex. 3:15, 16); and he also declared his name to be, "I AM THAT I AM." Ex. 3:14. This was a declaration that he is the living God, the self-existent One, the Creator of all things. So when from the mount God made himself known to the assembled multitude as the one who had brought them out of Egypt, it would recall the fact that he is the self-existent Creator, who has a right to make and enforce laws. It would also recall his power as manifested in their behalf.

### THE FIRST COMMANDMENT

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Ex. 20:3. This was placed at the head because it is the foundation of everything. We may say that all the rest of the law is summed up in this first commandment. For having no other gods before the true God, means sincere heart worship of him, and perfect worship of God means obedience to all his requirements. The first four commandments embody our duty to God, and the last six our duty to man. But the last six are secondary to the first four, since love to God is first. Love to God necessarily presupposes love to man; "for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" 1 John 4:20.

Paul says that "there be gods many and lords many." 1 Cor. 8:5. A god is an object of worship. Worship is reverence; one worships whatever his thoughts center upon. As everyone must think, and must have some object toward which

his thoughts and efforts are directed, so everyone must have some god. If it is not the living God, it is some god in his stead. Some trust in riches (1 Tim. 6:17); such make money their god. See Job 31:24-28. In Col. 3:5, also Eph. 5:5, covetousness is declared to be idolatry. The covetous man's mind is absorbed in the contemplation of some earthly object, which shuts out thoughts of God. It is not the rich alone who become idolaters by trusting in uncertain riches instead of the living God, for a poor man may make gold his hope, and long for it to the exclusion of every other object of thought, and thus he is an idolater.

Others worship appetite and the baser passions. Paul speaks of some "whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Phil. 3:19. There are thousands in so-called Christian lands whose principal thought is, What shall we eat? or what shall we drink? Thousands have let liquor deprive them of their hope of eternal life. Thousands who use the filthy weed tobacco, when they learn that God requires purity of flesh as well as of spirit (2 Cor. 7:1), have said, "Well, I can't give up my tobacco." Thus they have made a god of a pipe, or a plug of tobacco. Is not such idolatry fully as debasing as the crocodile worship of the Egyptians? But we have not space to pursue this subject further. Suffice it to say that the first commandment forbids anything that is not done to the glory of God.

## SECOND COMMANDMENT

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." Ex. 20:4-6.

This commandment does not, as many suppose, forbid the simple making of pictures or statuary. It does not forbid the use of postage-stamps or coins having the mark of some Government. No mechanical art could be carried on without making something that is like something else, and the commandment does not forbid this. What the commandment does forbid is the making of any image for the object of worship. The Catholic Church has omitted the second commandment from the list, claiming that it is the same as the first. But this is an error and is done simply that they may seem to have Bible authority for image worship. When Catholics are charged with worshiping images, as, for instance, images of Christ, they reply that they do not worship the image, but the One who is represented by it. That is just what is forbidden by the second commandment. Ancient heathenism originated in the same way,-God was thought to be *represented* by certain images, while the people knew that the images themselves were not God. This was the case with the Israelites when they made the golden calf. See also Acts 17:29. But such worship necessarily soon degenerated into the worship of the images. Making a graven or molten image,

and putting it in a secret place, was one of the things against which a curse was pronounced. See Deut. 27:15.

The second commandment manifests God's love and mercy. This shows that the law of God is a law of love. God gave his law in love, as we read: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of his saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea, *he loved* the people." Deut. 33:2, 3. As it is a law of love, so obedience to it is the test of love on our part; "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3.

315

In the second commandment we have a refutation of the charge that the law was designed to be merely temporary. The iniquity of the fathers is, as a natural consequence, visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, but the mercy of God is to be shown unto thousands of generations of them that love God and keep his commandments. Compare Deut. 7:9. The world has not yet stood even half of a thousand generations, and so the commandments of God are still the test of loyalty to the Creator.

### **THIRD COMMANDMENT**

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Ex. 20:7. This commandment forbids not only what is called "profane swearing," that is, the use of blasphemous oaths, but all irreverence. Substitutes for oaths which contain the name of God are condemned equally with the oaths themselves. By this commandment all "by-words" and unnecessary expletives, are forbidden.

This commandment may be violated even in worship. The unnecessary or vain use of titles belonging to Deity in prayer or exhortation, is taking the name of God in vain. Those who regard this commandment will not use the name of the Creator except when it is absolutely necessary, and then only with great reverence. The repetition of profane expressions which others have used, is also a violation of the commandment.

In Ps. 138:2 we read: "Thou has magnified thy word above all thy name." Then irreverence for God's word, and disobedience of his commandments, are both violations of the third commandment. Perversion of Scripture, and the quoting of texts in jest or to give point to a joke, are gross violations of this commandment.

Still further, this commandment enjoins reverence for places of worship. The sanctuary of old was a sacred place where God's name was. Deut. 16:6. To act irreverently in the sanctuary is to dishonor God. When the children of Israel were in captivity, God promised that he would be to them "a little sanctuary." Eze. 11:16. This was equivalent to the promise recorded in Matt. 18:20. Now a place that is sacred because of God's presence, should be regarded with reverence; and irreverent conduct in such a place is showing disrespect to God; and disrespect to God is a violation of the third commandment, and of the first as well.

## FOURTH COMMANDMENT

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

On this commandment we have space for only a few points, whereas pages might be written. It is not because the commandment is obscure that so much might be written upon it, but because it is so comprehensive, and because so many people, either willfully or through wrong education, misinterpret its plain terms. We ask the student to note these points:-

The Sabbath-day is *the seventh day*. Since the Sabbath is to be remembered, that is, it is of constant recurrence, it follows that "the seventh day" means the seventh day of a period of seven days. Hence it must mean the seventh day of the week. That this is so will be seen by comparing Luke 23:54-56; 24:1, where the Sabbath-day "according to the commandment" is the day before the first day of the week, and is, consequently, the seventh day of the week.

It is contended by some that the commandment does not enjoin rest on a specific seventh day, but on any day that has been preceded by six days of labor. This matter can be readily settled. In Ex. 16 we have the account of the fall of the manna, where the terms "sixth day" and "seventh day" are employed. Now it is very evident that in this place the sixth day means the sixth day of the week, and the seventh day, the seventh day of the week. There is nobody who imagines that the Israelites were left to choose the day of their rest, or that the manna would keep over one day for one family or tribe, and would spoil at the same time for another family or tribe who might not have had the same day of rest. Thus, since the terms "sixth day" and "seventh day" refer to the week in this instance, they certainly must mean the same thing in the fourth commandment.

Further; all admit that it is necessary that there should be uniformity in the observance of the Sabbath. If each one were to choose the day that pleased him, there would be confusion. But how could this uniformity be secured? Not by the *dictum* of any man, for there is no man whose authority all men would recognize. God alone has authority in matters pertaining to morals, and he alone could direct which day shall be observed as the Sabbath. This he has done. "*The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.*"

From the part of the commandment just quoted, it appears that the Sabbath-which is the name of the seventh day of the week-is the Lord's day. In Isa. 58:13 the Lord calls it his "holy day," and in Mark 2:28 Christ declares himself to be Lord of the Sabbath. He was speaking to the Jews of the day which they observed; hence it is the seventh day of the week which is the Lord's day. This shows us the impropriety of calling the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath." There is not, and never was, anything Jewish about it; it is the Lord's. But someone may

say that it was given to the Jews, and they were required to keep it. So God made himself known to the Jews (Ex. 3:13-16), and declared himself to be their God; and they were required to worship him. But we do not therefore call Jehovah the Jewish God. He is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. Rom. 3:20. And since he is the God of the Gentiles, just the same as he is the God of the Jews, he requires the Gentiles to keep the same commandments, that he imposes on the Jews. And he promises rich blessings to the Gentiles who shall keep his Sabbath. Isa. 56:6, 7. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Hebrews standard very aptly says: "There are lots of people who mix their religion with their business, but forget to stir it up well. As the result the business invariably rises to the top." Such a mixture is no better than none at all.

"Since these meetings opened," said Dr. Pentecost speaking of his Cleveland revival series, "fifty young women, and as many young men, have confessed Christ. And not one of those was from a worldly home. Why? It is the curse of unconsecrated property, and of this awful spirit of worldliness." Truthfully did the great Teacher say, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!"

The gifted writers for the *Homiletic Review* find exercise for their minds in the discussion of such subject as, "Where was the Creator before the creation?" The *Independent* disposes of this question in the following eminently sensible manner: "It is a good thing in reasoning the subject of religion, as well as upon other matters, to know what are the boundaries of human thought, and always keep within them. If we get beyond them, we simply overwhelm ourselves in the great deal of our own ignorance."

We are asked by a subscriber in an Eastern State, whether or not the Bible teaches that the Jews will all return to the land of Palestine just previous to the second coming of Christ. He also wishes us to give our views through the SIGNS, with all the Scripture references on the subject. At some future time we may furnish an article or two on the subject, but it would take more than one article to give all the Scripture references on the subject, with even the briefest comment. We can simply state the fact now, that the Bible does not teach that the Jews will go to Jerusalem before the coming of the Lord. All the passages which speak of the gathering of Israel refer either to the gathering after the Babylonian captivity or else to the gathering of the true Israel to the New Jerusalem, after the coming of the Lord. For a full exposition of this subject see pamphlet entitled, "Refutation of the Doctrine of the Age to Come," for sale at this office. See advertisement on the preceding page.

The Sunday closing law is being rigidly enforced in New York City. The *Observer* says of a recent Sunday that it "was probably the most quiet day that these cities [New York and Brooklyn] have seen in many years." Even the hotels refused to serve wine or other liquors to their guests, and it seems that prohibition does prohibit, at least on Sunday, which shows that it could also

prohibit on every day. Morally it is no worse to sell liquors on Sunday than on Monday or Tuesday, but because so many people are idle on that day probably there is more drunkenness where liquor is sold freely, than on other days.

In this Sunday closing movement, however, we do not see zeal for the cause of temperance, but only legislation in behalf of Sunday. The power which can close saloons on Sunday, can close them every day of the week, if it is so inclined; and the fact that the zealous "reformers" of New York and Brooklyn can close saloons on Sunday, but allow liquor to be sold freely on every other day, shows that they have no special love for temperance. By their action they virtually say to the saloon-keeper, "Your business is all right, and we will find no fault with you, provided you do not pursue it on Sunday."

The San Francisco *Morning Call*, in answer to a question as to the possibility of keeping the Sabbath in all parts of the world, revives the old threadbare story that if a man who observes Saturday should start from San Francisco and go westward around the world, he would, on arriving at the starting-point, find himself keeping Sunday; but that if he went eastward, he would be keeping Friday. It was not long since that the *Argonaut* had something to the same effect. One would suppose that the writers of such stuff never heard that people do actually cross the ocean and go clear around the world. The fact that observers of the seventh day have crossed the Pacific Ocean in both directions, and each time have found themselves keeping Saturday when they landed, ought to convince anybody that the Sabbath can be kept anywhere. Yet notwithstanding this fact, and the fact that every month people are crossing the ocean from west to east and from east to west, and still find no hitch in their reckoning of the days of the week, certain wiseacres will persist in saying that the thing can't be done. Perhaps it is not to be wondered at, since there are still some people who believe that "The sun do move."

### **"Horrible Case of Hydrophobia" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The telegraph dispatches bring us full accounts of a hegira of New Yorkers, which took place on Sunday, May 15. Over 250,000 persons are reported to have fled to Jersey City and its suburbs on that day. The following description of the flight shows that the case was extremely urgent, and that the aroused populace did not stand upon the order of their going:-

"It was just about church-time when the extent of the exodus began to be manifested. On all the thoroughfares leading to the ferries there were seemingly endless processions of men, women, and children, on foot, and in carriages and street-cars. Around the ferry-houses they spread out into crowds, unceremoniously pushing and scrambling, in their efforts to get through the narrow spaces over which the fare-taker held sway. Even then their petty troubles were not over, for the number of berths was inadequate and people were compelled to remain from fifteen minutes to an hour in poorly ventilated and ill-smelling waiting-rooms."

But what was the cause of this impetuous flight? Had pestilence broken out in the city, and were the people fleeing for their lives? Not at all; they were going after a drink. What! was there no water in all the city of New York? Certainly; plenty of it, and of a very good quality, too. But no beer or whisky could be obtained in New York on that day, and those people were almost wild with the thought they might have to pass an entire day with nothing to drink but water. It was a warm day, and they were thirsty, so they fled from the pure Croton water, in order to find some liquor which would increase their thirst, thus enabling them to drink more liquor, to aggravate their thirst, in order to drink more liquor, etc.

Talk about hydrophobia! No brute, except the human brute, was ever afflicted with such a disease. Some unreasoning quadrupeds are occasionally afflicted with a disease which makes it impossible for them to drink when they wish to, but they never fear the water, and they never substitute anything else for it. It is only beings that are made in the image of God, and endowed with faculties capable of the highest development, who can make a god of their belly, and glory in their shame. The old catechism evidently made a mistake in its definition of man's chief end. A modern catechism, if true to the times, would say that man's chief end is to glorify himself and to enjoy his depraved appetites. And still God lets the world stand.

### **"A Little Mixed" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* of May 12 gives its readers the astonishing information that "the Supreme Court of Tennessee has decided that a blacksmith belonging to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week as *Sunday*, violates the law by working at his trade on the day observed by the general community as Sunday." Now we happen to know something about this case, and are sure that the Tennessee blacksmith does not belong "to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week as *Sunday*." If there is any such sect the members composing it should be carefully collected, and placed in some house for the feeble-minded.

There are thousands of Christian people who observe the seventh day of the week instead of the first, because it is the divinely appointed Sabbath, but that anybody keeps the seventh day as *Sunday*, is a figment of the imagination of people who fail to distinguish between the terms Sabbath and Sunday, and improperly use the one as a synonym of the other.

Sabbath is the name which the Bible gives to the seventh day of the week, while Sunday is the heathen name of the first day; and there is no more propriety in speaking of keeping the seventh day as *Sunday*, than there would be in speaking of keeping it as Monday or Friday. There are a great many people who keep Sunday as the Sabbath, which it is not, but it is safe to say that there is no sect the members of which keep the seventh day of the week "as Sunday."

**June 2, 1887**



## **"Faith and Humility" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

"For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." Rom. 12:3. This text indicates that the greater a man's faith is, the less will he think of himself. As the apostle expresses it, he will "think soberly." Pride is intoxication. Just as alcohol stimulates a man without building him up, and finally deprives him of reason, so a man, to use a common expression, "loses his head" when he gets to hunting for the good traits in his character. And withal pride, like alcohol, furnishes no nourishment with which to build the man up. If a man is to grow strong, he must receive nourishment from a source outside of himself; but the vain person lives upon himself, and so becomes poorer by what he feeds upon. And as alcohol causes a man to stumble in his walk, and finally brings him to ruin, so "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." Prov. 16:18.

So the apostle well describes humility as thinking soberly. But why will a man live soberly, according to the measure of faith which he possesses? The answer is not difficult. Faith is that which justifies the sinner. Rom. 5:1. If men were not sinful, they would have no need of faith. The only reason for having faith in Christ is to secure pardon for past sins, and freedom from the love of sin. No man will exercise faith in Christ unless he feels himself to be a sinner. It is the sense of sin, which comes by the law, that drives a man to Christ that he may be justified by faith. Therefore for a man to confess Christ, is to acknowledge himself a sinner. Great diseases call for great remedies; the weaker a man is, the more aid will have to be given him. So the more the man feels his sinful condition, the more faith in Christ will he exercise. Therefore it is true that great faith on the part of any person is an evidence that that person feels that he is by nature very weak and sinful, and that without Christ he is nothing.

But such a feeling is in itself humility, which is nothing else but "a sense of one's own unworthiness through imperfection and sinfulness." Such a man estimates himself at his true value, which is nothing. And since faith in Christ cannot be exercised by any except those who "have no confidence in the flesh," it follows that the man who walks by faith will be a humble man. It is only when Christians lose their sense of unworthiness, and begin to look upon themselves with complacency, that they lose faith. When the individual is nothing in his own eyes, Christ is everything; but when he begins to rise in his own estimation, Christ sinks out of sight. Nothing can produce true humility but a knowledge of one's natural imperfections.

In harmony with these ideas, and the text first quoted, are the words of the prophet Habakkuk: "Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him; but the just shall live by his faith." Hab. 2:4. Faith and humility are inseparable. We ask again, Why does a man exercise faith in Christ? Simply because he feels a need of Christ; he has no confidence in his own strength, and feels that without Christ he must perish. It is not natural for the human heart to acknowledge

another as superior. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Independence, boastfulness, and self-conceit are natural to the human heart. But "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." He became a new creature in consequence of acknowledging his wretched sinfulness, and pleading for mercy through Christ. This in itself was a humiliation of soul. Now, so long as he continues in that state of justification by faith, he must retain a sense of his own unworthiness, for by the law of faith boasting is excluded.

Says the beloved disciple: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John 5:4. It is only as we exercise faith that God's strength supplies our lack, and keeps us from falling. And since faith and humility are so closely joined together, Bunyan has beautifully written,-

"He that is down needs fear no fall;  
He that is low, no pride;  
He that is humble ever shall  
Have God to be his guide."

The man who is lifted up with pride and self-esteem must assuredly fall sooner or later, for the time will come when "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled," and the Lord alone exalted; but the man who is down cannot fall, for he is already as low as he can be. But such an one shall not always be abased. The promise is "Humble ourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." James 4:10. Not in their own estimation, not in the estimation of the world, will such be lifted up, but they will be raised up to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Eph. 2:6.

"Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." Jer. 9:23, 24.

"But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. 1:30, 31.

Therefore "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." Gal. 6:14. W.

### **"They Stumbled at That Stumbling-stone" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the head of "Hasty Generalizations," the San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* says:-

"One of the delegates to the recent convention of the Young Men's Christian Association is reported to have said that nothing but the grace of God could save a young man in this city. The delegate to whom this remark is attributed may have been in San Francisco at the time for as long a period as forty-eight hours.

How he could in that brief space have made so thorough an analysis of our social condition as to warrant the statement must remain a marvel."

One can hardly refrain from laughing as he imagines the honest indignation of the editor of the *Bulletin* when he penned his article repelling the base insinuation that it would require nothing less than the grace of God to save a San Francisco young man. But the matter has a serious side, in that it shows how ignorant many people-probably the great majority-are of even the necessity for a divine Saviour. The world has erected a fictitious standard of goodness, and the man who is "as good as the average," is esteemed a good fellow. It matters not that the average standard is falling lower and lower, they continue to judge themselves by themselves, and so rest satisfied with their condition. So complacent are they that they regard it almost an insult to be told that they never can be saved without divine assistance; and the minister who should repeat to one of them the words of Christ, "he that believeth not shall be damned," would be thought guilty of criminal libel.

It is impossible to imagine what would be thought if one should say that such persons are no better off than heathen, yet we have scriptural authority for just such a statement. Even the Jews who made their boast of the law, were told by Paul that they were no better than the licentious and depraved heathen, because both Jews and Gentiles are "all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;" and that "there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:9, 10, 22-24. No man ever lived on earth who was good enough to be saved without the grace of God, and the man who, in his self-righteous pride, stumbles at that stumbling-stone, will in the end be no better off than the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. See Rom. 9:20-32.

### **"Exposition of 2 Cor. 3:7-11" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Several questions have of late been asked us upon 2 Cor. 3:7-11. As that is a passage which those who are striving to teach the law often find difficult to explain, and which enemies of truth use with great confidence as being opposed to the law, we will try to give a simple scriptural exposition of it. The fifth and sixth verses of the chapter read as follows:-

"Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

It will be noticed that the last clause of verse 5 is an answer to the question, "Who is sufficient for these things?" asked in verse 16 of the preceding chapter. The subject which is under consideration is the Christian ministry, as is seen by verse 6, and the first verse of chapter 4. The apostle is showing its excellence, and in so doing contrasts it with the ministry of the old covenant. The word "testament" in verse 6, means "covenant," and the statement is that we are made ministers of the new covenant; "not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter

killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Many people seem to have the idea that in this verse Paul is contrasting the two testaments or covenants. The old covenant they call the letter, and the new covenant the spirit. But one who reads the verse carefully cannot fail to see that this is an error. The old covenant is not referred to till we reach the seventh verse. Paul's statement is simply to the effect that he and his associates were ministers of the spirit of the new covenant, and not of its letter; for the new covenant has its letter as well as the old. On this point Dr. Clarke makes the following pertinent comment:-

"Every institution has its letter as well as its spirit; as every word must refer to something of which it is the sign or signicator. The gospel has both its letter and its spirit, and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart. Water, in baptism, is the letter that points out the purification of the soul; they who rest in this letter are without this purification; and dying in that state, they die eternally. Bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are the letter; the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus, and the grace communicated by this to the soul of the believer, are the spirit. Multitudes rest in this letter, simply receiving these symbols without reference to the atonement or to their guilt; and thus lose the benefit of the atonement and the salvation of their souls. . . . It may be safely asserted that the Jews in no period of their history ever rested more in the letter of their law than the vast majority of Christians are doing in the letter of their gospel. Unto multitudes of Christians Christ may truly say, Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life."

In the above quotation it is shown that the letter of the new covenant kills; but the reason why it kills will be made plain after we have made a brief comparison of the two covenants. These two covenants with their ministrations are brought to view in contrast in verses 7 and 8, which read thus:-

"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?"

In this verse the old covenant is called the "ministration of death." Why it was so called is very apparent to one who understands what the old covenant was. We will state it briefly. Before the Lord gave the ten commandments from Mount Sinai, he said to the Jews:-

"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Ex. 19:4-5.

On the third day after this, the Lord spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all the people: "and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone." Deut. 5:22. Then Moses went up to the Lord in the mount, and the Lord gave to him precepts growing out of the ten commandments. See Ex.

21, 22 and 23. The confirmation of the covenant, the preliminaries of which are given in Ex. 19:5-8, is related in Ex. 24:3-8. There learn that,

"Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." After this "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord;" and after he had built an altar and offered sacrifices, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Then "Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Thus was the covenant confirmed. We learn from this that the old covenant was simply an agreement between God and the children of Israel, concerning the commandments of God. The people on their part promised faithfully to keep the commandments, and the Lord promised to make of them a great nation.

In connection with this covenant there were "ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary," Heb. 9:1. This sanctuary is described in Ex. 25; 26, 27, and 30, and the principal "ordinances of divine service," are described in Ex. 29:38-42, and Leviticus, chapters 4 and 16. With these facts before us, we may understand why the ministration of the first covenant was called a "ministration of death."

(1) In this covenant the people had made an explicit agreement to keep the law of God. (2) By this law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:20), "for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. (3) The "ordinances of divine service" connected with the first covenant were for sin; but Paul tells us (Heb. 10:4) that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Those "ordinances of divine service" were only "a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," and therefore the sacrifices which the people offered had no power to make them perfect. Therefore (4) all who had to do with the old covenant alone were condemned to death; "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23); "and the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. There was in the old covenant no provision for the forgiveness of sins; therefore the ministration of that old covenant, which was performed by earthly priests, was, so far as their work extended, the ministration of death. Only the perfect can have life, and their ministration made nothing perfect.

It is true that during the time of the ministration of the old covenant, sins were forgiven (Lev. 4:26, 31, 35), and this forgiveness was real, but it was obtained solely by virtue of faith in the promised sacrifice of Christ, and not because of anything in the old covenant. Paul says of Christ, in Heb. 9:15, that "he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Thus we see that when sins committed under the first covenant were forgiven, they were forgiven by virtue of the second covenant.

Some stumble over the first clause of 2 Cor. 3:7, "The ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," but the Scriptures furnish means for the complete exposition of this. Paul cannot mean that the *ministration* was written

and engraven in stones, for that would be impossible, because the *ministration* was the service of the priests. Then it must be that he means that death was written and engraven in stones. But some will say, "This makes nonsense of the text." Let us see. It is very easy to ascertain what was written and engraven in stone. Ex. 31:18 says that the Lord "gave to Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two

328

tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." "And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 32:15, 16. These two tables were broken, and after Moses had, by the command of the Lord, made two other tables, he said, "And he [the Lord] wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly." Deut. 10:4. These texts show that it was the ten commandments, and the ten commandments alone, that were written and engraven in stones; and therefore by the word "death," in 2 Cor. 3:7, Paul must refer to the ten commandments.

But is it allowable to speak of the ten commandments as "death"? Are they death to anybody? It certainly is allowable, for they are death to all men, because all have sinned, and the "wages of sin is death." The law is the cause of death to every sinner that shall perish, and so by metonymy it is called death. In like manner the sons of the prophets said of the poisonous gourds, "There is death [i.e., a cause of death] in the pot" (2 Kings 4:40); and the Lord said that "the tree of the field is man's life" (sustainer of life). Deut. 20:19. So when Paul describes his conviction as a sinner, he says of the law, "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Rom. 7:10.

Thus we find that in every case of the word, the ministration of the old covenant was "the ministration of death." We have found, then (1) that the law, which was the basis of the covenant, was death to all, and (2) that the ministration concerning that violated law offered no relief, but in itself tended to death.

Notwithstanding all this, there was a wonderful glory connected with the old covenant and its service. The giving of the law was attended with glory the like of which has never been seen on earth before or since, and will not be until the Lord shall come in the glory of his Father with all his angels. When Moses returned from the mount, his face was so glorified that the people could not look at it; and the glory of the Lord was present in the sanctuary to so great a degree that the priests were forced to obscure it with a cloud of incense, lest they should die.

Now let us briefly outline the new covenant. Paul says that this was established upon "better promises." Its terms are found in Heb. 8:8-12, which reads thus:-

"For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of

Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

We find here the same condition as in the old covenant,-the people are to obey the law of God. But this covenant is established on "better promises" than the first, in that the Lord promises to forgive their sins, to write the law in their hearts, and to remember their iniquities no more. These things are all accomplished by virtue of Christ, who is the mediator of the new covenant. Heb. 8:6; 9:15. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7), by securing the remission of past sins (Rom. 3:24, 25), and enabling us to walk in harmony with the law. Gal. 2:20; Eph. 2:10; Heb. 13:20, 21.

The law, then, is the basis of both covenants; hence it could not be done away with the old covenant, else there could be no new covenant. The terms of the new covenant leave no doubt on this point, and Christ's connection with it brings the fact out still more clearly. Thus Christ is the minister of this new covenant (Heb. 8:1, 2) and is now performing the ministration in the true sanctuary in Heaven. Heb. 9:24. His ministration has reference to the law, for he came to save sinners (1 Tim. 1:15), and he is offering his blood to save men from sin. Rom. 3:24; 1 John 1:7; Matt. 1:21. This redemption we get through faith (Rom. 3:24), and faith establishes the law. Rom. 3:31. The law itself, having been violated, brings death; Christ redeems us from its curse (Gal. 3:13), and thus becomes our life. Col. 3:4.

Now note the contrast between the two covenants: The first had the ministration of death, because everything connected with it tended to death; the violated law was death to the sinner, and the earthly ministration freed no one from that condemnation. The second covenant has the ministration of the Spirit, because "the Lord is that Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17), and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and life. Gal. 6:8. But although there is no death in the second covenant, there is in the rejection of it, for the law is still death to sinners, and all who are opposed to Christ are sinners, and condemned to death; so Paul says that the letter of the new covenant kills. The reason is that holding the mere letter of the new covenant,-the performance of the gospel ordinances while not receiving Christ in the heart,-is really a rejection of Christ. Of the Lord's Supper, Paul says that he who does not discern the Lord's body, eats and drinks damnation to himself. 1 Cor. 11:9. He is in the same condition as though he had never heard of the new covenant. But in every case, whether of the sinner under the old covenant, or of one who rejects the new, it is the law that causes his death.

In the text under consideration Paul contrasts the two ministrations as to glory. If the ministration which could not cleanse from sin, was glorious, the

ministration of the Spirit, which gives freedom from sin, must be more glorious. "If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." And so much more glorious is the ministration of the second covenant than that of the first, that in comparison the first covenant seems to have had no glory. Why the ministration of the second covenant should be so much more glorious than that of the first, is because it is established upon "better promises," and Christ is its minister.

"For if that which is done away was glorious, much more than which remaineth is glorious." 2 Cor. 3:11. Now what was done away? The answer must be that it is that which was glorious. Verse 9 states that it was the ministration of condemnation that was glorious. Then it must be the ministration of condemnation that was done away; that which remains is the ministration of the Spirit. By no possibility can verse 11 be made to refer to the law, because it contrasts something done away with something that remains. And we have found that the law is the basis of both covenants, and therefore it cannot have been done away; but the ministration of the old covenant as well as the covenant itself was done away, as was indicated by the fading glory upon the countenance of Moses. But it needs no abstract reasoning to show that it is the tabernacle service, and that alone, to which the apostle refers in verse 11 as being "done away," for he says, "if that which is done away was glorious," showing by the "if" that he had before called attention to something glorious; and the only thing which he has so designated in this connection, is the ministration of death. Verse 7.

We think that any read who carefully follows this brief exposition will be able to see for himself, on reading 2 Cor. 3:7-11 that the apostle is simply contrasting the glory of the service of the two covenants, and that the law of God is not under consideration at all, except by an incidental allusion which goes to show its permanent character. W.

### **"Importance of Obedience" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Sabbath, June 18.)

1. When the angels are sent to gather God's elect, whom will they take?

"Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Ps. 50:5.

2. What does God regard more highly than sacrifice?

"And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Sam. 15:22.

3. How is disobedience described?

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king." Verse 23.



4. When Samuel first came to Saul, how did the latter feel respecting what he had done?

"And Samuel came to Saul; and Saul said unto him, Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord." Verse 13.

5. After Samuel reproved him, what did he say?

"And Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice and unto Lord thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed." Verse 15.

6. How was Saul deceived?—*He thought that by making a sacrifice to the Lord he would excuse him for not doing just as he had commanded.*

7. Was there any way by which the people would benefit themselves pecuniarily by this disobedience?—*They could use these cattle for sacrifice, and save their own for themselves.*

"But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, and the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal." Verse 21.

8. What was the final result of Saul's course?

"And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou. And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent." "And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death; nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul; and the Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel." Verses 28, 29, 35.

9. In what manner was the ark to be conveyed from place to place?

"But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none; because the service of the sanctuary belonging unto them was that they should bear upon their shoulders." Num. 7:9.

10. By what means was it carried from the Philistines to Beth-shemesh?

"And the men did so; and took two milch kine, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home; and they laid the ark of the Lord upon the cart, and the coffer with the mice of gold and the images of their emerods."

11. How were strangers the nation for looking into the ark?

"And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men: and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter."

12. What arrangements did David make for taking the ark from the house of Abinadab?

"And they set the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah; and Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave the new cart." "And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals."

13. Why was Uzzah smitten by the Lord?

"And when they came unto the threshingfloor of Chidon, Uzza put forth his hand to hold the ark; for the oxen stumbled. And the anger of the Lord was

kindled against Uzza, and he smote him, because he put his hand to the ark: and there he died before God."

14. What was the real sin here committed?

"For because he did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order." 1 Chron. 15:13.

15. When the ark was removed from the house of Obededom, in what manner was it carried?

"So the priests and Levites sanctified themselves to bring up the ark of the Lord God of Israel. And the children of the Levites bare the ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves there on, as Moses commanded, according to the word of the Lord." Verses 14, 15.

16. If God's miraculous care was over the ark when it was brought from the Philistines on a cart, why was he displeased when it was placed upon a new cart prepared expressly for that purpose by David? See notes.

17. What practical lesson can be learned from this?—*Although men may have zeal and care for God's cause, the Lord will not except that in the place of obedience.*

## NOTES

It is a great mistake to presume that our property or anything we possess belongs to us to use upon our lusts. Whatever talents men possess, either natural or acquired, are loaned them of God, and those who are not faithful in that which has been loaned them will never receive the true riches which Christ has purchased for us; for if we have not been faithful in that which is another man's, none will give us that which is our own. Nothing in this life belongs to us, but an inheritance to eternal life in the kingdom of God has been purchased for us by Christ. We were God's by creation, and after having lost the privilege of children by the fall, we have been purchased or redeemed by the blood of Christ. We have no right, therefore, to devote our powers or possessions to our own selfish interests. Every sacrifice made to the glory of God will meet its reward in the kingdom of God. Hence God will except nothing but that obedience which proceeds from the heart.

Saul was a rash man, and his case fitly illustrates the course of many professed Christians at the present time. Although apparently conscientious, he was impetuous, and could not wait for God's providence being brought into straitened circumstances. He had never learned the important lesson of quiet trust in God, and in consequence, his entire life was one of fitfulness.

"Saul had not a high and exalted sense of the excellence and terrible majesty of God. He had not a sacred regard for his appointed ordinances. With an impetuous spirit because Samuel did not appear at the appointed time, he rushed before God presumptuously, and undertook the sacred work of sacrifice. While equipped for war, he built the altar and officiated for himself and the people. This work was sacredly given to those appointed for the purpose. This act was a crime in Saul, and such an example would lead the people to have a low estimate of the religious ceremonies and ordinances sanctified and

appointed of God, prefiguring the sinless offering of his dear Son. God would have his people have a holy regard and sacred reverence for the sacrificial work of the priests, which pointed to the sacrifice of his Son."

"God proved Saul by intrusting him with the important commission to execute his threatened wrath upon Amalek. But he disobeyed God, and spared the wicked, blasphemous king Agag, whom God had appointed unto death, and spared the best of the cattle. He destroyed utterly all the refuse that would not profit them. Saul thought it would add to his greatness to spare Agag, a noble monarch splendidly attired; and that to return from battle with him captive, with great spoil of oxen, sheep, and much cattle, would get to himself much renown, and cause the nations to fear him, and tremble before him. And the people united with him in this. They excused their sin among themselves in not destroying the cattle, because they could reserve them to sacrifice to God, and spare their own cattle to themselves."

"Samuel informed Saul that his rebellion was as the sin of witchcraft. That is, when one commences to travel in the path of rebellion, he yields himself to be controlled by an influence that is in opposition to the will of God. Satan controls the rebellious mind. Those who are thus controlled lose a calm trust in God, and have less and less disposition to yield loving obedience to his will. Satan becomes more and more familiar with them, until they seem to have no power to cease to rebel. In this respect, rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft."

"Saul's stubbornness in persisting before Samuel that he had obeyed God, was an iniquity and idolatry. His love to carry out his own will was more desirable to him than to obtain the favor of God, or the approbation of a clear conscience. And when his sin was opened clearly before him, and his wrong definitely pointed out, his pride of opinion, his excessive self-love, led him to justify himself in his wrong course, in defiance of the reproof of Samuel, and the word of the Lord by the mouth of his prophet. Such obstinacy in a known transgression, separated him forever from God."

"He knew that he had gone contrary to God's express command; yet when reproved by God through Samuel, he would not humbly acknowledge his sin, but in a determined manner uttered a falsehood in self-justification. If he had humbly repented, and received the reproof, the Lord would have had mercy and forgiven Saul of his great sin. But the Lord left Saul for his stubbornly refusing to be corrected, and for uttering falsehoods to Samuel, his messenger. Samuel told Saul that, as he had rejected the word of the Lord, God had rejected him from being king."

There is one thing noticeable in the case of Uzzah's being smitten before the Lord. It cannot be said that David did not have a proper sense of the sacredness of the ark. It seems that a new cart was especially prepared upon which to convey the ark. It probably had never been used for any other purpose. David also sang and gave praises before the ark with all his might. But the sin committed was in the disregard of the law which said that the ark should be borne by the priests. Uzzah was a Levite but not a priest. All the circumstances seemed to be in harmony with the mind of God except this provision for carrying the ark upon a cart, instead of by the proper means, which would have avoided

all danger, such as Uzzah apprehended from the stumbling of the oxen, and the shaking of the ark. This incident illustrates the grand truth that a conscientious zeal never can take the place of obedience in God's sight.

Another important truth is brought out by this circumstance, namely, that God does not hold people responsible when they do not have the light. God's miraculous providence was over the ark when it was first sent to Beth-Shemesh, although it was then draw upon a cart; for the Philistines had no knowledge of how the ark should be carried; but to the people of Israel, God had made known the manner in which he was pleased to have it conveyed.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

One of Oakland's wholesale wine merchants, who certainly is qualified to speak understandingly, says that "more wine is being used in families than ever before."

At Sacramento, Cal., tent-meetings are being conducted by Elder E. R. Jones, with a good interest and steady attendance. The tent is located on the corner of Sixteenth and I Streets.

A question that was asked concerning a point in the prophecy of the eight and ninth of Daniel was answered for this number of the SIGNS, but the answer was necessarily held over until next week, on account of pressure of other matter.

We hope that none of our readers will skip the Home Circle Department this week. It does not contain a story, but it is filled full of good sound sense which will profit all who will heed it. Parents and children both should read it. Don't skip it because it is long, and doesn't look like a story.

We call special attention to the article on the preceding page, concerning the canvassing work. A perusal of it should convince anyone that in spite of the great demand for trashy reading, a living may be made even now by selling good books,-books that are devoted solely to expositions of Scripture. And how much better a man, must feel after selling a good book, which the people need, than after selling something that is worse than nothing.

Those who have asked for an explanation of 2 Corinthians 3:7 and onward, will find it in the body of the paper this week. We have no idea that the subject is made so plain that anybody can understand it without the exercise of any thought; but we think that a careful reading of this article, and perhaps a little study, will enable any reader to arrive at an understanding of the text. The article is not by any means exhaustive, and if after carefully reading it anyone should find himself still in the dark on any point, we shall be glad to give the matter further consideration, if he will let us know what his difficulty is.

We have received a letter from a gentleman in San Francisco giving his ideas on evolution, and asking that we state our views on the same subject; or, as our questioner himself puts it: "I ask that you will kindly state what are your views upon the deductions and upon the ideas, or theories, of scientific men, based on scientific facts."

To answer this question fully would require far too much time and space. We can only say that we have no faith whatever in evolution; it is contrary to the word of God; and as it is not possible that any *fact* should contravene the word of God, the "deductions" of scientific men concerning it are not "based on scientific *facts*." The world is full of unbelief and all manner of wickedness, but the Bible is full of precious truths which are able to make us "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Paul exhorts Timothy to "avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called," and we cannot do better than to heed the admonition.

The comprehensiveness of the law of God attests its divine origin. Men make laws, and find after a while that they have to be amended. Why? Because circumstances arise which the framers of the laws did not foresee. But the law of God needs no amending, for infinite wisdom foresaw every circumstance that might arise, and framed commandments which covered every possible case. Take the sixth commandment as a sample. Hatred and anger are violations of this commandment. See Matt. 5:21, 22; 1 John 3:15. Now if the Lord had simply forbidden anger or hatred, or some other thing which the commandment forbids, he would have had to multiply commandments to cover every phase of sin. But it is an axiom that the greater includes the less, and therefore the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids not only the actual taking of human life, but every thought which if cherished and allowed to work itself out would result in murder. Everything of human make is narrow and imperfect, but the commandment of God "is exceeding broad."

Very often after a discourse we hear some person say, "I liked that sermon; it is just what I have always believed." This is usually said with an air which indicates that the speaker thinks he has given the preacher and his sermon a wonderful compliment. It is, in fact, nothing of the kind; the person is simply complimenting himself, and, like all who compliment themselves, he thereby reveals a state of mind which is not at all praiseworthy. When he says he believes, he indicates that no matter how scriptural the sermon might be, he would not like it if it contained ideas contrary to his former belief. It shows a trace of that spirit which Paul said should be so common in the last days, which shall lead men to heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts. 2 Tim. 4:3. Happy is the hearer whose honest desire is to "hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord," and who will like every scriptural discourse or printed article, even though it is contrary to his preconceived ideas; and happy is that preacher who, regardless of the *likes* of the people, will heed the command of God, to go and preach "the preaching that I bid thee."

We are told that the new Andover theory in regard to future probation "is working serious injury to the life and activity of the churches." What else could be expected? If those who have "not had a fair chance" in this life are sure of having the gospel preached to them, after death, in greater purity than it could possibly be done by mortal men, why should the churches worry themselves over the condition of the heathen either at home or abroad? And why should the unconverted be anxious to improve present gospel privileges? The doctrine of probation after death is one of the lies which Satan has invented to strengthen

the hands of the wicked, "that he should not return from his wicked way." Eze. 13:22.

### **"Evolution vs. the Bible" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

A lecture on "Evolution" was delivered in San Francisco one evening last week by Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, said to be the one "who discovered, independently of Darwin, the laws of evolution." He claimed that "any other than an animal origin for man's body is inconceivable and contradictory." This proposition he proceeded to "demonstrate" in the following manner:-

"If all other animal forms have been derived from one another by the natural processes which have been pointed out, and which has brought up the animal structure so near to that of man that, as Prof. Owen remarked, to define what distinguishes the ape from the man is the anatomist's difficulty, how can he suppose that the final steps never occurred at all, but that by an entirely new process of creation, of which there is no shadow of a proof, man sprang, *de novo*, into existence, yet bearing in every part of his structure countless indications of his animal origin? To believe this is to believe that the Creator of man created him so as to mislead us, and is, to any unprejudiced mind who will study the facts, utterly incredible."

We suppose that in such demonstrations the "if" is spoken under the breath, so that the condition shall have the appearance of an axiom. If the lower animals have been derived from one another by successive steps, then it is incredible but that man must have been similarly derived! Well, we will accept that, but how are we to know that the lower animals were derived from one another by passing from lower to higher forms? Why, we must take that for granted, to be sure; we must accept it because "there is no shadow of proof" that the various animals sprang into existence by a new process of creation. So Dr. Wallace tells us. But must we throw aside that ancient record which says that in the first week of time God caused the waters and the earth to bring forth every living creature, and that out of the dust of the ground he "created man in his own image?" Why, certainly, if you are going to accept evolution; for you must know to begin with that evolution has no use for anything so old-fashioned as the Bible.

Yet many professed Christians accept the doctrine of evolution! What can be the condition of men who will exchange the "full assurance of faith," by which "we know that the worlds were framed by the word of God," for a theory which entirely denies the Bible, and has no stronger foundation than an "if"?

**June 9, 1887**

### **"Blessed Are They that Do" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that there is no word in the Bible the meaning of which is more generally misunderstood than the word "conversation." The reason is that the meaning of the word has changed since the authorized version was made, and

the word is now used in a much more restricted sense than it was used with reference to one's general deportment. From a failure to recognize the fact that the word is used in the Bible in a sense which is now obsolete, many lose very much of the force of the texts in which it occurs. A little examination of the principal texts in which the word is found cannot fail to be profitable, on account of the practical truths which they contain.

The first time the word occurs in the Bible is Ps. 37:14: "The wicked have drawn out the sword, and have bent their bow, to cast down the poor and needy, and to slay such as be of upright conversation." The margin has the correct rendering: "The upright of way." The idea of this text is the same as that of verse 12: "The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth;" or that stated by Paul in 2 Tim. 3:12: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

In Ps. 50:23 we have the word again: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God." Here, as before, the correct idea is given in the margin. It should read: "To him that disposeth his way aright, will I show the salvation of God." This gives a much broader meaning to the text. When we remember that the Judgment will take cognizance not only of words and actions, but of the thoughts, we find that the word here rendered "conversation" covers every duty. They who dispose their way aright, are "the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord" (Ps. 119:1), and the promise in Ps. 50:23 is equivalent to the statements in Matt. 19:17 and Rev. 22:14, that they who keep the commandments will be saved.

The next occurrence of the word is in Gal. 1:13: "For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it." Here it is absolutely impossible that the word should be limited to talk. Paul's wasting of the church of God was not idle talk, but stern reality. He says that his "conversation" when he professed the Jews' religion was to persecute the church.

Again we read: "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Eph. 4:22. Here it is obvious that "manner of life," as it is in the revised version, or "practices," as the Syriac version has it, expresses the sense much more perfectly. The "old man" is the "body of sin" (Rom. 6:6), and Paul means that the "former conversation" which is to be "put off," is the past course of sin. In contrast with this "conversation" which is to be "put off," is the "new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24), which is to be "put on." "Righteousness and true holiness" do not consist of talk, but of deeds, and so that which is "put off" to make room for these, consists of deeds.

The same meaning attaches to the word in Eph. 2:3, where the apostle, after speaking of the children of disobedience, says: "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind." He does not mean that once we simply talked with the children of disobedience, but that our manner of life, including words, thoughts, and actions, was the same as theirs.

1 Tim. 4:12 shows that the word means more than simply talk. Paul exhorts Timothy to be an example "in word, in conversation, in charity." "In word" covers all that he may say, but "in conversation" indicates the whole behavior. It is not enough that a minister should talk well both in the pulpit and out, but his behavior must correspond.

In the thirteenth of Hebrews the word occurs twice. In verse 5 we read: "Let your conversation be without covetousness." Covetousness is a sin of the mind, and not of words. The rendering, "Be ye free from the love of money," or, "Let your turn of mind be free from love of money," is much more in accordance with the nature of covetousness, and with the exhortation which immediately follows, "And be content with such things as ye have."

Verse 7 of Hebrews 13 might with more reason be thought to have reference to words, if we did not know that the usage of the Bible is in favor of a more comprehensive application. When the Bible was translated, it is not probable that the word "conversation" was rendered in its present limited sense. It was then used in the sense of the Latin word from which it is derived, namely "turning about," indicating all the turns of one's life, or in other words his way or manner of life. So in this text when the apostle says, "Remember them which have the rule over you, . . . considering the end of their conversation," he means that we should consider the object of their manner of life, -why it is that they live as they do. The same thought is expressed in Phil. 3:17; 1 Cor. 4:16; 1 Thess. 1:6.

In 1 Peter 1:15, 18 it is very clear that if "manner of life" or "conduct" be substituted for "conversation," the text will read more smoothly, and the one who has always limited the word "conversation" to mere talk, will find a deeper meaning to the text than ever before.

In 2 Peter 2:7 it is very evident if we regard the context that something more than talk is meant. The text says that just Lot was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked." Now there can be no doubt but that the Sodomites were obscene and vulgar in their talk, but verse 8 is explanatory of verse 7, and that says: "For that righteous man dwelling among them, *in seeing and hearing*, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their *unlawful deeds*." Here it is shown that the word "conversation" covers both speaking and doing. In this connection it is well to remember that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Matt. 12:34) and that as a man "thinketh in his heart so is he." Prov. 23:7. So that if a man's words are evil, it is very certain that his deeds will be no better.

2 Peter 3:11: "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness," is often quoted to show that in these last days our talk ought to be pure and elevated. So it ought, but the text teaches vastly more than that. Many people whose talk is faultless will be left outside the kingdom of God. What Peter wants to impress is the thought that in view of the soon coming of Christ our whole conduct should be holy.

The faulty rendering of Phil. 3:20 has caused many, perhaps the majority of persons, to lose the force and beauty of that text. It reads: "For our conversation is in Heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ."



Now our talk may be of a heavenly nature, or about heavenly things, but it would be absolutely impossible for us to have it in Heaven unless we ourselves were there. When we get to Heaven, our talk will of necessity be there, but not till then. The word here rendered "conversation" is *politeuma*, and means "commonwealth," or "citizenship." The reader will no doubt at a glance see the truth of this, since *politeuma* must bring to his mind the word "political," which has reference to governments.

In the passage in which this text occurs, the apostle tells the brethren how they ought to walk, or live. The reason why we should not live like the enemies of the cross of Christ, but should reach forth unto those things which are before, is that this world is not our home, but that our citizenship is in Heaven, and we should live as would become people of such high birth. We are not dwellers here upon this earth, therefore we should not live "according to the course of this world;" but if we have been born of the Spirit, we are only sojourners here. In Heaven we have an enduring substance, "a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." If we are "called to be saints," we are sons of God, and ought to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. If we should live like the children of disobedience, we should deny our royal birth. The thought that our citizenship is in Heaven, that our names are enrolled in the Great Register of that country, should lead us to study the laws of that place, that we may know how to conduct ourselves when we go there. And since we cannot conduct ourselves properly there unless we have learned how here, it follows that a proper understanding of this text constantly borne in mind will serve as a great incentive to holy living. This is the only place in the Bible where the word rendered "conversation" has this meaning.

These are not all the instances of the occurrence of the word "conversation" in the common version, but they are the principal ones. It is not merely as a matter of curiosity that one should understand the proper sense of this word in the various places where it occurs, but that he may get the full meaning of the texts in which it is found. Let us be careful not to narrow the sense of the Scriptures, nor give words a meaning which they do not possess. Let us also remember that the Bible lays far more stress on deeds than on words; for while a good talker may be a very poor liver, it will invariably be the case that "a good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things." The man whose works are committed to the Lord, will have his thoughts established; and the man whose thoughts are pure will talk accordingly. W.

### **"Unity of the Eighth and Ninth of Daniel" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

That there is the most intimate connection between the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel, must be patent to anybody who reads that book with even ordinary attention. The eighth chapter records a vision which the prophet had "in the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar." In that vision Daniel saw the last three great universal empires of the world, under the symbols of a ram, a goat,

and a little horn; and at the close, he heard one angel, in reply to the question, "How long shall be the vision?" say, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Then the angel Gabriel received the divine command, "Make this man to understand the vision," which he at once proceeded to do. He briefly, yet comprehensively, sketched the course of empires from the rise of the Medo-Persian Empire to the overthrow of the Roman power. Verses 20-25 of chapter 8 cover the interpretation of what Daniel *saw*, and in verse 25 the angel begins the interpretation of what Daniel *heard*. Said he, "And the vision of the evening and the morning [compare margin of verse 14] is true." Then Daniel fainted, and the angel was obliged to postpone any further explanation.

The commission which the angel had received remained, however, in full force, and Daniel himself was not the one to rest quietly with the vision unexplained. In the first year of Darius, Daniel knew that the time of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon had nearly expired, and thinking, doubtless, that his vision in the third year of Belshazzar, part of which was still unexplained, applied to this time, he engaged in earnest prayer to God. Verses 4-19 of the ninth chapter of Daniel record this prayer, and in the twentieth verse the prophet begins:-

"And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." Dan. 9:20-23.

Now note these points: 1. Part of the vision of the eighth chapter was still unexplained. 2. Daniel was pleading for light upon this unexplained portion, as is evident from verse 22. 3. The same angel who had received the commission to make Daniel understand the vision, and who had partially done his work, now came the second time. 4. Daniel identifies him as "the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning," an obvious reference to "the vision" of chapter 8. 5. Almost the first thing the angel said was, "understand the matter, and consider *the vision*." What vision? Why, the only one that needed considering, the only one to which such matter-of-fact reference could possibly be made,-the vision recorded in the eighth chapter. 6. And lastly, without any further introduction, the angel began the explanation by saying, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people," etc. The point in the vision where he had ceased his explanation, was the time portion, and right there he begins. These facts prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that verses 24-27 of Daniel 9 are the completion of the explanation of the vision of Daniel 8.

The question now arises in many minds, "How long a period of time intervened between the two parts of the interpretation?" This is really an unimportant matter, but since it is asked, it is proper to answer it as well as may be done. According to the chronology of Usher, which is found in the margin of

our Bibles, it was fifteen years. The date B.C. 553, in the margin of chapter 8, is based on the supposition that Belshazzar's reign began in B.C. 555. If that were true his third year would be 553. But comparatively recent explorations show that Belshazzar was not upon the throne of Babylon so early as 555 B.C.

There has always been a little obscurity about Belshazzar. The fact that Nabonadius was the only name mentioned in the ancient records as coming to the throne of Babylon in 555 B.C., led many historians to discredit the Bible narrative, which speaks of Belshazzar as king; while commentators generally bridged the difficulty by claiming that Nabonadius and Belshazzar were two names for the same man. Thus the matter rested until scholars learned to read the cuneiform inscriptions, when it was discovered that Nabonadius was indeed king of Babylon from B.C. 555 to B.C. 538, and that Belshazzar was his son, whom he associated with himself in the empire, in order that opposition to the encroachments of the Persians under Cyrus, might be made from different points at the same time. By this discovery, the Bible was proved to be historically accurate, and Bible scholars learned why Belshazzar made Daniel only the *third* ruler in the kingdom. Dan. 5:29. It was the highest position to which Daniel could be raised. Nabonadius was first, Belshazzar was second, and Daniel was made third.

If now we can tell at what date Belshazzar became joint ruler with his father, we can easily determine the length of time between the third year of his reign and the first year of Darius. But that cannot be done with exactness. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says that "all that is known with any certainty on the matter will be found in Rawlinson's "Great Monarchies." Without entering into details as to how he arrives at his conclusions, we will state that Rawlinson regards Belshazzar as the son of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, whom Nabonidius married after he became king. See in "Seven Great Monarchies," chapter eight (and notes) of Fourth Monarch. He says of Nabonadius: "At the earliest possible moment-probably when he [*i.e.*, Belshazzar] was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government his son Belshazzar, or Belshar-ezer, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar. . . . He was young and inexperienced, but he had the counsels of the queen-mother to guide and support him, as well as those of the various lords and officers of the court."

If Rawlinson's date is correct, the third year of Belshazzar's reign was his last; and the time between the giving of the vision of the eighth of Daniel, and the first year of Darius, when the interpretation was completed, was very short. Not more than a year could have separated the two installments of the interpretation, and without doubt the whole of the transaction occurred in the same year. This serves to bind the two chapters under consideration almost as closely together in point of time as they obviously are in subject.

The actual time, however, between the two portions of the interpretation, is, as we have already intimated, a matter of comparatively little importance. There is no escaping the conclusion that the ninth of Daniel is a continuation of the eighth, and the student can connect verse 24 of chapter 9 with verse 26 of chapter 8, and follow the interpretation through without a break. So far as the interpretation is concerned, it makes no difference whether the time between the

two parts of it was fifteen years or fifteen minutes. The close connection between the two chapters having been demonstrated, the student or expositor should drop all thoughts of the time occupied in interpreting the vision, and read Dan. 8:20-26; 9:24-27 as one continuous narrative.

This explanation may serve as an aid to some in the study of one of the most important prophecies of the Bible. W.

**"The Commentary. God Requires Strict Obedience" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.**

(June 26.-Lev. 10:1-11; Ex. 35:20-29.)

"And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary out of the camp. So they went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said. And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, Uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled. And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

"And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses."

There are two or three points in this portion of Scripture which the student should not fail to notice. The first and most important is that God is very particular, and will not countenance any deviation from directions which he has given. He had specified the kind of fire and incense that should be used in the sanctuary. Ex. 30:9. He himself had kindled a fire on the altar when the first offering was made upon it, and no other was to be used. It might have seemed to Nadab and Abihu that there was no difference between the sacred fire and ordinary fire; but God had made them different, and it was their duty to recognize that difference.

It may seem to many that death was a severe penalty for so slight a deviation from the commandment of the Lord; such must remember that the fact that the death penalty was inflicted by the Lord himself, is sufficient evidence that the offense was not small. The Judge of all the earth will do right. It must also be borne in mind that the heinousness of a sin is not determined so much by the actual quality of the deed itself, as by the spirit in which the deed is committed. Contempt for the Lord may be shown in the willful disobedience of a supposed minor precept, as well as by some act which would be generally recognized as a sin. But the sin of Nadab and Abihu was not a small one. It was the result of lightly regarding the service of the Lord. They engaged in his service as carelessly as they would in some business of their own; and this showed that they had no real reverence for God.

The same reasoning that Nadab and Abihu may be supposed to have used is indulged in by thousands of people to-day in regard to the Sabbath. The fourth commandment says: "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; for the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work;" and it gives as a reason for this, the fact that is stated in Gen. 2:3, that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it [made it holy]; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Yet in the face of this, there are people who say that there is no difference in days, and that one day is just as good as another; that since all days are alike, it makes no difference which day we observe as, Sabbath, providing it is one day in seven. There is just the same difference that there was in the fire. The two kinds of fire no doubt looked just alike. But one was not holy and the other was. It was holy because God had made it so. So all days look alike; but they are not all alike, for God has made the seventh day holy.

Refusal to obey any commandment of the Lord, is evidence of a lack of respect for him. In Eze. 22:26 the Lord through the prophet says of the church, "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbath, and I am profaned among them." Her hiding the eyes from the Lord's Sabbath is counted as the same sin that Nadab and Abihu committed. Moreover, the Lord says that he is *profaned* because the people have not put difference between the holy and the profane, but have violated his holy Sabbath. This is because God has magnified his word above all his name (Ps. 138:2); disregard of his word dishonors him; and for a man to treat the Lord with disrespect is as bad as to speak disrespectfully of him.

Some may say that the Lord is not so particular now as he used to be, because he does not destroy people for making no difference between the day which he has sanctified, and common days. This illustrates what Solomon said: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Eccl. 8:11. But God says, "I am the Lord, I change not." He is just as particular now as he ever was. But at no time in the history of the world has he executed summary punishment upon all transgressors. If he had, there would have been no people left on earth.

Occasionally he has suddenly cut off some terribly presumptuous person, but those were only exceptional cases. "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness" (Acts 17:31, and he has reserved the unjust "unto the day of Judgment to be punished." 2 Peter 2:9. The instances in which God has summarily cut off transgressors are simply reminders of how he regards disobedience to his plain requirements. Let us therefore not tempt the Lord, but on the contrary, seek earnestly to know what his will is, and then with diligence do all his commandments. Upon all such a blessing is pronounced.

The passage of Scripture upon which we are commenting is also a temperance lesson. After Nadab and Abihu were destroyed "the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean." This seems to indicate that Nadab and Abihu had been drinking wine before they went into the sanctuary, and that this was the cause of their sin. From this we learn that God does not regard drunkenness as an excuse for crime. If a man commits a murder when he is crazed with liquor which he voluntarily drank, he is as guilty as though the crime were premeditated; because he of his own accord took that which he knew would deprive him of reason.

Whether or not Nadab and Abihu were thoroughly intoxicated, we cannot tell, but we know that their sensibilities were blunted. How many there are who engage in the work of the Lord with their mental faculties all deadened because of intemperance in eating or drinking. Such cannot appreciate the plain word of God. And it is largely because of gross habits that people cannot sense the importance of sacred things. Both their mental and their moral faculties are blunted, so that they can see no difference between things holy and things common. But people who cannot see the truth, because their own wrong habits have blunted their senses, are just as accountable for their disobedience as though they could see the truth and should willfully disobey it. To all the exhortation comes, "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit."

Attention is called to just one point taught by Ex. 35:26-29. That is that "everyone whose heart stirred him up, and everyone whom his spirit made willing," brought an offering for the sanctuary; God had told Moses to take an offering only "of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart." Ex. 25:2. The result of this willing offering is given in Ex. 36:2-7. The people brought unto Moses "free offerings every morning," until the overseers of the work said to him, "The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work, which the Lord commanded to make. And Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the ordering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing. For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much." Such a thing as this is of rare occurrence, but it would not be if the people who profess to be God's would all give willingly and make free offerings. The cause of God would prosper, and all would be blessed.

We cannot help thinking that there were some in the camp of Israel who had not given anything when the proclamation went forth that no more offerings were needed. There are always some who do not intend to give anything. To such it would make no difference whether there was enough or not. Such ones would doubtless congratulate themselves on their prudence, since they had saved their means, and the cause was well supplied besides. But there are always others who do intend to give, but not now. They cling to their means yet a little longer, but fully design to make a liberal donation at some future time. How disappointed such ones must have felt when they learned that their offerings were not needed. So it will doubtless be in these last days. God's work will close without having been helped by many who designed to help sometime. Too late they will find that while the work of the Lord could get along without their help, they cannot get along without helping the work. The lesson that we should learn is never to put off service of any kind for the Lord. *To-day* is the call to everyone. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The report of the proceedings of the North Pacific Conference is of necessity laid over until next week.

In our reference to Henry VIII., last week, we stated that he cut off the heads of three wives. This is a mistake, he cut off the heads of only *two*-Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard. Wicked murderer and libertine as he was, we would not lay more to his charge than rightly belongs there.

For several days passed a fair has been in progress in a Catholic Church which has recently been erected in Oakland, the object being to raise money to pay off the indebtedness. The following announcement which was made in one of the Oakland dailies, shows that the Catholic Church will not consent to being outdone by Protestants, in the way of "reaching the masses":-

"A large attendance is expected at St. Francis the Sales fair to-night, and there will be several fresh attractions. The shooting gallery must do well if it plans its own against some of the crack shots to ring the bell and pocket a good cigar every time. The refreshment department might make the staff of the first-class hotel turn green with envy, so varied an excellent is the bill of fare."

In a supplemental report of the North Pacific camp-meeting, we learned the following additional particulars. The Sabbath-school, conducted by Professor Granger, numbered four hundred thirty members. Last year there were but two hundred sixty. The class contributions for the day amounted to \$47.53. Children's meetings were conducted daily by Sister Morrison. In this work the Lord especially blessed, and many of the children were converted. Special pains were taken to instruct the children in the simple principles of the Gospel, and those who accepted Christ did so understandably. Of the thirty-one who were baptized, the majority were children and youth.

A Baptist paper (the *Flag*, of St. Louis, in animadverting recently upon certain remarks of the *Midland* (United Presbyterian), relative to the practice of infant communion, prevalent in the third century and for some time thereafter, says:-

"If Protestant churches receive infant baptism by tradition, why not receive the infant communion, which rests upon the same foundation? However, it would be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles."

These Protestant churches which "receive infant baptism by tradition" might turn this upon their Baptist critic, by asking, If Protestant churches receive Sunday-keeping by tradition, why not receive infant baptism, which rests upon the same foundation? And no one can give any good reason for receiving the one rather than the other. "It would," indeed, "be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles," which gives no more warrant for regarding Sunday as the Sabbath, than it does for baptizing infants or giving them the communion.

In our report of the Kansas camp-meeting, in another column, we stated that Elder Kilgore was called by telegraph to the capital of Illinois on account of the Sunday law bill which was to be made the special order for Tuesday, May 21, in both houses of the Legislature. Since writing that we have received a note from Brother Kilgore in which he says:-

"I arrived here on Tuesday morning, but the bill did not come up till Wednesday morning. A motion was made to call it back to the second reading but it was defeated by a large majority, and it then passed sweeping through the House by a vote of eighty to forty with cheers. There was more interest shown in it than I had seen in connection with any bill before the house prior to this one, or since it passed. It was then taken up in the Senate and at once placed on the order of the second reading; and now it is still subject to an amendment. We have several senators pledged to us that they will do all they can to support a saving clause in our behalf. But I have learned by the experience of yesterday, that it is vain to trust in the arm of flesh."

We hope to be able soon to lay before our readers a copy of the proposed Illinois Sunday law, so that they may see what a gentle(?) spirit actuates the Chicago preachers.

A few nights ago a meeting was held in Oakland, to express sympathy with Ireland. One of the speakers was Father McNally, who in his speech made the following inquiry:-

"When did the Irish people, who have made up for centuries the Irish society, transfer their government to the English tyrant? Where are the deeds of transfer."

Of course the *Irish people* never transferred their government to the English. But *the Pope* did. He not only transferred the government, but the people and the whole island itself. And if Father McNally, or anybody else, will call at this office we will show him the deed of transfer, in the original Latin. Why don't Father McNally and his compatriots and fellow sympathizers with Ireland call upon the Pope to give back to Ireland that which he gave away? Is England to blame for keeping what the Pope gave her to keep?

The papers announce that "the Pope grants unprecedented honors to Queen Victoria." It is very kind indeed in the dear good Pope to condescend to "grant" honors, unprecedented or otherwise to the queen of Great Britain. The unprecedented honor in this case is that the Pope has "entirely of his own



accord, and without any hint from Cardinal Manning, based a rescript which ordains that on Jubilee day, June 21, high mass and a Te Deus shall be performed in all Roman Catholic Churches in England." It is said that "his holiness could not have done more in the case of the most faithful Catholic sovereign." And then it is suggested, very innocently of course, that "the English clergy might return the compliment on the occasion of his holiness's approaching jubilee." Yes, they might, nor should we be much surprised if they do so. Of course some such thing as that is just what the Pope is fishing for, if only if it should be so at the official direction of the queen, such a recognition on the part of England would be of great weight in the longed-for universal recognition of the Papal sovereignty.

### **"Sunday Labor and Morality" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The rector of Trinity Church in San Francisco, Rev. Dr. H. W. Beers, was recently called as a witness in a case being tried in Oakland. The Doctor had testified that the defendant in the suit was a man of good moral character. On cross-examination he was asked if his opinion would have been different if he had known that the defendant attended baseball games on Sunday. His reply was, "I know very decent people who attend baseball games on Sunday." To the lawyer's question, "If Mr.--attended a baseball game instead of going to church, would it not affect his moral character in your opinion?" the reverend gentleman replied, "It would not affect my estimate of his moral character."

Well, why should it? Moral character is determined by moral or immoral acts. An immoral act is one that is contrary to the moral law; and since Sunday observance is not required by the moral law, it follows that an act performed on Sunday cannot affect one's moral character, unless the act itself would be an immoral act if performed on Monday or Thursday, or any other day of the week.

In saying this, we do not mean to be understood that the time when a certain act is performed has nothing to do with the morality or immorality of the deed. Far from it. There is a day which God has declared holy, and whose observance is enjoined by the moral law. The fourth commandment gives us six days of the week in which to do all *our* work, but commands us to rest from our labor on the seventh day of the week. Now since morality is nothing else but conformity to the moral law, it follows that it would be immoral to do things upon the seventh day, which might be perfectly legitimate on any other day. But aside from the nature of the act itself, no immorality can attach to any deed performed on Sunday.

### **"A Good Description" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The International Sunday-school lesson for June 12 is on the first four commandments, and it is interesting to note the different reasons which different lesson commentators give for keeping the first day of the week instead of the seventh day, as enjoined by the fourth commandment. Dr. Alexander McLaren, of

Manchester, England, has an article in the *Sunday School Times*, in which he says:-

"We have not the Jewish Sabbath nor is it binding on us. But as men we ought to rest, and resting, to worship on one day of the week. The unwritten law of Christianity moulding all outward forms by its own free spirit, gradually, and without premeditation, slid from the seventh to the first day, as it had clear right to do."

This is about the best statement of the case that we have yet seen. It is a truth that "we have not the Jewish Sabbath" and that it is not binding upon us, because the fourth commandment knows nothing of any such Sabbath. The Sabbath which we have, and which the fourth commandment enjoins upon us, is the Sabbath of the Lord, which is the seventh day of the week. But what we wish to call especial attention to is the aptness with which the writer describes the change from the seventh day to the first. The law of God did not change, but "the unwritten law of Christianity," which is another term for the natural inclinations of professed Christians, "gradually, and without premeditation, *did* from the seventh to the first day."

That's just it; that sentence describes the case as well as a whole volume could. There was no commandment for the change, but the people gradually *slid* over onto the first day of the week. In so doing, they clearly slid away from the commandment, which they had no right to do. If they had heeded the commandment, as they ought to have done, they would not have slid; for Inspiration describes the righteous man thus, "The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide." Ps. 37:31. When men let go of the commandments of God, they are sure to slide.

**June 16, 1887**

**"Born of God" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are few texts that have been the subject of more anxious inquiry than 1 John 3:9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." This is made much of by the self-styled "holiness" people, who use it to bolster up their own claims to perfection. They seem to take it for granted that they are specially referred to in the text, and think that all one has to do to be beyond the reach of sin is to profess to be born again. On the other hand, there are some who think that such a condition as the text describes is impossible in this life, and that it refers to the life to come, claiming that the new birth is at the resurrection. A question having been asked as to the meaning of the text, we take space for a brief exposition of it.

In the first place we would say that being "born of God" is a change that takes place in this life, and not at the resurrection. John says in this same chapter (verses 1, 2): "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not,

because it knew him not. Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God." Men are not by nature children of God. Paul says that the "children of disobedience," who walk according to the lusts of the flesh, "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind," are "by nature the children of wrath." Eph. 2:2, 3. To the unbelieving Jews, who sought to murder Christ because he reproved their wicked deeds, the Saviour said, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." John 8:44. Now since "all have sinned" and are consequently by nature the "children of wrath," children of the devil, it follows that those who are now the sons of God have become so by the new birth.

Again, being born again is a prerequisite to obtaining the life to come. Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, ye cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3. And he repeated the statement in these words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Verse 5. These texts not only show that the new birth takes place before the resurrection, but they also set us on the track of what the new birth is.

We learn that in the new birth both water and the Spirit have a part. This reminds us of what Paul says in Rom. 8:11-14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." The possession of the Spirit shows that we are sons of God, and that we are Christ's. Rom. 8:9. It is called "the Spirit of adoption."

The first work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men, is to "reprove the world of sin." John 16:8. Conviction of sin, if not stifled, will necessarily drive the soul to Christ (see Rom. 7:24, 25; 8:1); and Paul says that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5:17. But if a man in Christ is a *new creature*, it must be that he has had a new birth; therefore we know that one who is born of God is one who is in Christ.

Now read Rom. 6:1-3: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" And also Gal. 3:26, 27: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Here we learn, what has already been stated, that sons of God are they who are in Christ; and we learn also that we put on Christ, or are ushered into Christ, by baptism. Now connect with these texts 1 Cor. 12:12, 13, where baptism and the Spirit are coupled together, as in John 3:5. It reads: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Thus the Spirit convicts of sin; the convicted sinner repents and flies to Christ for cleansing from sin; he shows his acceptance of Christ by being baptized, and rises to walk in newness of life, a new creature in Christ, if he abides in Christ. This is the new birth, or, as it is commonly called, conversion.

But what has this to do with the statement in 1 John 3:9 that whosoever is born of God sinneth not? We shall see, when we have examined one or two texts more which relate to the new birth. We have already seen that the Spirit of God is the prime factor in effecting the new birth. It first works upon the heart, to convict of sin. But how does the Spirit convict of sin? Through what does it operate? In Eph. 6:17 we are told that the sword of the Spirit is the word of God. Then since the word of God is the Spirit's sword, it must be by means of the word that the Spirit convicts of sin. In support of this conclusion we read Heb. 4:12, 13: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."

Then the word of God,-and by this the law is specially referred to,-has much to do in the work of conversion, or the new birth. Without it, the Spirit could make no impression on the heart; and so the psalmist ascribes to it a leading place in the work of conversion, saying, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. Now we are prepared for a text which will bring us right back to the one with which we started. We quote 1 Peter 1:22, 23: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

In these texts last quoted we find the word of God

354

brought to view as the seed by which men are begotten sons of God. Now read once more the text which we are studying: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; *for his seed remaineth in him*; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Why does not such an one commit sin? Because the seed by which he was begotten remains in him. And what is that seed? The word of God and the Spirit of God.

That the possession of the word of God in the heart is a guard against sin, is shown by the psalmist, who, speaking of the righteous man, says: "The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide." Ps. 37:31. And again he says: "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee." Ps. 119:11.

This statement about the law of God being in a man's heart, reminds us of what the Lord Jesus said, through the psalmist, of himself: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:7, 8. Now since David says that the law in the heart keeps a man's feet from slipping, we will examine a notable instance in the life of our Saviour, to see how it works.

After Jesus was baptized, he was led into the wilderness to be tempted. After he had fasted forty days and forty nights, the devil said to him: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." Matt. 4:3. How did Jesus meet this temptation? Not with parleying, but with the words, "It is written, Man

shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." That settled the question once for all.

Then the devil took Jesus up and placed him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down." Again the prompt reply came: "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Here again, from the fullness of the word which was hidden in his heart, Jesus drew a weapon which foiled this attack of the enemy.

Once more the devil plied his temptation. Taking Jesus into a high mountain, he showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, promising them all to him if he would but for one moment worship Satan as God. Quick as thought came the words from the lips of Jesus, "Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

Notice that Jesus met every temptation with a text of Scripture. But these temptations were suffered and recorded for our benefit, that we might learn how to resist.

Again: Faith is said to be the Christian's shield. Eph. 6:16: "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." But faith cannot be separated from the word, for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17. One's faith is just equal to the amount of the word that he has-not committed to memory, simply-but hidden in the heart. Now we can understand 1 John 5:18: "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." The object of a shield is to protect the person from fling missiles. In ancient times, when men fought with swords and bows, the man who received all the blows on his shield kept himself, so that he was not touched. So in the Christian warfare, the one who receives the assaults of Satan upon the shield of that faith which is the outgrowth of God's own word, will keep himself untouched. Thus it was that Christ came off unscathed in his contest with Satan.

Once more: In John 15:7 we read: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." That is a comprehensive promise. "Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." What will be the constant request of the one who abides in Christ? It will evidently be for more of a likeness to him. David expressed it when he said: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." Ps. 27:4. Dare anyone say that such desires will not be gratified. They must be because Jesus said: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Matt. 5:6. Not filled with a good, happy feeling; not filled with complacency; not filled with self-conceit; but filled with righteousness-right doing-obedience to God's commandments; as righteousness is inseparably connected with meekness. Zeph. 2:3; Ps. 25:9.

From this brief study it will be seen that 1 John 3:9 does call for perfect obedience. So does the whole Bible. That book makes no provision for a little sin to be retained. Christ died that he might present to himself, that is, find when he comes for it, "a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. 5:27. This is the requirement.

And surely if one abides *in Christ*, and if the word of truth by which he was turned from sin, still remains in him, it will continue to have the same effect that it had at first, and will keep him from sin. This does not mean that the individual will necessarily be perfect in knowledge, nor that he will be in a position where there is nothing more to gain; but it does mean that so far as he has knowledge of the law of God he will walk in it. He will be one of the "undefiled in the way." Ps. 119:1.

Such an one will never boast of his goodness. He will be too much occupied in keeping from falling, to boast, and how will he keep from falling? "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." The more he beholds Christ, the more will he feel his own nothingness in comparison; this will beget humility; humility will beget trustfulness; and trustfulness will bring strength. Thus he will be "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might," and, going on from strength to strength, will at last appear in Zion before God. W.

### **"What Is the Resurrection?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to a question upon the resurrection, the *Christian Union* says: "Resurrection, or 'rising up' (as the word means) is the entrance of the spirit into the embodied life of the world to come." This is Spiritualist doctrine, but it is held by very many who profess to be orthodox. There seems to be a sort of fascination about it, although we cannot conceive wherein the fascination consists, unless it is in the fact that the doctrine contradicts the Bible. Let the reader who is inclined to accept the *Christian Union's* definition of the resurrection, but who has a regard for the Bible, notice the following scriptures:-

1. Matt. 20:17-19: "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again." Paul also says that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." 1 Cor. 15:3, 4. And he also states that this was "the resurrection from the dead." Rom. 1:4. The Spiritualist theory says that the resurrection is the rising of the soul from the body, at death; the Bible says that the resurrection of Christ was not till three days after his crucifixion. Which is more worthy of belief?

2. Matt. 27:62-64: "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead." Notice the direct contrast between the Spiritualist theory of the resurrection and the Bible teaching. According to the Spiritualist theory, the resurrection of Jesus took place as soon as he breathed his last breath upon the cross. But here we find that the next day after the

crucifixion the Jews desired a guard so that the disciples might not steal his body away and so claim that he had been raised from the dead according to his prediction. From this we learn that when Jesus, his disciples, and the Pharisees spoke of the resurrection from the dead, they all had the idea but that some time after death the body should be restored to life. And the Bible nowhere recognizes anything as resurrection, except restoration of the body to life. Just imagine the Pharisees asking for a guard to prevent the spirit of Christ from leaving the body! The Spiritualist theory makes nonsense of the Bible.

3. John 6:40: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." These are the words of Christ. The Spiritualist teaching is that everyone is raised at what is called death; Christ says that believers shall be raised *at the last day*. No "advanced thinker" would be so wild as to claim that the spirit does not leave the body of any man until the last day, yet Christ says that that is when the resurrection will take place. And lest some should claim that the "last day" refers to the last day of a man's earthly life, we quote the words of Christ in John 5:28, 29: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This shows that the resurrection is a coming forth from the grave.

4. 1 Cor. 15:51-54: "Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." No comment could make it plainer that the resurrection takes place at the last trump, and that it consists in the raising of the body to life.

We might cite additional texts by the score, showing the same thing. Shall we not believe the Bible doctrine of the resurrection, rather than the Spiritualist theory? Reason alone would say that we ought, since it is the Bible alone that reveals the fact that there will be a resurrection. And does it not seem strange the Spiritualists, and those who follow their teaching without taking their name, will prate loftily about the resurrection from the dead, while all the time they deny that there is any such thing as death? Surely "the legs of the lame are not equal," and all who depart from the simplicity of Bible doctrine are deplorably lame. W.

**"What Absurd Thing Shall Come Next?" *The Signs of the Times* 13,  
23.**

E. J. Waggoner

We had often head of the mind-cure theory, but now we see it. We always thought it was a mess of nonsense, but now we know that such only it is. We have before us the "formula" by which prescriptions are to be compounded for

the cure of all diseases that humanity is heir to. What? "humanity" did we say? Oh, no, there is no humanity! It is all divinity. And "diseases" did we say? It is all a mistake. There is no such thing as disease, nor ache, nor pain-all this is a hoax. You get your finger caught as in a vice; it is not pinched, it does not hurt-it can't hurt, for don't you know that "matter has no life, and is insensible to pain or pleasure?" You only believe it hurts, and that is all. In fact matter "has no real existence" anyhow, and how can anything be really affected that has no real existence? "Matter is only an appearance like an image in a mirror;" and do you suppose that your reflection in a mirror could have its hand cut with a buzz-saw, or its finger mashed with a hammer? Do you suppose its tooth or head ever aches? Does it ever have the dyspepsia or neuralgia? Why, of course not. Well, then, are you so lost to all true ideas of sense or perception as not to know that "you are not material," and that that about you which appears to be matter "is only an appearance like an image in a mirror"? And are you so dull as to suppose that an appearance can ache, or swell, or be inflamed, or be sick? If you are, you must get bravely over all that, for "pain and sickness exist only as beliefs, and come from consulting the appearance instead of clinging to the reality?"

Gentle reader, do you wonder whether we are not just "making this up"? Do you wonder whether there is anybody in this wide world who would put forth in sober earnest, and apparently with the expectation of being believed, such utter senselessness? If you do then you may safely lay aside all wonderment, for such is the case, and it is all sober fact. Let us proceed:-

"The belief you have entertained of neuralgia, constipation, hoarseness, etc., is a profound error from beginning to end."

We know better, for we have had them all-not all at once, but one or two at a time-and instead of it being only a belief that we had them, it was a painful reality.

"You are a spirit. . . you cannot commit sin, be sick, or die."

Wrong altogether. We are not spirit, we are flesh, subject to all the laws of flesh. We *can* commit sin, and are afraid we shall (especially if we read much more of this stuff), and we often have, and are sorry for it. We *can* be sick, and must be very careful that we be not, as thousands of people are. We *can* die, as everybody, except two persons, has died that ever has lived in this world, and multitudes are dying daily, and as multitudes shall die.

"You are perfectly well [yes, we are], ever have been [no, we have not], ever will be." Thank you

361

for the conclusion; hope we may be, yet we doubt it much.

"Jesus conquered all these beliefs in false seemings [that is, false, for he died], and was lifted up into a perfect person of the spiritual truth of being, and he said that if he was lifted up, he would draw all men unto him. Therefore, because he did reveal this Christ-life of spiritual truth to man, you have only to follow that thought of his in your thoughts to come, yourself realizing that you are perfectly well and cannot suffer from any inflamed nerves, or irritated vocal organs or bronchial tubes, which you call neuralgia and hoarseness; it is an illusion."

There, that is all we need to quote; there is much more to the same purpose, but this is enough. We can only say that if anything could possibly be more of "an



illusion" than this theory of the mind-cure, we should like to know how any conception of it could be conveyed to the human mind. And when we realize that there are men and women who actually believe in such unmitigated nonsense as is set forth in this "formula," we confess that our confidence in human nature is just about in the last stages of dissolution, for after that what is there, or what can there be, that men may not believe.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In these days when so many people are claiming that the Sabbath law is abolished, we are glad to find some who will testify to the perpetuity of the Sabbath commandment even though they do not observe it. Thus the *Interior* of June 2 says concerning the fourth commandment:-

"Observe (1) this Sabbath law is as old as Creation being found founded on the fact that God rested after he completed his creative work. (2) It will never cease to be binding on man. Christ did not abrogate it anymore than he abrogated the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' or any other precept of the moral law."

E. C. G. having read the articles on the millennium lately printed in the SIGNS, asks the following questions on Rev. 20:9:-

"How can the wicked compass the camp of the saints about unless it is upon the earth? Does the beloved city come down from Heaven before the wicked are destroyed?"

The wicked cannot at all compass the camp of the saints about unless it is on the earth. And the text itself shows that it will be on the earth when they do compass it about. "They went up *on the breadth of the earth*, and compassed the camp of the saints about, *and the beloved city*." And as they compass "the beloved city" before they are destroyed, that of itself proves that the beloved city must have come down from Heaven before they are destroyed. This is at the close of the thousand years.

We often hear people refuse to make pledges of means for the support of some missionary enterprise, on the ground that they don't think it right to make a pledge. They always say that they intend to give something, though whether they do give or not is a question. The following from an English paper would seem to indicate that giving is a habit, and that those who have not the habit give nothing, while those who have the habit give to every worthy object:-

"No fewer than thirty-one people of position in England declined to subscribe to the Church House on the ground that they wished to give their money to the fund for the poor clergy; yet it was found a day or two ago, on examining the list, that not one of them had sent a donation to the latter fund. On the other hand, fifty-seven subscribers to the Church House, whose contributions amounted to over 2,450, appeared as donors to the poor clergy fund of no less a sum than £3,630."

The Vienna correspondent of the *London Times* is the authority for the statement that a second edition of 120,000 copies of Rev. Isaac Salkinson's

Hebrew translation of the New Testament has been published. Of this number 100,000 copies have been bought by one man for gratuitous distribution among Hebrew-reading Jews all over Europe.

### **"Making the Sabbath a Holy Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In one of the religious weeklies we find the following, which is part of a comment on the fourth commandment:-

"On the seventh day our bodies and minds must rest; and our souls also. Our spiritual nature must hold communion with Heaven, thus making the Sabbath a holy day."

The thought here expressed is altogether too common. It is a grave mistake to suppose that we have anything to do with the degree of holiness of the Sabbath-day. No man can make a day holy, no matter how holy or how absorbed in spiritual contemplation he may be. If all the Christian people in the world should agree to set apart Wednesday for rest and religious meditation, and worship, that day would not be any more sacred than it is now. The seventh day is a holy day because God made it holy; he "hallowed it." He alone could do this. It matters not if everyone in the world devoted the day to secular work and pleasure, the day would be just as holy as it was when God hallowed it. But the people themselves cannot be holy. This is the point: The action of people in regard to sacred things makes no difference with those things, but with the people themselves. By constantly reverencing holy things, men become holy; by disregarding holy things they injure themselves, but do not detract from the holiness of the sacred thing. Men cannot make God's name any the less sacred by blaspheming it; neither could they make the name of Baal holy by reverencing it. So men cannot make the seventh day any less holy by devoting it to secular uses; and all the "*consensus* of Christian thought" that there is in the world, cannot attach a single iota of sacredness to Sunday.

### **"Humility Wanted" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

Simulated Christianity is often so nearly like the genuine that it cannot be detected upon a short acquaintance, and yet there is generally something about it that arouses a suspicion that it is not just what it should be. A meek and quiet spirit must characterize every true Christian, and it matters not how loud the profession nor how great the manifestation of feeling, if humility dwells not in the heart, "this man's religion is vain."

In view of the maximum of profession, and the minimum of possession, in religious circles to-day, the following truths incidentally expressed in a recent number of the New York *Christian Advocate* are to the point. Speaking of "*De Imitations Christi*," a book written nearly five hundred years ago, probably by Thomas a Kempis, the *Advocate* says:-

"The restless activity of this age needs the calmness of the "*Imitatione*," and its call to stop and think and look within. The superficial views prevalent as to sin,

and the easy-going sort of piety which flourishes, nowadays, need the earnest and penetrating teachings of this little book. And for the cant, narrowness, and pharisaic self-righteousness of much of the present so-called holiness literature—especially that circulated among Methodists—there needs to be substituted the sincerity, freshness, humility, and depth of spiritual insight, which constitute some of the chief charms of the "*Imitatione*," and which have attracted to it devout minds of all communions."

### **"Scripture Verified" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

Every new discovery by those who are busily engaged in the work of unearthing the monuments and records of antiquity, serves to make more evident the simple, straightforward truth of the Scripture narrative. The statement in Ex. 1:8, that "there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph," is one that commentators have thought it necessary to almost apologize for. They have given learned explanations, showing in what figurative sense the words were to be taken. But now the mummy of that "new king" has been discovered, and visitors to the Bulaq Museum may gaze upon the features of that mighty tyrant who lived over three thousand years ago. We have not space to tell all the circumstances of the finding (they are given in the *May Century*), but it is sufficient to say that it is quite conclusively demonstrated that this king was not of Egyptian stock at all, but of Assyrian. He was the second of a new dynasty, but as his father reigned but a very few years, and did nothing of note, he was practically the first.

This fact shows the appropriateness of the expression, "there arose a *new king*," and the reader can readily see how a foreign usurper would not know Joseph, and would care nothing for the kindred of one who had done so much for Egypt. He owed the Israelites no debt of gratitude, and saw in them only a people whom he could use to advance the glory of his reign, and who, if left to themselves, might prove formidable adversaries.

And this also throws light upon another text. In Isa. 52:4 we read: "For thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause." This verse has been supposed to refer to two distinct independent events, but the discovery shows that it is the statement of simple fact.

This is only one of hundreds of instances where the correctness of Bible history has been demonstrated by discoveries of ancient records, and should serve to teach people that they need not get scared and begin to reject or apologize for the Scriptures when they find statements that they cannot understand.

### **"Celibacy of the Clergy" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

L. A. T. asks if it can be proved that the Simon spoken of in Luke 4:58 is Simon Peter, the one whom the Catholics claim was the first Pope, and thinks

that if it can be so proved, it will be very much against the Papal dogma that the clergy should not marry. We reply that the Simon of Luke 4:58 is none other than Simon Peter, as may be seen by reading Matt. 8:14, 15, where we find the same thing that is recorded in Luke. But this does not affect the Papal doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy. The Catholic Church does not profess to derive that point from the Bible, and consequently nothing that can be drawn from the Bible will have any weight with them. They are very well aware that Peter was married. In fact, it is not probable that there was one of the apostles who was not a married man; and Paul, in giving the qualifications of a bishop, says that he "must be blameless, the husband of one wife."

In the early history of the church, no such thing as the celibacy of the clergy was known. In the third century it began to be taught that a clergyman should not marry the second time. This was from a false conception of 1 Tim. 3:2. In the fourth century, as the "mystery of iniquity" was approaching its full development as the "man of sin," decrees began to be issued forbidding the clergy to marry. For several centuries there was controversy over this subject, and perhaps the majority of Catholic priests were married, although councils were declaring against them. It was not till the pontificate of Gregory VII., A.D. 1073-1085, that the celibacy of the clergy was fully established in the Catholic Church, that Pope being the first who had the determination and the power to enforce his decrees. Those priests who were married were obliged to put away their wives. Many scandals ensued, and at the time of the Reformation these were so common among the clergy as to scarcely excite remark. There can be no doubt that while celibacy has been a fruitful source of the abominations of the Papacy, it has added to its power, since the priests, having no family ties, may be sent at a moment's notice wherever their superiors indicate.

**June 23, 1887**

**"Effects of Erroneous Opinions" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is very common for those who are quite loose in their belief, or who do not believe much of anything, to ease their consciences by saying, "God will never condemn a man on account of his opinions; it is how a man lives that determines his condition at last." How these people acquired such intimate knowledge of God's plans, so as to be able to speak so definitely of what he will or will not do, is not apparent; for it is very evident from the Bible that a man's opinions have a good deal to do in deciding his final destiny.

It seems never to occur to those who use the expression quoted above, that they are strangely inconsistent with themselves. The very ones who use such language will speak very slightly of one who "has not the courage of his convictions," that is, one who holds opinions which he dare not act out. Such a man they justly accuse of leading a double life; and yet they seem to think that God will be perfectly satisfied with a man who leads such a life.

But the great mistake is in supposing that a man can hold opinions which will not to a greater or less extent influence his actions. The statement by Watts, that "the mind's the standard of the man," is but another way of expressing the truth uttered by Solomon, that as a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he." A man cannot entertain vile thoughts and still have all his actions pure. Neither can a man entertain erroneous opinions without acting in accordance with them, unless his circumstances hinder him; and in that case he is entitled to no more credit than the thief in prison is to be commended for not stealing.

In times past people have suffered severely on account of their opinions. When Paul says, "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace," he says in effect that the inhabitants of Jericho perished because they believed not. If they had believed, they might have been saved as well as the harlot Rahab. But they were of the opinion that their gods were stronger than the God of Israel. Somebody might have said to them, "It doesn't make any difference what ideas you have about God; it is your actions that will determine your final lot." But their ideas of God had everything to do in shaping their actions and their erroneous ideas led them into practices which caused their ruin.

Again, we read of the children of Israel: "For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he [Christ] grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." Heb. 3:16-19. Here we have the plain declaration that it was the unbelief of the Israelites that shut them out of the promised land. "They could not enter in because of unbelief." But would they not have been allowed to enter in if they had not sinned? Certainly; and they would not have sinned but for their unbelief. Their sin was a necessary consequence of their unbelief.

How was it with the inhabitants of Sodom? When Lot, who believed the warnings of the angels, went out to tell his relatives that God was going to destroy the city, "he seemed as one that mocked." They regarded him as a fanatic; very likely they thought he was losing his mind, and would have to be cared for. But the Lord did destroy the city, and all those who disbelieved perished with it. It was their opinion that they were safe enough, and in consequence of their erroneous opinion they perished.

We may learn a lesson from them. Indeed their case is recorded for our admonition. Christ says: "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:28-30. All over the land the coming of the Lord is being proclaimed. The same word of prophecy foretells that his coming is now very near. Yet these things are to thousands as idle tales. Those who preach the nearness of the second advent are regarded as fanatical. It is the common opinion that the world is just in its infancy. Men say, "Well, it doesn't make any difference how we believe in regard to the coming of the Lord, if we only live

right." But still the truth exists that only "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28. Why will this be so? Simply because those who do not believe that his coming is near at hand, will not be getting ready for it.

Let no one delude himself with the idea that he has "a right to his own opinions," and that he can believe what he pleases and still be safe at last. It is true that so far as other men are concerned, he has a right to his own opinions; that is, he is not answerable to any man for what he believes; but all men are answerable to God for their opinions. No man has a right to hold an opinion contrary to what God has revealed in his word. And those who shall cling to their self-assumed right to believe what they please, will find at the last that it was a dearly-bought privilege. Among those who "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death," the *unbelieving* occupy a prominent place. "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." W.

### **"The New Law" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

An exchange says: "Many persons seem to think that because the ten commands were done away, we have no moral precepts to guide us. I will, therefore, in a few words, show that nine of the commands—all the moral part—are adopted or re-enacted in the new law (New Testament) which is now our authority in place of the old law that it supercedes and annuls." There are many people who entertain, just such ideas as are expressed in this quotation, and therefore before we examine that which the writer gives as a substitute for the decalogue, we wish to show how erroneous such assumptions are.

(a) It is assumed that the ten commandments were done away. But this is in direct contradiction of what the Scriptures say of God's purpose concerning the law, and of its nature. First read a few statements: "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever." Ps. 119:152. "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." Verse 100. "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand [margin, "are established"] fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111:7, 8. Again, our Saviour said: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. If it is asked how this can be, the briefest examination of the nature of the law will give the answer.

(b) The law of God is the righteousness of God. This is indicated in Isaiah's prophecy: "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable." But Isa. 51:6, 7 shows beyond all question that the law is God's righteousness. We read: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. Harken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose

heart is my law." The people who know righteousness are they in whose heart is the law of God; the obvious meaning is that they know righteousness because the law is in their heart; and this will be made still more evident further on. The righteousness which is known by the law of God is God's righteousness; and when that truth is grasped, we scarcely need to be told that it will not be abolished, for that would be to tear God from his throne. Now we can understand how it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for a particle of the law to fail.

(c) The law of God is his will. Paul says: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." Rom. 2:17, 18. This is perfectly in harmony with the statement that the law is God's righteousness, for God is righteous, and his will must be righteous. That the ten commandments are referred to by "the law" is evident from verses 21-23. Now since the ten commandments are the righteousness of God, and his will, it necessarily follows that they *cannot* be abolished. Be it understood that when "the law" is mentioned, there is no discrimination, but the whole law is referred to. David had reference to the whole law when he said: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Now if a part of the law were abolished, it would be no more perfect.

But it is useless to speak about the possibility or probability of the abolition of any part of the law; for it would be impossible to abolish any portion of it. God himself could not abolish any portion of it; for that would be to abolish his own goodness, and "he cannot deny himself." So long as God's throne is in Heaven, and his kingdom rules over all, so long must the ten commandments, the law of his kingdom, remain intact.

2. It is assumed that only nine of the ten commandments were moral, and that the fourth was not. But this assumption is itself fatal to the assumption that the ten commandments were done away; for a moral law cannot be done away. Moral duties grow out of the nature of God, and they can not be done away so long as God is God. He who admits that nine of the ten commandments are moral thereby admits that they cannot be abolished.

Let us make this point a little more clear. If a law is abolished, then the duty which it once enjoined is no longer a duty, and that which it forbade is no longer a crime. Now take the seventh commandment. If that were ever abolished, even though it were afterward re-enacted, there must have been a time when it was not an immoral act to commit adultery! So also of the eighth commandment: if that were abolished, then it was not wrong to steal. But no right-minded person can conceive of a time when it would be right to kill, steal, or commit adultery. Now if it could never be right for all people to live promiscuously, as to persons and property, or for human life to be considered as of no value, or for God's name to be held in no repute, then it follows that the commandments which forbid such things must always be in force. It is impossible for anyone who has any just conception of morality to imagine such a thing as a moral law being abolished.

Having seen that moral commandments cannot be abolished, let us consider the fourth commandment in particular. It is claimed that it is not moral. Did it ever occur to anyone to wonder why God should insert a non-moral commandment in

the midst of moral precepts? It would be much easier to answer the statement that it is not moral, if those who say so would tell us what is necessary to constitute a moral precept. "Moral" is defined as "relating to duty or obligation." Well, the Sabbath commandment was given by the Creator of the universe, and

375

certainly it is man's duty to obey. We cannot conceive of anything that could have more effect in making a commandment moral than that it came from God, for he is the source of all morality.

As with the other commandments, so with the fourth; we cannot conceive of a time when to violate it would not be sin. The Sabbath commandment is the first of which we have the record of its being given to man. In Eden at the close of creation it was sanctified. It "was made for man." It was based on the unalterable facts of creation (Gen. 2:2, 3); so that the only way it could be abolished would be to abolish the fact that the earth was created, which is of course impossible.

It is sometimes claimed that the fourth commandment is not like the others, because, while they are to be kept every moment of time, it requires a duty only once a week. Such have read the commandment to little purpose. The very first word, "remember," covers every moment of a man's life. Not only during the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath is the fourth commandment to be kept, but during all the hours of the week. The man who does not remember the Sabbath every working day, will not keep the Sabbath when it comes. The fourth commandment covers the six days of labor as well as the seventh day of rest; and when we consider that it alone of all the ten, names and specifies the giver of the law, we cannot fail to see that it is the very heart of the moral law. Take it away, and there would be nothing to point out the authority of the lawgiver.

We will now examine the new law, as given by our exchange. It is as follows:-

- 1-One God; Eph. iv. 6 and 1 Cor. viii. 6.
- 2-Idolatry forbidden; 1 Cor. vi, 9; x, 7-14, and 1 John v. 21.
- 3-Swearing forbidden; Jas. v. 12.
- 4-Sabbath; nowhere enjoined, either by precept or example.
- 5-Obedience to parents enjoined; Eph. vi. 1-2, and Col. iii. 20.
- 6-Murder forbidden; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 1 John iii. 15.
- 7-Adultery; Rom. xxi. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 9; Heb. xiii. 4; Jas. iv. 4.
- 8-Steal not; Rom. xiii. 9; Eph. iv. 28.
- 9-False witness; Rom. xiii. 9.
- 10-Covetousness forbidden; Rom. xiii. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 10; Eph. v. 5.

We have copied the above exactly and are not responsible for the reference to Rom. 31. The first "commandment" of this new law tells us that there is one God. Very well, we can *believe* that, but the mere statement that there is one God does not involve any duty. The devils themselves can and do keep such a commandment as that. See James 2:19. The fact is, the texts cited contain no semblance of a commandment, as anybody can see for himself.

Those scriptures which are referred to as containing the second commandment, refer simply to the first. The second commandment forbids bowing down to images, or the representation of God, by something in heaven or earth. Nothing to this effect is found in the New Testament. Without the Old



Testament it would be utterly impossible to convict the Catholic of sin when he makes obeisance to the image of the Virgin Mary or of Christ.

The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments, as given in the "new law," are simply quotations from the Decalogue given upon Sinai, and do not purport to be anything else. We are told that, just as the new constitution of California contains many things that were in the old one, so the new law contains many things that were in the decalogue of Sinai, and that therefore we must consider these commandments as part of the new law. But now that the new constitution of California is in force, men do not quote anything from the old one; whereas Paul is quoting directly from the ten commandments of Sinai, and is not giving a new law, nor quoting from some other law in the New Testament. Moreover he declares (Rom. 7:7) that long before this was written, he was convicted of sin by the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet."

As to the fourth commandment, we find it taught by the example of Christ and the apostles (Luke 4:16; Acts 13:14; 17:2; 18:4), and also by precept. Matt. 24:20. But this is not why the Sabbath should be kept. It should be kept because "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

One more point should be noticed concerning this alleged new law. That is, that it is quoted from four different men, who wrote about thirty years after Christ. Allowing that they had a right to make laws, and that the scriptures quoted constitute the new law, we should have a period of about thirty years between the crucifixion, when it is alleged that the old law was done away, and the giving of the new law. Thirty years in which there was no moral law whatever! Thirty years in which it was not wrong to swear, kill, steal, lie, and commit adultery! To such lengths of absurdity will men go in their attempts to evade a plain but unpleasant duty.

But the simple fact is that Peter, James, John, and Paul had no more authority to enact or re-enact moral precepts than the Pope of Rome has. "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." James 4:12. Isaiah tells us who this "one lawgiver" is; "For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us." Isa. 33:22. If any of the apostles had presumed to speak anything on their own authority, or to enact or re-enact any moral precept, they would have been acting the part of the "man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." To say that the apostles presumed to institute moral precepts, is to basely slander them.

From this examination of the matter, and if space allowed it might be made much more thorough, we find that if there is any moral obligation in the world at the present time, it is by virtue of the ten commandments. If they have been done away, then there is no such thing as morality or immorality; there can be no such thing as character. But they have not been abolished; they cannot be abolished; and therefore to fear God and keep his commandments still constitutes the whole duty of man. He who presumes to sit in judgment on the law, and to absolve

himself from obedience to any part of it, will find to his sorrow that there is one Lawgiver who is able to destroy. W.

### **"Faith and Works" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber says: "Please harmonize James 2:24, 25 with verses 22 and 23 and verses 17 and 18 of the same chapter." This is easily done, or, rather, there is no necessity for doing it, as they are already in harmony. The statement in each is practically the same. Beginning with verse 15 we read: "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works."

Verses 15 and 16 forcibly illustrate the truth that words, without corresponding deeds, amount to nothing. Professions of sympathy for the distressed are worthless, unless some practical sympathy is shown. A man may, for a short time, get the reputation of being charitable, simply because of his fervent professions of sympathy for the poor; but if he is never known to render them any assistance, people soon come to regard his professions of sympathy as false, and become disgusted with them. Just so it is with faith, says the apostle. A man may profess faith in Christ, but if no works are manifest, there is no faith there.

In the eighteenth verse he supposes a case. The man who has works may say to one who professes faith without works: Show me your faith without works, and I will show you faith *by* my works. But, according to verse 17, a man cannot exhibit faith without works; if he has no works, it is an evidence that he has no faith. But the fact that a man has good works is of itself evidence that he has faith, for good works are the invariable result of living faith.

This is shown by verses 21-23: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Some have thought that this contradicts Paul's statement that a man is justified by faith only; but it does not. James explains how a man is justified by works, by the case of Abraham. His faith was manifest by works, and by works was made perfect. That is, his works showed that he had perfect faith. By proceeding to offer Isaac upon the altar, he showed his faith in the power of God to raise him from the dead, and thus to fulfill the promise, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." See Heb. 11:17-19. James himself says by the offering of Isaac the scripture was fulfilled which says, "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness," thus showing that he was justified by faith and not by works; and so when he says that Abraham was justified by works, it is in a secondary sense, since it was the works alone which showed that he had saving faith.

It was the same with Rahab. James says, "Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way." James 2:25. Paul says, "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." Heb. 11:31. Now both are strictly correct. Rahab was justified by faith; but she would not have been justified by faith if her faith had been merely a simple assent to the fact that God was leading the Israelites. Such a belief as that would not have been real faith. But she had so strong a faith in what she had heard about God's leading the Israelites into the land of Canaan, that she did the works required of her, and so in a secondary sense she was justified by works, since it was her works that testifies to the reality of her faith.

These scriptures show how inseparable are faith and works. So closely united are they that the possession of one presupposes the possession of the other. Yet it must not be forgotten that faith is first. There can be no works where there is no faith. We read: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," and, "the just shall live by faith." This is literally true. It is also true, as Paul says, that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. 10:9. Also when the jailer asked, "What shall I do to be saved?" Paul answered him truly, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 16:31. This may be said to comprise all that is necessary for salvation, because works are included in faith; they follow it as surely as flowers follow the showers of spring. If a man has the faith of Abraham, he will do the works of Abraham; if a man really believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, he will bring forth works "meet for repentance." W.

### **"The Lord Not Slack" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." 2 Peter 3:8.

This is a much abused text. It has no doubt been quoted, in part, at least, by thousands who have never read it; and of the thousands who have read it, probably comparatively few realized its force. We say the text is much abused, because it is almost always referred to to sustain some erroneous opinion. One will quote it as proof that "the day of the Lord" (see verse 10; 1 Thess. 5:2, etc.) is a thousand years long; but the text does not intimate anything of the kind, and from other texts it may clearly be shown that "the day of the Lord" is not a thousand years long. Another will quote it as proof that the days of creation were not literal days, but that they were periods of at least a thousand years. This is even worse than the other; for the sacred record shows beyond the possibility of an intelligent doubt that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. Still others hold that the text shows that the coming of the Lord may not come for a thousand years or more. This also is a gross perversion.

The real force of the text can only be learned from the context. The chapter is devoted wholly to the second coming of Christ. The apostle tells us that some will

say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" The word "promise" here is evidently used in an accommodated sense, as meaning the prospect of the fulfillment of the promise; they can easily read the promise in the Bible, but they are skeptical as to its fulfillment, as is shown by their saying, "For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."

The apostle cites the case of the flood, and says that the same word that formed the earth a liquid mass in the beginning, and stored up within it the elements of its destruction, still keeps it stored with fire reserved against the day of Judgment, and perdition of ungodly men. Just as surely as the world was once destroyed by water, so surely will it again be destroyed by fire.

But, then, the objector will urge that it has been a long time since the signs which Christ gave (see Matt. 24) were fulfilled, and there seems to be almost as much to be done now as then. He is like the "evil servant" who says in his heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming." To all such the apostle says that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." What does this mean? Simply this, that God, being infinite, and inhabiting eternity, does not regard time as we do, whose lives are but a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then passeth away. A thousand years are in his sight as one day. That is, compared with his eternity, a thousand years is but as a day would be to us.

Does this, then, give any color to the idea that the coming of the Lord may be perhaps thousands of years distant? Not by any means; for the Scriptures plainly teach that after certain signs have taken place, Christ's coming is near, "even at the doors." Those signs have been seen; and now to the one who says that at the rate the truth has been going to the nations of the earth, it will require many, many years for all people to be warned, the apostle says that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years." That is, in one day he can accomplish as much as in a thousand years, if he so chooses. He has infinite resources at his command, and he has promised that he will "finish the work and cut it short in righteousness," and will make a short work on the earth. He who is able to raise up children to Abraham, of the stones of the earth, is able to raise up laborers sufficient to do in one week as much work in warning the world of Christ's coming as has been done in the last hundred years. What he has promised he is able to perform; he has all time for his own; and since he has given his word, we may *know* that Christ's coming is "at the doors," no matter how much appearances may be to the contrary.

The fact that a thousand years are with the Lord as one day, shows that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Instead, therefore, of caviling at the promise of God, or wickedly saying in our hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming," we should thank God for his longsuffering in waiting for us to get ready for the coming of the Lord, and should cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light, knowing that the night is far spent, and the day is at hand. W.

## "Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

J. T. C. writes: "As Oregon is about to vote on an amendment to the constitution, to prohibit the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, what should Seventh-day Adventists do,-vote for it, or sit still?" We answer unhesitatingly, Vote for it, by all means. When prohibition is joined to a political party, there are many temperance people who cannot conscientiously vote for it, and this is especially true, when, as is usually the case, the party favors Sunday laws. But when the question of prohibition comes before the people on its own merits, as a simple amendment to the constitution, and not as a political issue, every good citizen should use all his influence in favor of it.

The New York *Observer* remarks that there are at least two classes in that community who can "look upon the record of the last Legislature with feelings of profound satisfaction. They are the liquor dealers and the pool-sellers." There is yet another class who, along with these two, ought to look upon that Legislature with profound satisfaction. To satisfy a capricious demand of the churches, that same Legislature made the Sabbath of the Lord a half-holiday. Perhaps, however, the satisfaction on their part will not be so profound as is desired until the Sabbath is made wholly a holiday, and the Sunday rigorously enforced upon all people. But with politics as it is, and with the start that they have, it is probable that their supreme satisfaction will not be long delayed.

June 4, Cardinal Gibbons arrived in Baltimore from Rome, whither he went to receive the red hat from the Pope. His return was in such state as befitted "a prince of the church." It is true that the Government did not send a revenue cutter to meet him, as was done for the Papal ablegate last fall, but the railroad company provided a special car for him, and all the officials of the city of Baltimore headed the immense procession which turned out to do him honor. After parading the streets to the music of no less than eleven bands, the procession halted at the cathedral; "his eminence" entered, and sat down upon *his throne*, when the clergy were graciously allowed to approach him and kiss his great ring. And all this was an "informed reception" tendered to a "prince" who "reigns" in Republican America.

One of the chief characteristics of the denomination known as Disciples, is its teaching that the moral law is abolished. It is therefore with equal surprise and pleasure that we find the following in the *Christian Standard*, the leading journal of that denomination:-

"All of the commands of the stone tables are 'thou shalt nots' and warnings. But there is the same love in the law as in the gospel. The difference is only one of expression, as when I warn one against venturing into a roaring flood, and when, on his leaping madly in, I follow to save him. In the law love warns; in the gospel it plunges in and saves."

The truth on that point could not be more clearly and tersely put. It expresses the exact relation of the law and the gospel. The law warns the man of the danger; when its warning has been unheeded, the gospel pulls the man out; then the law still warns him to keep out.

Says Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., in the *Sunday School Times* of May 28:-

"The obligation of the Sabbath is based upon the Lord's example in the work of creation, and his blessing the Sabbath-day (Gen. 2:3), which, like every other blessing connected with creation, was pronounced at the time, and not deferred until the promulgation of the fourth commandment from Mount Sinai. The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27), not for the Jews alone. This command is of universal obligation, as truly as any other in the decalogue."

These statements do not derive their truth from the fact that they are made by Professor Green; they are true whether anyone believes them or not. They are a part of the Bible truths concerning the Sabbath, which the SIGNS is constantly teaching. Perhaps some who do not dare to trust their own judgment as to the truth of any statement, may accept what Professor Green says as a foundation upon which to build positive knowledge for themselves on the Sabbath question.

It is a fixed principle that a law must always carry with it a penalty; and of course the law-making power must prescribe the penalty. It is also true that the one who makes a law has the right and the power to pardon the transgressor. Now let us apply these principles to the idea that the apostles made laws for the guidance of Christians. If it is claimed that the apostles did enact the moral laws which people are now to follow, then it must also be claimed that they had power to execute the penalty of the law upon the transgressor, or to forgive him. But they are dead, and therefore if they were lawgivers, and their laws are to be enforced, they must either be somewhere administering the government of the earth, or else they must have committed their power to someone else on earth. This savors considerably of Catholic doctrine, and of Popery; but it is not the worst error into which they fall, who claim that the apostles made laws to take the place of the law of God. If they made laws which superseded the Sinaitic law, then of course the sacrifice of Christ, who was offered for the transgressions of the law, can be of no avail under the new law. Therefore it follows that if the law of God be done away, and a new law made by the apostles be in force, one of three things must exist: either there is no pardon for transgressors, or another sacrifice has been made, or else every sinner atones for his own sins. But neither of these can be the case; for besides the name of Christ, "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 3:12. There is no salvation in any other. It seems strange that people with reasoning faculties should say that the apostles made the laws which we are now to obey. Even a child must see that so long as God is king and judge of the universe, so long must the entire universe, not excepting the inhabitants of this little earth, be subject to his law. And he has but one law, and that is the perfect, holy, just, and good law which was spoken from Mount Sinai.

When we speak slightly of the "advanced thought" of this generation, we must not be understood as deprecating new ideas. There are two kinds of advanced thought. One is the kind which does not begin to advance till it has turned aside from the truth. When a man turns his face from the word of God, every step of his advance must be into deeper darkness. The farther he goes with his face from the word, the deeper is his darkness, and consequently the more "advanced" ideas he has, the greater is his exhibition of human folly. But

the man who clings to the law may advance as much as he pleases. He will find in it enough for constant meditation. To such, knowledge is promised: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." John 7:17. "For the Lord giveth wisdom; out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous; he is a buckler to them that walk uprightly." Prov. 2:6, 7. And "the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Prov. 4:18. The man who clings close to the law, may welcome new ideas; yea, he may earnestly pray, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Ps. 119:18.

In the May *Missionary Review* Dr. McCosh tells the story of two young men, graduates of Princeton, both of whom were sons of missionaries, and were born in India, who started out last fall to visit the various colleges and theological seminaries, and invite students to declare themselves to be "willing and desirous, God permitting, to be foreign missionaries." As the result of their work, 1,800 students, out of about 100 educational institutions, have signified their desire to become missionaries. Dr. McCosh thinks that the majority, at least, of those who have offered themselves are sincere and thoroughly in earnest, and says that if the movement is genuine it lays a great responsibility on the church. The point is that the church expects to convert the world, and can with difficulty secure the funds to support those who are already in foreign fields.

### **"The Eighth Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is no greater cause for wonder in this age of wonders, than the inventions which men devise to bolster up Sunday keeping. We know of no so-called argument that has ever been invented that is more wonderful than that which makes Eze. 43:26, 27 a basis for Sunday observance. The wonder is that people with the ability to read and reason for themselves should seriously entertain it. The verses read as follows:-

"Seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it; and they shall consecrate themselves. And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt offerings upon the altar, and your peace offerings; and I will accept you, saith the Lord God."

This reference to "the eighth day" is said to be a prophetic statement that Sunday should be kept. We wonder (1) how people who cannot locate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, can so readily tell on what day the seven days of purification were to begin, so as to make the eighth day come on Sunday; (2) how, after they have so begun their count as to make the eighth day fall on Sunday, they would manage to have the next eighth day come on Sunday also; (3) how they make "upon the eighth day, *and so forward*" refer to every eighth day; and (4) how they can find in a Jewish sacrificial ordinance the slightest reference to a rest-day of any kind.

The argument from this text is so flimsy, so far fetched, and so absurd, that it seems like folly to notice it, yet honest people who were groping for light, have stumbled over it. One text will show the absurdity of the argument. In Lev. 22:27

we read: "When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord." Now according to the Sunday argument from Eze. 43:27, this means that the young sheep or goat should remain with its mother seven days, and that on every eighth day afterward it should be offered for a burnt-offering! That is absurd, it is true, but no more so than it is to talk about keeping Sunday on every eighth day.

**June 30, 1887**

**"What Condemns Men?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Solomon, the man to whom God gave wisdom such as none ever had before or since his time, sums up everything as follows: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12:13, 14. There is a very close connection between these two verses. The statement in verse 14 depends upon that in verse 13. To fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man; and the necessity of performing this duty is enforced by the statement that God shall bring every work into judgment, *with every secret thing*. From these verses, then, we learn: (1) That the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man; there is no duty outside of them; (2) That the ten commandments are the standard by which men shall be judged; for they are to be judged according to what they have done, and the ten commandments is what they are required to do; (3) That the Judgment will take into account every work, and every secret thing; and (4) That therefore the ten commandments cover every work and every secret thing, that is, every thought.

From the nature of the law of God we know that it must of necessity cover every work or thought for which it is possible for God to call men to account. 1. It contains the *whole duty* of man. 2. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. If it is perfect, the man who obeys it strictly must also be perfect, and God requires nothing more than this. Matt. 5:48. 3. Above all, it is the statement of God's character, which is perfect righteousness. God himself calls his law "my righteousness." Isa. 51:5-7. It is the will of God. Rom. 2:17, 18. Now since all God requires of men, in order that he may admit them into his eternal kingdom, is that they should do his will (Matt. 7:21), therefore there can be no duty for man outside of the ten commandments. It is utterly impossible to conceive of any sin which is not forbidden by some one of the commandments.

When this statement is made, people sometimes cite the case of the ancient Israelites, who were required to bring offerings and make sacrifices for sin. On the day of atonement an offering was to be made for the whole congregation, to atone for the sins of all the people; and it was declared that whoever should not afflict his soul on that day should be cut off from among the people. Now it is asked which one of the ten commandments was violated by the man who



refused to regard the day of atonement; and the idea intended to be conveyed by the questioner is that there are moral duties outside of the ten commandments. Again we are cited to the ordinance of baptism as something which the Lord requires, but which the commandments say nothing about. Both these objections are the same, and are covered by the question which we have been asked, "What commandment does a man violate by not having faith in Christ?" We think it can be shown that although death will be the portion of those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, their destruction comes primarily and solely because they have not kept the commandments.

1. In Rom. 6:23 we read that "the wages of sin is death." Wherever there is death there must have been sin, for without sin there is no death. But "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), and therefore it is certain that all who shall be "punished with everlasting destruction," will be punished because they have broken the law. But the law to which the apostle refers is the ten commandments, for Paul says that it was only the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet," that convicted him of sin.

2. We are also told that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23. "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12. "There is none righteous, no, not one." Rom. 3:10. All men then are condemned to death, and condemned solely by the law of God. When Christ was upon earth, he was not acting as judge, but as reconciler, and therefore he did not condemn sinners. He did not come to condemn, but to save. He himself said: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:17, 18.

3. This being true, it follows that nothing which pertains to Christ's work of saving men, can condemn them. Christ came to save the world, not to condemn the world. Therefore nothing in his work of saving the world can condemn the world. Let the reader bear in mind the reason why Christ did not come to condemn. It was not because he had any sympathy for sin, but because he came to save. Now the very fact that he came to save, shows that they were lost. They had violated the law of God, and consequently were "condemned already."

4. The ancient sacrifices, like baptism and the Lord's Supper, were connected with Christ's work of saving men. They were part of the gospel. Men who are "condemned already" may be justified by believing in Jesus. Rom. 3:24-26. Christ has died, and we are saved by faith in him. Our faith in him brings strength to overcome (1 John 5:4), but first we must have the "remission of sins that are past," which is given in return for simple faith in Christ's sacrifice. Now all the ancient sacrifices of the Jews were simply means by which they showed their faith in the Messiah, whose blood could take away sin. In like manner baptism and the Lord's Supper are ceremonies by which we show our faith in Christ's death and resurrection. Someone may say that many of the Jews did not understand the full meaning of their sacrifices, and did not fully understand the work of Christ. Very true, and so thousands of professed Christians do not understand the full meaning of baptism and the Lord's Supper; yet the fact

remains that these ceremonies are for the purpose of manifesting faith in Christ, and the object for which they were designed is not affected in the least by the ignorance of any who may use them.

5. From the above, it will readily be seen that a refusal to offer sacrifices, or to take part in the exercise of the atonement day, indicated a lack of faith in Christ as the Saviour of sinners. Since Christ has ordained that men shall show their faith in him, if they have any, by the ordinances of the gospel, it follows that those who reject those ordinances, do so because they reject Christ and his sacrifice. In other words, they refuse pardon and salvation. All such, without any doubt, will suffer destruction; but it must be remembered that the penalty which they suffer is not as a punishment for failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they might have been freed by accepting the gospel.

Let us illustrate this by something which is more common. Here is a murderer who is under sentence of death. He is told that the Governor will pardon him if he will acknowledge his guilt and make application for pardon, promising, of course, to obey the law in the future. But he refuses to do this, and the law is allowed to take its course, and the man is hanged. Now why is the man hanged? Is he hanged because he refused to sue for pardon? Of course not. He is hanged for the murder. There is no law saying that a man *must* apply for pardon, and making death the penalty of refusal, but there is a law against murder, and death is the penalty for its violation. Whoever commits murder is condemned, and is subject to the penalty. If he is hanged, even though a pardon has been offered and rejected, he is hanged solely for the murder. No part of the penalty is inflicted because he refused the pardon, although every particle of the penalty would have been remitted if he had accepted the pardon.

Carry the illustration a little farther: Here are two murderers in their cells awaiting execution. Both are equally guilty; their crime is the same. Now suppose that pardon is freely offered to one, but not to the other. The one who has been offered pardon refuses it, and both he and the one that had no pardon offered him are hanged. Now which is the guiltier man of the two. When they were put in their cells, both had the same degree of guilt. Has the one who refused to be pardoned acquired additional guilt by that refusal? Not by any means. If he is hanged, he is hanged for precisely the same reason that the other one is, - because he has broken the law.

So it is with the sinner in his relation to the law of God. He is "condemned already." Now Christ comes, offering pardon; if the sinner accepts it, he may be saved; but if he refuses pardon, then the curse of the law, death, is allowed to fall upon him. God *invites* men to be saved, but he has no law to *compel* them to be pardoned. The refusal to receive the pardon is not that for which men are destroyed, but it is the sins which they committed and which condemned them even before the way of salvation was made known to them.

Now if it is borne in mind that a failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, whether in the so-called old dispensation or in the new, is simply a refusal to receive the pardon which the gospel brings, it will be seen that the fact that men were cut off for not afflicting their souls on the day of atonement, is no

evidence whatever that the death penalty is inflicted for anything save violation of the ten commandments. As Christ said, "He that believeth not is condemned already."

"Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 4:3. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23. Not merely have all men broken the law as a whole, but all men have broken every portion of the law, as it is written: "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:10-12. We read also that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Therefore if we were asked, "What commandment does a man violate if he doesn't have faith in Christ?" we should reply that he breaks them all, or rather that he is a breaker of all of them, and that his punishment will be inflicted for such violation and not for his lack of faith.

Once more: Sin is active and positive. Failure to have faith is not an act at all. It is the absence of action. It is a passive condition, which leaves him exposed to punishment for sin, but it is not of itself a sin for which he is to be punished. But enough has been said to make the point clear, that violation of the law of God, and that alone, brings punishment. Let no one think that we lightly regard the ordinances of the gospel. We do not. No one can lightly regard them if he has any just conception of the law of God. But they are not primary duties. The punishment which will be inflicted upon the finally impenitent will be death, just what would have been inflicted upon man if the gospel had never been introduced. The gospel, with its ordinances, furnishes the way by which man may escape the wages of his sins, and therefore it is of the most vital importance. To those who imagine that a belief that men are punished only for violation of the moral law must be at least a partial ignoring of the gospel, the following words are in place:-

"And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

391

But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to *his deeds*." Rom. 2:3-6. W.

### **"Cut Off from Among His People" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Just as we were writing the article, "What Condemns Man," in which we made reference to the cutting off of those who would not afflict their souls on the day of atonement (Lev. 23:29) the following question was received:-

"In Lev. 23:29 it is said that 'whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people.' Does this mean that they were to be killed, or only separated from the people?"

We think the text means that they were to be killed, and the following are some of the reasons for so thinking:-

1. Where the expression "cut off" is used in other similar instances, it is known to mean death. In 2 Sam. 7:9 we read that the Lord had cut off all the enemies of David out of his sight. There can be no question as to the meaning of this. Again, the Lord promised to send an angel before the Israelites, and to "cut off" the Amorites, the Hittites, the Canaanites, etc. Ex. 23:23. And in Josh. 23:3, 4 we read that the great nations had been cut off. We know that those nations had been exterminated.

In 2 Chron. 32:21 we read thus of Sennacherib, who had invaded Judah: "And the Lord sent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land. And when he was come into the house of his god, they that came forth of his own bowels slew him there with the sword." Compare this with 2 Kings 19:35-37, and it will be seen that this cutting off of the mighty men of valor, was the killing of one hundred and eighty-five thousand men.

More positive proof is found in Ex. 31:14: "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Here we see that being "cut off from among his people" is the same as being put to death.

In Num. 15:30, 31 we are told that the soul that should do aught presumptuously should be "cut off from among his people," and again that he should "utterly be cut off;" and in the verses following we are told that one who presumptuously profaned the Sabbath was stoned to death with stones. Read now the sins that are forbidden in Lev. 18:7-26, of which it is said: "For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people." Verse 20. And then read in Lev. 20:2-16 the same list of sins, where it is stated of each one that those who do them "shall surely be put to death." These passages, with many others that might be mentioned, show clearly what meaning usually attaches to the expression "cut off," or "cut off from among his people."

2. This is still more apparent when we consider the meaning of the day of atonement, and the whole Jewish sanctuary service. The Jewish priests served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." Heb. 8:4, 5. Each year of service closed with the day of atonement, and was a type of the whole gospel dispensation. The day of atonement, closing the year of sanctuary service, was a type of the general Judgment, closing the period of human probation. In the work of the sanctuary service the Jews had before them continually a graphic representation of the penalty of the law and of the great propitiation.

When the sinner brought his victim to the door of the sanctuary, and, having confessed his sins upon it, killed it, he signified (1) That the wages of sin is death; (2) That he himself was worthy of death because of his sins; and (3) That he believed in the Lamb of God, who should take away the sin of the world. When the offering was placed upon the altar and entirely burned up, the fate of the victim that was offered for sin showed them what the sinner himself justly

merited; and thus they learned that "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Ps. 37:29.

At that time God was leading his people directly. The Jewish Government was a pure theocracy. Consequently when outbreaking crimes were committed, the offenders were at once put to death. This was not meant to take the place of a final judgment, but was an indication of how God would deal with sinners. So when we come to the closing up of the Jewish service, to the day when the priest made an atonement for the people, to cleanse them from all their sins, the man who obstinately refused to humble himself, with contrition of heart, was cut off, put to death, just as will be done to those who, at the close of the real Judgment, shall be found impenitent. The people of Israel were the people of God; they had his law and his gospel. To be cut off from Israel was to be cut off from God as a worthless branch, and the death penalty was inflicted at once, and thus the type of the real work connected with the sanctuary in Heaven was completed.

It is very common to speak of the finally impenitent, that when the Judgment closes they are found with their sins upon them. This is strictly true, and shows the contrast between the sinner and those whose sins have been washed away in the blood of the Lamb. There is an expression in Num. 9:13, which, while it does not refer to the day of atonement, does have reference to an important feature of the sanctuary work, and shows just why those who refused to take part in any of the ceremonies of the sanctuary were cut off. The passage reads thus:-

"But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbearth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people; because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin."

The Passover represented the sacrifice of Christ, our Passover. The man who was not hindered by absence or sickness, or some other unavoidable circumstance, from celebrating the Passover, and who should indifferently let it pass by, was to be cut off. Why? "Because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin." From this we may learn again, what has before been proved, that failure to accept the gospel, as indicated by neglect of its ordinances, simply left the man to bear his sins, and it was for those sins that he was cut off.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation." Heb. 2:1-3. W.

### **"Who Are the Sadducees?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber enters a mild protest against the doctrine taught in the SIGNS, that when man dies his soul, or spirit, or any part of him, does not continue to live, and he adds: "Are you not becoming modern Sadducees?" We have often

heard it charged that those who do not believe that there is any life for the dead except by means of the resurrection, are Sadducees; but whenever we hear such a charge, we conclude that the one making it has very little idea of what the Sadducees were.

The Sadducees were the cultured aristocracy of the Jewish nation. Two texts of Scripture plainly tell their belief concerning the state of men after death. Read Matt. 22:23: "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection," etc. Their question and Christ's answer, which we will comment upon next week, taken with this statement, show that the Sadducees did not believe that there would ever be any life for the dead. Again we read in Acts 23:6-8: "But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." In direct opposition to this non-resurrection doctrine of the Sadducees, we teach that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts 21:15. We believe that "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his [Christ's] voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:28, 29. We believe that "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible" (1 Cor. 15:52); "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise." 1 Thess. 4:16.

Now we would like to ask our friend who holds that those whom we call dead are not really dead, what he believes in regard to the resurrection. If the righteous dead are not dead at all, but are alive in Heaven, how can Christ come to receive them to himself (John 14:1-3)? and how can he call them from the graves, to clothe them with life and immortality? Is it not clear as noonday that they who hold that the soul of man is by nature immortal, thereby deny the necessity for, or the possibility of, a resurrection? And now, reminding our readers that the distinguishing characteristic of the Sadducees was that they denied the resurrection, we leave them to decide who in modern times most nearly represent the Sadducees-whether it is those who teach that there can be no resurrection, or those who hold that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23), to be bestowed "at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

By an inadvertence the Bible-reading which appeared in last week's SIGNS was not credited. It should have been credited to Mrs. A. W. Heald. The conclusion of the subject appears in this issue.

We are sorry that this week again, as well as last week, we are unable to furnish the regular Sabbath-school lessons, for we know that many of our readers looked anxiously for them; but we have received none to print, and therefore had no alternative. We are sure, however, of the lessons for the next two weeks, and we hope that the Sabbath-school machinery will soon get in such a good running order that the lessons may be furnished to us without any break.

The series of tent-meetings that has been in session in Oakland for the last six weeks, closed Sunday evening, June 26. The attendance has been very good through the entire series, and we think that solemn impressions have been made upon the hearers. Seventeen have taken their stand for the truth, and others are almost persuaded to obey. While the tent-meetings are being continued in another quarter of the city, the interest started by the late effort will be followed up with personal labor; and it is hoped that several more will be gathered in.

In a private letter, Elder G. B. Starr, of Springfield, Ill., says:-

"Well, you may rejoice with us that the Sunday bill failed to become a law. Our friends in the Senate never allowed it to go to a second reading. We feel sure that God worked for us, and held the winds for the work here a little longer. Several urgent petitions were read in the Senate and an effort was made to get the bill through; but the Senate, by a vote of 21 to 14, refused to suspend the rules to consider it. We feel very grateful to God, and shall try to consecrate ourselves anew to his service, to work harder while the day lasts."

We do rejoice that there are men who love justice so well that they will not listen to the voice of bigotry, but will stand against those who preach that no definite day, but only one day in seven, is required by the Lord, but will try to force others to keep a definite day of which their conscience disapproves.

From reports and comments and lesson helps (?) received at this office there can hardly be a doubt that the Sunday-school children throughout the land have actually been taught that the manna did not fall *on Sunday*, and that it would keep only over Saturday night and Sunday. Now even though the subject were a mere matter of history, and nothing more, such teaching could not be excused from the imputation of downright dishonesty, nor would it be by any intelligent person. How much less then can it be excused when the subject is one of divine truth, given by inspiration of God, and which deeply concerns the eternal interests of every human soul. Then, such teaching becomes not only dishonest but it is wicked deception, and is simply teaching rebellion against the Lord by causing the people to trust in a lie. Jer. 28:15, 16.

It has been a standing assertion among a certain class of people that wine drinking tends to temperance, because where wine is freely drunk there will be less whisky consumed. The logic of this has never been very apparent, even though it be allowed that wine drinking diminishes the amount of whisky drinking; for wine itself is an intoxicant, although not so powerful as whisky. But now the falsity of the assertion has been demonstrated. France has always been noted as the great wine country of the world; and if the assertion just noted be true, it ought to be the most temperate. But now we learn that the drinking of spirits has assumed such proportions in that country that the Senate has decided that steps must be taken to diminish it. Drunkenness is getting so common that it cannot be

endured. And this will prove to be the invariable result. The desire for stimulants always increases as it is gratified.

Just before Cardinal Gibbons returned from Bonne, a Baltimore priest named J. L. Andreis preached to his congregation, in St. Levi Church, a discourse which was simply a mass of servile flattery of the Cardinal. It was not simple flattery, either, for the following paragraph from the "sermon" contains blasphemy as great as any that ever issued from the mouth of the beast:-

"The importance of the threefold reception is equal to the meaning. The clergy will spontaneously be made to ask, 'Who is this that cometh from Rome with dyed garments, this beautiful one in his robe, walking in the greatness of his strength? And why is his apparel red, and his garments like them that tread in the winepress?' The answer to them will be that he is their own archbishop, whom the Vicar of Christ has made his immediate counselor, and as such has clad him in red robes," etc.

Those to whom the blasphemy is not apparent will be able to realize it by comparing the paragraph with Isa. 63:1-3.

The report of the "Committee on the Sabbath," at the late Reformed Presbyterian Synod, says:-

"Sunday saloons robbed the working classes of their weeks' pay, and turn the working man's home into a very healthy."

Indeed! It is the Sunday saloon bar robs people. It is the Sunday saloon that turns people's homes into a hell! What a wicked thing that Sunday saloon is! Annihilated it by all means before next Sunday comes, so that the working classes may be perfectly secure in their money, and the working man's home may be made happy. But by all means let the dear, good, honest, week-day saloon, that makes gentle the British husband, that makes kind the cruel father, that protects the promising youth, that turns the working man's home into a paradise-let it remain, and touch it not, for a blessing is in it. Robbery and hell are found alone in the Sunday saloon.

But what makes the Sunday saloon so intensely bad that it must be denounced more than any other saloon? Any saloon at all is an unmitigated curse. Then why condone it on weekdays by condemning it only on Sunday. If the Sunday saloon can be abolished, why cannot all be abolished? There is quite a large class of people who, realizing that the sale of intoxicates cannot yet be absolutely prohibited, propose to cut off as many saloons as possible by high license. This the Prohibitionists denominate "a covenant with death and an agreement with held." Very well. Then the same prohibitionist will loudly denounce the Sunday saloon and demand laws that shall close the saloon on Sunday but let them run full blast all the rest of the week. What is that then but "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," just as much as is the other? The high license folks say, "If we can't yet abolished all, we will abolish all we can." This the Prohibitionists denounce in the unmeasured terms, and then say the same thing, only in other words. We wish the Prohibitionists would stick to their text, and not so stultify themselves. Prohibition absolute, everywhere, all the time, and forever, say we.



### **"The Truth Told" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago a friend sent us a copy of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* of April 3. It contained an article on "Sunday Legislation" by Rev. John Snyder, of St. Louis, who, while he believes in Sunday and Sunday rest, does not favor hasty legislation on the subject. He believes that Sunday should be kept because man needs a rest-day, and Sunday seems to have the majority in its favor, and he knows that the Sunday-sabbath stands on no other foundation than this. He says:-

"The truth must be spoken, and the truth about the Sunday question is simply and briefly this: If we would preserve the day of rest for wholesome and rational use, if we would make it truly a day of peace and worship, it must frankly be placed upon a sure and solid foundation. Every instructed man knows that the Christian Sunday and the Jewish Sabbath are not identical. That the sanctions of the one cannot be transferred to the other. If there is anything plain in the Bible, it is that not 'any day,' but one particular day, is sanctified by the older law, and testified to by miracles. That day is the seventh and not the first day of the week. Every instructed man knows that the Catholic Church gave to the Christian world the Sunday, and determined the manner in which it should be used. And when Protestantism threw off the authority of the Catholic Church it abandoned the only ecclesiastical foundation upon which the Sunday can logically rest."

### **"Is There Room Enough?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

"It is asserted that there is not room enough on the earth for all the people who have ever lived on it. Is there anything in print on the subject? J. M. D."

Yes; the folly of assertion has been shown scores of times, yet it is made with as much confidence as ever. It is a standing objection with infidels against the possibility of a general resurrection, and evinces just about as much learning as the usual run of infidel objections to the Bible. We think that the falsity of the assertion will be apparent to all who read the following brief calculation:-

"The present population of the world is, in round numbers, 1,400,000,000. The earth has been standing about six thousand years. It is true that many people claim that the earth is much older, but they do not claim that it has been inhabited by man for a much longer period. Now we will allow that the entire population has changed every thirty years, and that there were just as many people the first thirty years and every thirty years after, as there are now. This is an exceedingly liberal allowance, for there were but two people in the beginning, and but eight after the flood. The whole number of people, then that have lived on the earth, would be 1,000,000,000,000 or 2,000,000,000,000. Now if we should allow each one of these people a square rod of land for standing room, they would occupy only 2,734,316 square miles. The area of the United States and Territories is 3,442,198 square miles. Therefore all the people who have ever lived on the earth could be accommodated in the United States, with ample room

for everyone and there would be more than 800,000 square miles of land to spare."

Don't be afraid when infidels prate about the impossibility of things which the Bible says shall take place. There was never an infidel assertion that could stand for a moment against the Bible. All the arguments brought to bear in the Bible have had less effect than so many feathers would have upon the rock of Gibraltar.

**July 7, 1887**

**"The Question of the Sadducees" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

"The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren; and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother; likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine teaching." Matt. 22:23-33.

Well might the multitude be astonished at the wonderful readiness with which the Master put to silence the cavilings of the infidel Sadducees. The reply of Jesus was simple, as was all of our Lord's teaching, -so very simple that people who are looking for a great display often misunderstand it. First of all, it must be premised that Jesus exactly and completely answered the objection which the Sadducees raised. They denied the resurrection, and brought a hypothetical case to show, as they supposed, that the doctrine of the resurrection could not be reconciled with the teachings of Moses. Thus they hoped to put Jesus to confusion before the multitude, who revered Moses as a prophet of God.

The first thing that Jesus said to the Sadducees was, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." This was said in view of their denial of the resurrection. The same may with propriety be said to all who deny the resurrection, or who, while professedly believing in the resurrection, hold theories which are virtually denials of it. They who know the Scriptures, know that the dead will be raised, for the Scriptures are full of this doctrine; scores of texts which do not speak directly of the resurrection, prove that doctrine most conclusively, when, like the one with which our Saviour silenced the Sadducees, they are correctly interpreted. And they who know the power of God will never cavil at anything which his word declares shall be done.

Since the Sadducees denied the resurrection, and asked their question in order to prove that there could be no such thing, we must conclude that the reply of Jesus was positive proof that there will be a resurrection. Let us read his proof again: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." From the expression, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," may have supposed that Jesus taught that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then living, and that Jesus met the caviling of the Sadducees by proving to them the immortality of the soul. But if that were the case, their objection would not have been answered. They were denying the resurrection of the dead. Now if Jesus had given them a discourse on the immortality of the soul, and had claimed that the essential part of man, the man himself, can never die, he would not have touched their objection, nor proved anything about the resurrection of the dead. On the contrary, if he had proved that the patriarchs and all others never really died, he would have denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as much as the Sadducees did. If there be no death, there can be no resurrection. Therefore we must conclude that since Jesus effectually silenced the Sadducees in their denial of the resurrection, he did not assume that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had never really died, and were then living.

To make this more evident, we quote Christ's words as recorded by Mark. Jesus said: "For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" Mark 12:25, 26. Here it is evident that Christ based his argument on the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were *dead*; for he says that the words of God at the bush (see Ex. 3:1-6) are proof that *the dead rise*. Such an argument could not have been made if the patriarchs were the alive in some part of the universe. Christ's answer to the Pharisees proves that the dead are not in existence, as fully as it proves that there will be a resurrection of the dead; for he could not prove the resurrection of the dead if there were no dead. Those, therefore, who say that Jesus here taught that the soul of man never dies, not only occupy the Sadducean ground that there can be no resurrection, but they do so in the face of Christ's positive argument showing that the dead shall rise.

If we turn to Luke's account we shall find still more light on this matter: "And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die any more*; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush," etc. Luke 20:34-37. Here we learn that Jesus was speaking of those who are *dead*, as were the Sadducees themselves. The resurrection is spoken of as something future, for "they which *shall be accounted worthy to obtain* that world, and *the resurrection from the dead*," cannot "*die any more*."

It seems impossible that anyone should carefully read what Jesus said to the Sadducees, as recorded by the three evangelists, and still claim that he held to the idea of the conscious existence of those who are called dead. Such an idea is not reconcilable with his words; for he speaks of *the dead*, which he could not do if there were no dead; and he says that the dead shall *rise*, which he could not say if they had already risen, not from the dead, but from this life to a higher one; and he says they who are accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead, *cannot die any more*, which would be nonsense if nobody had ever died. If Jesus had held the theory that "there is no death," as professed theologians of this day often claim, he could only have said, "Moses showed that there are no dead, but that those whom you call dead are living;" but in that case he would not have touched their anti-resurrection theory, neither would he have shown the folly of their supposed case of the woman and the seven brothers. What he did show was that those who are dead have not perished beyond the hope of recovery; God does not call himself the God of creatures which exist for a brief space and then become as extinct as the crumbling leaf. But he is God "both of the dead and living," for the dead are having only a temporary sleep; God's thoughtful care for them does not cease when they die; but he marks the place where they lie, and at the last day "he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect," and the dead in Christ shall come forth from their graves. See Matt. 24:31; John 5:28, 29; 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. They rise to immortal life, and the little time they have unconsciously slept is as though it were no break in their lives.

It will be worth while to notice more particularly how completely the objection of the Sadducees was met and answered. Jesus said that they erred because they did not know the Scriptures; and then he showed wherein, by stating that in the resurrection there would be no marrying nor giving in marriage, because, being children of the resurrection, they could not die any more. The arrangement to which the Pharisees referred (see Deut. 25:5-19; Ruth 3:11-13; 4:1-6) was made so that a man's inheritance in the land of Canaan might not pass out of his family. If a man died without an heir, his property would pass into other hands; but if his brother should marry his widow, the first-born was to be counted as the heir of the one who died, and thus the homestead would be retained.

But all this will be unnecessary for those who "shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead," for the Scripture says that "they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." Isa. 65:21, 22. They cannot die any more, therefore there is no need of any arrangement for keeping the inheritance in the family. The new earth, the inheritance promised to Abraham, will after the resurrection and its restoration be portioned out to all who are Christ's and consequently Abraham's seed. Gal. 3:29. The whole earth will be thus divided, and then each man's inheritance will remain unimpaired throughout eternity. Thanks be to God, who has devised means "that his banished be not expelled from him," and who, though the dead are "as water spilt on the ground,

which cannot be gathered up again" (compare 2 Sam. 14:14 and Job 14:10-12), can call himself their God, through his power to quicken the dead, and call "those things which be not as though they were." Rom. 4:17. W.

### **"We Have Abraham to Our Father" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Matt. 3:9. These are the words which John the Baptist spoke to the Pharisees and Sadducees who came to his baptism. These men were corrupt at heart. Their character is described by our Saviour himself in Matt. 23:13-33, where they are said to have outwardly appeared righteous, while within they were full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Both John the Baptist and our Saviour called them vipers.

These men were lineal descendants of Abraham, and were of the stock of Israel, but they had lost the spirit of Israel. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob confessed that they were pilgrims and strangers on the earth. Heb. 11:13. They did not expect their portion in this life, nor an earthly inheritance; but they looked for a city from Heaven, and an inheritance in the new earth, wherein righteousness alone should dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. And they knew that the possession of righteousness would be the only passport to that heavenly inheritance.

The Pharisees, on the other hand, had ceased to look for a Messiah who should finally reign over a righteous nation, and who should prepare subjects for that kingdom by cleansing them from sin. They did not look at their hearts, which were corrupt, but only on the outward appearance, which was fair. Consequently, seeing no sin in themselves, they felt no need of a Saviour. And so they came to John's baptism, not because they felt any need of flying from the wrath to come, but because they thought that by enrolling themselves in the ranks of the new leader, whose coming John announced, they would be sure of places of honor in the coming kingdom. They expected that that kingdom would bring simply emancipation from the Roman yoke, and would place the Jewish nation in the seat of dominion over the whole world; and they had not the slightest doubt but that they would have a place in the kingdom, because they were children of Abraham. Their sole anxiety was to have as high a place as possible.

John saw through their mask of hypocrisy, and told them that they need not flatter themselves that they were children of Abraham. The promise to Abraham and to his seed would be fulfilled, but sooner than count them as the seed of Abraham, God would raise up children unto Abraham, out of the stones of the ground. The inheritance was promised to Abraham, not because God regarded his person or his descent as superior to that of other men, but because he had the righteousness of faith. Consequently those who are counted as heirs with him, must be men of like character. It certainly would not be just to accept Abraham solely because of his faith in God, and to accept others solely on account of their parentage.

Afterward, when Christ was talking to the wicked Jews, he said, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." John 8:39. The apostle Paul also says, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:29. The Pharisees who came to John to be baptized thought that the fact that they could prove their descent from Abraham, would insure them a place in the kingdom of Christ; but Paul shows that they had turned the matter around. They could only prove themselves children by bringing forth such works of repentance as would show them to be Christ's.

There are many today who have as erroneous ideas of the kingdom of Christ as the Pharisees and the Sadducees had. There is a large party called the National Reform Association, whose members think that Christ's kingdom is going to be established at the polls, by the voices of men. And they imagine that they are sure of a place in that kingdom, because they can trace their ancestry back to the Covenanters, or some of the Reformers. They forget that the Reformers did not follow the multitude, but took the Bible for their guide, as far as its truths were revealed to them, and that in following its teachings they suffered untold hardships. The Reformers became such solely because their love for God and his truth was so great as to lead them to endure privation and to be considered as outcasts. And yet these men imagine that they can ride into the kingdom of God on the top wave of popularity. How terribly mistaken they will some day be.

The kingdom of Christ is promised only to the true Israel, but the true Israel are only those "whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. 2:29. Those who will be great in that kingdom, must be content to be small here; and whosoever will be chief, must be a servant; "even as the Son of man [the King himself] came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20:28. He was in the form of God, and had all glory and honor, yet when he saw the lost world, he did not think his glory was a thing to be desired, so he laid it all aside, and "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth." Phil. 2:7-10.

"The servant is not great than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." Let none therefore imagine that he is going to get into the kingdom on the strength of a profession, nor because he is a descendant of the Reformers, nor because he is a member of a large and influential church organization. Let none think that he can be more favored than the King, and can obtain the kingdom by any other means than humble self-denial and a godly life. Neither let any think that Christ's reception of the kingdom depends on them. He receives his kingdom from the Father (Ps. 2:7, 9; Dan. 7:13, 14), and will admit into it only those who upon the foundation of faith have built a superstructure of virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. 2 Peter 1:5-11. W.

## **"The Baptism of Fire" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

To the multitude who ad come to the banks of Jordan to be baptized, John the Baptist said: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Matt. 3:11. There is no question but that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was administered on the day of Pentecost, although it is not probable that John had special reference to that occasion. That was simply a notable example of what John said should take place. All believers in Christ must be baptized with the Spirit, and must "walk in the Spirit," if they share the final reward. But many people suppose that the baptism of fire was also administered on the day of Pentecost, which is a grave error.

The next verse plainly indicates what was meant by the baptism of fire: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." This shows that although the words of verse 11 were addressed to all the multitude, John did not mean that all should receive both the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the baptism of fire. He might baptize them all with water, and thus they might all be counted by men as followers of Christ; but He who should come after, would have his fan in his hand, and would thoroughly purge his floor, saving the wheat, and burning up the chaff in the fire. This is the meaning of John's words. The expression, "He will thoroughly purge his floor," shows that especial reference is made here to those who, by baptism, have professed to be Christ's. It was well understood by all that those who did not profess to be Christ's would be destroyed, but here they are shown that a profession alone is not sufficient, because the floor will be purged.

Now there was no baptism of fire on the day of Pentecost. It is true that "there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them" (Acts 2:3), but this was not a baptism of fire. In the first place it is not said that there was actual fire present, but something which had the appearance of fire. Secondly, even if it had been fire, it would not have constituted a baptism of fire, for baptism is not administered in that way. Baptism means immersion, or an overwhelming. The disciples were baptized with the Holy Spirit, because "it filled all the house where they were sitting." They were completely submerged in the Spirit. And the cloven tongues like fire formed a part of this manifestation of the Spirit.

But who will receive the baptism of fire? All those who do not receive the Spirit, or who, having once received it, do not walk in it, they will be burned up in that fire that shall burn as an oven. In Rev. 20:10; 21:8 it is said that the wicked shall have their part in a "lake of fire." The whole earth will be melted (2 Peter 3:10) with the fervent heat, and will present the appearance of a sea of liquid fire. "And the works that are therein shall be burned up." The destruction of the wicked in this lake of fire may, without doing violence to language, fitly be called a baptism. In this lake of fire they will be submerged, and will be consumed root and branch.

Thus John was speaking of two baptisms,-one which saves and one which destroys. And since he was talking, not to certain individuals whose destiny he might foresee, but was talking to the multitude collectively, some of whom would be saved, and some lost, he could truthfully say to them collectively, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *and* with fire." Some of them would receive one baptism, and some the other.

There are some well-meaning persons who pray to be baptized with fire; and there are hymns which call for the baptism of fire. Such prayers and hymns cannot but cause a shudder to one who knows what the baptism of fire will be. Let us pray above all things for the baptism of the Spirit, but let us pray most earnestly to be saved from the baptism of fire. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The new meeting-house in Healdsburg will be dedicated the last Sabbath in July. More next week.

It is said that an English scientist has been making experiments by which he concludes that the effect which alcohol has upon a person is determined by the amount of brain that he possesses. He made his experiments upon pigs, which have very small brains, and found that alcohol had very low appreciable effect on them. Hereafter when a man boasts that whiskey has no effect on him, the people will know the reason.

Various comments are made upon the conviction of Jake Sharp, the notorious New York briber, but quite a common sentiment seems to be that he should receive only a nominal sentence, because he is an old man. We cannot see that age is an extenuating circumstance. On the contrary, it rather aggravates the offense. One man says that the ignorant and corrupt aldermen who were anxious to receive bribes, should be punished instead. And still another says that Sharp did what any other businessman would do,-he found a set of corrupt aldermen, and he used them to further his ends. That is to say that Sharp should not be punished, because he would never have given bribes if somebody had not been willing to receive them. All of which shows that there is among many businessmen a very low grade of morality.

It is said that Dr. McGlynn calls himself the Martin Luther of the nineteenth century, but we fear that he is still too much of a Catholic to be able to appreciate the work of Martin Luther. The only likeness between the two men is their opposition to Popish tyranny, but their opposition is from entirely different standpoints. Martin Luther's work was wholly on a moral basis. He sought to free the minds of the people from the bondage of Papal superstition, and to teach them that "the just shall live by faith." Dr. McLynn's work has solely a political aspect. He is not seeking to reform the church nor the people outside of the church, and his aim seems to be to teach the American citizen that he shall live by free land. His opposition to the Catholic Church is only to the extent that that church opposes his land theories. There is plenty of room for reformers, but they must preach the word, and not preach land.



The "Seybert Commission" that has been investigating Spiritualism for some time, has finished its labors, and reports that Spiritualism is wholly a fraud. The members says that they had the best mediums in the world before them, and that afterwards they had a professional juggler, who did everything that the mediums did. This decision will satisfy a few people; but those who know anything of Spiritualism, whether they believe it or not, will have little regard for it. A skillful general will always conceal his movements, and no doubt Satan is pleased to have "scientific" men thus pronounce Spiritualism a fraud, so the people may still continue blind as to what Spiritualism really is, and may fall into its snare even while they are denouncing it. There is only one way to successfully investigate Spiritualism and that is with the Bible as a guide. The "investigation" conducted by the "Seybert Commission" seems to have been a very tame affair, but the very best "scientific" investigation will never amount to anything in explaining the phenomena, for the simple reason that the devil is more acute than any scientists, and can fool them every time.

### **"Faith Healing" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the *California Christian Advocate* says:-

"I am persuaded the cause of religion, and Methodism in particular, is suffering to-day from 'Holiness Bands' and 'faith-cure' fanaticisms more than from any other source. If the failures to heal were reported as faithfully as the supposed cures, there would be less of the latter in a little while."

We are convinced that this is the truth. But while we say this, we do not wish to be understood as decrying real holiness or denying the efficacy of faith in the healing of disease. What we do object to as bringing a reproach upon true religion, is "holiness" that would never be recognized if the possessor did not call attention to it, and to "faith" that is advertised as a quack doctor would advertise his nostrums. We believe most implicitly in the truth of James 5:14, 15. We have seen marked instances of healing in answer to prayer. We do not believe that anything that concerns the welfare of God's creatures is of too little importance for him to notice; and we believe and know that in *all* cases of necessity he may with confidence be implored for help.

But there is nothing in the Bible nor in common sense that would indicate that God will interpose to save a lazy man from starving, or that he will work a miracle to cure a man who is in distress, when a cure might be effected by taking a bath or drinking a copious draught of warm water. In other words, while we are to recognize that it is only because of God's continued care that we live at all, and that we "ought always to pray," we are not to expect God to do for us directly that which he has given us the power to do for ourselves. Neither are we to suppose that God holds himself subject to the beck of everybody who thinks he knows what he wants better than the Lord does. The Lord has all power; but for a man to set up a "cure" and advertise himself as the Lord's special agent in healing disease, and to warrant a cure every time, is blasphemous presumption.

## **"Rome's Work" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

Dr. McGlynn's case is assuming pretty large proportions. The following cablegram was sent from New York to Cardinal Simconi at Rome, for the Pope, June 22:-

"One hundred thousand Catholics, in a mass-meeting held in this city on Saturday, June 19, denounced the threatened excommunication of Dr. McGlynn, with whom they are prepared to stand, and protest against ecclesiastical interference with the political rights of American citizens.

JEREMIAH COUGHLIN, M. D., *Chairman*.

JAMES GAHAN, *Secretary*."

But this is not all. Owing to the continued pressure upon him from Rome, Dr. McGlynn has begun to grow resentful, and is telling some things that he knows about Romish affairs. In an interview, June 23, he said:-

"The people may know, what I can tell them on the highest authority: The Roman machine is to-day most anxious to have a minister of the Pope accredited to, and received by, the Government at Washington. Such minister would be an archbishop and one of the Italian ring, in whose hands it is the Roman policy to keep the power. His presence there could not fail to be a fruitful source of corruption and enslavement for the Catholic Church in this country. The Pope is also trying to have diplomatic relations with Queen Victoria, in order, as he is alleged, 'to be able to get accurate information about Irish affairs.'"

We have not the least doubt that this is the exact truth. Nor have we the least doubt that the Pope, under cover of the Irish question, will yet succeed in establishing diplomatic relations with England. Nor have we *much* doubt that the Papacy will yet have an accredited minister at the capital at Washington. When the Papacy shall have been recognized as a sovereign power by all the powers of Europe, and thus becomes a personal factor in all the affairs of European States, exceedingly plausible reasons can be produced to show that this Government ought to receive an accredited ambassador from one of the chief sovereign powers of the world. It might well be counted the height of presumption for the Government of the United States to refuse recognition to a sovereign power that was recognized as such by all the world besides. These arguments would be exceedingly convincing to politicians, when backed by the solid Catholic vote of the nation.

As for these "one hundred thousand Catholics," what does Rome care for them so long as she receives official recognition, and is courted by Governments and nations? She knows that this, being entirely political, will soon blow over. Besides, she is playing for larger stakes than anything that is involved in the question of disobedience of a mere priest. And with the accumulated experience of centuries she knows she holds the winning hand, and she, above all others, knows how to play it. The secret of Rome's consummate power is that she looks not at things in the narrow view of parties and administrations, but in the broad view of nations and ages.

## **"Trusting a False Guide" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of a religious weekly we find the following:-

"Think how Abraham received his message in Chaldea. Little by little his mind opened to the truth. Day after day he became more certain of divine help. By and by, clear and sweet as an audible voice, came the words into his soul, 'I will bless thee,' and 'thou shalt be a blessing.' The Holy Spirit will bring the words of Jesus so close that you know they were sent from God to you."

This paragraph occurred in the course of an article designed to teach that we should recognize God in our every-day life. The real effect of such things is, however, to induce people to take their own imaginings for the voice of God. We have seen of late a strong tendency toward eliminating the supernatural from the Bible, and bringing everything down to the human level. The "new school" will have it that God did not speak to Abraham with an audible voice, but that when the Bible says that God spoke to Abraham, it means that he had an overpowering impulse from within, to do a certain thing. We cannot expect such people to be logical, but if they were, they would necessarily have to explain the command to offer Isaac, and the subsequent call to Abraham not to harm the lad, as meaning that Abraham felt an uncontrollable impulse to kill Isaac, which, when he had the knife in his hand, suddenly passed away. The great trouble with such interpretation is not alone that it robs the Bible narrative of all sense and consistency, but that it teaches people to follow the insane promptings of their own hearts. It teaches that the voice of God is simply a strong impression, and is thus identical with the Spiritualist teaching that "truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul." And all such teaching, if believed, as it surely will be, can result in nothing else but moral anarchy and corruption. We may never hear the voice of God as did Abraham, and there is no need that we should, for God's will is fully revealed in his word, and we are to follow that; and not feelings and impressions. That alone can make us wise unto salvation. It is as true now as it ever was, that "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool."

**July 14, 1887**

## **"The Growth of Evil" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a growing tendency towards the belief that evil is a necessary thing in this world. This is a fundamental principle in the creed of Spiritualists, and it is gaining ground exactly in proportion to the growth of Spiritualism. Spiritualism professes to be a religion of nature, and sin being natural, it is very evident that the idea that sin is necessary will very easily find a multitude of adherents. The very fact that Spiritualism makes such a claim is sufficient evidence that, despite its pretension to elevate the race to the love of the pure and the beautiful, it can only result in the total degradation of the race; for let men once be assured that evil is in even the slightest degree necessary in this world, and they will be sure to make no efforts to get rid of a thing which is so pleasing to them.

A few Sundays ago, Professor Fiske, of Harvard University, lectured before the Unitarian Society of San Francisco. His address was on the nature and origin of evil. Following is a portion of the newspaper report of the address:-

"Mr. Fiske then went into a discussion of considerable length to establish the relativity of all knowledge. We know nothing, he said, except by contrast with or relation to something else. If there were only one color in the world, we would be unable to conceive the idea of color at all. If everything were as sweet as sugar, we would not know what taste means. In the same way, evil exists only by contrast-the contrast of a lesser good with a greater. Evil may be defined as a low stage of existence looked at from a higher one. There is ground for the hope that evil may be evanescent in the universe, but it now exists as a necessary condition of the development of man, like the relation of the shadow to the light. Were there no evil in the world, there could be no morality-no man in the highest sense; human beings would be so many puppets, but such a thing as character would be impossible."

With all due respect for the learned Professor, we can think of nothing else, as we read his words, but the apostle's description of the downward progress of enlightened men toward heathenism: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." Rom. 1:22-25.

Such teaching as that of Professor Fiske is identical with that which sunk the ancient world into the most licentious idolatry, and it cannot fail to have the same effect now if it is but followed. Our boasted superior enlightenment will be no bar whatever to such a result; for, in spite of our boasting, the ancients were wiser than we, and it was, in fact, their boasted wisdom which led them into such folly and degradation.

Take now the statement that evil is necessary, and that without it there can be no morality. Can anyone fail to see that this makes the goodness of God dependent upon evil, and actually denies his absolute goodness? and that this is simply to deny his existence as God, and to degrade him to a level with man? This is identical with what Paul said: "They changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." And when men have done that, the changing of it still further into an image like to fourfooted beasts and creeping things, and giving of themselves up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, is only a question of time, and not a very long time, either.

The Professor thinks there is ground for hoping that evil may be evanescent; but what necessity is there for such a hope, or what incentive to induce man to eradicate it in himself, if evil is only a lesser good, and consequently no evil at all? Indeed, if it were true that evil is a necessary condition without which there could be no morality, then it would follow that evil ought not to be evanescent; for no matter to what heights of morality man had attained, we would begin to degenerate as soon as the evil was removed! Is it possible to conceive of a more

absurd proposition? Yet in spite of its absurdity, it is seriously advanced by men who have committed to them the task of educating the youth of our land.

This theory is simply another way of expressing the idea that "whatever is right;" that man can do no wrong, for really there is no wrong. So, then, whatever a man may do, it is only a necessary step in his development. This is a pleasing thought to the carnal heart, and one that will find adherents without much urging. Now when it is remembered that "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked," and that "from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness" (and these statements may be verified by anyone who knows much of his own heart), it is easy to see how those who think that all the impulses of their nature are only undeveloped good, could plunge into any excess. Public sentiment may act as a restraint upon a man with such an idea; but when the public sentiment is the same, when the majority of people conclude that nothing that they want to do is evil, then there will be no restraint, and the floods of iniquity will cover the earth.

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God." 2 Tim. 3:1-4. It now requires no prophet's eye to see this state of things just ahead. When men occupying the highest positions as moulders of the thought of the rising generation, can without rebuke give utterance to sentiments that directly lead to unrestrained vice, it is surely time for an alarm to be sounded.

"But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:11, 12. W.

### **"The Sure Word" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." 2 Peter 1:19.

The apostle is not comparing one prophecy with another, but he is comparing prophecy with something else. He does not say that we have one word of prophecy that is "more sure" than some other word, but that the word of prophecy is more sure than some other thing. What that other thing is we may learn from the context. In verses 16-18 he speaks of the certainty of Christ's coming, and the reason why he is so certain in regard to it. He says: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we

were with him in the holy mount." The idea is this: At the transfiguration the apostles saw Christ just as he will appear when he comes in his glory. They also heard the voice of God from Heaven. So when they declared the coming of Christ, they did it on the evidence of both their eyes and their ears. This is accounted the best possible evidence; but Peter says that there is something that is more sure than this. What is it? It is the "sure word of prophecy." It is possible that a person's eyes or ears might deceive him, but there is no possibility of doubt in regard to the prophecy. And why not? Because it did not come "by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The prophecy, therefore, is as reliable as God himself. There are very few things in this life upon which we can depend implicitly; how gladly, then, we ought to receive this sure word, and how eagerly we ought to search it.

### **THE OBJECT OF PROPHECY**

As noted by Peter, the object of the sure word of prophecy is that we may be more certain in regard to Christ's coming, for that is the grand event to which all prophecy points. Christ's first advent was the basis of many prophecies, and it was the most momentous event since the creation of the world. Upon that coming the redemption of the whole human race depended; but even that with its attendant sacrifice would be lost to us if Christ were not to come the second time. Christ came and died that man might be redeemed, to reign with him forever; but those whom he has purchased cannot be with him unless, according to his promise, he comes again to redeem them to himself. There is no other way by which we can go to Heaven. So the redemption of the race depends fully as much upon Christ's second coming as upon the first. It is no wonder, then, that so much prophecy has been given in regard to so important an event. We will examine a little of it, and we shall see that the coming of our Lord is not so vague and indefinite a matter as some would have us believe.

### **NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM**

This dream, related in the second chapter of Daniel, is familiar to every reader of the Bible. The circumstances attending it are such as would attract the attention of one who was reading merely for pleasure, for they are highly interesting. But our interest in the narrative is increased a thousand-fold when we learn the object and interpretation of the dream. The object of the dream is told in few words. Daniel said to the king, "There is a God in Heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar *what shall be in the latter days.*" Then it is for us far more than for Nebuchadnezzar.

The dream was as follows: A great image, bright in appearance and terrible in form, appeared to the king. Its head was of fine gold, its breast and arms and its feet of mingled clay and iron. While the king looked upon this image, a stone was cut out of the mountain without the aid of human hands. This stone smote the image upon the feet, and instantly the whole image was reduced to fine powder,

and was blown away; but the stone immediately became a great mountain and filled the whole earth.

The interpretation of the dream occupies but little more space. Daniel, after reminding the king that God has given him universal dominion, tells him that his kingdom is symbolized by the head of gold. The other three divisions of the image, the silver, the brass, and the iron, symbolize three other universal empires. The last one of these is to be divided into ten parts, as is indicated by the ten toes of the image, which shall be distinct from each other. And now comes the closing scene: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall *stand for ever*. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king *what shall come to pass*

423

*hereafter*: and the dream is certain, and *the interpretation thereof sure*." Dan. 2:44, 45.

This dream with its interpretation was not given that men might be informed in regard to earthly kingdoms, but for the sole purpose of pointing out the fifth universal kingdom. Then we may know something in regard to the time of its setting up. Let us follow the connection. Babylon was conquered by the Medes and Persians, B.C. 538. Medo-Persia, then, was the empire symbolized by the breast and arms of silver. The Persian Empire in its turn gave away to the Greeks. This took place B.C. 321. Here we have three of the four kingdoms; and since there were to be but four universal, earthly monarchies, the fourth cannot be difficult to locate. There is no doubt but that Rome was symbolized by the iron part of the image. It was at the height of its power at the first advent of Christ, having fully completed the conquest of Greece half a century before. There is no disputing the fact that it was universal in its dominion, and Scripture proof of the fact is found in Luke 2:1. Now we have the four universal empires before us. Where shall we look for the setting up of the fifth. In the days of Christ? No; because Rome was then undivided. It could not be set up until the division of that empire into its ten parts, which was completed A.D. 457. The coming of Christ, and the setting up of his everlasting kingdom, is the next thing brought to our view. And this is in reality the next thing to be accomplished. Certain things must be done by powers that now exist, but when earthly governments again fall, their place will be taken by Christ's kingdom.

Now is not this a sure word of prophecy? Kingdoms have risen and fallen just as predicted by the prophet. He said that the ten divisions of the Roman Empire would seek to consolidate their power, but would be unsuccessful, and so it has been. Every attempt to unite the nations of Europe has ended in failure. And if the past has been fulfilled to the letter, we have the assurance that that which yet remains will as surely be fulfilled. Inspiration did not point out the length of time that these earthly kingdoms should exist, and it has not told when the heavenly kingdom will be set up, but we know it cannot be far distant. The divided state of

the image has continued for 1,400 years, much longer than any other division. Other prophecies show more definitely that the end is very near. We learn from this that God's kingdom is as much a reality as any earthly kingdom, and that those whose interest is in earthly things can have no part in it. Are we fitting ourselves for citizenship in that glorious, everlasting kingdom? W.

### **"Life and Death Everlasting" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

When we read the words of the Lord concerning the wicked, "For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of all the land;" "for yet a little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction" (Isa. 10:23, 25), and say that the Lord never designed to keep the wicked alive to all eternity suffering torture, we are told that if we limit the suffering of the wicked we have no assurance that the righteous will have everlasting happiness.

This idea is based upon the erroneous idea of what is to constitute the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. It is true that the wicked are to suffer torment, and the righteous to have fullness of joy evermore at the right hand of God; but neither of these constitute the reward promised to the two classes. All that is promised to the righteous is life. Said Christ, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10:10. "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5:10. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the *promise of life* which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 1:1.

To the wicked, death is threatened, "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. "But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and

424

all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; *which is the second death.*" Rev. 21:8. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Deut. 30:19. "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Rom. 8:13.

We find that everywhere the choice is between life and death. The reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are exactly opposite. As we said, all that is primarily promised to the righteous is life, but that comprehends everything else. The man who has unlimited life may have all things. Then, too, that promised life is really *life*. It is not partial life, as is our short life, but perfect life in every organ, so that there will be no sickness to interfere with plans. Therefore we say that this promise of life comprehends all blessings that may be desired.

But how long will it last? To all eternity, for the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. "But," says one, "you limit the punishment of the



wicked, which the Bible declares will be eternal, and why may you not as well limit the reward of the righteous?" That is a mistake; we do not put a limit to the punishment of the wicked. It will be everlasting, that is, without end. It will be just as long as the reward of the righteous. "These [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. 25:46. But this does not say that the wicked shall be in eternal *torment*. As we have seen, the punishment of the wicked is not primarily suffering, but it is death. They will suffer torment, and doubtless for a very long time, but until death shall have ensued they will not have received their punishment. Since their punishment is death, and it is also eternal, it follows that the punishment of the wicked is eternal death. And this agrees exactly with the words of Paul, who says that they "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*." 2 Thess. 1:9.

There is no life except in Christ. The righteous have the promise of life which is in Christ. Their life is hid with Christ in God. And when they, in common with all men, are redeemed from the death which came upon them as the result of their inherited mortality, they will live as long as Christ does. The wicked, however, after having their mortal life restored to them, shall be punished with death for the sins which they have committed, and when they go down to the grave the second time there is no way by which they can be rescued, and they "sleep a perpetual sleep." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

The last Australian steamer brought meager news from the laborers there, owing to the fact that it sailed a little sooner than was expected. A brief note from Elder Daniels states that the church in Auckland now occupy their own house of worship, and that a missionary society of forty members has been organized.

Subscriptions to the *American Sentinel* are now coming in a way to delight the hearts, not only of the publishers, but of all who believe that the *Sentinel* has an important work to do. Every mail brings in scores, and some hundreds of subscriptions. That it does occupy a position second to none in importance is conceded by all who are awake to the issues of the day. Let its friends rally to its support.

One of the main points in a recent address delivered by George W. Cable, in Nashville, Tenn., was that "the ideal government must be by a minority, elected by the majority, whose will is to be appealed to frequently, administered in harmony with the higher law of God." Of course it is understood that the majority are to decide what is in harmony with that higher law of God; and there you have National Reform governments in a nutshell.

The *Truth Seeker*, which is the inappropriate name of the chief infidel organ in this country, has a correspondent who has been studying Spiritualism in Boston. As the result of his investigations he reports that all the Spiritualists are infidels, but that not all infidels are Spiritualistic. He is undoubtedly correct, but if he should make his investigations a few years from now he would have to change

the last part of his report, for all the infidels will then be Spiritualists. But they will still be infidels.

Quite a stir has been made of late over the charge that Canon Fleming, of the Church of England, had appropriated one of Dr. Talmage's sermons, and had preached it as his own. The Canon now admits the deed, and confesses that he was guilty of an "inadvertence." This is the latest euphemism for stealing. What with "defalcations," "shortages," "failures," "appropriations," "inadvertances," etc., we shall soon have no such thing as stealing. Then will all the world be honest! But it will be honesty that will correspond to the chastity of the ancient Spartans, among whom, we are told, it was impossible to find an adulterer, and that they knew not what the name adultery meant. This, however, was solely because what is now universally known as adultery was exceedingly common, and was sanctioned by law. This seeking to relieve a thing of the odium attached to it, by changing its name, is indirectly encouraged by those who think to avoid the imputation of breaking the fourth commandment calling the first day of the week the seventh.

The tithe question is making no small stir in Wales. The case stands thus: The Church of England being a State church, derives its income from the country, just the same as the general Government. The tithe is the tax which the church imposes for the support of its ministers. Now many of the farmers of Wales are dissenters, and while they may be willing to give even more than a tithe for the support of the gospel, they do not wish to be forced to pay, nor to pay tithe at all for a religious establishment with which they have no sympathy. Accordingly the English Government proceeds to sell their property for delinquent church taxes, and the farmers rebel. The same thing would be done in this country if the National Reformers had their scheme in running order. Everybody, Jew, Gentile, and Christian, would be *compelled* to pay for the support of the ministers of the State religion, just as they now have to pay for the support of the civil Government which protects them, no man ought to be *compelled* to contribute for the support of any religion. And the injustice is increased when the support is demanded of one who is not in sympathy with the ecclesiastical establishment. But justice in any particular is not to be expected when religion is made a matter of politics.

### **"To What Profit?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking of the study of the Sunday-school scholars and teachers, during the past six months, the *Congregationalist* says:-

"We doubt if the Old Testament has ever been studied with more eager interest, or with greater profit and delight."

And yet the lesson for June 5, on the falling of the manna, a copy of which now lies before us, has the following questions and answers, exactly as we here insert them:-

*Question*- "How often did they gather it?"

*Answer*- "Every day except Sunday."

Q.-"Could they keep it overnight?"

A.-"Only Saturday nights."

Q.-"Why was this?"

A.-"So they need not break the Sabbath."

So ho! The children of Israel kept Sunday for Sabbath did they? We know that there has never been a more "eager interest" to make out that Sunday is the Sabbath than there is now, and it may have been a source of great "delight" for the lesson writers to corrupt the word of God that it might be made to appear so to the Sunday-school scholars; but when the day of reckoning comes, we think that they will not find it so profitable as they now imagine it to be. With what eager interest indeed the Scriptures must have been studied, especially by those who wrote the lesson helps, to learn from it no better than to teach that the manna did not fall on Sunday, and that it would keep only on Saturday night. It is hard to see how the writers of these lessons can escape the just imputation of turning the truth of God into a lie. For how else shall the shameful thing be characterized? If that is not the proper charge, we wish somebody would tell what would be proper in the premises.

### **"Only the Living Give" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among the resolutions adopted at the recent meeting of the American Home Mission Society, was the following:-

"That legacies shall be appropriated and expended the year after their receipt, to the end that the society shall always have on hand some resources commensurate with its ever-enlarging work. We urge especially in this transition period, a great increase in the gifts of the living."

The last sentence is the one that particularly caught our attention. When we read the plea for an increase in "the gifts of the living," the thought instantly arose, Who else but the living ever give anything? Careful thought has not enabled us to find any other givers. "But," says one, "you seem to forget the great legacies that have been left by people who are dead." No, we do not forget the legacies, but they are not given. That word "left" expresses the situation exactly. No matter how much a man has, he *leaves* it all when he dies. But how much credit is a man entitled to for leaving that which he cannot by any possibility carry with him? When a man gives of his means as he goes along, we know that he has an interest in something besides himself; but when a man with large wealth clings to it just as long as he possibly can, is it altogether uncharitable to suppose that if it were possible he would cling to it after death?

No matter how benevolent a person may have been in his life-time, we still insist that he does not in any just sense *give* that which he *leaves*. He may indicate in his will that he wishes a certain institution to have that which he leaves, but if the institution gets it, it is only after a severe struggle. So in reality his "giving" amounts to this statement: "This money is of no more use to me, and you may have it if you can get it." The moral is, If you want to give, and thus lay up treasure in Heaven, don't wait until you die, when you cannot give.

**July 21, 1887**

**"Our Senses Not Infallible" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

In speaking and writing on the subject of Spiritualism, and the lying wonders that will be manifested by it just before the end, we have often said that in order to stand firm during that trying time, one must have such an implicit, fixed faith in the Bible that he will trust it rather than his senses, and even against the evidence of his senses. A recent published statement to this effect was noted in a leading Spiritualist journal, with the request that we should tell "for what purpose our senses are given us." This we shall endeavor briefly to do, negatively at least, not especially for the benefit of the questioner, but for thousands of others, who may not be in the snare, but who may be in danger of it through their too great confidence in their own sensations.

It requires not much thought to convince one that he can know very little by his unaided senses. For instance, our senses would tell us that the earth is stationary, and that it is the sun and moon that move. There is not a sense, even allowing that we have seven instead of five, by which we could tell that the sun does not actually sink into the ocean at night, and in some mysterious way slip around to the east in time to start the next morning on another trip overland. The native Indians have the sense of sight and of hearing far more acutely developed than we have, yet they have never discovered the rotation of the earth. Once, we are told, the question was discussed in a certain tribe that had heard the new-fangled notion from a white man. An old Indian philosopher took steps to settle the question effectually. He drove a stake into the ground, and then placed a round stone on top. In the morning the stone was found in its place on the top of the stake, and the whole tribe knew at once that there was nothing to the white man's notion that the earth revolves, for if it did, would not the stone have fallen from the stake during the night?

We repeat: The senses of savages are far more acute than those of others, yet a knowledge of the movements of the heavenly bodies exists only among civilized nations. Why is this? The skeptic will no doubt laugh at our reply, but we have not the slightest doubt that it is because civilized nations have the influence of the Bible. It is because of the direct or indirect influence of the Bible that nations are civilized, even though they may not acknowledge this influence. We can trace the increase of knowledge right along with the increased circulation of the Bible. In the Dark Ages, when the Bible was almost unknown, scientific knowledge was at a low ebb, yet many hundreds of years before, a book had been written, which said: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Job 26:7. And the same writer said that the winds have weight. Job 28:25. Where did he get his knowledge? From God.

We are not claiming for the Bible that it is in the popular sense a scientific book. That is, it is not designed as a text-book on philosophy; it was written for a different purpose. But we do claim that it is scientifically correct, and that it is the

foundation of all knowledge. It is only the literal truth when the Bible says: "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding." Without stopping to dwell on this point, we will simply say that, notwithstanding the infidel taunts that Christianity has done nothing for science, the men who have added the most to our store of real knowledge, as Newton and Kepler, were devout Christians, and the vague hypotheses and groundless assumptions that have had to be abandoned, were devised by men who scouted the Bible.

Our senses are not infallible. "Optical illusions" are among the most common occurrences. The moon has a fixed, unvarying size, yet there are probably no two persons to whom it has exactly the same appearance. One will say that it looks as large around as a cart-wheel, while another will say that it looks no larger than the bottom of a quart cup. Of a dozen persons who hear a statement, scarcely any two will repeat it exactly alike.

Yet it will be said, and truly too, that we cannot perceive anything except through some one or all of our senses. It is only by means of our senses, after all, that we are able to realize the fact that the earth is round, and that it revolves on its axis and moves through space. But let it be remembered that this knowledge comes to us only after our senses are educated; and faith is the prime agent in this education. We may say that we use our reason in determining the truthfulness of any statement that is made to us; but we have to accept certain things on trust as a basis for our reasoning. Certain things must be accepted simply on the authority of the one who tells them to us, before we can have any starting-point for our reason. The science of mathematics, which calls for the exercise of pure reason, depends upon certain principles which the child must take upon trust. And the whole of our knowledge of nature depends upon faith. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3.

Now we come to the phenomena of Spiritualism, and we will take the phenomena of materialization, which is the *we plus ultra* in the "proof" of Spiritualism. There are only three senses available in testing the claims of this phenomena,-seeing, hearing, and feeling. By these it may be ascertained that the spirits that appear are real beings. But this does not settle the case at all, for we do not question the fact that real beings do appear, and will appear more frequently as the end approaches. The real question is, Are these beings what they profess to be,-the spirits of men who have once lived on this earth? The only help that one can get from his senses in determining this point is through looking at them and hearing their testimony. As to the first, we know that cases of mistaken identity are very common, and that it is possible for a man to so disguise himself as to deceive his most intimate friends, making them think that he is somebody else; or, on the other hand, a stranger may so change his appearance as to impose on people, and make them believe that he is some one of their acquaintances. This being the case, it is evident that seeing the appearance of one's dead friend is by no means positive evidence that it is indeed that friend.

If it is said that the spirits tell things that were known only to the hearer and the departed friend, that is easily explained by the Bible doctrine that "they are the spirits of devils." Once allowing that there are angels, both good and bad, who are of a higher order of creation than man, and who are invisible to our natural sight, and the conclusion is necessary that they must know many things that we do or say when we think we are unseen and unheard.

Then we come to the testimony of the spirits themselves. We may hear them say that they are indeed our friends who have been long dead. But this appeal is not to our senses but to our trust in their word. They say that they are the spirits of dead men, and the Bible says that they are the spirits of devils. So it is simply a question of evidence, and we must decide as to which is the more reliable. But Spiritualists themselves admit that the testimony of the spirits is unreliable. The editor of the *Golden Gate* says:-

"Whoever surrenders his individual judgment, and places his trust implicitly upon the communications of spirits, as given through promiscuous mediumship, is almost certain to be deceived. It matters not how confiding his trust, or implicit his faith, nor how sincere or honest he may be in his intentions, he will find the average spiritual message a broken reed, if he attempt to lean upon it to the exclusion of the staff of his own reason."

Again, in his issue of May 6, 1886, he gave a *fae simile* of some slate writing done by the spirits, and in commenting upon it he said:-

"It is not claimed that this writing was done, in all instances, or even in any instance, by the spirit giving the name. Much of it, no doubt, is done by the medium's control, or by spirits skilled in the manipulation of the pencil tips; and such spirits act as mediums for those less proficient in the matter. This explains the poor grammar and orthography sometimes witnessed in communications from spirits who, in earth life, we know would never have committed such mistakes."

That is to say that the awkward language in a communication received from Webster is due to the acknowledged fact that Webster never wrote it! A very good reason. But when it is admitted by Spiritualists themselves, that communications from the spirits are untrustworthy, the last plea for the evidence of our senses in determining their character, is voluntarily withdrawn.

In contrast with the confessedly false testimony of the spirits, we have the testimony of the Bible, which is not yea, and nay, but yea and amen. It is always consistent with itself, which is one of the highest evidences of truth. That book assures us that "the dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5) for when "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth," and "in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:4. We are told that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence," (Ps. 115:17); that "his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them" (Job 24:21); and that "neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Eccl. 9:6. It also tells us that these wondrous miracles that are alleged to be performed by departed spirits of men, are the work of "the spirits of devils" (Rev. 16:14); and this tallies exactly with the Spiritualist's statement that

the spirits are untrustworthy; for the devil is a liar and the father of it; it is his nature to lie.

Therefore we repeat that when the devil shall come down "with great power, knowing that he hath but a short time," and shall work "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," the only safeguard any person will have will be his faith in the sure testimony of the Bible. Our senses will be appealed to, to bear witness of the reality of these miracles, and so far as the senses themselves can determine, the spirits will be what they profess to be; but we must remember that our senses may be deceived, and can therefore do nothing but distrust their evidence, and depend on that higher evidence-implicit faith in God's word. Happy will it be for those who are now trusting that word so implicitly, and testing it so fully by a practical application of its teachings to their lives, that when that trying time comes they will turn to it as the most natural thing to do, and will meet every attempt at deception with the words, "It is written." W.

### **"Baptized for the Dead" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

"If Christ did not preach to the spirits of the dead in prison, as explained in Vol. 13, No. 17, and the dead are unconscious, then what does 1 Cor. 15:29 mean? E. J. G."

That text reads as follows: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" We do not know what view our friend has of this; but if he thinks it has any bearing whatever on the condition of man in death, he must believe in the theory of a probation after death. We will not take the space here to again show the fallacy of that theory, but will give the simplest exposition of the text in question.

The whole chapter is a defense of the doctrine of the resurrection. The apostle has nothing directly to say of the condition of man in death, for that is unnecessary; the very fact that he is demonstrating the truth of the resurrection, shows that he

439

regarded the dead as unconscious. For if the dead were to be unconscious-that is, if they were not really dead-there would be no necessity for a resurrection. Incidentally, however, the apostle shows the condition of the dead when he says that if there be no resurrection, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." That is to say that the promised resurrection is all that stands between the dead in Christ and eternal extinction.

Christian baptism is an act expressive of faith in the death and *resurrection* of Christ. See Rom. 6:3-14. It is also an act representative of faith in the future resurrection, for the resurrection of Christ was a pledge of the general resurrection. He says, "Because I live, ye shall live also." So when a person is baptized he shows (1) his belief that he is a sinner under sentence of death; (2) his acceptance of the condemnation as just; (3) his belief that Christ "was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification;" and (4) that by being thus baptized into Christ's death, and rising to walk in newness of life, he will finally have a resurrection from the dead, and will live with Christ. Paul's

argument is evidently addressed to those who professed Christianity, and who believed in baptism, but who questioned the doctrine of the resurrection. To such he shows the inconsistency of their position, by proving that if there be no resurrection, Christ is not raised, and if Christ be not raised, those who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished; and since if they are baptized it is only into a *dead* Christ, their being baptized amounts to nothing, since baptism derives all its force from the resurrection.

### **"Virtue at a Discount" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is nothing that can equal the certainty of some people, concerning things that have never been revealed, unless it is their condition of blissful uncertainty concerning things that are clearly set forth in the sacred word. For instance, notwithstanding the plain wording of the fourth commandment, it is a rare thing to find one who knows that the seventh day of the week, Saturday, is the Sabbath of the Lord, and ought to be kept holy, while the same ones who express so much doubt on this point, are very sure that any man who has died in the belief that the soul is immortal, has gone to Heaven.

An instance of the positiveness is given in a matter-of-course way in the *Congregationalist* account of the closing exercises of Andover Theological Seminary. After the professors had completed their work of examination on the subject of eschatology, the board of visitors began their catechizing thus: "Are Socrates and Plato in Heaven?" And the reply came back promptly, "Yes, sir."

Unfortunately we are not told why Socrates and Plato are so undoubtedly enjoying the bliss of the saved, so we must examine their character for ourselves. Socrates wrote nothing, and about all we know of his teaching is what we learn from Plato, who was his echo. One or two statements, however, will throw a little light on his character. In the first chapter of his "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," Dr. Horne, speaking of the ancient heathen philosophers, says:-

"Truth was but of small account among many, even of the best heathen; for they taught that on many occasion a lie was to be preferred to the truth itself! To which we may add that the unlimited gratification of their sensual appetites, and the commission of unnatural crimes, was common even among the most distinguished teachers of philosophy, and was practiced even by Socrates himself. . . . 'The most notorious vices,' says Quinetilian, speaking of the philosophers of his time, 'are screened under that name;' and they do not labor to maintain the character of philosophers by virtue and study, but conceal the most vicious lives under an austere look and singularity of dress."

It is a well-known fact that Socrates had a *dream*, or familiar spirit, from whom he derived all his knowledge, and upon whose counsel he depended for direction in the affairs of life. In other words, Socrates was a Spiritualist, and his life was perfectly in accord with the teachings of Spiritualism when they are carried out to the fullest length. We have the authority of Potter's "Antiquities of Greece" for the



statement that "it was frequent in some parts of Greece to borrow one another's wives. At Athens, Socrates lent his wife Xantippe to Aleibiades."

Of Plato's morals we learn an abundance from his own teachings. He it was who formulated the pernicious doctrine that was held in principle by all heathen, and is a cardinal doctrine of modern Spiritualism, that man is the sole judge of his own actions; that truth is inherent in the human soul, or, in other words, that man himself is God. Consistently with a doctrine which opens the way for the fullest gratification of one's passions, we find that Plato advocated community of women, and the education of them the same as men, and together with them, even so far as exercising together in the gymnasium naked. He also advocated perjury in matters of love, advocated also that "on an expedition soldiers should be allowed unbounded license both with respect to women and boys, as by this means they will be more inflamed to gain the victory." He himself was no more austere in his personal life than was his master, Socrates, and made no secret of his association with prostitutes.

Yet these are the men whom modern theology unhesitatingly grants a place in Heaven, thus anticipating the sentence of God, the Judge of all. And why do they do this? Solely because to them the Christian church owes the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul. All their vice and immoral teachings are condoned, and they are translated to the third Heaven simply because they taught that the soul was immortal. Surely such teaching places virtue at a discount, and really puts a premium upon vice. Nowadays when a man dies, no matter if he had been perfectly indifferent concerning religion, if it can be remembered by anyone that he ever expressed a belief in the immortality of the soul, he is at once set down as undoubtedly a Christian, although his belief in immortality had no connection whatever with Christ.

Socrates and Plato are accounted as saved because they taught the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul. Now it is susceptible of the clearest proof that their immortality, which would most surely shut them out of Heaven (Eph. 5:5) unless they repent, of which there is not the slightest evidence, was the direct result of their belief in the immortality of the soul. Here is the proof:-

The apostle Paul tells us that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Now their belief in immortality was not based upon faith at all. It was based solely on self-conceit and egotism. They had so exalted an idea of their own attainments, and of the powers of their own mind, that they could not conceive of anything in the universe greater than man. They thought that the mind of man was "lord of itself and of all the world beside;" and that all knowledge was inherent in the human soul. Thus while they professed belief in the gods, and even in one supreme God, they had no higher conception of God than that he was like themselves (Ps. 50:21); for they thought that they themselves were part of God, and their gods were dead men. But if knowledge was inherent in the human soul, it must be, they reasoned, the latent knowledge that was acquired in some anterior state of being; and if man was a part of God, he must be immortal; that is, mind being supreme could have neither beginning nor end. Thus their belief in the supremacy of the mind of man was inseparable from their belief in the immortality of the soul; the two were one. But their exaltation of the human

mind led them into the grossest licentiousness, for they thought that whatever the mind conceived must be right and proper. Thus "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." They had faith only in themselves, and that was, of course, no faith at all; and this self-exaltation led them into sin.

At some future time we shall show, what is here implied, that all the evil that has cursed this earth sprung from the teaching of the immortality of the soul. We are aware that some will regard such language as almost blasphemy, but they will change their minds when they study the subject from the Bible standpoint. Let no one think that we are not believers in immortality. We believe that Christ "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," and that all who truly believe in Christ will be clothed with immortality when he comes. We believe in immortality that is received through faith, which exalts Christ, and not in immortality which a man has without faith, which exalts man and ignores Christ. A belief in immortality through Christ, is Christianity; a belief in immortality without Christ, is paganism, even though it be taught in a professedly Christian theological seminary. W.

### **"The Gospel of the Kingdom, and the End" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Our Saviour taught us, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, that the gospel should be preached in all the world, and then the end would come. How is it that the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven in Paul's day (Col. 1:23) and the end is not yet? Please explain. A.J."

We think that the explanation may be found in a portion of Matt. 24:41 which our correspondent did not quote, and in the context of the same passage. The text reads: "And this gospel *of the kingdom* shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." "This gospel of the kingdom" can be nothing else than that of the preaching of the coming of our Lord in his kingdom. Now while it is true that Paul and the other apostles taught that Christ would come again, they did not set his coming forth as an event immediately to take place, but on the contrary warned the people against the idea that his coming was immediately at hand. Knowing, as the apostles did, that the day of the Lord could not come until after the great apostasy, and the revealing of "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," the Papacy, it is not possible that they should preach "this gospel of the kingdom," just as it must be preached when the kingdom is about to be set up. They taught the people to look forward to it as being the grand consummation of all their hopes, but they did not teach them to expect it in their day.

But the explanation is found chiefly in the context of Matt. 24:14, which shows when that passage applies. In this and the preceding verses of the chapter, beginning with the fourth, Jesus has given a brief answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It is very evident that verses 4-11 cover in brief the same ground that is covered in verses 21-47. "For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." Verse 7.

This did not take place in Paul's day, nor for many years after. In Paul's day the Roman Empire was a unity, and there was no general uprising such as is indicated in this verse. The reference is unmistakably to the conflicts of nations and kingdoms which resulted in the overthrow of the great Roman Empire, and the establishment of the Papacy, which was but the beginning of sorrows.

This conclusion is verified by verses 9, 10: "*Then* shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another." After the rising up of nations and kingdoms, and the establishment of the Papacy, which was the beginning of sorrows (verse 8), came the terrible persecution, during which the saints of God were delivered up to be slain, and they were hated of all nations for the sake of Christ.

Then verses 11-14 brings to view the terribly lax state of morality that will exist even in the professed church of God in the last days (see 2 Thess. 3:1-5, 12, 13), when the love of many shall wax cold, and then comes the statement that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Verse 14. Now it seems evident that this statement is entirely independent of the general one made by

440

Paul. This one refers to a special time. In the days of Christ and the apostles the world had wonderful light. The gospel in its purity was carried everywhere. (See Acts 2:8-11.) But the great apostasy almost drove the knowledge of the gospel from the earth, and in the Dark Ages generations of men lived in darkness greater than that of many of the heathen before the time of Christ. But a reform was prophesied. The Reformation begun by Luther and others was to go on until the work of reformation should culminate in the Third Angel's Message, which should bring the gospel of the kingdom to all nations; and when all the world had received the warning message, and the whole earth had been lightened with its glory, then should the end come.

This prophecy has nearly reached its complete fulfillment, and the end is close at hand. And now it behooves all to heed the admonition, "Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Independent* is a very sound opinion of a widely prevalent practice. With that the advice might be followed in all the pulpits in the land:-

"The minister that is constantly on the lookout among current events for the topics of sensational sermons on the Sabbath, and uses his Bible mainly for texts on which to hang the sermons, is almost anything but a preacher of the gospel. He had better read his Bible more and study current events less. He will thereby better edify the church, and be the means of saving more souls."

Sunday evening, July 10, the eminent Baptist preacher, Dr. J. D. Fulton, of Brooklyn, N. Y., delivered an address in Oakland on "Romanism in America." It was an excellent portrayal of the encroachments of the Papacy in our country

and upon our institutions. Yet we cannot see any prospect that the Doctor's remedy will prove adequate to conquer the disease-that is, to have Rome and Romanists all to turn Protestant. The Doctor's diagnosis was most excellent, but his prescription we are confident will never prove effectual.

The *Mirror* says that "a Catholic prayer cannot be too circumspect in dealing with unhappy differences that are liable to crop out now and then in an institution embracing men of every cast of mind and temperament." And that is a fact; for it is by no means a pleasant thing for anybody, either Catholic or Protestant, to retract honestly expressed convictions without being convinced that they are erroneous; but that is just what Catholic papers must do if in dealing with unhappy differences they chance to express opinions not entertained by the Pope or even by the bishop of the diocese in which they are published. Truly, papers which support infallibility should be both circumspect and servile; they must be the latter if they would remain Catholic; and a good degree of circumspection renders the servility much less apparent though none the less real.

A paper recently read before a Boston missionary society speaks thus of the native Christians in the Sandwich Islands:-

"Commercial prosperity and a misguided king have done much to increase the temptations to wrong-doing, mainly in the way of liquor-drinking, a revival of heathenish dances and official corruption, which have been fostered and even pressed on the people by the king and his ministers. . . . Still there are probably no people who yield more readily to good influences than the Hawaiians; . . . and they are always and everywhere ready to join actively in church and Sunday-school work when it is made attractive."

And in this respect they are not at all unlike thousands of professed Christians in more favored lands. It is a pretty hard matter to find any great number of people anywhere who are willing "to join actively in church and Sunday-school work" unless "it is made attractive." And that is why there is so much show and so little reality in the religion of the present day. The people not only in Hawaii but everywhere are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," and that is why we have so much "church work" that simply ministers to the passions and appetites of those who are drawn into the church because religion "is made attractive."

If all the modern devices for making the church attractive, from the oyster supper to the latest invention, the "donkey social," were once and forever banished from Christendom, there might be fewer names upon the church books, but it is pretty certain that there would be more in the Lamb's Book of Life.

The following from the *Independent* is, we believe, strictly according to the facts in the matter. We have no doubt that much the same line of thought has occurred to almost everyone who has thought upon the subject at all. It seems that in most theological seminaries the Bible is the thing that is studied the least. And so far as we have been able to observe the evil is not corrected even when the students leave the seminaries and get into the pulpit:-

"It has often occurred to us that our theological seminaries do not sufficiently, especially in the matter of theology, teach the theology of the Bible as the word of

God. The young men are taught systematic theology, dogmatic theology, and polemic theology, but in our judgment not sufficiently taught the theology of the Word. We have been struck with this defect when they appear before councils or presbyteries, and are examined as to their qualifications for the Christian ministry. In far too many instances, indeed almost as a general rule, so far as our observation has been extended, they have been unable to give their reasons from the Bible for what they believe. Put them to the task of citing proof-texts for their opinions, and they usually show a lamentable defect in their education. They do not seem to be as familiar with the word of God as they ought to be. The language of the Scriptures does not readily occur to their lips. This proves that they have not been thoroughly trained in Biblical knowledge, which we regard as absolutely primary in all training for the gospel ministry. For this kind of knowledge there is no substitute. It is the *sine qua non*, and should take the precedence of everything else."

Mrs. Leavitt, who is making a journey around the world in the interests of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, sends the following word from Siam:-

"DEAR REVEREND MISSIONARY BOARDS: Pray do not send out any more wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking missionaries; there is bad example enough in all these lands from ungodly men of Christian lands who are in Government employ and engage in business. Let Christian missionaries be so free from all these things that no poor soul or body can be injured by following their example."

That any such should ever have been sent at all, is entirely too bad. Yet we do not see exactly how it is that a wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking missionary in Siam is any worse than is a wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking minister in America. If such do not represent Christianity there neither do they here. And how missionaries, ministers, or people can practice such things and yet think themselves Christians is something we cannot understand. It shows an estimate of the virtue of Christ that is deplorably low.

The Healdsburg school begins Monday, July 25. All who expect to attend this term should be there the first day if possible, much will be lost otherwise. Also remember the dedicatory services of the new meeting-house at Healdsburg, Sabbath and first-day, July 30 and 31. Meetings will commence Sabbath eve, the 29. Come to the meeting praying, and bringing the blessing of God with you.

### **"Not a Godless Nation?óWhy Not?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* declares of France that "the nation is not godless," and in proof of the statement adduces the fact that there was celebrated in the Paris churches "the other Sunday, the *Fete Dieu*, or God's Festival." It says:-

"The Madeleine Church was especially decorated for the occasion and the ceremonies, closing with a procession, were performed with the scenic splendor of the Roman ritual. . . . The procession, as it wound along the church and descended the steps at the rear of the edifice, presented a most striking and effective picture, with the priests in gorgeous vestments, the acolytes, or altar

boys, and choristers in their snowy surplices and crimson girdles, and the numerous school-children in white veils and dresses, who carried banners and pennons. . . . A well-dressed man who was looking on, neglected, either unintentionally or with design, to take off his hat. He was instantly set upon by a dozen persons, whose religious enthusiasm had been suddenly kindled by the music, the flowers, and the incense, and was severely beaten. He escaped, all bleeding, from their hands, and his clothes were torn almost to shreds."

On, no! France is not godless. Neither is China, nor Hindostan, nor any other Catholic or heathen nation. And in all these lands their "godliness" and their "religious enthusiasm" find expression in about the same way. In view of this report it is a happy thing that we have the assurance of the *Christian at Work* that France "is not godless;" otherwise we might be inclined to doubt whether such actions were a manifestation of the genuine righteousness that becometh a nation. But this undoubted assurance, supported by such signal proofs, we suppose establishes once for all the important fact that France is a godly nation; which fact, with the proofs, we commend to the National Reform Association. The United States alone among nations is "godless." But in that respect may she remain forever just as she is. We have no desire to see here Popish processions or anything else that shall kindle the "enthusiasm" of violent national religionists.

### **"Puritan 'Rights'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

Rev. Geo. C. Adams, writing from St. Louis to the *Advance* about the Sunday law, says:-

"The charge is freely made that it is an effort to make a 'Puritanical' Sunday, and so it is; for the Puritan certainly believed in equal rights for all and was not willing to allow any privileged classes."

Yes, indeed! The Puritans of New England "certainly believed in equal rights for *all*" *Puritans*, but they just as certainly believed in no rights at all for anybody else, not even the right to *live*, in New England. They were indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes" except Puritans. In them were summed up all rights and all privileges, even to the right and privilege of hanging Quakers and witches, whipping Baptists and banishing dissenters of all kinds, under pain of death. Theirs was the right to compel people to go to church on Sunday and listen to sermons such as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomach of an ostrich." Theirs was the right to be women to tie tails of carts and drag them through New England towns, at the same time lashing them upon the bare back with heavy two-handed whips made of three thongs "of twisted and knotted cord or catgut," while one of the "privileged" preachers looked on and laughed at such an infliction as, if suffered to be completed, would have amounted to one hundred and ten lashes each, as the poor women were dragged through dirt and snow half-leg deep, and the weather bitter cold. And all because the women had the impudent presumption to claim the right and privilege of being Quakers. In this case when the poor, tortured women had been

lashed through three towns with ten stripes each in each town, the people arose in their righteous indignation and set the "ghastly pilgrims" free.

Oh, yes, the Puritan was indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes!" But may Heaven protect this dear land from any revival of Puritan rule, or any other rule according to Puritan principles.

**July 28, 1887**

**"That Cloud of Witnesses" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith."

The word "witnesses," in this text, conveys to many a wrong idea, or, rather, many persons give it a meaning which does not belong to it in this place. A witness is one who testifies in a cause, from personal knowledge, and in this sense it is used here. This chapter is a continuation of the argument on faith, and the cloud or multitude of witnesses who are here spoken of are the worthies whose deeds are recorded in chapter 11. They are not "witnesses" in the sense that they are *looking on* to see us run the race, for all of them except Enoch died. Now of the dead it is said that "they know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5); that in the day of their death their "thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4); and that they are not conscious of the elevation or disgrace of even their dearest relatives. Job 14:21. It is certain, then, that those of whom the apostle says that they "all died in faith," are not cognizant of anything that is now taking place on this earth. How then are they "witnesses"? They have all run the race, and obtained great victories through faith; and by means of the sacred record their lives bear witness to the power of a firm, abiding faith. Of Abel it is said that "he being dead yet speaketh." So likewise all these worthies are standing by to cheer us on by their testimony as to the possibility of making the race a success.

One stanza of an excellent hymn that is based on this passage, is ruined because the writer of the hymn mistook the meaning of the word "witnesses." The stanza is this:-

"A cloud of witnesses around,  
Hold thee in full *survey*;  
Forget the steps already trod,  
And onward urge thy way."

But this is not true. These witnesses do not hold us in survey. They know nothing of our existence. In short, they know nothing at all, because they are dead.

"Seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses." The position of a small word in a sentence may make a great deal of difference. The word "also" is here out of its proper place. The text should read thus: "Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses,

*let us also lay aside every weight,"* etc. It is not true, as implied in the common version, that those in ancient times were compassed about with witnesses. The Bible was not written in their day, and they had no precedent for their faith. Noah had no example of those who had trusted in God before his time, and had been preserved. He had simply the word of God. There had been no rain on the earth, and if the philosophers of his day were like those of the present time, they doubtless said that such a thing was contrary to nature. Nevertheless he believed and obeyed the word of the Lord, and by so doing he "condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

Abraham was called out from heathen surroundings, and "went out, not knowing whither he went." He had not before him a long list of persons who had tested the promises of God, and found them sure. So far as we know he had never been associated with anyone who worshiped the true God. Still he had evidence enough. He had "two immutable things," the promise and the oath of God. But we have in addition to these a great array of men "subject to like passions as we are," who gained glorious victories through faith in God. Since they accomplished such great victories through faith, let us be encouraged to do likewise. If they, who had so much less light and encouragement than we have, persevered thus manfully, what patience and faith and zeal ought we not to exhibit!

The apostle declares that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. Now there is to us abundant ground of hope, in the lives of the patriarchs. We seldom take all the encouragement from the record of their lives that we ought. We are apt to imagine that those men were composed of different stuff from what men are now, that there was something peculiar in their natures which gave them favor with God. But this is not so. Some sin or weakness appears in the life of nearly everyone. Human nature was the same in their day that it is now. Wherein, then, was their strength? Simply in this: They were able to take God at his word. It is written, "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." All the difference between them and us is that they believed implicitly, while we doubt. But it is just as easy for us to believe as it was for them; otherwise there would be no propriety in giving them as our example. Indeed, it ought to be easier for us, since we have their lives as assurance that God is "a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." If human nature is the same now that it was then, we have the assurance that God is the same also, and is just as ready to give us his aid in transforming ourselves, that we may be partakers of the divine nature. The lives of these worthies, and the exhortation of the apostle were not written for nothing. Will we give them the attention that they deserve? W.

### **"The Promise of His Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the second epistle of Peter, the third chapter, and the third and fourth verses, we find the following statement: "Knowing this first, that there shall come



in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." From this, we indirectly learn two things: First, that in the last days there will be some who are teaching that the Lord is coming; for if no one were asserting that there is a promise to that effect, there would be no reason for the inquiry as to where that promise may be found. And, second, we learn that there is such a promise, and that those who teach it are correct, for they who question it are "scoffers" who walk after their own lusts.

The question in itself is a perfectly legitimate one, if it is asked from a sincere desire to know the truth. It is only when asked by those who are "willingly ignorant," that there is in it the element of mockery. For the benefit of the first class, a Scriptural answer to the question will be given.

The question "Will Christ come?" does not admit of argument. The answer is given in the Bible in plain and unequivocal language. Admit the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the question is at once answered in the affirmative. In this article, therefore, little more can be done than to cite the reader to a few of the passages which positively affirm that Christ is coming again to this earth. Those passages only will be quoted which state the simple fact. Other questions as to the time, manner, object etc., of his coming will be considered hereafter.

Perhaps the oldest direct testimony concerning Christ's second advent is found in the fourteenth verse of Jude. "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints." This testimony, although second-hand may not be impeached, for it is from one who "walked with God," and is vouched for by "the servant of Jesus Christ."

Another testimony is found in Numbers, chapter 24, and verse 17 verse. It may be objected that Balaam was a wicked man, and, therefore, not entitled to credit; but we must remember that at this time he was under the influence of the Spirit of God, and unable to say anything except as God permitted him. Speaking of what shall happen "in the latter days," he says: "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." The language used, as well as

456

the context, shows that Christ is referred to; and it is his second coming that is spoken of for it is then that Christ's enemies are to be destroyed. See 2 Thess. 1:7-9; 2:8.

But we have still more positive testimony in the Old Testament. Job, in the midst of his afflictions, comforted himself in the following manner: "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that *he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Job 19:23-27. This language is very positive;

and Job shows his sense of its importance by wishing it to be preserved by all the means of writing then known.

Passing to the Psalms we read the testimony of David. That David was inspired of God, we learn from 2 Sam. 23:2: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." He says: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. Again: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth." Ps. 96:11-13.

We come now to the New Testament, and we shall see that the testimony is even more positive. Paul's words in Heb. 9:27, 28 are very explicit: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him *shall he appear the second time* without sin unto salvation." There is nothing figurative or uncertain about these words. They are a plain declaration of fact. Either Christ will come the second time, or else Paul is an unreliable witness. The latter, no Christian will admit.

Again Paul writes: "For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For *the Lord himself shall descend* from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." Could language be made plainer than this? This is a statement of what shall actually occur. No more definite language can be found in the Bible. It will not do to evade this testimony by saying that Paul did not understand what he wrote. There is not the slightest evidence that he did not fully comprehend the force of every line that he wrote; but even allowing that he did not, the Holy Spirit, which inspired him, certainly did understand what he wrote, and had an object in giving it.

Although no clearer evidence can be given than that quoted above, yet the words which come to us direct from the lips of our Lord himself, have a peculiar force. In Matt. 16:27 he says: "For the Son of man *shall come* in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew is devoted entirely to a description of his coming, but as we are now giving direct answers to the question "Will he come?" we pass this by for the present. The same subject, however, is carried on in the twenty-fifth chapter, and in the thirty-first verse Christ says: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." He here speaks of his coming as a settled fact, so that his words amount to a positive statement.

In John 14:1-3, we have a statement by our Lord, which, if such a thing is possible, is even stronger than any of the foregoing. As Jesus was about to leave this earth, he comforted his sorrowing disciples with the following words: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." The

point of comfort in the above is the promise that he would come again. The disciples were sorrowing because he had said he was going away. He says, Be not troubled; I will come again. He did not deceive them with a false hope; he will certainly come again. His word is pledged to this and it cannot fail.

These are only a few of the many passages which teach that Christ will come again, but they are sufficient. They are so simple that a child can understand them. No other meaning can possibly attach to them than that Christ is coming the second time to this earth. The Bible abounds with testimony to the same effect. And yet there are people who profess to believe the Bible, who say that the second coming of Christ is a non-essential doctrine. If it is not essential, why is it given so large a place in the Bible? W.

### **"Bible Exposition Against Human Speculation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

Says the *Independent*: "The anthropology of the Bible as to what awaits man after death is comprehensively given in these words: 'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.' The body sinks into the bosom of its mother earth, and moulders back to dust; but the soul ascends back to God, and meets the issues of another life."

This doubtless expresses the unthinking belief of thousands, yet it is inconsistent and unscriptural in the following particulars:-

1. It starts out with a Bible statement concerning the Spirit, and ends with the human statement concerning the soul, thus assuming that soul and spirit are identical; whereas:

2. Soul and spirit are not the same. Paul prayed that the Thessalonians might be sanctified in their "whole spirit and soul and body." 1 Thess. 5:23.

3. The Spirit, which returns to God, is identical with the breath of life. Job said: "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit." Job 27:3, 4. Compare with the expression, "the Spirit of God is in my nostrils," Isa. 2:22: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" That which is in the nostrils is breath, but it is also called Spirit; and the translators made a just comment on Job 27:3, "the Spirit of God is in my nostrils," when they placed in the margin, "That is, *the breath which God gave him*, Gen. 2:7."

4. Man was a soul, although lifeless, before he received his breath or spirit from God. See Gen. 2:7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust

457

of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man *became a living soul*." The old catechisms recognize the fact, unconsciously, perhaps, when they say that "man is a dual being, composed of a body and soul." But the Bible says that *man* was formed of the dust of the ground. That everything which goes to constitute a man is also of the dust; the addition of the breath of life makes a *living man*.

5. Nothing can come from man except that which was given him. There can be no more elements after dissolution than were made use of in building him. Now Gen. 2:7 is the record of the building of man, and Eccl. 12:7 is the record of the manner of his unbuilding; therefore we must find the very same parts in Eccl. 12:7 that we find in Gen. 2:7. In Gen. 2:7 we find *dust*, of which man is formed, and *breath* breathed into his nostrils to make him alive. In Eccl. 12:7 we have the spirit or breath returning to the One who gave it, and the man returning to the dust of which he was formed. Now unless the *Independent* is willing to claim, and able to prove, that the *breath* which God gave Adam was conscious before Adam received it, or that it ever obtained consciousness while Adam had it, it had no right to assume that, it was conscious when it left Adam.

6. Let it be emphasized that nothing "returns" to God except that which God gave, and that all that came directly from God in the making of man, was the breath. Now read two Bible statements concerning the unmaking of man, which corroborate the positions to stated: "If he [God] set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Job 34:14, 15. And this: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:3, 4. These passages cover exactly the same ground as Eccl. 12:7. Bible expositions of the text are much better and more trustworthy than human assumption.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under a new treaty lately made the United States and Mexico are made practically one country in the matter of postage. Hereafter letters and packages can be sent from this country to any place in Mexico as cheap as from one place to another in the United States.

The cruel and senseless antipathy to the negro is becoming more general and more marked in the North. Lately the House of Mercy in the city of New York refused to receive a girl committed to it, solely because she is colored. At this the *Independent* very aptly exclaims, "Mercy!" It is very certain that that is not the kind of mercy whose equality is not strained.

The *Catholic Mirror* says that out of a population in Mexico of 10,105,000, the church claims 9,864,000. If only she could claim the whole 10,105,000 then Mexico would be a "Christian nation" after the National Reformer's own heart. However, as it is, Mexico is one of the countries which "could be represented only by Roman Catholics," in "a world's conference for the promotion of national Christianity," as suggested by the *Christian Statesman*.

As a good deal is being said about the great age of the Emperor Wilhelm, a German paper hunted up and published the names of all the people in Prussia that are older than he is. The list contains one hundred and sixty names of persons who are over one hundred years old. As there are many more who are more than ninety years old, and as the Emperor was only ninety on his last birthday, Kaiser Wilhelm may well feel himself not so very old after all.

The New York *Observer* complains that "Sunday newspapers have done more than all other influences combined to destroy the popular reverence for the Sabbath." And then almost in the same breath *naively* states that "during the summer season thousands of nominal Christians will find the Sunday newspaper where they will fail to find a place of worship or the hour of prayer." Therefore abolish the Sunday newspaper without delay. By all means take away at once all opportunity for these very excellent nominal Christian to do wrong, so that they may all become real strong, vigorous Christians (?) by doing because they have no chance to do other than the Sunday newspaper may be a very wicked thing, but how much more wicked it is than the professed Christian who would rather read it than to go to worship or to prayer perhaps the *Observer* can decide, but we can't.

### **"More of Rome's Work" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* says:-

"There is no sign of diminution in the political activity of the Pope. Daily telegrams give him credit for efforts of one kind and another in many different quarters. It was cabled to the *Herald*, June 30, that King Leopold, of Belgium, had applied to the Vatican to influence the party of the right to secure the passage of a bill relating to personal military service. Manager Rampolia, the Papal Secretary, is said to favor the measure. Much of this political influence will be of no advantage to the Church of Rome, and some of it may do harm. It might be better for all concerned if the Pope would apply himself to the finances of the Church of Rome in Ohio, where the debt of the two estates of Archbishop John B. and Father Edward Purcell is reported at \$3,739,321, and the number of creditors that have proven claims is 3,196. Local efforts to meet the necessities of most indigent creditors are entirely insufficient."

There is no danger of "this political influence" doing harm to the Church of Rome. Every particle of it will be turned to the advantage of the Papacy. The Papacy is to-day the most influential political power in the world, and in trickery, chicanery, or political influence of whatever kind Rome is abundantly able to outdo every other power, to reap advantage from every alliance, and to come out ahead in every contest.

And as for her ever restoring what she has embezzled from the poor Catholics of Cincinnati through the two Purcells-archbishop and priest-people might as well whistle at the wind, as to call for that. So far is she from restoring any of it, she is actually adding to it the possessions of the assignee and his bondsmen of the bankrupt (?) estates. The *Catholic Mirror*, of July 16, gives the result of the first turn of the wheel. It says:-

"Judge Goeble, of the Probate Court of Cincinnati, has announced the result of his investigation into the liability of J. B. Mannix and his bondsmen as assignees of the estates of Archbishop Purcell and his brother, Father Edward Purcell. He found that he was entitled to no compensation for his services as assignee, and that he and his bondsmen owe to the Edward Purcell estate

\$78,000, and that Mannix and his bondsmen owe to the J. B. Purcell estate \$236,500. Judge Hoadly, one of the sureties, has been released by the payment of \$62,500."

The only way in which ex-Governor Hoadly got released, however, was by paying into court everything he had, making himself a bankrupt in his old age. And now others have to follow suit, perhaps with the same result. But it is a most singular thing that the courts can find hundreds of thousands of dollars due the estates from the assignee and his bondsmen, and yet cannot find in the estates a single cent for the poor people who have been robbed of it. The fact is that Rome has the money, and she will get as much more as possible, and she will wear out all the courts in Christendom before she will restore a cent of it.

### **"Prussia at the Pope's Feet" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope has sent out a note of rejoicing over his triumphant conquest of Germany, upon which, under the above heading, the *Christian Advocate* comments as follows:-

"One of the most pitiable spectacles presented in these later days to the world's gaze is that of Prussia-great and Protestant Prussia-doing obeisance to the Pope of Rome.

"If any human force could make Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon arise from their graves beneath the marble slabs in the Wittenburg church, it would be this. But, alas! so bound hand and foot is their land to-day, that not one strong voice in the whole country dares to sound the alarm and tell the whole civilized world what is going on in Berlin.

"The climax has just been reached in the Pope's allocution, which came by cablegram from Rome. His holiness appeals to the whole world to hear his cry of victory over German Protestantism. Here are some of his jubilant notes:-

"We felt more concerned at the evils of this religious struggle with Prussia, and as we were unable to remedy them by striving alone, owing to the obstacles which impeded our power, we invoked the cooperation of the German bishops and the Catholic deputies in the Prussian diet, from whose constancy and concord the church derived great fruits, and expects still greater. Thanks to the equitable and pacific sentiments of Emperor William and his counselors the Prussian Government removed the more serious inconveniences, and then accepted the various practical conditions of peace, by which some of the former laws against the church have been repealed and others mitigated. Something remains, but we must rejoice at what we have obtained, and, above all, in regard to the free action of the Pope in the government of the church in Prussia.'

"If Bismarck is not entirely blind to all Protestant sentiment, and is not utterly consumed by his love of Prussian imperialism, whatever becomes of the people, he must have some sense of shame when he reads the Pope's allocution-that this triumph of Romanism in Germany is made the basis of an appeal to Italy to range herself on the side of Papal interests. Germany more Catholic than Italy! That is the picture now, and the world is told so by Leo XIII."

## **"Owning the Responsibility" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking of the wild methods of the Salvation Army the *Christian Advocate* very appropriately remarks that:-

"If the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, and other churches were as energetic, zealous, and spiritually-minded as they should be, and in earlier times were, and as deeply interested in the conversion of the abandoned as the Methodists were when they could get a hearing from no other class, there would be no need or place for any such irregular guerrilla religious warfare."

There is no need anyhow for any such irregular guerrilla religious warfare as is carried on by the Salvation Army; but there is a world of suggestiveness in that idea of the Methodists being deeply interested in the conversion of the abandoned, *when they could get a hearing from no other class*. Those were the days of the genuine power of Methodism, because they were the days of her humility. But now her humility is gone and her power with it. Shorn of her humility, she is as weak as any other, and can only stand and complacently view and tacitly indorse the irregular guerrilla religious warfare of the Salvation Army. Nor is she the exception.

**August 4, 1887**

## **"The Besetting Sin" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us." The apostle here takes the figure from the running course, where the contestant before starting in the race would lay aside every superfluous thing. Nothing was retained that would in the least hinder his progress. So we must lay aside everything that would hinder our progress in the divine life. These weights are of various kinds; some we have by nature, and others we voluntarily assume. Their number is legion, comprising every sin and evil tendency common to mankind. Barnes well says that "some very light objects, in themselves considered, become material and weighty encumbrances. Even a feather or a ring-such may be the fondness for these toys-may become such a weight that those who wear them will never make much progress toward the prize." The original signifies something that may be hooked or fastened on. Constant watchfulness, therefore, is required on the part of the runner, lest, after he has laid aside a certain weight, Satan, who is ever on the alert, may fasten it on again.

In addition to the "weights," of which different people have different kinds, there is a constantly recurring sin, to which all are liable, and which not only hinders our progress, but effectually stops it. If we trace the connection between Hebrews 12 and the two preceding chapters, we cannot fail to see that the sin to which the apostle here refers is the sin of unbelief. Chapter 10 closes with these words: "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; of

them that the leave to the saving of the soul." The eleventh begins with a definition of faith, and a continues with notable examples of it, showing that without faith it is impossible to please God. Then, the exhortation which we are now considering. Many suppose that by "the sin which doth so easily beset us," the apostle means some especial sin to which have differed persons are liable, differing in different cases. So we hear of impatience as the besetting sin of one person, and covetousness as the besetting sin of another. But the apostle speaks of "*the* sin," and not of the *sin* which so easily besets us. It is a fact that may be demonstrated, that lack of faith is the greatest source of trouble with every person, manifesting itself, of course, in many different ways. Lack of faith keeps back thousands from being Christians, and causes many professed Christians to stumble and fall by the way.

The word which is rendered "easily beset," does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. It properly means "the surrounding," and has been defined, "easy to encircle." Tindal renders it, "the sin that hangeth on us." Bloomfield supposes that it means "the sin which especially winds around us and hinders our course," with reference to the longer garment worn by the ancients, which, if not removed or fastened up, would wind around the legs of the runner, and cause him to fall. In harmony with this view is the exhortation given to "gird the loins of your mind," meaning to have faith.

How few there are who believe with all their heart. But a belief that admits of a doubt is not faith. True faith is that condition into which not the slightest element of disbelief enters. Who has the faith of Abraham, or Noah, or Moses? We think we have faith because we assent to the most prominent doctrines of the Bible, or to what is known as the "Third Angel's Message." A simple belief that Jesus is the Son of God, and that all the ten commandments are still as binding as when they were given, will not save it anybody. "The devil's believe and tremble," their belief is not imputed to them for righteousness; they are devils still. Genuine faith in the Third Angel's Message is evinced by a practical reception and of all the truths brought out by it. Among them may be mentioned the spirit of the prophecy. One who does not believe in this is not a believer in the message, it is one of the main points. Compare Rev. 12:19 with Rev.19:10, etc. But this also involves a practical believe in true temperance, that is a vital part of the Third Angel's Message. True temperance, or health reform, as it is termed, has been declared to bear the same relation to the last message that the right arm does to the body. Then if we do not believe and practice it, our faith is a crippled faith.

We may also show our lack of faith by neglecting to render to God his dues. Among nearly all denominations the tithing system is now recognized as the Bible plan of supporting those who labor in the cause of God. It is founded on the same principle as the Sabbath-the right of property. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord;" whoever uses that time for himself takes that to which he has no right. So also "the tithe is the Lord's," and whoever does not return it to him is guilty of robbery. Men who would scorn to defraud their neighbors of a dime, will systematically rob God, and think there is no wrong done. The Bible bears no uncertain testimony on this point. In astonishment the prophet says, by direct inspiration from God, "Will a man rob God?" Someone will say, No; a man



cannot rob God. But listen: "Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." Mal. 3:8, 9. Abraham did not do so, for he paid tithes to the Lord's servant. Noah, in gratitude for his preservation, sacrificed not merely one-tenth, but one-seventh of his property. The neglect to honor the Lord with our substance, and with the first-fruits of all our increase (Prov. 3:9), is a most flagrant manifestation of unbelief. God makes his care for us both temporal and spiritual, dependent on our remembering him; but if we do not thus honor him, we intimate that we have no faith in his ability or willingness to care for us, or else that we lightly esteemed his protection. W.

### **"Manner of Christ's Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is most unfortunate that the tendency nowadays is almost entirely against a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. It seems difficult for people to understand that Christ and the apostles ever spoken plain, simple language, such as one person would use in speaking to another. Whenever a passage is read, the first thought with many is, What hidden meaning is there in it? What lesson is conveyed? Any one who reads the popular Sunday-school comments will see this tendency conspicuously displayed. Now it is proper to search the Scriptures; and if there be a difficult text, it is right to find out its meaning, by comparing it with other texts; but there are some things that are so plain that any attempt at explanation only obscures the meaning. And this is the case with by far the greater part of the Bible.

It is true that there are parables, but these are readily distinguished from the direct, simple statements, and are usually either explained, or in such common use as to need no explanation. When Christ was on earth, one of the proofs of his divine mission was that the poor had the Gospel preached unto them; consequently we should expect his teaching to be such as could be understood by poor people who have not had the advantages of an education. And this is the case. The Bible is a model of simplicity; it uses the language of the common people.

We have seen how very plain and direct the statements are in the Bible concerning the second coming of Christ. No believer in the Bible pretends to deny these statements, for to do so would be to deny the Bible. But there are very many who evade these statements, and virtually deny them, by claiming that Christ's second coming is spiritual. Some claim that Christ comes when a good man dies; and others claim that his coming is at conversion; while others still, carrying the latter idea out still further, claim that there will sometime in the future be a temporal millennium, when all men shall have been converted, and that Christ will then come and reign over his people spiritually, and that this is what is meant by the second coming of Christ.

Now the Bible is just as definite in regard to the manner of Christ's coming, as it is in regard to the fact of his coming. It plainly says that Christ will come

personally and visibly. The texts which prove this will of course furnish additional evidence that Christ will certainly come.

And first it may be well to notice Heb. 9:28: "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Christ is to come the *second* time; but if the theory that he comes at death or conversion be correct, he would already have come many thousands of times.

Again, the time of Christ's ministry here on earth, of which we have a record in the New Testament, is conceded by all to be his first advent. But men had been converted previously to that time, and for thousands of years good men had been dying. If Christ comes at conversion or at death, he must have come millions of times before his first advent. Anyone can see the absurdity of those theories.

It is not denied that Christ has, at different times in the world's history, met and conversed with certain of his devoted followers, or that he is ever present with his people by his Spirit; but nothing of this kind can be referred to in the texts under consideration.

It would, however, be manifestly inconsistent to refer to any one of these times as the second coming of Christ. One of them has no precedence over another. But there was one time when he was here in person, when he talked with thousands, and was seen by thousands more. At that time there was probably no nation on earth that did not know of him and his mighty works; and there has been no nation since then that has not heard of that wonderful event. Now at that time he said he was coming "*again*," and Paul speaking of that first advent and its object, said that he would come the "*second* time." Consistency, therefore, would demand that his second coming be also personal and visible, and no less conspicuous nor less widely known than his first. And this we are positively told shall be the case: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye *shall see him*," and they also which pierced him." Rev. 1:7.

Again we read: "For the Son of Man shall, in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. Those who place the second coming of Christ at death, or at conversion, must have a very faint conception of the glory of the Father. When the Lord came down on Sinai, "the whole mountain quaked greatly" (Ex 19:18); and when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, even Moses was not able to enter. See Ex. 40:34, 35. The glory of a single angel, at the resurrection of Jesus, caused the Roman guard to fall as dead men. Matt. 28:4. What then will be the manifestation when he comes in his own glory, and that of the Father, and all the holy angels? This glory which will attend Christ's coming is thus described: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. Paul says that when Christ comes he will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. That this glory will be seen by all is proved by Rev. 1:7 already quoted, and by the words of our Saviour in Matt. 24:27: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Any one who has seen the lightning flash across the sky in the

sheets so tensely bright to that even the closed eyelids could not wholly shut out the impression, can appreciate

471

to a faint degree the terror of that day. Of the key facts of that glory, we learn again 2 Thess. 2:8: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." The fire that David says shall "devour before him," is the glory of his presence.

Nothing further is needed to prove that the coming of the Lord will be nothing like the quiet of a death-bed scene, or the hour when an individual gives his heart to God. There are, however, a host of other texts on this point, no less strong than those already quoted. Two only will be given to show how literal and personal that coming is. The first is Acts 1:9-11: "And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up in heaven? *this same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The second is 1 Thess. 4:16: "For *the Lord himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*; and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

These texts speak for themselves. The language is clear and plain, and anyone can understand them. And yet, who can realize the terrible scene which they foretell? The human mind cannot conceive of the awful grandeur of that hour when the Lord of heaven and earth shall be revealed. Let each one ask himself the question:-

"How will my heart endure  
The terrors of that day,  
When the earth and heaven, before the judge,  
Astonished, shrink away!" W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

We heartily agree with the following statement by the *Journal* and *The Messenger*:-

"The Sabbath-school is the church at steady, while the service following is the church worship. Parents and children should unite in both. In the former they may separate into classes according to mental attainments, but in the latter they should be together."

The camp-meeting in Eureka, Cal., will be held on the same ground as last year-Cormick's Grove, between II and I Streets. It is hoped that every Sabbath-keeper in Humboldt County will be present at this meeting, unless unnecessarily detained at home by sickness. Besides the regular religious services, instruction will be given in various parts of the work, which no one can afford to lose.

There has been much questioning among the brethren in California, whether or not the General Conference would be held in this state this year. We are glad

to be able to announce that beyond all doubt the Conference will be held in Oakland this fall. Word has been received from the General Conference Committee to this effect. We are not informed as to the time, as it has not yet been fixed. Work is being pushed forward on the Oakland house of worship, which, according to contract, will be completed by the first of November.

We are able to announce that at the Eureka camp-meeting special attention will be given to the interests of the Sabbath-school. The State Secretary will be present for the express purpose of giving instruction in the work of keeping records, making of reports, etc., and especially of helping the teachers in the primary departments, so that they may become more efficient workers with the little ones. Every Sabbath-school officer and teacher should be present. All teachers and secretaries are requested to bring their record books to the meeting.

Cardinal Gibbons was in Washington Sunday, July 10, and, as the *Catholic Mirror* reports it: "At the special request of President Cleveland his eminence called upon the former at the executive mansion. The cardinal recounted some of the features of his interesting trip abroad, to which the President listened with evident pleasure. Mr. Cleveland expressed his pleasure at the safe return of his eminence in good health, and the distinguished pair parted with cordial manifestations of mutual esteem and respect." Yes, the influence of the Catholic vote is very respectable, and Rome is very glad to make as many visits as possible to the executive mansion, so the respect is "mutual."

For the first time in the history of Iowa the State penitentiary at Fort Madison is so short of convicts as to prevent the fulfillment of the prison contracts. One such fact as this is a stronger argument in favor of Prohibition than are ten thousand utterances against it of the cry that "Prohibition does not prohibit." When Prohibition so interferes with the business of penitentiaries that they cannot fulfill contracts made on the basis of crimes committed, then that is tangible proof that Prohibition *does* prohibit a large per cent of *crime* at the very least. And in so largely prohibiting crime, it must in the very nature of things prohibit that which leads to the commission of crime, and the connection is perfectly clear that it is liquor-drinking that leads to most of the crime. Let Prohibition succeed everywhere and continue forever.

### **"Intemperance Rampant" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

Quite recently Mrs. Margaret Parker, of Dundee Scotland, the World's Organizer of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, was interviewed by a reporter concerning the status of temperance in the world. As Mrs. Parker is one of the foremost temperance women in the world, and is probably possessed of the best information on that subject, the following extract from the interview will be of interest:-

"Do you find that the temperance movement has been gaining ground in the past few years?"

"I find that the temperance movement is winning adherents but I also find that the liquor traffic is advancing immeasurably faster. Why, I see since my last visit to America that the liquor business has fairly made leaps and bounds. Saloons and places of iniquity have sprung up by the myriads. No, I am sorry to confess that liquor has far outdistanced temperance of late years. There is a growing temperance feeling, it is true, but the opportunities for indulging in iniquity are increased by the tenfold."

"Do you find the same condition of affairs all over the world?"

"Pretty much so, but more particularly in Great Britain and America. It is difficult to decide which of the two has become the greater victim. But there is one thing I do not observe and that is that liquor has a much less hold on women in America than in Great Britain. I rarely see a woman touch intoxicants here, but it is far too common, I regret to confess, among my countrywomen."

One would naturally wonder what comfort those who are expecting the universal triumph of good in this world could gather from the fact that although temperance is growing, intemperance is increasing tenfold. But Mrs. Parker is not at all discouraged, because she expects that the ballot will very soon be given to win, which, she says, will make everything right.

### **"Don't They Know Better?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

On a recent Sunday Paul Boynton, the famous swimmer, gave a public exhibition by floating in a rubber suit (after his usual fashion) from Holyoke to Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts; and, as might have been expected, the thousands of idle and curious people lined the river banks to witness the spectacle, which was attended with considerable noise because of the salutes which everywhere greeted the swimmer. This circumstance a correspondent of the *Congregationalist* takes as a text for a sharp sermon on the sin of violating the "Sabbath," which title he applies to Sunday.

Of course Boynton's exhibitions are not worth seeing; but assuming that they are wrong because given on Sunday, is simply begging the whole question; for we cannot for a moment suppose that either the editor of the *Congregationalist* or the correspondent who wrote the article is so ignorant of divine truth as not to know that Sunday is not the Sabbath; and that, therefore, if such an exhibition is right on any day it is not wrong on Sunday, simply because it takes place upon that day. But the *sang-froid* with which so-called orthodox ministers and editors insist that Sunday is the Sabbath, would be amusing were not for the innate wickedness of the deception which they are thus palming off upon the people.

All who teach such palpable errors that Sunday is the Sabbath, should consider well the question: "Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, and whereas ye say, the Lord saith it; albeit I have not spoken?" Eze. 13:7. And if they are honest with themselves and with God they must answer that they have done this very thing: for "they have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith; and the Lord hath not sent them; and they have made others to hope that they would confirm the word." Verse 6.

"They are foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing;" for, as every intelligent Bible student knows, there is not one word in that book to justify any man in calling the first day of the week the Sabbath. The Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments know but one Sabbath, to wit, the seventh day of the week, the day just before the first day of the week, the day upon which the holy women "rested according to the commandment," before coming to anoint the body of the Saviour. See Luke 23:56; 24:1.

### **"Reckless Statements" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some weeks ago we made the statement that Sunday-keeping and infant baptism rest upon precisely the same ground, namely, human tradition; and that no one can give any good reason for receiving the one rather than the other. For this the *Baptist Flag* takes us to task, and stoutly asserts, but does not at all attempt to prove, that Sunday was "established as the 'Lord's day' by example of Christ and his inspired apostles;" and that "the first day of the week, Sunday, or Sabbath, was observed by the apostolic Church from the time of Christ, for hundreds of years before the rise of Popery"!

This statement, soberly made in a religious journal, serves to show the utter recklessness of those who, right or wrong, are determined to bolster up an unscriptural practice. Even if the *Flag's* first proposition were true, its second could not be; for there was no "apostolic church from the time of Christ, for hundreds of years before the rise of Popery." This idea of stretching the apostolic church over several centuries is certainly original with our Baptist contemporary, but it is scarcely worth copywriting; it is, however, in perfect keeping with the argument (?) that Sunday was "established as the 'Lord's day' by the example of Christ and his inspired apostles."

There is scarcely a papal abomination for which the same claim is not made, at least so far as the example of "inspired" men is concerned. This is notably true of the practice of pouring or sprinkling for baptism. The claim that affusion is apostolic is made with the utmost apparent confidence even by learned men in several of the most respectable and influential churches; and yet there is not an intelligent Baptist anywhere who does not *know* that there is not a shadow of truth in it. Anyone reading the Bible without bias or prejudice would certainly conclude that immersion an immersion alone is baptism; and just as surely must the candid reader conclude that the seventh day is the only divinely appointed Sabbath or Lord's day. And to turn aside from the Scriptures and recognize the authority of tradition, even though it claim to be apostolic, is simply to open the floodgates of error; and they who do it are not really Protestants, even though be Baptists, for the fundamental principle of Protestantism is that the Bible is a sufficient role faith and practice, while Popery asserts that apostolic or church tradition is of equal authority. Sunday-keeping is not taught in the Scripture and is, therefore, not Protestant but Papal.

**August 11, 1887**

**"The Making of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the Baptist Ministers' and Layman's Conference, recently held in Oakland, one of the ministers read a paper on the "Seventh-day Sabbath," which was, as usual, highly satisfactory to those who have their minds already made up that Sunday is the only Sabbath. We have looked with interest for the publication of the paper, but finding that nothing worthy of an extended review. The writer claims that the seventh-day Sabbath was only a Jewish institution, that it originated at the exode and ended at the cross, and that the Sunday Sabbath is an institution by itself, having no connection whatever with the fourth commandment. In this latter proposition the writer is correct, for the Sunday institution certainly has nothing to do with the fourth commandment, except to be condemned by it; and since all moral duty is contained in the ten commandments, it follows, from this Baptist writer's admission, that there is no moral obligation attaching to the observance of Sunday.

That the author of the article in question has no knowledge of the seventh-day argument, will be evident to anyone who reads the following:-

"The Sabbatarian bases his theory largely upon the following passage:-

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day for all his work which yet made. And God bless the seventh day, and sanctified yet; because that in it he had wrested from all his work which God created and made.' Gen. 2:2, 3. It will be observed that these words contain no precept or command. We have in them a simple historical statement, and that is all. The substance of the statement is this: *God ended his work on the seventh day; on that day he rested, and in so doing he blessed and sanctified it.*"

It is true that a great deal does rest upon Gen. 2:2, 3. It is also true that that passage contains no precept or command, and that it contains only a simple historical statement. But it is also a fact that it contains a simple historical statement that the commandment was given enforcing the observance of the seventh day. This we shall show, and in so doing we shall also show how the author of the paper referred to has utterly failed to comprehend either the Scripture or the argument based upon it. He says:-

"The substance of the statement [in Gen.2:2, 3] is this: God ended his work on the seventh creation day; on that day he rested, and in so doing he blessed and sanctified it."

It is possible that there are many others who have read the Scripture thus carelessly. Let such read it again with us, carefully: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he *had rested* from all his work which God created and made." That is very far from saying that God rested on the seventh day, and that "*in so doing* he blessed and sanctified it." The blessing and the sanctification are entirely distinct from the resting, and were subsequent

to it. God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, "because that in it *he had rested*."

Three acts went to make the Sabbath a holy day for man's observance: 1. God rested upon the day. This made it a Sabbath, for Sabbath means rest. It made it the Sabbath, or rest, of the Lord; but if nothing more had been done, men would have been under no obligation to keep it. 2. "God blessed the seventh day." This was done after his rest upon it, for he blessed it *because he had rested* in it from all his work. 3. God sanctified the seventh day. This also was done after the rest; and in this simple statement that God sanctified the seventh day, we find the evidence that God did, at the close of this rest, command man to keep holy. The following evidence is offered in proof:-

The word sanctify means, "to make sacred or holy; to set apart wholly or religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rights; to hallow." Now a thing cannot be set apart for a holy or religious use, unless the ones who are to so use it are informed of each setting apart; in fact, setting it apart must necessarily consistent in the notification to the people, and the commandment to observe the day thus set apart.

This definition is in harmony with Scripture usage. In Ex.19:23 we read as follows concerning Mount Sinai, just before the Lord came down upon it: "And Moses said on to the Lord, The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou of chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mountain, and sanctified it." In verse 12 we have an inspired comment on the meaning of "sanctify" as used in this first. The Lord said to Moses: "And thou shalt set bounds under the people round about, say, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mouth, or touch the border of it; whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." Thus we find that sanctifying the amount consisted in setting it apart by bounds, and forbidding the people to pass over those bounds. In like manner sanctifying the seventh day consisted in setting it apart by the sanctions of God's word, and in forbidding the people to overstep the bounds and trample upon the Sabbath.

These three things, resting, blessing, and sanctifying, made the Sabbath of the Lord of lasting obligation upon all people. Yet notwithstanding the bounds that were set about the seventh day, men have dared to break through it and trample the holy Sabbath under their unholy feet. And this, although the penalty against breaking through the bounds about Mount Sinai was not more severe or more sure to follow than the penalty against breaking through the bounds set around the Sabbath. But "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Eccl. 8:11.

And now, to all who have broken through the bounds, and have trampled upon God's holy Sabbath, the long-suffering and merciful Father says: "If thou turn away by foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and called the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee



to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. 58:13, 14. W.

### **"When Does the Sabbath Begin?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

This has been a puzzling question to very many. They cannot understand why Sabbath-keepers should begin their rest at the setting of the sun, while other people regard the day as beginning at midnight. Some have thought that was an arbitrary distinction more for the purpose of peculiarity than anything else; but a little reference to the Scriptures will suffice to clear the subject of all doubts.

In the first place, we have evidence that the first day of time began in the evening. That is, the dark portion of the day preceded the light portion. "The evening and morning were the first day." Gen. 1:5. That this was necessarily the case, can be seen from the order of events in the creation. Time, as distinguished from eternity, commenced with the first creative act of God. The first act was the bringing of the earth into existence. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 1:1. That this occupied by a brief space of time, and not a long, extended period, is proved by the context, also by Ps. 23:6, 9: "By the word of the Lord for the heavens made; and although most of them by the breadth of his mouth." "For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." But at that time there was still light, nothing but intense darkness, for we read that "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The next half was to create light. "And God said, let there be light, and there was light." Gen. 1:3. God thus ordained that darkness and light should henceforth succeed each other in continuous round, and a period of darkness and one of light, called respectively night and day, should constitute one entire day. This completed the first day's work. The first day began with darkness, and ended as darkness began once more to overspread the earth. As though to establish beyond question the fact that this was to be the order of all days, it is stated of the first six days that the "evening and morning" constituted the day. But if the first six days commenced with the evening, and ended with the following evening, it is evident that every succeeding day, the Sabbath with the rest, must begin and end in the same manner. This is further verified by Lev. 23:32, where the Lord says, "From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath."

Having settled the fact that the day begins and ends at evening, the only thing necessary to understanding of the main question is to find when it is evening. This is easily settled by the following passages: "But at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even, *at the going down of the sun.*" Deut. 16:6. "And the king of Ai hanged on a tree *until eventide*; and *as soon as the sun was down*, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcass down from the tree." Josh. 8:29. Also, Josh. 10:26, 27: "Joshua smote the them, and slew them, them on five trees; and they were hanging upon the trees *until the evening*. And it came to pass at the *time of the going down of the sun*, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees."

These texts plainly show that the evening and the setting of the sun are identical. In the New Testament we have additional testimony. In the first chapter of Mark we have an account of the events of one Sabbath in the life of Christ. First he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and taught. Verse 21. Here he found a man with an unclean spirit, whom he healed. Verses 23-27. Then he left the synagogue, and went to the house of Simon, whose mother-in-law he healed. Verses 29-31. The rest of the people, however, dared not ask him to heal their sick during the hours of the Sabbath, but waited till its close. We read in verse 32, "And at *even, when the sun did set*, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and then there were possessed with devils." Thus we see that the people unanimously regarded sunset as the close of the Sabbath, and if sunset was the close of the Sabbath of course sunset twenty-four hours earlier must have been the beginning. This was the divinely appointed order.

The question then arises, How does it happen that people nowadays begin and end the day at midnight? The answer is this: When men became idolaters, and did not like to retain God in their knowledge (Rom. 1:28), they soon lost all knowledge of the institutions and commandments of God, so that their forms of worship and of daily life differed entirely from those of God's people. Each nation had gods of its own, and customs peculiar to itself. The Persians and the Syrians worshipped the sun, and began the day at sunrise. That the Jews, during their captivity, did not lose their reckoning, and conformed to that of the Babylonians, is proved by the passage in Mark already quoted. The Romans, for some reason, selected midnight as the time for the beginning and ending of their day. The barbarous tribes that conquered Rome accepted her customs, and transmitted them to their descendants. Thus the Roman method of beginning the day has become the settled custom in Europe and America. Since it is an established custom, it is necessary, in order to be understood, to conform to the usage in speaking with others, also in business, since the custom is fixed by law. But in the observance of the Sabbath, God's order is unchangeable. Those who accept the Sunday festival, which is a man-made institution emanating from Rome, may be allowed to keep it in such a manner as man decrees; but those who keep God's rest day-the memorial of his creative power-will take the day just as God gave it, and not offer a substitute by attaching a portion of two days together. W.

**"Piety Without Display" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

(August 28.-Matt. 6:1-15.)

The best manuscripts have "righteousness" instead of "alms," in verse 1, and this seems to be the truer meaning of the text, for righteousness includes all right actions, and no good deed of whatever kind should be done for the purpose of winning the applause of men. In the verses following, three divisions of righteousness are considered, namely, almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, none of

which should be done with the design of attracting attention. A deed, however right itself, loses all the quality of righteousness when it is done simply for display. This is evident from the statement that those who do thus have no reward from God. Ostentatious piety is not piety at all, but it is simply an exhibition of selfishness. It is a fact that there may be as much of selfishness displayed in the giving of alms as in the withholding of them.

"Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward." This does not mean, as a careless reader might suppose, that they shall have a reward, or that a certain kind of reward is in store for them, but that they already have their reward. The new version expresses the exact idea in the words, "They have received their reward." They gave alms to be seen of men; men sought them, and that constitutes their reward; it is all the reward they wanted.

The command in verse 3 coincides with the exhortation of Paul and in Rom. 12:8: "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;" and again with his statement in 2 Cor. 9:7: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." The man who gives liberally, with a sincere motive, will not seek for the applause of men. On the contrary, he will rather avoid public notice, because, by measuring himself by the true standard, he will realize that what he does is in reality very insignificant. Yet insignificant though a deed may be in itself, and hidden from the eye of everybody, it does not escape the eye of God, and the promise is, "Thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly."

The same rule applies to praying. True prayer is the desire of the heart made known to God. In it the person appears as a petitioner making known his urgent wants. Such prayer is always heard; but of those who pray simply an order that others may applaud their piety, or their elegant language, the significant statement is made, "Verily I say unto you, They have their reward." They do not ask with the expectation or with the desire that their petitions shall be granted, and consequently God takes no notice of their prayers. All that they desire from their prayers is to be heard of men, and the fact that men hear them, constitutes the answer to their prayer. Nevertheless, such persons are not mere harmless utterances that passed entirely unnoticed by the Lord; they are violations of the third commandment, which says: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." They constitute the worst kind of profanity, since the petitioners use the name of the Lord to exalt themselves.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter it into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father which see if in secret shall reward thee openly." This must be understood as a principle rather than an explicit command for every occasion of prayer. It does not mean that it is wrong to pray in public, but that one should not pray in public for the sake of publicity. We have in the Bible many instances of public prayer: Solomon prayed before the thousands assembled at the dedication of the temple. 2 Chron. 6:12, 13. The Levites prayed publicly, as recorded in Neh. 9:4-38. When Paul separated from the Ephesian brethren he prayed with them all. Acts 20:36. He

also gave thanks to God in the presence of all the passengers and crew on his notable sea voyage to Rome. Acts 27:35. And Christ himself prayed with his disciples many times, and at the grave of Lazarus he prayed not only in the presence of his disciples, but of a great company of Jews. Moreover, in the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, we have explicit instructions concerning public prayer. All of these things show that public prayer is not only not forbidden, but is enjoined as a duty. But even in public prayer, if it is sincere prayer, the spirit of privacy is maintained, for the individual is as it were shut in with God, and loses thought, to a certain extent, of those who are present.

One of the most comforting promises in the Bible is given in this connection to those who pray in secret, namely, "Thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." This seems to be an unconditional promise; for sincere prayer, asking in the name of Jesus for those things which a person really needs, will always be heard answered, and it is not to be presumed that one would go by himself to engage in prayer with any other than a sincere motive. The prayer is made in secret, but the reward is open. Men may know nothing of the agonizing petitions, but they cannot fail to see the grace which is abundantly bestowed in consequence. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to state that prayer is not necessarily secret because the individual prays in a room by himself. We have known people to make a great display of their "secret devotions." They were careful to let people know when they retired for prayer, and very often if such announcement was unnecessary, because their voice would be raised to such a pitch that everybody in and about the house *must* hear. We can see no difference between such prayer and prayer upon the street corner. Of course there is no wrong attached to the individual if someone chances to over hear his prayer; but he who prays professedly in secret, but with the expectation that others shall notice prayer, comes very far from obeying the injunction of the Saviour, "When thou prayest thou shalt not be as the hypocrites."

In the seventh verse our Saviour teaches that mere words do not constitute prayer. God is not moved by the eloquence of man, but by his needs, and a man's real need may often be expressed better in few words than in many. The heathen, we are told, thought that they should be heard for their much of the speaking. Examples of this are found in 1 Kings 18:26 and Acts 19:34. Some even have carried this matter of vain repetition to such a pitch that they use what is called a prayer-wheel. Writing off the petition, they fasten it to the rim of the wheel, which they

cause to revolve for rapidly before their idol, every revolution being a prayer. The difference between this sort of prayer and many prayers of professed Christians is only in degree. In Catholic catechisms and books of religious instruction, we find vain repetitions actually enjoined. The multiplied repetition of *Ave Maria* or the *Pater Noster* is counted as a great virtue, and the one who says the most prayers supposed to be the most pious. But such prayer, notwithstanding the fact that the Lord's Prayer itself is repeated, are destitute of any semblance of real prayer. A parrot might be taught to repeat the Lord's Prayer, and he might

mutter it over a thousand times a day, and yet there would be no prayer in it. The unreasonableness of such vain repetitions is shown by the statement that "Your father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him." It is not necessary for us to pray in order that the Lord they know what we need, but that we may bring ourselves into a proper condition to receive the things which we need.

The question often arises in the minds of some, "What is the use of praying at all?" They argue that we cannot change the mind of God, that praying is useless since God knows what we want before we ask, and, further, that the universe is governed by fixed laws, and that therefore praying will not affect matters in the least. To this last it can be answered that there are no laws which are not subject to God. To say that what we call the laws of nature cannot be changed or suspended if necessary to the answer of prayer, is to say that God is restricted by the things which he rules, which is an absurdity. Moreover, there are instances innumerable in which in direct answer to prayer the laws of nature have been suspended. The raising of the dead is a case in point. In answer to the first objection, it is enough to say that although God desires only the welfare of his creatures, and he knows what they need without being told, he does not force upon people what they do not want, even though they really need it. And when a person who recognizes his need, and really wants that which will supply it, and feels that he cannot get along without it, the natural impulse is to ask for it, and then it is that God gives his special blessings.

Verses 9-13 contained the model prayer. In introducing it the Saviour said, "After this manner therefore pray ye." This indicates not that the prayer which follows is to be invariably used, although it is very often fitting to use it, but that it should serve as a model for our petitions. Since it is the petition, framed by divine wisdom, it must necessarily and does cover everything which man needs, both temporal and spiritual. It is because of this comprehensiveness that the Lord's Prayer may be repeated by all classes of people, both young and old, in all time. It never grows old. It is the only prayer ever written which was worthy of being repeated by others than the one who composed it. This is because it is the only prayer ever composed for man by a divine being. Praying in which petitions made by men are used, must necessarily be largely mechanical, and therefore destitute of the real essence of prayer, which is the sincere desire of the individual at that present time. When a man is in extremity he will have no difficulty in forming his own petition, and he would have no use for a petition made by someone else. A prayer-book would have been of very little use to Peter when he was sinking in the Sea of Galilee.

From this prayer we learn that we are to come to God not as to a judge or a governor who is to be appeased, but as to a Father who is all sympathy and love. Many people have entertained a wrong idea from the parable of the unjust judge, recorded in Luke 18:1-7. The unjust judge at first refused to grant the request of the poor widow, yet he finally granted it because of her importunity. The idea too commonly drawn from this is, that if we persevere in prayer God will relent and answer repetitions; the parable is not designed to compare God with the unjust judge, but to make a contrast. If the unjust judge who neither feared God nor

regarded man, would grant the widow's petition, because of her importunity, then most assuredly God will avenge his own elect who cry earnestly unto him. This parable and the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are sufficient in themselves to give Christians the most confidence when they pray. Add to this the fact that we have a merciful and faithful high priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and "was tempted in all points like this we are," and we may "come boldly unto the throne of grace, a that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in times of need."

We have seen it stated that the term "Our Father" implies that all men are brethren, because children of the same Father. But this is a mistake. Paul says that we are all by nature the children of wrath "because we are" the children of disobedience. Eph. 2:2, 3; 5:6. And as the devil is the author of sin, Christ directly charged the disobedient Jews with whom he was talking, of being the children of the devil (John 8:44); and in Matt. 13:38-42 he expressly states that those who do iniquity "are the children of the wicked one." The apostle John also speaks of those who keep the commandments, and of those who transgressed them, and says, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (John 3:10), thus showing a direct contrast between those who have God for their Father, and those whose father is Satan. Moreover, we learned in Rom. 8:14-17 and Gal. 4:4-7 that people become the children of God by adoption, and that the mark or seal of adoption is the Holy Spirit; but if they were by nature the children of God, they would not need to be adopted. Paul also declares that "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

"Thy kingdom come." This is nothing less than a prayer for Christ's second coming, for his coming and kingdom are associated together. 2 Tim. 4:1. When he was on earth, Christ told his disciples, who thought that his kingdom should immediately appear, that he was like a nobleman who "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return" (Luke 19:11, 12), thus indicating his return to Heaven to receive his kingdom, and his second coming to gather the subjects of it. In harmony with this we find in Dan. 7:13, 14 a prophetic description of Christ appearing before the father and receiving "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And Christ himself said that when he should come in his glory with all his holy angels with him, then would be the time that he should sit upon the throne of his glory, and that he would then say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:31-34. This kingdom is entirely distinct from the kingdom of glory, upon the throne of which God the Father sits, and before which Christ ministers as priest. *That* kingdom has already come, and if that were the kingdom referred to, in the Lord's Prayer, it would be out of place to use that petition. But the kingdom referred to is the one of which the faithful followers of God are at present only heirs, waiting for the promised possession.

"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." The will of God is simply the law of God, see Ps. 40:8 and Rom. 2:17-20, where we learn that those who know the will of God are they who are instructed of the law. How the will of God is done in Heaven is told in Ps. 103:20: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in

strength, that do his commandments, harkening unto the voice of his word." When the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven, it will be when all the works of the devil had been destroyed, and when the new heavens and the new earth have been given, wherein righteousness shall dwell. Then will be fulfilled the words of the prophet: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." Isa. 60:21. Therefore the uttering of this part of the Lord's Prayer, if the petitioner is sincere, indicates a complete submission to the will of God, and an earnest desire to keep every portion of the ten commandments.

"And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." In this is implied what is plainly stated in Matt. 6:14, 15: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Therefore it is utterly useless for any one to use this prayer, or to expect God to pardon his sins, unless he freely forgives all who have trespassed against him. Paul says (Eph. 4:32), "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, for giving one another, even as God for Christ's sake have forgiven you."

This is the merest glance at the Lord's Prayer, but it is all that we have the space for. To give it any adequate study, not less than an entire lesson should be spent upon each clause of the prayer. But perhaps even with this glance some may see a depth of meaning in the prayer which they have never before realized, and may be led to study it more carefully until they can pray it "with the spirit and with the understanding." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

The dispatches state that the Pope has sent an autograph letter to the Emperor William in reply to a letter recently received from him. Nor is it forgotten to give the highly interesting information that "both letters are couched in very affecting terms." "Very affecting" indeed, we have no doubt! Behold how these innocents love one another!

The rector of one of the Episcopal Churches of San Francisco preached a few Sundays ago on "The Mission of Beauty." Just what connection this has with the Gospel, we cannot discover, for we read of the Founder of the gospel that "he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." From the list of pulpit topics which we occasionally see, we should judge that the Bible is almost out of date. Yet there are people who can still find "wondrous things" in the word of God.

The brethren in California will notice that the time of camp-meeting is changed from September 22 to October 3, to October 6-17. This postponement was made in order that we might be sure of the presence and help of Brother and Sister White, who could give us no assurance of being present earlier. We feel sure that the certainty of their presence will ensure a full attendance from all parts of the State. We do not apprehend any serious inconvenience on account of the lateness of the meeting, for the weather will be no colder than in

September, and the liability of an early rain is not much greater. At any rate, none should be deterred from coming to the meeting, by the possibility of a little physical discomfort. Come expecting nothing but good, and you will not be disappointed. The meeting will be in Oakland, but the site has not yet been decided upon.

The new meeting-house at Healdsburg was dedicated Sunday, July 31. There was a good attendance of the citizens of the place, also of our own people. The sermon was preached by Elders J. N. Loughborough; the dedicatory prayer was made by Elder J. O. Corliss. Meetings were held beginning Friday evening and continuing day and evening till Sunday night. Good impressions were made in favor of the truth, and arrangements have been made by the church to have preaching regularly on Sunday evening until our State camp-meeting. They have now a most excellent house, the largest of the kind north of San Francisco, a place where it is a comfort and a pleasure to go. There is nothing fancy about the building, and nothing elegant-except its plainness-and we do not think we have ever seen a house more convenient in all its arrangements. Not only will the house be a great help in the work and service of the church, but it is an immense advantage in the college work. For two years the college has been cramped in its energies, and crippled in efficiency, for lack of room. Now the Sabbath-school department of the meeting-house will be used for classes in the school work and will afford ample room for all purposes. We congratulate the California Conference and the Healdsburg Church and College that they have such a comfortable, commodious, and convenient place of worship and for work.

The Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Mirror*, writing under date of July 12, says:-

"Monsignor Ruffo and his companions were well received in England, as you know from the reports of the English press. Mgr. Ruffo is convinced that the time is not distant when an amicable arrangement will be made between the English Government and the Papacy and official representatives accredited from both. The Queen was especially kind to the Papal envoy, and assured them that she remembered with great pleasure the visit made by the present Pope to Windsor [before he became Pope] after completing his mission in Belgium."

We have no doubt at all that the convictions of Mgr. Ruffo are well founded.

Not long since at an installation service in one of the Central States, a minister preach or read word for word a sermon which was preached in the first Congregational Church in Chicago, by the Rev. Dr. Noble, and published in the *Homiletic Monthly* for March, 1880. Strangely enough, in that stolen sermon were the following words:-

"There are the trades and professions-each with its distinctive code. There is a railroad ethic, and there is a tradesmen ethic, and there is a house builders ethic, and there is the newspaper ethic, . . . and men are all the time dropping down into the narrow schemes of morals, and estimating conduct, not by the eternal rule of right, God's will, but by some current custom, or miserable conventionalism, or low cunning expediency. I say to a man, why do you adulterate these goods? Why do you weave shoddy into these clothes? Why do you peg shoddy into those shoes? Why stamp your flour with a false brand, and



put a label on the silk and the hat and the coat that you sell? His answer is, they all do it; it is one of the tricks of the trade, and something of this sort has to be done to make a living."

This matter of plagiarism is getting so common that it will soon be pertinent to inquire, what is the code of the clerical profession? A man who could steal a sermon which itself condemned stealing, must have very little moral sensibility? And what can be expected of the people whose teachers are so morally obtuse? "Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words everyone from his neighbor." Jer. 23:36.

The following question and answer we take partly from the New York *Christian Advocate*:-

"*Question*-Do you suppose that Lazarus remembered his experience in the other world after being raised from the dead?"

"*Answer*-You ask us what we 'suppose.' We suppose, first, that all inquiries on a subject of that kind are useless; we suppose, second, however, that they will be made to the end of time; third, we suppose that Lazarus did not remember his experience in the other world, because we suppose that he was dead in the same sense that a man who is drowned is dead before he is brought to life, and that he never would have come to life without our Lord's voice or some miraculous power; but that he was dead in the sense that his spirit was permanently and entirely free from the body we don't suppose, and therefore we suppose he did not know anything during the interval. And, finally, we don't suppose that you will agree with this view.

"N. B. The longer we live the less we suppose."

This is a much better answer than we expected to find in the *Advocate*. But the editor of the *Advocate* has evidently not yet live long enough to get over making foolish suppositions. For to suppose that a man who was so dead that nothing less than the voice of Jesus could bring him to life, was simply suffering from suspended animation, as in the case of a person nearly dead from drowning, is extremely foolish; and to suppose that the spirit had not left the body of a man who has been buried four days, and whose body had decomposed till it was offensive, is downright absurdity. More than this, it is directly opposed to the divine revelation, for Christ said plainly, "Lazarus is dead." This "supposition" that Lazarus was unconscious simply because he was not dead enough to be conscious, is worthy only of the pagan philosophy which it seeks to support.

It is announced from Rome that the Pope has decided to take part in the coming political elections in France, and that he hopes to secure a strong party in the Chamber of Deputies. Yes, he hopes to secure a strong party and the Chamber of Deputies so as to hold the balance of power and virtually control legislation in France and control it too from Rome. And France dare resent this political interference of a foreign religious power. How long will it be before the Pope will decide to take part in our political elections? Only let the National Reform religio-political party succeed in its design of establishing a constitutional basis for religious legislation, and this question will answer itself.

**"A Vigorous Statement and Challenge" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent* has been on the fence on the question of probation after death, the editors not seeming to have any fixed opinion of their own; but the publisher, Mr. Henry C. Bowen, has a decided opinion of his own, and he expresses it in a straightforward manner. After giving details of a correspondence between himself and Prof. E. C. Smythe, in which it appears that Professor Smythe could not, in answer to Mr. Bowen's request, give, without comment, any Scripture texts in support of this theory, Mr. Bowen says:-

"We cannot forbear saying, in this connection, that in all of our acquaintance with the secret movements and sometimes strange performances of men connected with our various churches, sects, and denominations, and all the excitement and maneuverings of the politicians in our heated presidential campaigns, and the most hard-fought battles of the great thirty-years antislavery conflict, in the desperate and ceaseless efforts of men in all directions in the pursuit of worldly gain, we have never seen a more senseless, uncalled-for agitation than the one started a year ago by the Andover teachers and speculators in regard to future probation."

He then called on them to "show any warrant in the Bible for the mischief they have done and are doing, or for the special help and encouragement they are now giving to the teachers and preachers of universalism and other isms, indulging downright infidelity, or for the pernicious hopes given by them directly and indirectly, to the unconverted, the world over." It is safe to presume that hereafter the editors of the *Independent* will know what position to take concerning the Andover speculations on probation after death.

**August 18, 1887**

**"The World Is Round" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

We do not design to make an argument to prove this statement, for we think that there are so few who would deny it that we can safely take it for granted. And yet we are occasionally led to believe that there are some people to whom this statement is news. We have but recently received a letter from a gentleman in Iowa, who seems to have but just heard that the world is round, and who has not yet fully waked up to a realizing sense of all that that implies. As his letter is a very fair sample of the trouble in which many people find themselves when the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is brought to their attention, we publish it in full:-

DEAR EDITOR: I am an occasional reader of your paper. I indorse your position against the worldliness of professing Christians, and temperance reform. I also believe in the near approach of the second coming of Christ. But as yet I cannot accept your views on the fourth commandment. Thus far some physical facts stand in the way of my believing that the seventh day of the week instead of the seventh part of time is intended by that command. As you kindly answer all

reasonable questions, giving light to those who sit in darkness, I take the liberty to address you. As the Master did, I will form a parable and state the case, and you will have the goodness to help me out of the difficulty you think I am in.

There are three brothers who live in the same town, Peter, James, and John; they are good Adventists, and keep the seventh day as their Sabbath. Peter and James desire to see the world, so they start out to circumnavigate the globe, while John remains at home. Peter starts east and James west. Each keeps his course, counts his weeks, and observes strictly his seventh-day Sabbath till he gets back to his native town. The three brothers meet and talk over the fourth commandment. They discover to their sorrow and astonishment that each is keeping a different day. Each one accuses his brethren of changing the day.

Peter, who sailed east and carried his time carefully and correctly, is keeping the first day of our week, or Sunday; James, who sailed west and carried his time carefully and correctly, is keeping the sixth day of our week, or Friday; while John alone is keeping the day they all observed before they parted. Now which one is keeping the right day? If we say John, then why haven't Peter and James, who observed correctly each succeeding seventh-day Sabbath on shipboard, as much right to their days as John, who observed his on land?

If your Sabbath views are correct, these physical facts can be shown to harmonize with them, for all natural truth is in harmony with revealed truth, because all truth is God's truth. If this harmony cannot be shown, I shall still feel that my first-day Sabbath is as good as yours. Yours for the truth. A. S.

We cannot think that we mistake when we judge that this brother has but recently heard that the world was round, for although he speaks in the beginning of his letter of the seventh part of time, the closing sentence shows that the seventh part of time which he observes always comes on the first day of the week. We take it, therefore, that he is a professed Christian and a conscientious observer of Sunday. And yet until he read in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, he never imagined that the rotundity of the earth would interfere in any way whatever with the keeping of the first day of the week. How is it that people will keep Sunday all their lives, and will send missionaries to the opposite side of the globe to teach the heathen that they must keep Sunday, but as soon as the Sabbath of the Lord is broached they declare that *it* cannot be kept because the world is round? Is the world round only when a person tries to keep the Sabbath, and flat at all other times? Is it not just as wrong for the first-day missionary who goes to China, India, or Africa, as it is for the seventh-day keeper who goes around the world? The simple fact that people do keep the first day of the week in every part of the world, should be a sufficient answer to the objection that people cannot keep the Sabbath on a round world. Indeed, it should prevent such an objection from ever being made.

But since our brother has used a parable, we feel like adopting it and improving upon it a little. The three brothers of whom he speaks were all born on the same day. With this correction we will adopt a parable as he has given it. Peter has just come home from his journey eastward around the world, and having gained one day is one day older than his brother John, who stayed at

home. James, who has just returned from his journey westward around the world, has lost a day and is keeping Friday, and so he is one day younger than his brother John, who stayed at home, and two days younger than Peter, who went around the world the other way. Now if our friend will accept this conclusion of the parable, we shall conclude that he is more puzzled over the fact that the world is round than any person whom we ever saw. But we believe that he will say that it is impossible that Peter should have gained a day on his brother John, and James should have lost one, and that their relative ages must be the same as before they started. But if this is so, his supposition concerning the Sabbath must be abandoned.

As a matter of fact, there is no trouble whatever in circumnavigating the globe in any direction. To say that one cannot keep Saturday if he goes to the other side of the globe, is equivalent to saying that they do not have the days of the week over there. But we have evidence from history that people on the other side of the world knew something of the days of the week even before America was discovered. It is true that it is not a given part of the day at the same moment all the world, just as it is true that no man can be all over the world at the same instant. But as the man can only be in one place at a time, all he has to do is keep the Sabbath when it comes to him, wherever he is. If anybody should start out to travel, with the idea that when it is noon in his native town, it is noon at the same instant all over the world, or, in other words, that the sun rises and sets at that same instant all around the globe, he would find out his mistake before he had traveled a thousand miles. He would find that he would have to set his watch ahead a little every day if he were going east, or back if he were going west.

The day is formed by the revolution of the earth. So far as the formation of days is concerned, the sun is fixed; but as a given portion of the earth in its revolution from west to east comes into the light of the sun, the sun is said to rise at that place, and when it comes into the shadow, the sun is said to set. Now if the person is traveling westward, he is going with the sun, and so he will see it above the horizon each day longer than if he remained in one place; while the one who goes east, goes with the motion of the earth, and so earth passes into the shade quicker and has less of the sunshine in the day, than if he remained at home. Therefore the one who goes west must set his watch back a few minutes each day, and the one who goes east must set his forward, so that he will be in harmony with the local time wherever he may be. And when both return home, having kept their time accurately, they find themselves perfectly in harmony with those who have remained there. Each one has kept his Sabbath, when he came to it, from sunset till sunset; and this is all that is required. If the commandment required the seventh part of time, this would not meet the demand, for when a man is traveling westward, it is longer from sunset to sunset than when he is traveling eastward. In short, all that the commandment requires is to keep the seventh day of the week wherever a man may be. This can be done in China as well as in America, and it can be done in any intermediate place between America and China, whether we go east or west.

If this were an age in which a trip of fifty miles from home would be a great wonder, the objection which our brother has made might seem plausible, but

when a trip around the world is a thing so common as not to attract any attention, and is accomplished every year by thousands and tens of thousands of people, and yet no individual has found his reckoning out of harmony with the reckoning of those whom he meets in any part of the world, the objection is simply absurd.

To conclude: The Lord made the earth and therefore we cannot doubt that he knew that it is round. He also made man, as the apostle says, "to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17:26. He also instituted the Sabbath, declaring it to be a fixed, definite day, and commanded men to observe it. Christ says that the Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27), meaning all mankind. Therefore we must conclude that God designed the Sabbath to be kept by men on every part of the round world. If God gave mankind such a commandment, knowing all the time that the world was round, it is nothing else but charging God with folly to say that man cannot keep the Sabbath of the Lord on the Lord's earth.

We trust that our friend will cling to his statement that all truth is God's truth, and that since the God who made the world also made the Sabbath, there can be no physical facts to interfere with the keeping of the day. W.

### **"Punctuation and Inspiration" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

Not infrequently we find people who seem to think that everything which may be found between the lives of the Bible is inspired. Some people think that the references under the verses are a sort of inspired comment, forgetting that they only serve as a miniature concordance, and were never put into the Bible until A.D. 1611, and the last of them not till 1785. There are others who think that Usher's Chronology, which is placed in many Bibles, is inspired, and who would think it heresy to teach that Christ was crucified in the year 31, when the date in the margin of the Bible says 33. Indeed, we have seen some who seem to think that the pictures in the large family Bibles are inspired, and who cannot be made to believe that when Jacob fled from home he was an old man nearly eighty years old, because in the family Bible illustration of Jacob's dream he is represented as a curly-headed little boy sleeping upon a rock.

But the most common error of this sort is in supposing that punctuation of the Bible is inspired. A friend who writes to us from Illinois seems to labor under this misapprehension. He says that he has been reading the SIGNS for some time, and has had the most implicit confidence in it until he read the article in the SIGNS of May 26, entitled, "What and Where Is Paradise?" In that he found that in our quotation of Luke 23:43, we placed, after the comma after the word "to-day," whereas in the ordinary version it is after the word "thee." Again he notices that in 2 Cor. 12:2-4 the Revised Version and King James's Version each have the text punctuated differently, while the text as we quote it is punctuated differently from both. Consequently, our correspondent says, "Now if you are right, it will be easy for you to explain; if you do not explain, the conclusion will be that you have punctuated it to bring out your own idea regardless of truth."

We are very happy to explain for the benefit of our brother and others who may be similarly troubled. We will consider the last text first. On this he can

certainly have no more fault to find with us than with the revisers, for, as he himself says, the punctuation is not the same in the two versions. We will quote the text just as it is in both of the versions and just as it appeared in the SIGNS; for thereby a point may be illustrated. King James's Version has it as follows: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up in the Paradise," etc.

The Revised Version has it thus: "I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth), such a one caught up even to the third heaven. And I know such a man (whether in the body, or apart from the body, I know not; God knoweth), how that he was caught up in the Paradise," etc.

Although there is some difference in the marks of punctuation used in those two verses, there is no difference in the sense. Punctuation marks are not used so freely as they were formerly, and the colon is seldom used in ordinary sentences. According to modern usage when words are inclosed in parentheses, the necessary marks of punctuation are placed *after* the marks of parentheses, and not *within*, and so the New Version conforms to this usage. All the other difference is that the New Version has a comma, instead of a semicolon, after the parenthesis as in the Old. The text as it appeared in the SIGNS was punctuated the same as in the New Version with the exception of the semicolon being used after the parenthesis instead of the comma. But this change was simply incidental, and it was not known at the time that there was any difference; but the matter is of no consequence anyway, as the meaning is not affected in the least by the difference in the punctuation.

All the readers of the Bible should understand that at the time that the Bible was written, there were no marks of punctuation, and the words in the sentences were not separated by spaces as we now have them. For example, the first verse of the book of John was something like this:-

INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHEWORDANDTHEWORDWASWITHGODANDTHEWORDWASGODTHESAMEWASINTHEBEGINNINGWITHGOD.

The American Encyclopedia says: "The modern points came into use very gradually after the invention of printing, the comma, parentheses, notes of interrogation, and period, being the earliest introduced, and the note of exclamation last. It was not till sixteen centuries that an approach was made to the regular system by the Manutii of Venice."

Modern punctuation has been a thing of growth. The marks have been invented and placed where the sense seemed to require them, to make it easier for the reader, and it follows, therefore, that punctuation which vary in some instances according as those who translated the Bible differed in their ideas of its meaning. In some instances the punctuation has been changed. Heb. 10:12 was formerly punctuated thus: "And this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." This would indicate that after making a sacrifice for sins, Christ sat down at the right hand of God never to

leave that place. But this idea is contradicted by the whole tenor of the Scriptures, which teach that Christ is going to stand up and come to this earth again, and finally to reign upon this earth; therefore the punctuation has been changed so as to present the true idea, namely, that when Christ had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, that is, a sacrifice once for all, he sat down at the right hand of God. This change has been made not to conform to anyone's theory of truth, but to the plainly expressed truth of the Bible.

Again, Matt. 19:28 was once in some Bibles punctuated thus: "Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This punctuation would make the text mean that the disciples had followed Christ in the regeneration, that is, that

505

they had followed Christ in being born again; but such an idea is monstrous, as it would indicate that Christ, like the disciples, had been a sinner and had been obliged to be born again, and so in our version the comma is placed after the word "me" instead of after "regeneration," so that the text expresses what Christ meant, that those who followed him, should in the regeneration, when Christ comes, that is, when all things are made new, sit upon twelve thrones.

So in quoting Luke 23:43, we placed the comma after the word "to-day," not to bring out our own idea regardless of truth, but to make the text express what is evidently the truth, and make it consistent with the plain declarations of Scripture. As it stands in the Authorized Version, it seems to indicate that Christ told the penitent thief that he should be with him in Paradise that very day on which they were hanging on the cross. But this would be to make Christ contradict himself, because three days later he said (John 20:17) that he had not yet ascended to God, and he would not receive the adoration of Mary until he had ascended; but God's throne is in Paradise, therefore, when Christ said that he had not ascended to the Father, it was equivalent to saying that he had not ascended to Paradise. But since he had not ascended the Paradise, it is very evident that he could not have told the thief that he would meet him there three days before, because he could not tell an untruth.

Perhaps it will be less objectionable if, instead of saying that we changed the punctuation of the verse, we imagine ourselves living before the art of punctuation was invented. Let us strike out all punctuation from the verse, and then we shall have it just as it was written in the inspired historian. Literally thus:-

" VERILY I SAY TO THEE TODAY WITH ME THOU SHALT BE IN THE PARADISE ."

Now we read it through, and, being acquainted with the teaching of the Bible, namely, that Christ did not ascend to Paradise until three days after the crucifixion, and, moreover, that he could not have ascended until the third day, when he rose from the dead, because the dead know not anything and have no power of locomotion, we know better than to place the comma after the word thee. We therefore consider the circumstances under which the words were uttered. We consider that Christ was hanging upon the cross, condemned as a malefactor, despised by almost everybody, and his teachings doubted even by

his own disciples, with no earthly prospect that any of his predictions could ever be verified, and we see how natural that Christ in making the promise to the thief should put emphasis upon the word "to-day," Verily I say unto thee *to-day*, notwithstanding these untoward circumstances, and that all my hopes and predictions seem to have come to naught, even *to-day*, I say unto you, that ye shall be with me in Paradise. But this, the only natural and consistent view of the text, would force us, in punctuating it, to place the comma after the word "to-day," because the voice, following the obvious meaning of the passage, makes a pause there whether one is indicated or not.

It is unfortunate that the translators of the Bible did not have a perfect and consistent view of its teachings. And yet we do not know but that it was providential, for there are but only a few passages where the meaning is in any way obscured by the translation or by the punctuation, and the meaning of those few can be easily determined from parallel passages; and the fact that the nature of man, the sleep of the dead, the seventh-day Sabbath, and similar unpopular truths, stand forth in bold relief in a Bible translated by those who believed none of those truths, makes it far more evident that they are unquestioned Bible truths, than if the Bible had been translated by men predisposed in favor of them. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

Elder E. J. Waggoner, and Mrs. Jessie F. Waggoner, the Secretary of the State Sabbath school association, left Oakland August 10, for Eureka, Cal., to attend the Humboldt County camp-meeting.

Prussia's hobnobbing with the Papacy has begun already to bear the unfailing fruit of a legal recognition of Romanism. A Lutheran minister in Prussia was recently sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for "insulting" the Romish Church. The insult consisted in publishing a pamphlet in which he remarked that the Romish apostasy is "built upon superstition and idolatry." And for such "insulting" remarks as this, to prison for nine months their author had to go. And this in the land of Luther! Let Prussia be called no more a Protestant country. She has been surrendered bodily to the Papacy, and Rome rules there, and that in Rome's own wicked way.

We sometimes hear the expression used that "good may come out of evil." This is very true, if we see the word "evil" in the sense of trouble, and not in the sense of sin. Affliction and trouble are often called evil, and in this sense good may come out of evil, "for our light of affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Again we read that "tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope;" and that chastisement which at the time is very grievous, afterwards yields the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them who are exercised thereby. And again, that "all things work together for good to them that love God." But from evil which is sin no good can possibly come. Sin has no manner of connection with good. From sin only sin can come. So none need console themselves with the thought, if they have done wrong, that good may come out of it. There is a mercy



for the sinner, and where sin of bounds, grace does much more abound, and so good may come after evil, if the sinner exercises repentance towards God, and faith in his Son Jesus Christ. But the good can come only after the sin has been put away, and it comes not because of the evil, but in spite of it. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid."

An exchange says:-

"The law cannot make a man moral, but it can make him dreadfully uncomfortable when he is immoral."

Well, that depends. It is true that the law cannot make a man moral; but if it is the law of the land that is referred to, as we suppose it is, then we know that a man may be terribly immoral without suffering the least inconvenience from the law. The trouble is, people have a very low standard of morality. If a man does no open violence, or cause any serious inconvenience to his neighbor, he is called a moral man; whereas, a man may do nothing for which the law could molest him, and still be as corrupt as the grave. It should be understood that civil laws cannot make men moral, and are not for the purpose of punishing immorality, but simply for the purpose of protecting the rights of people; in short, to deter men from acting in an uncivil matter.

Remarking on the late train robbery on the Southern Pacific Railroad, the San Francisco *Chronicle* says the robbers were successful "mainly, it would seem, because of the lack of resistance on the part of the engineer." So far as the *Chronicle's* own report in the same paragraph, that the robbers had turned the switch which threw the engine off the track, turned it over, and threw the engineer and fireman down an embankment fifty feet, we are rather inclined to think the engineers "lack of resistance" to the robbers was identifiable, and that the *Chronicle* was extravagant in its demands. If the editor of the *Chronicle* was in charge of an engine which should be upset by robbers and be thrown fifty feet down a bank, we have an idea that just at that particular moment even his resistance to the attacking robbers would not be particularly vigorous nor exceptionally gallant. "It would seem" so at least. The *Chronicle* went a long way to find something to find fault with.

About the middle of July, Mrs. Logan, the widow of General John A. Logan, was thrown from a buggy. The first dispatches stated that she was not seriously hurt, but a late report from her physician shows it to have been a very painful accident. He says: "Mrs. Logan's injuries are very serious. On the 25th ult., for the first time since the injury, she was turned upon her right side, with soft pads under her injured left arm. Her left shoulder was crushed by the wheel of the buggy running over it. The whole arm to the elbow is blackened from bruises, and the forearm to the wrist is slightly injured. Her head was stepped upon on its top and left side, the horse's shod foot tearing the scalp loose in a concentric shape, making a wound three and a half inches in length to the skull. The skull is uninjured. She has suffered exceeding pain at the shoulder and along the course of the arm. We rejoice to say she is improving in every respect."

Nearly every Protestant paper in the country, whether religious or secular, has confessed it to have been the duty of Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome when he was commanded by the Pope to do so, to answer for his opinions that were already

condemned. The truth is, that if he had gone to Rome, he could, and no doubt would, have been kept there forever, and that too in a dungeon, just as likely as not, unless he should have recanted. And even had he recanted he would never have been allowed to return to a free America. The chances are ten to one that had Dr. McGlynn gone to Rome he would never have been directly heard of more. The *Christian Advocate* (N.Y.) has come nearer to the truth in the matter than any other paper we have seen. It says:-

"Once in Rome he could have been kept there indefinitely. He could be assigned to duty in any part of the world; could be cut loose from his life-work, and removed from all his association and centers of influence, and be compelled to begin a new career under a ban."

But Mr. McGlynn knows Rome's methods too well to be caught in the toils of the Romish Inquisition, and he still breathes the free air of yet free America. But how long America shall remain free from Rome's pernicious power is a question. With the National Reform Party and its allies endeavoring to create a constitutional basis for religious legislation in national affairs, and bidding for Rome's influence to help secure it; and with the press of the country siding with Rome in a controversy involving the right of free thought and free speech of an American citizen; the prospect is not very reassuring.

The Inquiry columns of the religious papers furnish some rather queer matter occasionally. Here is a question and answer that appeared in the *Christian Advocate* of August 4-J. M. Buckley, D. D. editor:-

Q. 2435.-Can the dead perceive what is going on upon the earth?

A.-If we knew, we should hasten to publish the information, for we should be the only possessor of it on earth.

P.S. The Bible says that there is joy in the presence of the angels in heaven over the conversion of sinners, but no details are given as to how the information reaches them.

"If we knew." But why is it that he does not know? The Bible says as plainly as language can be expressed, "The dead know not anything. . . Neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." And again, "his sons, to honor and he knoweth it not; they are brought low and they perceiveth it not of them." Here then is this correspondent's question directly and plainly answered, but the *Advocate* can only answer, "If we knew." Again we say, why is it that the editor does not know? Is it because he does not know that these verses are in the Bible? or is it because he does not believe these words even though they be the word of God? We are inclined to think it is the latter, because the doctrine of the immortality of the soul does not allow a consistent belief of the words of the Bible.

So much for the *Advocate's* "answer;" but what is meant by the "P.S."? A correspondent asks, "Can *the dead* perceive what is going on upon the earth?" And he is informed that "there is joy in the presence of *the angels in Heaven* over the conversion of sinners." Does the *Advocate* mean to convey the idea that dead people are angels? or that the company of the angels is made up of dead people? What a queer idea that questioner must have had, in the first place, to

ask, "Can the *dead* perceive?" If a person can perceive at all, it seems to us that that would be pretty good evidence that he is *not dead*.

A religious exchange says: "Unless the churches in the United States gain as much as ten million members during the year 1887, there will be more unconverted people among us January, 1888, than there are now." There probably will be anyway; for unconverted people are coming to this country, as well as growing up in this country, continually, and, unfortunately, the making of church members is not necessarily equivalent to the making of converts.

**August 25, 1887**

**"Not 'A Daniel Come to Judgment'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

The state of Louisiana has, in common with many other States, been doctoring its Sunday laws, and now has a law requiring that, with certain exceptions, all places of business shall be closed from 12 o'clock on Saturday night until 12 o'clock on Sunday night. A case recently came before the Supreme Court of Louisiana in which the law was claimed to be unconstitutional. The court held the law to be valid, and the following is a portion of the opinion delivered by the Judge:-

"We take occasion promptly to say that if the object of law were to compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, we would not hesitate to declare it to be violative of the above constitutional prohibition. It would violate equally the religious liberty of the Christian, the Jew, and the infidel, none of whom can be compelled by law to comply with any merely religious observance whether it accords with his faith and conscience or not. With rare exceptions, the American authorities concur in this view. . . . The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be question, because in the exercise of a wide discretion, it has chosen that day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned, because in the exercise of a wide discretion, it was chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this state, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observed as a day of rest."

The New York *Independent* quotes this, and adds the following words of approval:-

"This is an exceedingly lucid statement of the theory which underlies all legislation that requires the suspension of ordinary labor on Sunday. The object is not to enforce religious observances of any kind, but simply to establish a uniform day of rest for the general good of the whole people; and this is no interference with the religious rights of anybody."

It may seem very presumptuous for a non-professional man to criticize the opinion of so great a person as a judge of the Supreme Court, but nevertheless we have no hesitation in saying that the opinion quoted is nothing but sophistry, and such sophistry as could be dealt out only by an adept in the art. This we think can easily be made apparent; and it is the more necessary that they should

be done, because the Sunday-law mania has now become quite prevalent, and just such sophistical arguments as those quoted above will be relied on in securing the enactment of those laws. These arguments will be used for the reason that they are the best that can be offered in favor of an unjust law, and also simply because they have been used before. Even the Louisiana judge himself did not pretend to originate them, but contented himself with giving the view in which nearly all "American authorities concur." If American legal business were not becoming more a matter of precedent than of common sense, Sunday laws could never be enacted; but the idea seems to be that whatever has been done ought to be done, and precedents for oppressing people under the guise of charity are not wanting.

The claim is made that the Sunday law does not compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, and that therefore it cannot be contrary to a constitution which forbids religious tests for office or citizenship. But the fact is, Sunday *is primarily a religious institution*, and its observance cannot be enforced

519

except as such. It cannot be separated from its religious (not *sacred*) character for the purpose of special legislation concerning it. It matters not what such legislation is called, whether a police regulation, or a law in the interests of the workingman, it is legislation concerning an institution of the church.

To make it evident that Sunday laws are laws in behalf of religion, three things only need to be borne in mind: 1. Sunday rest originated in the church. Catholics universally claim the church as the sole authority for Sunday observance, and many Protestants agree with them in this. The *Christian at Work* says: "We rest the designation of Sunday solely on the church having set it apart of its own authorities." But if the claims of those who say that Christ and the apostles set the day apart as a day of rest, were true, that would make it emphatically a church institution. 2. The observance of Sunday is generally considered by church people as the essence of religion. In the Sunday law contest in California five years ago, the *Christian Advocate* spoke of Sunday as "the foundation of our holy religion." Regarding Sunday rest as the memorial of the resurrection of Christ, they think that without it there would be no evidence of the truth of the gospel. 3. The churches and the churches alone are at the bottom of all Sunday legislation. No one ever heard of such a thing as a Sunday law being proposed by anybody except a zealous churchman or a deputation of ministers. It is true that, by pretending that Sunday laws are in the interests of labor, they are inducing labor and socialistic organizations to clamor for such laws, but these organizations come in only as allies to the church. Everyone who knows anything of the history of Sunday legislation, knows that it is *always* instigated by the churches.

Now in the face of these things, to say that Sunday laws do not compel men to observe Sunday as a religious institution, is not only sophistry, but it is positively untruth. Since the day as a day of rest is nothing else but a religious institution, how can it be enforced as anything else but a religious institution? It cannot be enforced as something which it is not. True, it is said that when the State enforces the observance of Sunday, it makes it a civil institution, merely a

legal holiday. Well, nobody contends that the State law makes Sunday a religious institution; it is that already. We freely admit that the State law in its behalf is only a civil ordinance, for the State could make nothing else but a civil ordinance; but, mark it well, what we do claim, and what all candid minds must admit to be the truth, is that a State Sunday law is a *civil ordinance* enforcing the observance of a *religious institution*.

Some years ago the city of San Francisco had a notorious mayor, who engaged in certain transactions that were inconsistent with his official position. His defense was that he did those things as an ordinary citizen, and not as mayor. It requires no argument to show the absurdity of such a statement. The man was mayor, and he could not separate himself from his office within the time to which he was elected. But this is just on a par with the argument that Sunday legislation is not the enforcement of a religious institution. If the friends of so-called National Reform admit such a plea, they must be prepared to see it carried out to its legitimate conclusion. They must expect to see the vilest rakes elected to office in their model government, under the plea that they are not bad citizens, but are simply bad men.

If anything further were needed to show the flimsy character of the arguments by which Sunday-law advocates attempt to make it appear that they are not working for an ecclesiastical establishment, it may be found in the last sentence of the judicial opinion first quoted. Said the judge:-

"The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned because, in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observed as a day of rest."

"A wise discretion," indeed! The State has chosen the day which a large majority of its inhabitants, under the sanctions of their religious faith, who voluntarily observe as a day of rest, and, at the instigation of that majority, has undertaken to enforce its observance as a day of rest, and yet this is no more in the interest of religion than if Monday or Thursday had been chosen! Such a monstrous assertion needs but to be quoted to be refuted. A man must be sadly blinded to put such a statement forth as a sober legal argument, and men must be pre-determined to have Sunday laws or they could not be deceived by it. Suppose that the State had, in the exercise of its "wise discretion," chosen Saturday instead of Sunday; would their not have been protests without number? Indeed there would. People would call it a law in the interest of the Jews and other Sabbatarians, and no argument could convince them to the contrary. "But," says one, "such a law would really be unjust to the great majority who observe Sunday as a day of religious rest." Indeed! Then by the same token a law enforcing Sunday observance is unjust to those who observe Saturday, or who do not choose to observe any set day. The discriminating reader can see that it is the word "majority" which catches the judicial fancy. It seems to be the idea that Sunday legislation cannot be wrong, because the majority favor it. As much as if to say that a thing is necessarily right if it is proposed by a majority of the people. But no majorities can ever make a wrong right, and State laws in behalf of an

establishment of religion are always wrong. The question whether or not Sunday ought to be observed as a day of rest, does not enter into the case at all. We believe in the God of the Bible, as the majority of people in this country profess to do, but we should emphatically protest against a State law to compel all people to recognize him as such.

Here is a point that should not be lost sight of: If Sunday laws are not for the purpose of compelling the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, for what purpose are they? The claim is that they are in the interest of humanity, so that laboring men may have the rest which their physical nature imperatively demands. Very well, thus we suppose it will be admitted that is within the province of the State to compel men to observe the laws of there being. Now it is just as certain that man's physical nature requires that he should take a definite amount of sleep every twenty-four hours, far more imperatively than it demands that he shall rest one day in seven. Will our Sunday-law friends admit that the State has any right to decide how many hours a man ought to sleep, and to enact a law compelling every man to sleep at least seven hours out of every twenty-four? Unless they are ready to advocate such a measure as this, let them say nothing more about enforcing Sunday rest on the basis of the necessity of man's physical nature. We have presented this view of the case before, but we do not expect ever to see Sunday-law advocates attempt to meet it.

Now one word concerning the *Independent's* statement that Sunday legislation "is no interference with the religious rights of anybody." We say that it is a positive and unjust interference with the religious rights of everybody who conscientiously observes any day other than Sunday. Here are laboring men who believe that when the fourth commandment says, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," means just what it says. They are conscientious in their observance of the seventh day of the week; and the needs of their families demand that they should spend the other six days in labor, as the commandment allows. According to the fourth commandment, it is their religious *privilege* to labor six days of the week, just as much as it is their religious *duty* to rest on the seventh. Therefore if the State steps in and *compels* them to rest on another day also, no matter on what grounds the rest is enforced, their religious rights are interfered with. And if these men shall be punished for continuing to make Sunday one of their six working days, their punishment will be an act of religious persecution. No assertions to the contrary can change the truth of this.

From the very nature of the case, Sunday legislation must interfere with the religious rights of some. For, Sunday as a day of rest is beyond dispute a religious institution; legislation enforcing its observance is legislation enforcing an establishment of religion; and when any religious tenet is enforced, the religious rights of all who do not hold that tenet must be interfered with, and oppression must result.

We hope that the people in those States that still allow full liberty of conscience, will take the time and trouble now to become well informed concerning the arguments used in behalf of Sunday laws, and will learn how to expose their fallacy, so that when the Sunday-law mania shall seize their State,

as it surely will, they will not allow their liberty to be taken away without making a well-directed, intelligent protest. W.

**"British and Foreign Bible Society" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

A retrospect of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the last half century discloses some very encouraging facts. Fifty years ago the annual issues of the Bible, and of portions of it, amounted to 600,000 copies; they now amount to 4,000,000. Half a century ago the cheapest Bible cost 48 cents; now it can be had for 12 cents. Then the cheapest New Testament cost 20 cents; now it can be had for 2 cents. Fifty years ago the Scriptures were published and circulated in 136 languages; that number has been increased to 280, in fact there is only one great language, the Japanese, which has not a complete translation of the Scriptures, and that one will have such a translation before the close of the current year. Altogether these statistics form a perfect fulfillment of the prophecy found in Dan. 12:4, that in the time of the end, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

**"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

Sisters E. G. White and M. K. White, Elders O. A. Olsen and D. T. Bourdeau, and others from Europe arrived safely at New York, August 11. Elder W. C. White will leave Europe for home about Sept. 1.

The Pope says that "not alone Italy," but "all other nations" "principally owe to the Papacy the civilization they enjoy." Yes, England and the United States, for instance, with Spain and Mexico, or the North of Ireland with the south, bear unmistakable evidence in the case. On a par with this is the statement in the same letter, that justice can never be done "if the Pope is not restored to his incontestable rights indeed temporal sovereignty-*rights founded upon the most legitimate and sacred of titles.*" The right founded upon the "Donation of Constantine" above all in legitimacy and sacredness, of course.

In the *Christian Advocate* of July 21, a certain Rev. J. W. Simpson says:-

"We admit immersion to be one mode of baptism, and yet can recall at present only four examples of it in the Scriptures. The first is the deluge; the second, that of Pharaoh's army; the third the case of a man, the leper who was so exceedingly foul that we are not surprised that it took old Jordan to cleanse him; and the fourth was that of a herd of swine which ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished in the waters."

As a display of downright egotistical ignorance we have never seen that surpassed. Nor is that all. His reference to the swine as an example of a baptism is contemptible, and his reference to the case of Naaman is basely irreverent.

A correspondent, apparently editorial, of the *Christian Union*, says that "Professor Harris is the philosopher of the Concord School *par excellence.* . . and the opinion is frequently heard that we may yet have an American system of philosophy." It seems that this "American system of philosophy" is embodied in

the idea of probation after death. And Professor Harris in his *par excellence* "makes the idea of the cessation of probation annihilate both" Heaven and hell. Then says this admirer of the "philosopher *par excellence*;" "This view of Dr. Harris is fully elaborated in his essay on 'The Philosophic Structure of Dante's Davina Commedia.' I am not sure that this paper will not prove itself to be one of the most inspiring missionary tracks of the time." Well an American philosophy extracted from Dante's "Davina Commedia" may be a very inspiring thing, but it is absolutely certain that such inspiration will never lead men to God or accomplish anything for Christ. Yet this wild nonsense is becoming very popular in the theological circle of which the *Christian Union* forms a part.

In the *Forum* for July Mr. Grant Allen says:-

"Life is merely some particular set of correlated movements, occurring, under the influence of the solar radiation, in a certain group of material bodies on the surface of one small and unimportant planet, in a minor solar system, hidden away on the skirts of a galaxy in some lost quarter of a boundless universe."

That is very exact. It is most satisfactorily definite. The *corner* of anything boundless is good, but when it is the corner of a boundless cosmos, and that, too, a lost quarter, and the thing hidden away there beside, then the thought becomes grand. Now with that definition of *life* put the following definition of *death*, by the much admired Professor Drummond-he who was brought all the way from England to help Moody in his missionary training-school:-

"Death is lack of correspondence with the environment."

These two definitions match very well, each is the complement of the other. And both answer very well to the demands of the Spiritualistic sentimentalism that now passes for the Christian religion.

I had rather speak five words with my understanding, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.

### **"Bogus Piety" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

A recent dispatch giving an account of a series of post-office robberies in a town in this State, by a man named Weston, whose evil deeds had just come to light, closed with these words: "Weston was a church member, and very pious." Now this is not true, and is never true in any similar case. The man was indeed a church member, but he was not pious. He may have had the *appearance* of piety, he had not the real article. Pious do not do such things. Moreover, the man who wrote that dispatch knew that the post-office thief was not pious, and every worldling knows that bank-defaulters, embezzlers, etc. are not pious men. They know that piety is not that kind of stuff, that Christianity calls for something better, and that Christians should act differently. And it is because they know this, that they never fail to mention that an erring man was a professed Christian. Such mention is always an unconscious and unintended tribute to the excellent character of true Christianity, because it shows that even the haters of Christianity know that evil and right are inconsistent with it.



But someone may ask how we explained the sudden falls from piety and integrity that we so often see or hear about. We answer that such sudden falls are not so common as is supposed. But when they do occur, we can explain them just as we would explain the sudden fall of a building. If a building falls suddenly and without warning, and apparently without sufficient cause, we say at once that there was a defect in its construction; it never was sound. It stood for a time, and was apparently sound, but continued pressure made itself fall in the place that was a weak. So a man who "suddenly falls" from piety, simply gives way under strong pressure upon some weak point. And as no building is any stronger than its weakest support, so no Christian character, however sound it may appear, is in any stronger than the spot that has never been built up. So in reality even this was not a sudden fall from true piety, but from the semblance thereof.

In general, therefore, it may be set down as a fact that men do not fall suddenly into great sins. Solomon says that "the beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water;" the tiny stream soon makes for itself a larger opening, which gradually increases until a mighty torrent rushes through. So a little sin, covered up, a little defect cherished, brings condemnation to the individual at first, but the voice of conscience being repressed, he becomes hardened, possibly at last really unconscious of the fact that he is living a lie, and then detection is the only thing necessary to make the world safe in derision, there is a specimen of a pious man, and others mourn over the "sudden fall" of one who was highly esteemed. They simply compound the detection with the fall, whereas the *fall* may have taken place years before. Then the cause of Christ has to suffer reproach, since people forget that it is really to the credit of Christianity that dishonest men put it on as a cloak for their ungodly deeds. They know that people do not look there for such things, and so they expect to escape without detection.

### **"Not 'Inferred' But Believed" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Standard*, in, an attempted, reasoning on the immortality of the soul, says:-

"When it is said that we do not read of the 'immortality of the soul,' in the Scriptures, the truth is spoken; but when it is inferred from this that there is nothing in man that remains in possession of conscious existence after death, the conclusion is not well drawn. The immortality of the angels is something not named in the Scriptures. Yet it would be most unsafe to infer that they are not to continue in this possession of conscious existence for ever. That which is mortal is subject to death, as the human body as it now is; that which is immortal is not subject to death, as the immortal bodies of the redeemed, as they shall be."

But the unconscious of men in the death is not "inferred" from the silence of Scripture on the subject of the "immortality of the soul." In fact it is not "inferred" from anything. It is the plain declaration of Scripture, and therefore, on the part of men who accept it, it is not an inference at all but is *belief* of the word of God.

The Scriptures plainly state that "the dead know not if anything," also "their love and their hatred and their envy" is "perished" (Eccl. 9:5 ); that when his breath goeth forth, "in that very day his thoughts perish" (Psalm 146:4); that "in death there is no remembrance of God" (Psalm 115:17 ); all these, and many more, Scriptures show that at death men go to the place of silence and forgetfulness, and to accept such a view as the truth, is not inference but perfectly-founded *faith*.

"The immortality of the angels is something not named in the Scriptures," says the *Standard*. Now the Scriptures say of those who shall be made immortal, that "Neither can they die any more, for [because] they are equal to the angels." To be equal unto the angels exempts from death for ever, and that is immortality. Therefore the immortality of the angels *is* named in the Scriptures. This is proved by the *Standard* itself. It says, "That which is immortal *is not subject to death*." And the Scriptures do certainly say that the angels cannot die, in that it is said that the redeemed cannot die anymore because they are equal to the angels. Therefore upon the *Standard's* following proposition the immortality of the angels is named in the Scriptures. Yet upon the supposition that the Scriptures do not name the immortality of the angels, the *Standard* says, "It would be most unsafe to infer that they are not to continue in the possession of conscious being forever." But if the word of God should say of the angels, as it says of men, that while they live "they know not that they shall die," but when dead they "know not anything," that their "thoughts" would then "perish," and they would remember not God, and "praise not the Lord," but would remain in silence and in the land of forgetfulness,-if the word of God should say all this of the angels, and much more to the same effect, it would *not* be unsafe to *believe* that they were not to continue in the possession of conscious being forever. And to believe so of men of whom all these things are said by the word of the Lord, is not only not unsafe, but is the *only real safe* thing to believe on that subject. This conclusion *is* well drawn.

**September 1, 1887**

**"The Logic of Lynching" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

The latest argument for the existence of an eternally burning hell, is found in the *Interior* under the above heading. The writer recounts a recent lynching case in Colusa, California, where a young Chinaman who had basely murdered his employer's wife, was taken from jail and hanged, after his trial was over, and he had been sentenced to imprisonment for life. The writer argues that the reason why those citizens hanged the Chinaman, instead of leaving him to spend his life in prison, and to die a natural death, was because they believed in the eternal torment of the wicked, and from this assumption he concludes that the eternal torment must be a certainty. The reader will be interested to learn how easily a modern creature can find in his own imagination a solid foundation for a pagan superstition, so we quote:-

"That crowd of lynchers must have believed that if they hung Hong Di he would have to spend those fifty years in a worse place than the penitentiary. Hence they must believe in hell. If they had been materialists, thinking, with Colonel Ingersoll, that death ends all, or if they had been Universalists, thinking that everybody goes to Heaven as soon as he dies, or if they had been soul-sleepers, thinking that the spirit is unconscious between death and the resurrection, they would have said, Hanging is too good for this fellow. We have him now in our power as long as he lives. We can be sure that he will suffer for a good while at San Quentin. But if we put him to death we put him out of his misery forever, provided that Colonel Ingersoll is right, or we give him rest until the resurrection day, if the soul-sleepers are right, or we send him straight to Heaven if the Universalists are right.

"If Colonel Ingersoll had gone to Colusa a few months ago, and lectured at fifty cents a head, probably most of the men who engaged in the lynching of Hong Di would have gone to hear him, would have laughed at his witty sophisms, and would have half believed that there is no hereafter. If some eloquent Universalist had visited the place, and preached in the courthouse or in some public hall, denouncing "the partialists" who limit the mercy of God, and contending that he is too good to send anybody to hell or even to have such a dreadful place in his universe, they would have listened with interest and said, That's the doctrine for me. If the soul-sleepers had held a camp-meeting nearby, and talked, as they do, about the long unconsciousness-the dreamless rest of the tired and troubled spirit until the end of earth and time-they would have welcomed this idea of repose. But when a time of excitement came all such figments of fancy were swept away as chaff before the whirlwind, and the men in Colusa, no matter how godless in their lives or how skeptical in their speculative opinions, found they did believe in hell,-at least for Hong Di.

"Those lynchers showed that they had faith in God, for what was hanging but taking the murderer away from the control of the judicial system of California, which they regarded as having failed to do full justice in the case, and sending his spirit to God to deal with him as he deserved? If there was no great unseen power in the spirit world to take that guilty man, and to punish him more fully than the jury proposed to, then the lynching was unreasonable as well as unlawful."

We feel like begging pardon of our readers for filling so much valuable space which belongs to them, with such childish reasoning. But we know that there is quite a general desire to hear "both sides," and in this case the "other side" is presented by "Obadiah Oldschool," the ablest writer of the *Interior*, whose good, practical, common sense is very conspicuous when writing on other subjects. Moreover, it is considered so good a presentation of the case, that the ideas have been copied and taken to form the basis of an article by the ablest writer of the *Occident*.

There is not the slightest possibility that one of the Colusa lynchers gave of a single thought to the future of the Chinaman. They simply knew that a great crime had been committed; they did not think the sentence of the court was severe enough; and so they determined to administer the proper punishment. It is not probable that one in ten of the men has any theory of future punishment;

but if they had philosophized as *Interior* writer imagines, that would not in the least affect the facts. The idea that the lynching of a murderer is an evidence of faith in God, is a most novel one. If such transactions are accepted as *evidences* of faith, then, we can readily understand how the National Reformers can soon exhibit this country as a model of the Christian Government; for there are thousands who are willing to show their faith in this way.

But the simple fact is, those men believed, what all laws recognize, that death is a more severe punishment than any length of imprisonment can be. And how comes it that this opinion is so prevalent? Because the law of life is implanted in the breast of every individual. This statement, "All the man hath will he give for his life," is none the less true because the devil used it; he was then talking with One to whom it was useless to lie. As long as there is life there is hope; but when life is gone, everything is gone. For this reason men universally regard the death penalty as the greatest penalty that can be inflicted.

But more than this, is the inspired statement that "the wages of sin is death," that "the soul of that sinneth, shall die," and that the wicked "shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*." Instead of reasoning as the writer in the *Interior* does, that men inflict the death penalty so that God the sooner can begin to torment men, how much more natural to reason that men regard death as the highest penalty, simply because God has decreed, and it is a fixed principle in nature, that death,-the total extinction of being,-*is* the sum of all calamities that can befall a man.

This would be in harmony with the Scriptures, which declare that the wicked "shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away" (Ps. 37:20); that they shall be "like the chaff which the wind driveth away" (Ps. 1:4); that the chaff shall be *burned up* with "unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:12); that day shall be "as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney" (Hosea 13:3); and finally, that "they shall be as though they had not been." Obadiah 16.

Life, under whatever conditions, is the gift of God. God is the *living* God, and the source of all life. "In his favor is life." Ps. 30:5. That is, whoever has life, has it by the favor of God, and only those have life, who are objects of God's favor. We are now living in the day of salvation,-the time of God's grace to mankind. All people alike share of the favor of God, in that he gives them time to become reconciled to him. "The longsuffering of our God his salvation." But when the wicked shall have filled up the measure of their iniquity; when even the longsuffering of God cannot wait any longer, because they have become "filled with all unrighteousness," so that they are only as thorns that cumber the ground;-then further probation will be of no use to them, and the favor of God will be wholly withdrawn. But since only in the favor of God is there any life, it follows that when that favor is withdrawn, life must cease; and this agrees with the inspired declaration: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth him." John 3:36. When God shall judge the world in righteousness then, he will "make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land." Zeph. 1:18. He will

have a clean universe, and not a corner of it will be defiled by being reserved as a prison pen where blaspheming wretches may be tormented to all eternity. W.

**"The SabbathóFor What, and to Whom?" *The Signs of the Times* 13,  
34.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Ex. 31:13 we read: "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Again in Eze. 20:19, 20 we read: "I am the Lord your God; walked in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and to them; and hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God."

These two texts declare the Sabbath to be a *sign* by which the people might know that God is indeed the Lord. The question would naturally arise, How can the Sabbath serve as a sign by which people may know the true God? This question is answered in Ex. 31:16, 17: "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days of the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."

Here it is plainly stated that the reason why the Sabbath is a sign, is that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and rested on the seventh day. Now remembering that the Sabbath is declared to be a sign by which the people may know God, it is pertinent to inquire what there is in the fact stated in the latter part of Ex. 31:17 which would constitute it such a sign. The answer is that the Sabbath brings directly to view and keeps before the mind, the fact that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested upon the seventh, which is the basis of the Sabbath commandment. See Ex. 20:8-11.

It must not be lost sight of, that God's distinguishing characteristic is that he is self-existent,-the living God,-and consequently a Creator. The fact that God can create distinguishes him from the "gods many and lords many" which people may worship. It is this, also, which constitutes his sole claim to the obedience of mankind, and, indeed, of all creatures. These points are plainly stated in the sacred word. Thus in Jer. 10:10-12, we read:-

"But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and everlasting; at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even day shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion."

Here the true God is contrasted with the false gods, in that he created the heavens and earth, and continues forever.

Again in Ps. 96:4, 5 the psalmist exhorts people to declare the glory of God, "For the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised; he is to be feared above all

gods. For all the gods of the nations our idols; but the Lord made the heavens." In Ps. 100:2, 3 we read:-

"Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture."

Here the fact that God has created us, and that he preserves us,-in other words that "in him we live and move, and have our being,"-is given as the reason why we should serve him. And a good and sufficient reason it is too. Indeed, it is the only reason that could be given, or that is necessary, for it is certain that if God had not created us, and did not sustain us, we should be under no obligation to serve him.

God's creative power, then, is his distinguishing characteristic, and the one by which he appeals to men to obey him. So long as men rightly consider the creation, so long they will remember God; for God is known by his works. "The heavens declare of the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." So Paul says that all that may be known of God is manifest unto the heathen, "for God have showed it unto them;" because ever since the creation of the world the invisible attributes of God, namely, his eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. Rom. 1:19, 20. But the Sabbath is the great memorial of God's power as manifested in creation. When kept aright it necessarily leads the mind back to creation; and the design of the Sabbath is that men may meditate upon God and his works. See Ps. 92:1-6, which is a psalm for the Sabbath day. Thus the Sabbath, being the great reminder of God's creative power, is emphatically a sign by which men may know the true God.

It will readily be seen, therefore, that the sincere observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, as set forth in the fourth commandment, is of the very essence of worship to God. One cannot fully keep the first commandment unless he keeps the Sabbath; for if he does not regard the memorial of creation, it must be that he does not properly appreciate the value of God's creation, nor his power as Creator; and to fail to recognize God to the full extent of one's intellect is to come short of the requirement (Matt. 22:37, 38); and when a man does not regard God with all his mind, he necessarily regards something else with at least a portion of it. Therefore to simply neglect to keep the Sabbath may be unconscious idolatry; but to willfully refuse to keep it is open idolatry. The individual may not bow down to images, but he worships himself more than he does God. There is plenty of idolatry without image-worship. While an image-worship is necessarily idolatry, idolatry is not necessarily image-worship. This is shown by the fact that there is one commandment forbidding idolatry, and another forbidding the making and worshiping of images.

In harmony with the thought in the above paragraph, is the fact that Sabbath-breaking and idolatry were inseparable among the ancient Israelites. They went and served Baal, yet it is stated that their captivity was a punishment for their persistent violation of the Sabbath. See 2 Chron. 36:14-21; Jer. 17:27. Now when it is remembered that Baal was the ancient sun god, the same to whom, under the name of Apollo, the Greeks and Romans dedicated Sunday, and that the first

day of the week was "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," the connection between the Sabbath-breaking and the idolatry of the ancient Israelites will be more apparent. When they joined themselves to the heathen nations around them, and forgot the Lord, they broke his Sabbath and began to celebrate "the venerable day of the sun." It would not be straining a point to say that the Israelites were punished for observing Sunday, in violation of the command of God.

But the objection is often urged that the texts which we have quoted refer only to the Israelites, and that therefore there is no evidence that the Sabbath was ever designed by the Lord to be observed by any other than the Israelites. Thus in the paper read before the late Baptist Conference in Oakland, after reference to Ex. 31:12, 13, and Eze. 20:12, 20, we find the following statements:-

536

"With these declarations before us we may observe: 1. That the duration of the seven-day Sabbath is at least impliedly limited to the generations of Israel. God says to that the ancient people: "It is a sign between me and you, *throughout your generations.*" Why should this language be used if the Sabbath was of universal application, given at the creation of the world, and designed for all time? The inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable, that when Israel's generations ceased, the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is placed upon the Sabbath and that limit is the limit of his people Israel."

This is a fair sample of the objection that is raised over these texts, and it *may be* that similar thoughts have sometimes crept into the minds of some who professed transference for the Sabbath of the Lord. For the benefit of such we wish to state a few points which will not only clear the matter of all difficulty, but show that the Sabbath is fixed to all eternity:-

1. We have already shown that the Sabbath is the thing which above all others helps us to recognize God and his power. It is the *sign* by which he may be known. Now while it is true that these words were addressed directly to the literal descendants of Jacob, there is no more reason for supposing that they apply to them alone than there is for supposing that the exhortation, "Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God" (Phil. 2:14, 15), applies to the Philippians alone. God is no respecter of persons, and what he requires of one he requires of all. He certainly desires to be known by all nationalities, as well as by the Jewish nation; therefore, although the language was addressed to one race, it is a fact that it should be heeded by all.

2. We cheerfully and hardly accept the statement that "the inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable that when Israel's generations ceased the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is placed upon the Sabbath, and that limit is the limit of his people Israel," we say that the inference is not "almost" but altogether unavoidable, that when Israel's generations cease, the Sabbath will cease, but not till then. Now when will Israel's generations cease? David was certainly an Israelite, and to him the Lord said: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations." Ps. 89:3, 4. Again, "His seed also will I

make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of having." Verse 29. And yet again: "Once have I swore by my holiness that I will not lie and to David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Verses 35-37. Surely if the Sabbath is to be limited by the limit of the generations of Israel, it has yet a long time to continue.

Again the Lord says:-

"Thus saith the Lord, which give the sun for a light day, which divideth the sea when the waves of thereof roar: The Lord of hosts is his name; if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever. Thus said the Lord: If Heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth search out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord." Jer. 31:35-37.

Here is stated in the most positive terms that the seed of Israel shall be a nation forever. Then the Sabbath, even according to the admission of the objector, must continue forever, and so it will. And let it be remembered that it is the seventh-day Sabbath,-the only Sabbath in existence,-which is to continue throughout all the generations of Israel. See Ex. 31:13-17.

These texts teach that the Sabbath of the Lord is to be kept by the saints throughout eternity. An abundance of texts might be cited to show that the generations of Israel will never cease, but the above are sufficient. Not only is it true that Israel shall never cease, but it is also true that it is the only people whose generations will never come to an end. To Israel alone are the promises (Rom. 9:4) and only Israel will be saved. Rom. 11:26. Two texts in conclusion must suffice, and they alone prove the proposition just made, that Israel alone shall continue throughout eternity, and that the Sabbath shall exist the same space.

Isa. 45:16, 17. "They shall be ashamed, and also compounded, all of them; they shall go to confusion together that are makers of titles. But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end."

Isa. 66:22, 23. "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall you receive and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." W.

### **"Solemn Warnings" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

(September 18.-Matt. 7:13-25.)



"Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and a broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Verses 13, 14. The way to enter into life, according to our Saviour's own words on another occasion, is to "keep the commandments,"-in other words, to do right,-to "cease to do evil, and learn to do well." Now the reason why the road to destruction is so broad, is because a person may get there by doing anything not in harmony with the ten commandments. There are thousands of ways in which a person may do wrong; there is only one way of doing right. The way to life is both a strait and straight. Right means straight, direct; as Bunyan expresses it, is a way cast up as straight as a line can make it. The broad way as all the world beside this straight and narrow way, which is not of this world.

But before the way to life is entered upon, one must pass through the gate leading to it. What is this gate? Said Christ: "I am the door; by me if any man in enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." John 10:9. The way to life is to keep the commandments; but before a start can be made in this way, the sinner must be delivered from the body of death, which can be done only by Jesus Christ. See Rom. 7:14-25. All a man's efforts to walk in the narrow way without Christ are vain and useless. But the first thing that God does for the sinner when he accepts Christ, is to forgive his sins; therefore pardon for past sins, through our Lord Jesus Christ, is the way into the Christian life.

When we have entered the door, however, our connection with Christ does not cease, if we walk the narrow way. Says Christ again: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6. How can it be that the keeping of the commandment is the way to life, and that at the same time Christ is the way also? Simply thus: Christ himself is "the truth," and the law of God is declared to be the truth. Ps. 119:142. Christ is law personified, and he who lives in Christ, and abides in him, keeps the commandments. And he who does not abide in Christ does not keep the commandments, for Christ says: "Abide in me, and I in you. As a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in a divine; no more can he, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." John 15:4, 5.

The same thought is expressed by Paul in Romans 10:1-4: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." The righteousness of God is the law of God; the Jews had not accepted Christ, and therefore they failed of attaining righteousness, for Christ is the only way by which the righteousness of the law may be obtained. That Christ is the end or object of the law, in the sense that in him we are enabled to keep the commandments, is evident from the next verse, which says: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them." So Christ is both the door and the way of life.

Whosoever at the last day stands without fault before the throne of God, will be only "complete in him."

The way is described as a narrow way, and yet it is the only way in which there is any real liberty and freedom of action. Said David: "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45. Said Christ to the Jews who were walking in the broad way, and boasting of their freedom: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth [the law of God as revealed in Christ], and the truth shall make you free. . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:31-36. There is no liberty except in the narrow way. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." Matt. 7:15-17. This warning is especially applicable at this time, for Christ said that one of the characteristics of the last days would be that "many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." Matt. 24:11. Peter, also, whose second epistle treats especially of the last days, says: "But there were false prophets also among the people [in old time], even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." 2 Peter 2:1, 2. A prophet is a teacher; of that Peter's statement that there shall be false teachers in the last days, is the same as Christ's statement that there shall be false prophets.

These false teachers will have a wonderful power to counterfeit the truth. Said Christ again: "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24. This has undoubted reference to the phenomena of Spiritualism, whose mediums are enabled, by their connection with the devil and his angels, to counterfeit the miracles of Christ and his apostles so successfully that no man by his unaided senses detect the difference. Some will thoughtlessly ask, "Why does the Lord allow his children to be thus deceived?" He does not. The people of God will not be deceived, and there will be no excuse for anybody's being deceived; for ample warning has been given. Says John: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." 1 John 4:3. This is of itself a sufficient warning against being deceived by the miracles of Spiritualism. All the miracles and the pretended good of Spiritualism are done for the express purpose of detracting from the glory of Christ as the son of God. If any are deceived by them, it is only because they "received not the love of the truth."

In the book of Deuteronomy there is a test by which we may be attacked the false prophet. Says Lord: "But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word

in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deut. 18:20-22. That certainly is evidence enough, for the word of the Lord never fails.

But it will be urged that sometimes the signs and wonders *do* come to pass, and that in such a case nobody can be blamed for not distinguishing between the truth and the false. The Lord has anticipated this objection, for we read: "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him." Deut. 13:1-4.

In this we are directed to the word of the Lord as the great counterfeit detector. The whole thing is summed up by the prophet as follows: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for

539

the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:19, 20. And this test is not only good in the case of the teacher of Spiritualism, but in the detection of false teachers of the less pronounced type. Whenever a teacher utters a thing that deviates from the plain word of God, he is not to be received. It may be that his error is comparatively slight; but an error is an error, and he who accepts the slightest degree of error, has no warrant against accepting the diabolical teachings of Spiritualism, which is the sum of all errors. Our only safety is then sticking to the word of God. He in whose heart the law of God is, will not slide.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7:21-23. Men may deceive their fellow-men with a great profession, they may deceive themselves; but they cannot deceive the Lord, who looks upon the heart. The Lord does not condemn the making of a profession of religion, nor prophesying in his name; what he condemns is the lawless lives of many who do these things. A man cannot serve God, with out having a form of godliness; but no perfection of form will save a man who does not do the will of God. The will of God is law of God (see Ps. 40:8, 9; Rom. 2:17, 18), and when Christ says, "Depart from me, chief that working iniquity," he really says: "Depart from me, ye that work unlawful deeds." Here again we are brought to the fact that

Christ is the truth,-the embodiment of the ten commandments,-and that no one can be really in Christ,-a Christian,-who does not keep the commandments. To profess Christianity while living in open violation of the law of God, is the sheerest hypocrisy. False prophets are declared to be a wolves in sheep's clothing; this hypocritical garb is necessary at first in order that men may be deceived; but sin has so terribly blinding an effect that after error has once been accepted and cherished, the wolves may throw off their mask, and appear in their true character, and still the poor, deluded victims will regard them as friends of the flock.

The sum of the whole matter is to build on a rock. The rock is the truth of God as it is in Christ Jesus, as far distinguished from the slime and mud of worldly things, in which all men grovel by nature. He who builds on anything outside of the word of God, is like the man who builds his house on the sand of the sea-shore at low tide, or who builds in the dry bed of a stream which in winter is a torrent. No matter how beautiful a structure he may build for himself, nor how smoothly the foundation may be laid, "There shall be an overflowing shower; and ye, O great hailstones, shall fall; and a stormy wind shall rend it. Lo, when the wall is fallen, shall it not be said unto you, Where is the daubing wherewith ye have daubed it? Therefore thus saith the Lord God; I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury; and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in my fury to consume it. So will I break down the wall that ye have daubed with untempered mortar, and bring it down to the ground, so that the foundation thereof shall be discovered, and it shall fall, and ye shall be consumed in the midst thereof: and ye shall know that I am the Lord. Thus will I accomplish my wrath upon the wall, and upon them that have daubed it with untempered mortar, and will say unto you, The wall is no more, neither they that daubed it." Eze. 13:11-15.

Then "let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. Thus shall we be "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. 2:19, 20. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the Annual Report for 1886-87 of the "Boys' and Girls' Aid Society" of San Francisco. The society is now in the fourteenth year of its existence, and of all the societies and institutions for the help of the homeless and unfortunate children and youth there is not one more deserving of the sympathy and charity of individuals and the generous support of the public. Mr. E. T. Dooley, superintendent, corner Baker and Grove Streets, San Francisco. Cal.

In the *Gospel in All Lands*, the M. E. missionary magazine, for August, there is a letter from a missionary in India in which he speaks of "baptized children not counted as probationers." Neither are they members. But if they are neither

members nor probationers, why then are they baptized? If it be said "for of such is the kingdom of Heaven," then how is it that they can belong to the kingdom of Heaven, and yet cannot belong to the church either as a member or as a probationer? Is the kingdom of Heaven made up of people who are neither members nor probationers of the church?

Mr. Grant Allen says that "the most important result achieved by science in the past fifty years has been the establishment of principles antagonistic to the Biblical teaching of the origin and nature of man, and the history and order of the universe." But such science as that is not science at all. It is speculation only, and science falsely so called. Yet it is the popular thing, even in the leading pulpits of the world. In fact the "leading" pulpits would not be leading pulpits if they were not first *led* by this anti-Biblical science. "The leaders of this people cause them to err, and they that are led of them are destroyed."

A San Diego (Cal.) correspondent of the *Golden Gate*, a Spiritualist, of course, closes an article with the following pertinent paragraph:-

"No greater failure has been witnessed in the history of the world than Spiritualism as it has been presented. Not twelve men have been gathered together in one place capable of founding a new church, or any institution, college, or university where mediums may be properly taught. Think of it; after forty years, with thousands of wealthy Spiritualists-not a university in the whole world endowed by the people who rail against the churches. Is it not time to cry, *Halt!* and ask ourselves what all this cant and chaos mean?"

Spiritualism, being a religion of selfishness, could not be expected to endow colleges and hospitals; but now that it sees the necessity of counterfeiting Christianity, instead of openly combating it, we may expect something of the kind before long.

The Rome correspondent of the *New York Observer* says that "Pope Leo, the great conciliator, hopes for a reconciliation with Italy before December, 1887, when his jubilee will be celebrated, all Roman Catholic nations sending ambassadors to do him reverence." And then quotes from the sayings of the Pope himself a paragraph in which are these words:-

"The only road to peace is to place the Roman Pontiff in a condition where he will be subject to no power whatever."

Yes, that has ever been the ambition of the Papacy, and that is precisely the view which the Bible gives of "That man of sin. . . who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." No power on earth, or that ever was on earth, except the Papacy, meets the prediction. But the Papacy fulfills it to the letter.

What would be thought of a soldier who should carry his weapons confidently and proudly when on dress parade, and throw them away as soon as he came into the presence of the enemy? Or, what would be thought of the soldier who carried the weapons of the ancient time, who would invariably throw his shield away as soon as the darts of the enemy began to fly? Everybody would say that he was most foolish. The weapons are made for the attack, and the shield for the time of danger. And yet scores of Christians act just so foolishly. The Christian's

shield is faith. With this we are told we may quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. With this we may ever see the loving, compassionate Father, and our faithful High Priest, and thus know that the Lord is on our side. But how many there are who have great confidence in God, and hold aloft the shield of faith when all is well, but to, when trials and affliction come, lose all heart, and think that even God has forsaken them? How foolish such a course seems, who has not done so? The faith which enables us to be at peace when the conflict is raging, is the only faith which will gain the victory. And this peace may be ours, for the promise is, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on the." Isa. 20:3. Therefore "trust ye in the Lord *forever*; for in the Lord JEHOVAH is *everlasting* strength." So the prophet says: "Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid." Isa 12:2. How true the words:-

"Oh, peace we often forfeit.

Oh, what needless pain we bear,  
All because we do not carry  
Everything to God in prayer."

In the *Occident* of August is an editorial on "The Righteousness of God without the Law," that is, the righteousness which God imputes to all that believe,-

"The righteousness of sinless creatures, though it be a perfect righteousness, well-pleasing to God, can only be available while it continues to be performed. The whole law is binding upon every creature during every instant of his existence. It is evident, therefore, that he can work up no superabounding righteousness to avail him in case of future transgression. The moment he transgresses, all the advantage derived from previous obedience ceases."

Boston has at last assuredly earned her right, if ever before, to be entitled the seat of culture and the chief city of refinement in the universe. The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union* gives decisive proof of this, thus:-

"If hitherto any doubt has existed in any mind that Boston is fairly credited with the title, Hub of the Universe, the event in the Boston Theater last week should be final on that question. The renowned citizen and accomplished John L. Sullivan, the great expounder, whom the New York police interfered with while in the practice of his humane art of making jelly of other people's faces, was given a magnificent reception and presented with a "golden belt" which cost \$10,000. The large hall was crowded to its last limits with representatives from the principal cities of the United States and Canada. His honor Mayor O'Brien and the Aldermen were present by invitation. The location was called a sparring exhibition. The Mayor and Alderman were publicly thanked for granting license to give such an exhibition for the first time in history of the Puritan city. When Mr. Sullivan was presented the orchestra played 'Hail to the Chief,' and the immense audience rose and cheered him to the echo. Thus John L. Sullivan the prizefighter, goes to Europe, as he says, 'to bring back the greatest honors the world ever conferred on an athlete,' indorsed by the presence of the Boston city government. The belt he will wear abroad, and the honors of the occasion will say to all European municipalities that the municipal authorities of Boston recognize Mr. Sullivan as a worthy citizen, and virtually commend him to foreign

countries as an honored American. They virtually send him over the waters as a boxing plenipotentiary, which is refined English for prize-fighter. He sails on this fighting exhibition (please remember the polite synonyms boxing, sparring) with their good-will and farewell blessing."

Of London's craze over the "Wild West" people the *Saturday Review* says: "This same worship is in close analogy to the later and more rotten days of the Roman Empire, when the gladiators were the favored ones and pets of the Roman ladies."

Yes, and so is Boston's craze for the modern gladiator, John L. Sullivan. Ancient Athens was the seat of culture and refinement, and yet her citizens loved to witness the brutal sports of the arena, and their highest conception of *virtue* was the strength and great courage of the champion of the prize ring. Thus it was with Rome. The modern Athens prides itself upon its culture, yet the man whose only claim to recognition is that he has more of the bull-dog in him than any other man in America, is thus officially recommended to the people of the Old World. And Boston is not alone in this sort of hero worship, only her "refinement" makes the comparison with ancient Greece and Rome more conspicuous. How long will it be before gladiatorial contests, possibly with some modifications, will be as popular among the "higher classes" in America as they were among the aristocrats of Rome? Not long, at the present rate of "progress."

**September 8, 1887**

**"What Constitutes Burial?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The excuses which people can devise in order to bolster themselves up in a wrong practice, are legion. An excuse is not an argument, although it commonly passes for one. The *Congregationalist* of June 2 quotes the following from a tract published by W. Erbury; 234 years ago, saying, for by way of comment, that the writer "pushed immersionists hard for a conclusion more rational than agreeable." He said:-

"How are you 'buried with Christ by baptism' when Christ's burial was not his going into the earth and rising suddenly as you do out of the waters; but his burial must be *three days and three nights* which is a mystery you know not; *let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I'll say they are dipt under!*"

And this is thought to be a disagreeable pressure of immersionists. It must then be considered the strongest argument in behalf of sprinkling. Let us therefore analyze it.

1. Granting for the moment that his point against immersion is well taken, his argument would amount to this: "Immersion in water is not in the likeness of Christ's burial, because those immersed do not stay underwater as long as Christ was in the earth; therefore sprinkling *is* a likeness of Christ's burial!" This is the common way of self-justification. When one is accused of wrong-doing, he points to someone else, and says, "Well, he is doing wrong too;" and then he feels that

he has fully cleared himself of the charge brought against him, and proof that he is in the right. Such methods are childish in the extreme.

2. Our author not only denies that immersion is baptism, but he denies that immersion is dipping. Says he: "Let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I'll say they are dipt indeed." As much as to say that a thing cannot be said to be dipped in water unless it remains there a few days! Our Pedobaptist friends will have to give us a new vocabulary, so that we may know what word to use in the place of "dip," when we wish to speak of anything placed in the water for only a moment. When Christ was importuned to tell who should betray him, he replied: "He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it." John 13:26. And the same person continues: "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." Would our ancient author, and the *Congregationalist*, which sustains him, claim that the sop remained in the dish three days and three nights before it was given to Judas? Certainly not, for they know that the whole supper lasted but a portion of one evening. But the sop was "dipt," for the Scripture so declares. Then a thing may be said to be dipped, even though it remains immersed only a moment. It ought not to be necessary to go to Scripture to prove a thing which is proved by the language of common sense; but many people imagine that Bible language has a different meaning from that of common sense.

3. This also shows the absurdity of supposing that immersion cannot exhibit the likeness of Christ's burial unless the person immersed remains under water as long as Christ was in the earth. "Baptize" means to immerse, to plunge, to dip; and just as a finger is dipped, even though it remains in the liquid but a moment, so a person is baptized although he is in water but a moment. Christ would have been buried, even if he had been raised immediately after being placed in Joseph's tomb; so a man who is buried in the water for only a moment is as surely "buried with him by baptism," as though he remained under the water forever. And added to all this is the tacitly admitted fact that baptism must be a likeness of the burial of Christ, and that nothing but immersion does represent that event. W.

### **"The National Reform Association" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

"EDITORS SIGNS OF THE TIMES: In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, as well as in the *American Sentinel*, I frequently see articles in opposition to the National Reform Association for some of its principles. Would it not be well to give your readers an opportunity to see the position of the Society and the principles it propagates? Then the readers can judge for themselves. The true character of the Association can be known by its own Constitution. Below I give you the preamble. It is as follows:-

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of the Nations and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;



"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath. Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and disregard of moral and religious character and those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves,' etc.

"The *Object* of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows:-

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and the other kindred peoples; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.'

"Now, as a friend of truth and of our common country, I respectfully ask you to designate which of the foregoing paragraphs or sentences you believe to be false or erroneous. Then, if it be your pleasure, I will try to defend them; for I believe they contain only the truth. And I am persuaded that the welfare of the nation depends, under God, largely upon their acceptance and practice by the people.

"N. R. Johnston."

It is not at all strange that articles in opposition to the National Reform Association are frequently seen in the *American Sentinel*, since that paper is devoted solely to the opposition of the work of the National Reform Association. It is the only paper in existence that has for its sole object the defense of American institutions and for liberty of thought and conscience, and which opposes the work of the National Reform from a strictly Christian standpoint. As a consequence, its readers have had, and do continually have, abundance of opportunity to learn the position and principles of the National Reform Association. The SIGNS OF THE TIMES, however, has necessarily a wider range of subjects to deal with, and although it is opposed to the work of the

National Reform Association, it has not, in the little that it has contained upon that subject, given its readers any extended idea of the character of that organization. We are therefore very well pleased to publish the above extract from the National Reform Constitution, and to comply with our friend's request to designate which of the paragraphs or sentences we believe to be false or erroneous. We shall also be pleased to let our readers see what defense our correspondent can make for them. From personal acquaintance with him we are sure that his defense will be made in a candid and courteous manner; and his position as regular correspondent of the *Christian Statesman*, and member of the National Reform Association, may be taken as an assurance that he will represent that Association in the best possible manner. We shall now proceed to note the points which we believe to be false or erroneous, and to give the reasons for our belief.

1. The first statement, namely, "that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government," may be true or false according as it is interpreted. It could be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises over ruling power, or as Daniel says "removeth kings and setteth up kings," we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority comes direct from God, and that he himself directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any nation whose civil powers was derived directly from God, since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, "the powers that be are ordained of God," but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily ordained as God's deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God's design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Roman was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero was better than anarchy.

2. With the second statement, namely, that "the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations," we take direct issue. We have no hesitation whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:-

(a) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. Heb. 8:1. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as "a priest upon his throne." Zech. 6:13. His work now is that of an intercessor. Heb. 7:25; 9:24.

(b) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself taking them and to return," and who after a time "returned having receive the kingdom." Luke 19:11-15.

(c) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, "Sit at thou my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1. And Peter (Acts 2:34-36) makes application of this to the present time, when

Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool.

(d) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See Dan. 7:13, 14; 12:1. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See Dan. 11:2. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, taking his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time everyone of God's people shall be delivered.

(c) The Father himself says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2:8. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall "break them with a rod of iron," and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was.

(f) In harmony with these statements, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations are angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and ye shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 11:15-18. In Rev. 19:11-21 we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that *then* he bears the title, "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And Christ himself (Matt. 25:31-46) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the wicked takes place, when the wicked are sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous are called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* "he will sit upon the throne of his glory."

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show almost conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations; that he will not be the ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his Father just before his second coming in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that men can have any part in getting the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption.

3. With the statement that "the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs," we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result;

nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contain the whole substance of Church and State union. For, it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of teaching them the true religion. But the religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State.

The revealed will of God cannot by any possibility be of supreme authority in human Governments, for that will require that men shall be perfect not only in our outward actions, but in thought. It requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous, and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreking sin. Now when it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it

552

is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone.

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have a right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people.

Again, the apostle Paul says: "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." 1 Thess. 5:18. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving Day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be a mockery, and it is not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him.

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the *May-flower*, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organizations of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard with them, we ask them, who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *May-flower* or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything that would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything.

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if their scheme should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be out-laws and both would be subject to persecution, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure.

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a qualification for office or citizenship. The appointment of days of thanksgiving and the election of chaplains to pray in legislative bodies, are optional, and are practices that would be far more honored in the breach than in the observance, for they are only a mockery. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government's connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity for any other religion.

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of "the moral laws of the Christian religion," whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, "Whosoever will, let him come." The ministers of Christ are simply

ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs, will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which followed immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world.

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immortality and corruption, and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men, for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it is expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." See 2 Tim. 3:13; Matt. 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

We said in the beginning that we should be pleased to see what defense our correspondent can make for the aims of the National Reform Association, but we will slightly modify that statement. It does not give us pleasure to see men defending measures, the tendency of which is to lower the standard of Christianity, to give loose rein to bigotry, and to revive the persecutions of the Dark Ages. But if there is a modicum of good concealed somewhere in the National Reform Constitution, we shall be very glad to have it brought to light. W.

### **"Love the Fulfilling of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

#### **NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.**

(September 25.-Matt. 14:12-16; Rom. 13:8-14.)

These two portions of Scripture are given respectively as a missionary lesson and a temperance lesson; but it is only by great twisting that either passage can be made to teach anything specially about either missionary or temperance work. We shall therefore take up the second portion of Scripture, and briefly comment on that, taking it in its obvious meaning.

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Rom. 13:8. Instead of, "He that loveth *another* hath fulfilled the law," we should read, as in the Revised Version: "He that loveth his neighbor, hath fulfilled the law." This shows that Paul has reference to the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This appears more positively by the following verse which reads: "For this, Thou shalt not commit

adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The apostle does not mean that there are no other commandments than these, but that this comprehends all the law of which he is speaking.

This passage proves beyond all chance for question, that civil governments have nothing to do with enforcing the first four commandments, which define man's duty to God. For, the verses preceding treat of man's duty to civil government, showing that men should yield the obedience to the powers that be; and now when he says that when a man loves his neighbor as himself he has fulfilled the law, it is proof that he has fulfilled all law of which human governments are empowered to take cognizance.

The Bible idea of love differs materially from that held by the majority of people, even among those who profess religion. Love is not a mere emotion, which only the individual himself can feel; but it is an active principle which makes itself felt by others. A person cannot love without *doing*. God's love to the world was manifested in giving his Son to die for the world. Our love to God is shown by our willing obedience to him; and our love to our fellow-men is shown only by the kindness which we show them. That which does not manifest itself in deeds of service for another, is not love.

There is so much selfishness in the world, and it is so natural to the human heart, that few have any proper conception of what love is. There is only one true standard of love, and that is the divine. That ye love one another, as I have loved you." John 15:12. And Paul says that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. This utterly overturns the common idea that was embodied in the Pharisaic saying, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemies." The Bible rule is, "Love your enemies." Therefore we are justified in saying that the one who loves his neighbor simply because his neighbor loves him, does not love his neighbor at all.

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:10. This does not mean simply that we must refrain from doing actual injury to our neighbors, but that we must do them all the good we can. For if I have power to save my neighbor from any ill, and do not do it, it is the same as though I did him the injury. So Paul says in another place: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. 6:10. To the same intent, Solomon says: "Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it." Prov. 3:27. And all is summed up in the Golden Rule: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12.

"And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." Rom. 13:11, 12. Much useless speculation is indulged in by commentators, concerning what is meant here by "the night" and "the day." The

following from Dr. Clarke, is a fair sample: "If we understand this in reference to the heathen state of the Romans, it may be paraphrased thus: *the night is far spent*; heathenish darkness is nearly at an end; *the day is at hand*; the full manifestation of the Sun of righteousness, and the elimination of the whole Gentile world, approaches rapidly." To perceive the fallacy of this conjecture, it is only necessary to remember (1) that the Gentile world have never been illuminated by the Sun of righteousness, and (2) that there is no promise that they ever will be. Moreover, armor is always for defense, and "armor of light" must be for a defense against darkness; but there would be no propriety in an exhortation to put on the armor of light, if the whole world was about to be illuminated. With such a prospect, it would be more appropriate to cheer the people with the charge to prepare to lay off the armor of light, as something no longer necessary.

The simple truth is that this present evil world is a world of darkness. Says the prophet: "The darkness shall cover thee earth, and gross darkness the people." Isa. 60:2. God alone is light. Before the fall, all was light. As men departed farther and farther from God, darkness covered the earth more and more. So we are now living in the night. In this night of darkness, the Bible is given as a light to our feet, and a lamp to our path. Ps. 119:105. It is a gleam from the world of light, which will make the path of them who walk in it, to shine more and more unto the perfect day. Those who are the children of this world, are the children of the night; but those who receive the light from God's word, are the children of the coming day. 1 Thess. 5:4-8.

But although it is now night, the day which is to dawn for the righteous will be to the wicked a night so dark that all the darkness they have lived in will be thought light in comparison. So the prophet says: "The burden of Dumah. He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will inquire, inquire ye: return, come." Isa. 21:11, 12. When the day dawns and the daystar arises in the hearts of the righteous (2 Peter 1:19) it will be impossible then for the wicked to find any light from the word of God (see Prov. 1:24-32; Amos 8:11, 12), but unto them will be reserved only "the blackness of darkness forever."

This time is near. No one knows how near, but it is certain that it is nearer than when we first believed. In view of this how necessary to heed the exhortation of the apostle: "Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof." Rom. 13:12-14.

### **"California Camp-meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The time and place of this meeting has been announced for some time, and we have no doubt but even now preparations are being made by many in



different parts of the State to attend it. The committee have secured good grounds, easy of access, and quite centrally located. The ground is between Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth and Market Streets and San Pablo Avenue. The Market Street horse-cars pass on one side of the ground, and the San Pablo Avenue cable cars on the other. For several years we have not had a camp-meeting so easy of access by people living in the city where it was held.

But it is not simply a large outside attendance that we want. We want to see a general turnout of our people from all parts of the State. This ought to be the largest camp-meeting ever held in California. And if it is to be so, it is high time for everybody to be preparing for it. Begin at once to shape your affairs so that you can leave, and when you come leave your homes cares behind you. Come also with the intention of remaining during the entire meeting. Moreover do not imagine that physical preparation is all that is needed; do not think that you will get all the spiritual good you need after you arrive at the meeting. If you would receive the proper benefit from the meeting, you must seek the Lord before coming. Bring his Spirit with you. Do this, not only for your own sake, but for the sake of others. Remember that you should not be content merely to receive blessings, but must be active to impart good to others.

Perhaps some are thinking that they will wait and attend General Conference. We earnestly protest against any such idea. General Conference cannot be to you what the camp-meeting should be. Most of the time of General Conference must necessarily be devoted to the transaction of business, and you would not be materially edified by simply listening to business, even of the utmost importance, for three full weeks. Moreover, to the brethren and sisters in the California Conference, the business of this Conference is of greater importance than is the business of the General Conference. You are *needed* at the business sessions at the camp-meeting, and must not fail to be present.

Again we say to everybody, Begin to make the proper preparations now; come early; and stay until the close.

### **"Religious Intolerance" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we gave an account of a Catholic procession in France at which a man was beaten nearly to death for not taking off his hat as the procession went by. It will be remembered that that was given by the *Christian at Work* as proof that France is not a godless nation. In the same paper, August 18, we have an account of another such procession, this time in Spain, as follows:-

"The Spanish Republic under Prim sought to establish religious toleration; and it was so successful that when the revolution came, and Alfonso ascended the throne, he had to accept the fact as a fundamental law. But the new law is not always respected, as the following shows. As the reader doubtless knows, in cases of administering the right of extreme unction to the dying it is customary in Spain to go in a procession through the streets, the priest carrying aloft the 'custodia,' and an acolyte ringing a hand-bell, at the sound of which all passers-by are expected to kneel until the procession passes. Since the establishment of

religious liberty in 1868 it is no longer obligatory on all to conform to this custom, and consequently many, from conscientious scruples, refrain from doing so, although, if possible, they endeavor to get out of the way, so as not to give needless offense. But the other day a woman—a member of the Protestant community—was passing through one of the streets of the town, and upon turning a corner came into contact with 'the procession of the host.' Not prepared to kneel, and unwilling to appear disrespectful, she stepped aside into a doorway to let the procession pass; but the priest rushed after her, dragged her out, and with great violence endeavored to force her upon her knees. Not succeeding in this, he handed her over to two policemen, and charged her before the Judge of First Instance with insulting the 'established religion.' The judge took the priest's declaration [in writing], absolutely refusing to hear the poor woman, and ordered her off to prison to await her trial. Heaven knows when this 'trial' may come on, and so this poor woman and mother is excluded from her home for an indefinite period. It is gratifying to know, however, that the matter having come to the knowledge of influential parties in London, counsel has been secured and funds raised for the purpose of seeing that the poor woman receives justice."

France and Spain are two of the European countries in which the *Christian Statesman* and National Reform "cordially and gladly recognize the fact that the Roman Catholics are to be recognized advocates of national Christianity and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism," and which "in a world conference for the promotion of National Christianity could be represented only by Roman Catholics."

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to inquiries, we would announce that the articles which appeared in the SIGNS last year, on "The Abiding Sabbath," will soon appear in pamphlet form.

If "A Reader," who under date of August 27 sent us two questions to be answered, will kindly send us his name, we shall be pleased to answer his questions the best we can. We do not wish to publish the name, but we cannot reply to anonymous communications.

The Rev. F. S. Hatch, of Hartford, Conn., telling in the *Congregationalist* of the success of the Connecticut law forbidding railway trains and traffic on Sunday, says that "Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics have united with Congregationalists in the successful attempt to secure this reform." He says the condition of affairs is not yet perfect, but that "it is a fresh illustration of the major truth that no evil in our midst can stand against the determination of the united Christian Church." And if the supposed evil happens to be a good, it is all the same. This is a pointer which shows how this church affair may easily be made national when the work of National Reform shall have progressed a little further.

There is in California a man by the name of Jesse Shephard, who is said to be a "musical phenomenon," producing the most wonderful music, both vocal

and instrumental, professedly under the inspiration of spirits. His home is now in San Diego, where he is said to have given some marvelous exhibition in connection with masses at the Catholic Church. The *Golden Gate* relates that he was recently in San Francisco, and sang at the nine o'clock mass in the French Catholic Church on Bush Street, and adds:-

"The admission of so well-known a spirit medium to a participation in the musical services of a Catholic Church, would seem to indicate that there is less hostility towards the Spiritualism among the Catholics than there is among Protestants."

And why should there not be? The Protestant Churches received the doctrine of inherent immortality, which is the root of Spiritualism as a legacy from the Catholic Church. In a speech in San Francisco, two years ago, Monsignor Capel said that "to Catholics the spirit world was as clear as the light of a gas jet. They walked the streets accompanied by guardian angels. The dead were in their eyes disembodied spirits who surrounded the throne of God. They prayed to them as well as to the saints and angels. To say that they did not hold communication with the spirit world, would be contrary to the whole evidence of the history of the church." However, Protestants are not far behind Catholics in their acceptance of Spiritualism, as we have abundant evidence to prove.

An elder in the Disciple Church writes to the *Christian Church News* to know what should be done with members to keep their places of business open on Sunday. As that church professes to take the Bible as the sole guide, and is honest enough to acknowledge that there is no warrant in the Bible for calling Sunday a sacred day any more than other days, it is evident that nothing can be done in such a case. The church will have to wait until there is a law of the land enforcing Sunday observance, and then it will have a basis for the discipline of those who labor on that day. But before that time comes, many members of the churches will recognize the inconsistency of the church having to depend on human laws for the enforcement of its ordinances.

**September 15, 1887**

**"Preachers" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Great harm comes to the church and public morality when preachers and other teachers hide themselves away from sight, become, in other words, recluses. But harm almost as great arises from their too prominent identification with affairs that do not properly belong to them. The latter difficulty is, perhaps, the present one, the many reforms and goodish movements of the period tempting them to help in their advancement. The middle ground is the right one, with a heavy leaning to the side of the gospel as a gospel of salvation.

**"That They May All Be One" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is no one thing to which Christians are exhorted more strenuously than they are to unity. Indeed it is the one thing essential. Without unity they have no means of proving to the world the truth of the religion which they profess. Christians are those who are united to Christ, and if they are united into Christ, members of one body, they must necessarily be united to one another. Therefore union is the great test of Christianity.

But when we say this, we do not mean that all who profess Christianity must necessarily be united. We can conceive of union that would be far worse than dissension. We refer to a union upon something contrary to the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Such a union would be no evidence of Christianity, as anybody can see. It must be, therefore, that when our Saviour prayed that all his professed disciples might be one, he designed that their union be a union upon the truth of God as revealed in his word. And this is still more evident from our Saviour's words in another part of that same prayer, where he said: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

These thoughts were suggested by reading a letter which we recently received, and which the writer deplored the fact that some are keeping the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath of the Lord, while the majority of Christians observe the first day of the week. He wished that there might be unity in this respect, and hoped that the time would soon come when Christians should unite in bringing about the fulfillment of our Lord's prayer, "that they all may be one." Inasmuch as he pleaded quite strongly for Sunday observance, we conclude that he wants those who keep the seventh day to unite with the majority, and thus fulfill our Saviour's desire.

It is not an unfrequent thing for people to accuse the seventh-day keepers of bringing in dissension, and of being the cause of there being a division among professed Christians. Now to us the case looks very much as follows: a teacher sends her score of pupils out to play, with instructions for them to keep within a certain inclosure, and an express injunction for them to keep together and be united in their play. Very soon they propose a game if carried out would make it necessary for them to go outside the inclosure. They all start over the fence, except two who refuse to disobey their teacher. The others beg them to come along, stating that the teacher will not care, because so many of them have already gone outside, and then they remind the two of the teacher's injunction that they should keep it together. But still the two refuse to go outside, and so the play is hindered, and the good feeling with which they all started out is marred. The teacher, hearing the dispute, goes out to see what is the matter, and is told by the majority that all the trouble is caused by those two obstinate ones, who refuse to act in harmony with them. Now we think that almost anyone will say that the two are all right, and that the trouble is all caused by the majority who refuse to obey the simple command of the teacher. The teacher also would say that when she enjoined them to keep together, she meant that they should keep it together in the place marked out for them. No one would say that the eighteen ought to be praised for being united in an act of disobedience.

Well, God has enjoined upon all who profess to be learners from him, that they should be one; but when he tells them that, he expects that they will be one

and obey his law. It would be too much to suppose that he would reward them for being united, if they were united in disobedience. Indeed, he has said that union in disobedience is displeasing to him, for we read: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished; but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered." Prov. 11:21. Numbers do not make a sin respectable in the eyes of God. He had more pleasure in Noah than in all the antediluvian world besides. In fact, Noah was the only one with whom he was pleased, and the reason is given thus: "For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Doubtless Noah was accused of being a disturber of the people; but it was better to be a disturber on the side of right than to be joined to the multitude in error.

In later times, when the Jewish nation had nearly all gone into idolatry, there was one faithful man, who refused to join their iniquitous union. The Israelites were a very united people at that time, and did not want to have any disturbing element among them. And so when Elijah came to warn them again, Ahab said to him, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" Elijah did not accept the accusation, but stated the matter in its true light, saying, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house [have trouble Israel], in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." 1 Kings 18:17, 18.

We love union, but we hope that we may never accept of any union that will involve a violation of the plain precept of God. Rather would we stand in the law of the Lord, calling the multitude to return and walk in the old paths. W.

### **"Once a Sin Always a Sin" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks us concerning the curse in Deut. 27:23, against a man marrying his mother-in-law, wishing to know if that prohibition is still in force, or if it is part of the law that was nailed to the cross of Christ. He says, "Does all from the 14th verse to the end of the chapter stand good, except the 23rd verse? Is so, why?"

We say most emphatically, None of it has passed away. The words at the close of the chapter: "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them," apply to all the precepts therein recorded, without exception. There is no more reason for saying that verse 23 does not apply now, than there is for saying that the 15th verse is out of date. To say that these verses are part of that which Christ took out of the way, nailing them to his cross, is equivalent to saying that Christ is the minister of sin. For even heathen nations recognize the fact that to set light by one's father or his mother (see verse 16) is a sin. If this law is done away, then it would follow that it is all right for one to smite his neighbor, provided he does it in such a way as not to be found out. See verse 24. No; these curses are in full force to-day, and it is as surely a sin for one to marry his mother-in-law, as it is to make a graven image to worship, to smite a man secretly, or to take a reward to slay an innocent person.

The curses recorded in Deut. 27:15-26, are all for violation of some one or other of the ten commandments. This can be seen by an examination of the passage itself and also by comparing verses 11-14 with Deut. 11:26-29. The latter passage reads thus: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a

curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known. And it shall come to pass, when the Lord thy God hath brought thee in unto the land whither thou goest to possess it, that thou shalt put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal." Now by reading Deut. 27:11-14, we find that the curses which follow were to be pronounced in harmony with the above injunction, and with the statement that God set a curse before those who should transgress his commandments.

The simple fact is, and it should be remembered by all, that no man can be blessed now for doing what would once have brought him under the curse of God. God's will is ever the same. He never pronounced a curse upon any thing except sin, and no one was ever cursed except for sin. And since God cannot change, the standard of right and wrong must ever be the same. Whatever would bring a man under the curse of God four thousand years ago, will bring one under that same curse to-day. Wherever in the Bible you find a curse attached to the performance of a certain thing, be assured that that thing is to be always and forever avoid by the children of men.

**"They Overpass the Deeds of the Wicked" *The Signs of the Times*  
13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

These words were used by the inspired prophet (Jer. 5:28) concerning the professed people of the Lord in ancient Jerusalem. The careful reader of the context, however, will readily see that their sole application is not to the ancient Jews, but that Jeremiah, while looking at the Jews, saw in prophetic vision far beyond them, and beheld another people in the last days walking in the same path. That the prophecy concerning Jerusalem has equal reference to the church in the last days, may be seen by reading from the beginning of the fourth chapter, and especially verses 19-31 of that chapter.

If anything more were needed to prove that the iniquity which brought destruction upon ancient Jerusalem will be duplicated in the last days, we have only to quote the plain language of the apostle Paul, in 2 Tim. 3:1-5:-

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."

The last sentence shows that these things will be seen among those who profess to be followers of God. Within the past three weeks, three different things have come under our notice, which vividly illustrate some of the things mentioned by the apostle as characteristic of the last days. First of all, as illustrating the phrase, "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," we quote the following

which appeared in the column of *Church News* in the *Oakland Tribune* of September 3:-

### "A CHURCH ENTERTAINMENT

"Yesterday afternoon was devoted by the ladies of the Church of the Advent, East Oakland, to the selling of fancy work, toys, candy, and other useful ornamental articles at a bazaar open in Washington Hall. In the evening a short literary programme was given, after which dancing was indulged in until 11 o'clock. Refreshments were served during the afternoon and evening. About 11 o'clock the company was called together to attend an auction of cakes. W. S. Goodfellow acted as auctioneer, and succeeded in getting a goodly sum of money into the church treasury by the sale of the delectable merchandise."

Lest some should by any possibility get a wrong impression, we will explain that the "Church of the Advent" is the name of an Episcopal house of worship, and has no reference whatever to Adventist. In regard to the above notice, some may say, "It shows, to be sure that they are lovers of pleasures, but how does it show that they are 'lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God'?" Just this way: Although professedly for the cause of Christ, the pleasures indulged in were such as are utterly incompatible with love to God. It was a pleasure which is only of the world. Now John says: "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2:15. Therefore the indulgence in such amusements at all, at any time or for any purpose, is evidence of absence of love to God. But such things are common nowadays, and we pass to another phase.

Indeed *New York Observer* of September 1, we find the following item:-

567

"Strange things are done in the name of charity. The 'champion' prize-fighter of America, Boston delights to honor, recently gave an exhibition of his skill in the fistic art for the benefit of a Roman Catholic benevolent society in Rhode Island. Some charitably disposed persons in Paris, France, have improved upon the Sullivan scheme by instituting 'a grand cock-fight for the benefit of the poor.'"

Certainly nothing more than this is needed to prove the correctness of the appellation, "fierce," those who in the last days are content with only a form of godliness. To be sure the prize-fighter in Rhode Island was under the auspices of the Catholics, but they are now, by the most of the so-called Protestants, recognized as a "branch of the Christian Church."

But all these acts of wickedness and worldly pleasures are over past by a thing which was done in Illinois about a month ago. It was a "crazy supper" given by the ladies of the Methodist church. No description could do justice to it, and so we give below as nearly as possible a fac-simile, reduced in size of course, of the hand-bill which announced it:-

The Magic MCON is BREAKING,  
Like a conqueror from THE east,  
THE waiting we Rid awaking.  
To A golden. Fairy feast-shakeSPEARE.  
The LADIES of the M. E. Church,

assisted by their many friends,  
 will give a CRAZY SUPPER At the ARMORY,  
 SULLIVAN, ILLINOIS, WEDNESDAY EVE., AUG. 3, 1887  
 BEGINNING AT 5:30 O'CLOCK P. m. and  
 "We won't go home 'till morning;"  
 Is it not Written, "Every vacuum must be filled?"  
 "Let no guilty man escape?" So come along.  
 Hear the words of the Prophet Jerry My Oh,  
 "The young MAN and HIS girl can't live on dry bread alone."  
 So the crzy, maizy MENU will consist, among other things,  
 Of Tongue, Chicken Salad, and just Everyday chicken,  
 Ham, Pickles, Jelly, Cake, Ice Cream, Tea, Coffee, etc.,  
 And will be served in many crazy, mazy, hazy waze.  
 "And the light shone down on brave women and fair men."-Burns.  
 Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity,  
 to the voice of DAVE, the SWEET RINGER,  
 "make a joyful sound on the 'Psaltery and the Buttery,  
 the TIN horn and the Cob Pipe,"  
 such excellent music will be furnished.  
 ADMISSION AND SUPPER, 25 CTS.  
 Friends, Romans, Countrymen, WE come not here to talk,  
 But to invite YOU to eat, drink and be merry.  
 THE JOHN L. SULLIVAN NEWS PRINT.

One of the original bills, of which the above is an exact copy, is in our possession, having been sent us by our friend Elder A. O. Tait, who was holding meetings in the town of Sullivan when the crazy revel took place. The shape of the hand-bill we cannot reproduce, but it is sufficient to say that it is fantastic, and fully in keeping with the matter which it contains, giving evidence that those who got it up were eminently qualified to conduct a "crazy" supper.

But while the bill shows the church people who got it up to be "lovers of there own selves," and "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," it proves to a demonstration that the epithet "blasphemers" is fully merited by these last-day professors. Passing by the extracts from the drunkard's song, "We won't go home 'till morning," which shows that their revel, beginning at 5:30 P.M., was to last all night, we call attention to the abominable caricature of the language of sacred Scriptures. Isaiah's prophecy of the forerunner of the Messiah, in which are found the words, "Every valley shall be exalted," (Isa. 40:3, 4 ), is distorted into "Every vacuum shall be filled," and made to apply to the filling of the stomachs of unholy gormandizers. The name of that holy man who before his birth was designated as a prophet of God, is caricatured as "Jerry My Oh," and then to him are attributed the words, "The young man and his girl can't live on dry bread alone." And then, worst of all, if we can mark degrees in such blasphemy, is the parody of the name of the psalmist, and of the language of the Psalms, in the sentence: "Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity, to the voice of Dave the Sweet Ringer, 'make a joyful sound on the 'Psalter-y and the Butter-y, the tin horn and the Cob Pipe.'"



We venture the assertion that there is not an infidel club in the United States that would dare put forth such a blasphemous caricature of sacred things. Truly the words of the prophet whom they have ridiculed apply to them: "For among my people are found wicked men; they lay wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore they are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine; yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the right of the needy do they not judge." Jer. 5:26-28.

It is not because we take pleasure in exposing the evil deeds of others, that we give such prominence to these matters, but that we may fulfill the injunction of Isa. 58:1, and if possible to rouse those who are not wholly given over to such abominations, to the fact that the end cannot be far off. There is another point also, that we should make. When we say that the passage of a Sunday law would result in the persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh day, we are told that fact cannot be, because Christians will not persecute, and worldlings will have no interest in the matter. Leaving "worldlings" aside, what clemency, we ask, can humble commandment-keepers expect from "Christians," who have no sense of the sacredness of the Bible? What better are such professors than "worldlings"? And when the matter comes to the test, no more zealous advocates for a rigid Sunday law can be found than these same ones who walk in "lusts, . . . revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries." Having no real godliness in themselves, they will think to make up for it by excessive zeal for a form thereof.

Further, Solomon says, "They that forsake the law praise the wicked" (Prov. 28:4); and they who praise the wicked must, as a necessary consequence, despise the good; therefore it is as clear as the noonday sun that professors who are guilty of such blasphemy as these which we have noticed, or who suffer them without stern rebuke, well, when the power is placed in their hands, the foremost in persecuting those whose godly lives and teaching condemn their course.

When the Saviour was on earth he drove from the temple those who made it a place of merchandise. Soon he is coming again, and terrible will be the fate of those who do abominable deeds under the garb of religion. The prevalence of these things of which we have spoken should serve simply to cause the servants of God to humble themselves, to seek righteousness, and meekness, that they might be hid in the day of the Lord's anger. "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: Your brethren that he did you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." Isa. 66:5.

Therefore, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Luke 21:34. W.

**"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS of September 1 contained the appointment for a camp-meeting to be held near Caldwell, Idaho Territory, beginning September 13. We have just received word that the date has been changed. The meeting will be held one week later September 20-25.

A writer in the *Evangelical Churchman*, of Canada, makes a strong plea for the Canadian Legislature at its next session to pass an Act authorizing the Governor-General "to issue a proclamation prohibiting all Sunday railway traffic throughout the entire dominion, at such a date as a similar Act shall come into operation in the United States." He says that "when the people of the United States know that Canada has passed an Act against Sunday railway traffic, which must remain inoperative until their own Congress passes a similar Act which in connection with the Canadian one would stop all Sabbath desecration by railway and steamboat companies, and when they are appealed to as they will be by pulpit and press, they will say, 'This thing must be done.'" This appeal by pulpit and press is even now being made, loud enough to be heard even to Canada. How long will it be before the thing shall be accomplished?

The question is frequently asked, "Why did God make a devil?" The answer is, He did not. He never made any being who was not perfect and pure. Satan was the chief of the angels who "kept not their first estate" (Jude 6), but who sinned and were delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto Judgment. 2 Peter 2:4. Some unthinking person is likely to ask, "Why did God let him sin?" Simply because God made him an intelligent creature and not a machine. God does not delight in sin, and it is certain that he did not want Satan to sin, but when Satan determined to sin there was no way to prevent it without destroying his identity; for if by almighty power he had been restrained from open rebellion, the desire itself would have been sin all the same. The fact is, Satan sinned, and God's disapproval of the act has been shown ever since, and will yet be shown in the most marked manner possible, when Satan, with all his hosts, shall be destroyed.

In answer to the question, "Has it ever been a doctrine of the Presbyterian Church that unbaptized infants were lost?" a correspondent of the *Interior* says: "It has never been. On the contrary, Presbyterians have protested always against the doctrine." Well, then, we should like to know why they baptize infants. It is very certain that adults are baptized in order that they may be saved; for whatever carping there may be about baptism as a saving ordinance, we have the declaration, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" also the command, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." See also 1 Peter 3:21, 22. The command is imperative for all who believe to be baptized; there is no exception made. To say that men who neglect baptism stand an equal chance of being saved with those who are baptized, would be to deny the necessity of that ordinance. And so when Pedobaptists admit, what they cannot deny, that infants who are not "baptized" will be saved as well as those who undergo the ceremony, they admit that the ceremony is entirely unnecessary, and if unnecessary, it is wrong. The so-called baptism of infants, which is in reality no

baptism at all in any sense of the word, is a gross perversion of a sacred ordinance, and a mockery which has about it none of the elements of solemnity.

**"What Shall be Done?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

P.A.F. asks: "What is a woman who is a Seventh-day Adventist, and whose husband is an infidel, to do if he requests her to buy or sell on the Sabbath day? Will not sin be imputed to her if she complies? Also her young children desire to keep the Sabbath, but the father will not let them do it. What shall she do? If she should resolve to live apart, she would lose the children entirely."

We do not know everything, and cannot undertake to tell people what their duty is in special cases, but so far as we have any light, the woman's course seems plain, although not necessarily easy. 1. She should keep the Sabbath. Her husband is not in the place of God to the woman; God's plain command far outweighs her husband's request or even command. There is no human obligation which can set aside one obligation to God. 2. Sin would most certainly be imputed to the woman, as well as to anybody else, if she violated the Sabbath. 3. She should do with her children the best she can, by precept and example. If the father will not allow them to keep the seventh as they wish, she cannot help the matter. If she should leave, her influence over them would be at an end. Moreover, she has no scriptural warrant for leaving, and to do so would be unjustifiable, and would bring reproach on the cause. A woman may not leave her husband simply because he is not a Christian. Possibly she herself cannot keep the Sabbath as well as she would if she were alone, but by her quiet, godly life, she may save her children, and possibly her husband too.

One thing ought always to be remembered; very often fierce lions appear in the path just ahead of us, making it seem impossible to advance; when we push straight ahead, we find that they are changed. People are lost because of trials and dangers which they saw but were afraid to meet, rather than by those which they pass through. All of which is summed up in the words of the apostle Paul: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." 1 Cor. 10:13.

**September 22, 1887**

**"Christ's Coming and Kingdom" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we were requested to explain Matt. 16:28, but the question was mislaid. We will now consider it. For the first reads thus:

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

That our Saviour did not refer to his coming at the end of the world is evident from the fact that in his discourse on that the event in Matt. 24, he foretold a long

period of persecution that was to intervene; and that he did not refer, as some have supposed, to the day of Pentecost or to the destruction of Jerusalem, nor to the spread of the gospel, is evident because (1) Christ did not come in any sense of the word either at Pentecost or at the destruction of Jerusalem; (2) the spread of the gospel is not the coming of Christ in any sense of the word; and (3) the gospel work had already begun by Christ, and had indeed been carried on from the days of Abel.

In 2 Pet. 1:16-18 we are set upon the track of that which our Saviour did really refer to in Matt. 16:28. That text reads as follows:-

"For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount."

The apostle here refers to the transfiguration scene which took place about a week after Christ's statement found in Matt. 16:28, and the account of which immediately follows those words. That account reads as follows:-

"And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here; if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." Matt. 17:1-5.

Remembering that Peter referred to this event as proving the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that it follows closely upon Christ's statement that some standing there should see him coming in his kingdom, and that just before he made that statement he was speaking of his second coming (Matt. 16:27), we must conclude that in the statement made in verse 28, Christ referred, not to his actual coming at the end of the world, but to a miniature representation of that coming.

Before proceeding to show how fully this was a representation of the second coming of Christ, we will quote some opinions of others. Dr. Geike, after commenting on Matt. 16:24-26, thus paraphrases, in his usual style, verses 27, 28, embodying the parallel passages in Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:26:-

"I shall one day return in a very different form, with the majesty of my Father in Heaven, and accompanied by legions of angels, to recompense everyone according to his works. In that day each true disciple will be rewarded according to his loving devotion and self sacrifice for my sake, and will be received by me, as the Messiah, into my kingdom. But I shall be ashamed of anyone, and call him unfit to enter that kingdom, who for love of life and ease, or for fear of man, or from shame of my present lowly estate, or of my cross, has wanted courage to confess me openly, and separate himself, in my name, from this sinful

generation. It may be hard for you to think, as you see me standing here before you, that I shall one day, in heavenly majesty; but that you may know how surely it will be so, I shall grant to you now present, a glimpse of this majesty, not after my death, but while I am still with you, that you may see me, the Son of man, in the glory in which I will come when I return to enter on my kingdom."-*Life of Christ, chap 46, last paragraph.*

In his "Life of Our Lord" (p. 321), Samuel J. Andrews made the following clear statement of the case, which is more satisfactory than Dr. Geike's testimony, because it contains the Scripture references which support the view:-

"The promise that some then standing before him should not taste death till they had seen 'the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (Matt. 16:28), or had seen 'the kingdom of God, with power' (Mark 9:1), was fulfilled when, after six days, he took Peter, James, and John into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them. These apostles now saw him as he should appear when, having risen from the dead, and glorified, he should come again from Heaven, to take his great power and to reign. They saw in the ineffable glory of his person, and the brightness around them, a foreshadowing of the kingdom of God as it should come with power; and were for a moment 'eyewitnesses of his majesty.' 2 Pet. 1:16. Many errors still remain to be removed from their minds, especially respecting the time of its establishment (Acts 1:6), but the great fact of its supernatural character they could not mistake."

Now let us briefly notice the details of this wonderful scene, to see how they agree with what we are told of the second coming of Christ in his kingdom.

1. "A cloud overshadowed them." So of Christ is said, "Behold, he cometh with clouds." Rev.1:7. He departed in a cloud, and he is to return just as he went. See Acts 1:9-11.

2. "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Mark says that "his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them;" and Luke says that "his raiment was white and glistening." So of Christ's coming we are told that it shall be "in the glory of his Father." One, prophetically describing that coming, says: "His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had bright beams out of this side." Hab. 3:3, 4, margin. John, who afterward had a view of his coming, said: "His eyes far as a flaming fire." Rev. 19:12. And Paul speaks of "the brightness of his coming" as being so great as to destroy the wicked. Then but those who have been strengthened by the Lord can behold the glory of his coming and live.

3. When he comes the second time he comes to take his people to himself, and this he does by raising the righteous dead, and translating the living. Says Paul: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. Again he says: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,

at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52.

So, then, when Christ comes on his throne of glory, with a cloud of angels, to give reward to the righteous, there will be two great classes of them: those who shall be translated without seeing death, and those who shall be raised from the dead. These, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, shall also appear with him in glory. Col. 3:4. Now these two classes were with him on the mount of transfiguration. If they had not been, it would not have been a true representation of the "power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," as Peter says it was. All Bible readers are familiar with the fact that Elijah (the Hebrew form of the name of which in Greek is Elias) was translated without seeing death. See 2 Kings 2:1-11. The record says that as he and Elisha walked on, and talked, "behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven." So Elijah was there with Christ in the mount as a representative of those who, when Christ comes, shall be caught up to meet the Lord without tasting death.

Concerning Moses, we have the record: "So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day." Deut. 34:5, 6. Turn now to Jude 9, where we read: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." What could cause a dispute between Christ (who is Michael) and the devil, concerning the body of Moses? Only this one thing, that the devil has the power (Heb. 2:14); he brought sin into the world, and death comes by sin; those who die he considers as his lawful prey, and he refuses to open the house of his prisoners (Isa. 14:16, 17), which is the grave. He is the strong man keeping guard over his house; but Christ is the stronger than he, who has entered into his house, overpowering him (Luke 11:21, 22) and who now has the keys of death and the grave. Rev. 3:18. This power Christ gained by his death (Heb 2:14); but long before his death and resurrection he had this power by virtue of the promise and the oath of God, which were the surety that he would be offered. Knowing these facts, that Christ contended with the devil over the body of Moses, we are forced to the conclusion that their dispute was concerning the resurrection of Moses, Satan claiming that Christ had no right to take him. But in every contest with Satan, Christ has come off victorious, and so Moses was raised from the dead, and appeared with Christ on the holy mount, as the representative of those who, at the second coming of Christ, shall be brought from their graves to ever be with the Lord.

If there should be a lingering doubt in the minds of any that Moses was really raised from the dead, and they should think that it was only his disembodied spirit that appeared on the mount, we will state (1) that the transfiguration is expressly declared by Peter to have been a representation of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," and that at that time he and James, and John were "eyewitnesses of his majesty," which shows that it was a view of Christ in his kingly glory; (2) it is absolutely certain that when Christ comes there will be no

such thing as disembodied spirits, because, says Paul, he "shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:20), and this change is performed for both the living and the dead. 1 Cor. 15:51. When the saints are caught up to meet the Lord in the air, it is with their own bodies glorified like the body of Christ. Therefore, (3) since, as shown above, the transfiguration was a representation, on a small scale, of this glorious event, it is certain that Moses must have been there in person, and not in shadow.

The transfiguration stands for us, as it did for the apostles, as a sure pledge of Christ's second coming in power and great glory; and yet "we have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." 2 Peter 1:19. Let us study this sure word of prophecy, that we may walk in the light, and be prepared for the dawning of the "perfect day." W.

### **"A View of the Sabbath Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

In compliance with the expressed wish of a correspondent to "Please give your readers this view of the Sabbath day," we print the following communication. "This view of the Sabbath day" has been given and answered in the SIGNS a great many times, but line must be upon line, and precept upon precept. Besides the SIGNS is continually going to new readers, and we are always glad to let them know on just what foundation Sunday rests. The claims of the Sabbath of the Lord never were so strong as when contrasted with the claims that are put forth in behalf of Sunday. Here is the letter:-

TO THE EDITORS OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: An article recently came to my notice in your excellent paper, headed, "God's Law and Sabbath, or Man's Law and Sabbath." It seems to me that the writer takes an imperfect and one-sided view of the subject. Christians are to look at the spirit of the ancient law as interpreted by Christ. The schism among professed believers is a stumbling-block to the world. Previous to his crucifixion, Christ's prayer for his followers was, "That they all may be *one*." Paul says in 2 Cor. 3:5, 6, "Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the *New Testament*; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." And 2 Cor. 5:17: "If any man be in Christ, let him be [margin] a new creature; *all things* are passed away; behold, *all things* are become a new." Again, in Rom. 7:6: "But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that [margin] wherein we were held; that we should serve in the newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." And further, we are to "delight, in the *law of God* after the inward man." Rom. 7:22. Please see Matt. 12:1-14. "The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day." Verse 8. He came "not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it in the 'Lord's day.'" Further, the resurrection of our Lord was on *the first day of the week*. Mark 16:1; Luke 24:1; John 20:1. See Acts 20:6, 7, where Paul says, "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came

together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Christ, kept the "*first day of the week*." Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day? And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the *first day* of the week, does it matter which day is kept; as much as that we *agree* to keep one day of rest, holy unto the Lord. E. C. R.

We do not recollect the article to which our correspondent refers, but no matter; we will consider his so-called proof for Sunday observance.

1. "Christians are to look at the spirit of the law, as interpreted by Christ." Exactly so. And his interpretation was that not one jot or one tittle of the law should pass away. Now if our friend would take the fourth commandment, and show that, although it declares the seventh day to be the Sabbath, it really means that the first day, there would be some point to his statement. But see further on this point in next paragraph.

2. Paul says in 2 Cor. 3:5, 6, "Our sufficiency is of God; who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." This is commonly interpreted as teaching that the letter of the old covenant kills, but the spirit of the new covenant gives life, which is true enough as a statement, but is not what the text says. The text makes no mention of the old covenant, but only of the new. The letter of the new covenant or testament kills just as surely as did the letter of the old, and it is only the spirit that gives life.

Some, however, and among them our correspondent, seem to get the idea that there is some sin attaching to the observing of the letter of the law, and that it should be kept only in spirit, and not in letter, we would like for someone to have the kindness to tell us how such a thing can be done. It is utterly impossible for any man to keep the spirit of the law if he does not keep the letter. For instance, the sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." How could anybody keep the spirit of that commandment if he did not refrain from taking life? None but a Catholic will claim that the spirit of the second commandment can be kept by one who bows down to images. Certainly the spirit of the third commandment cannot be kept by one who uses God's name unnecessarily. So no man can keep the spirit of the fourth commandment when he labors upon the seventh day, upon which he is commanded to rest. It is sometimes urged that the spirit of that commandment simply requires rest, and that if a man rest on the first day he complies with this spirit as well as though he rested upon the seventh day. With as good reason might the heathen say that the spirit of the first commandment is simply that men should worship, and that he who worships Jupiter for Juggernaut complies with the spirit as fully as does the one who worships Jehovah.

3. "Again, Rom. 7:6, 'But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter.' And further, we are to delight in the law of God after the inward man." Certainly nothing could be farther from proof for Sunday observance than this. The man who keeps only the letter, that is, the outward form of the law, is as though he did not keep it at all, because God requires truth



in the inward parts. The law goes farther than mere outward acts, and requires that the thoughts of the heart shall be in harmony with its requirements. A man may keep the letter of the law, and still violate in Spirit; but he cannot keep the spirit, and violate the letter.

This matter is fully illustrated by Christ in his denunciation of the Pharisees. They were very scrupulous in their outward compliance with the law, but maintained that it made no difference how a person felt or thought. Christ said that they made clean the outside, but within were full of extortion and excess. Said he unto them:-

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." Matt. 23:27, 28.

Now hear what Jesus say to us all: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5:20.

Notice, he says that our righteousness must *exceed* theirs. Now anything cannot *exceed* another unless it goes just as far as that other, and a good deal further. One man exceeds another in the amount of work done, because he does just as much as that other, and more too. So if our righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Pharisees, we must have all the righteousness that they had, and a good deal more. What did they do? They kept the letter of the law perfectly. What must we do? We must keep the law outwardly and inwardly too. To talk about keeping the spirit of the law while violating its plain precept, is as absurd as to talk of traveling east or going west. So to say that the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day, may be kept by the observance of the first day, is as absurd as to say that man in Chicago obeys an order to go to New York, by going to San Francisco.

4. "2 Cor. 5:17: 'If any man be in Christ he is [or let him be] a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.'" How anybody's mind can be so twisted as to suppose that this text warrants the keeping of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, is beyond our comprehension. If any man is in Christ *he* is a new creature; it is the *man* that is new, not the law, the Sabbath or any other thing. Before a man is in Christ he does not keep the law. See Rom. 7:14-25; 8:1. When he comes to Christ, he forsakes the old life and becomes a new man. As Paul describes it, he puts on "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4:24. And this agrees with 2 Cor. 5:17, 18, where Paul, after saying that if they man is in Christ all things are new, he continues, "and all things are of God." Whereas in his previous life everything was of the world, now everything

is of God. This is the exact meaning of the text. But to make it mean that when a man is in Christ everything in the universe that is old has passed away, is equivalent to saying that not only the Sabbath, which is as old as creation, has

passed away, but that the whole law, the whole creation, and even God himself, have all passed away, for all are of old.

5. "'The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day.' He came 'not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it into the Lord's day.'" We know not from whom our correspondent quoted this precious bit of nonsense, but a more self-contradictory thing was never written. It is true that Christ did not come to abolish the Sabbath, but if he had "merged it into the Lord's day," he would most effectually have abolished it. Our correspondent says, "to interpret it." But it needed no interpretation. A child can understand the fourth commandment. It is a legal maxim that the words of the law are to be taken in their obvious signification, and there are none but common words in the fourth commandment. Again he says that Christ came "to ennoble it." But that were impossible, for it was from the beginning as noble as it is possible for anything to be. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Gen. 2:3. Who can point to an institution more noble than that which was blessed and hallowed by the Lord himself?

It is said that Christ merged the Sabbath into the Lord's day. Impossible again, for the Sabbath was already the Lord's day. Christ himself said as much in the words, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," for it was of the seventh-day Sabbath,-the only Sabbath in existence,-that he was speaking. The Lord said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God (Ex. 20:10), and again Isa. 58:13 he calls it "my holy day;" and there is no other day that the Lord ever called his day. Therefore the seventh day is and always was the only Lord's day.

6. "The resurrection of our Lord was on the first day of the week." Granted; we wouldn't for a moment think of disputing it. We might state that his crucifixion was on Friday, and his ascension, was undoubtedly on Thursday. Our correspondent may ask, "Well, what of that?" We reply, Nothing in particular; but just as much importance attaches to these statements, as there does to the statement that Christ rose on Sunday. Why not keep Friday, because of Christ's crucifixion? or Thursday, because of his ascension? "Oh," the reply will be, "there is no authority for any such thing." Of course there is not; neither is there any authority for keeping Sunday, because Jesus rose on that day. The only authority is the Roman Catholic Church.

7. "We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Paul, kept the first day of the week." We beg our correspondent's pardon, but he doesn't know anything of the kind; and there is not a man on earth who knows anything of the kind; and there never was a man who knew any such thing. We have met assertion with the assertion; he offered no proof of his assertion, and so we have nothing to disprove. But if he will bring us from the Bible a single iota of *proof* that Christ, or Paul, or any other apostle, or any man named in the Bible as a companion or friend of Christ or the apostles, ever kept a single Sunday, we will print it in THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES in red ink, and in the largest type that we have in the office. Don't be backward with your proof, Brother "R."

8. "Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath,-the seventh day?" We ask, Why should Christians worship the God of the Jews, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Why should Christians follow the old Jewish custom of reverencing God's name? Why should Christians obey the old Jewish law that prohibited murder? You say that God was not the God of the Jews exclusively, but "of the Gentiles also." True; he is the God of all mankind, and consequently his holy Sabbath,-the seventh day,-is the Sabbath for all mankind; for "the Sabbath was made for man."

9. "And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the first day of the week, does it matter which day is kept?" That's the way it always ends: It doesn't make any difference what the Lord says, because people have taken it into their heads to do differently. Just as if the action of ten thousands of people could change the mind of the Lord!

This article is already too long, but we wish to call the reader's attention to one thing: Our friend has not presumed to offer a single Scripture statement to the effect that Sunday is the Sabbath; he has given a few texts which have no more reference to Sunday than they have to the Declaration of Independence, and winds up by saying that it doesn't matter which day of the week we keep, anyway. And, mark this, he has done as much for Sunday as could be done by the most accomplished minister in the world.

In contrast with the Sunday argument, notice the simplicity of Bible truth:-

"*The seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in *it* thou shalt not do any work." Ex. 20:10. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, then one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

From a single canvasser 594 subscriptions for the *American Sentinel*, accompanied with the money, were received one day last week. There are scores of people who want to "do something in the cause," who could do as well as this, and we do not know of anything which they could do which would more effectually help in the work. The field is wide, and but a very small portion of it has been worked.

Active preparations are already being made for the camp-meeting which is to be held in Oakland, October 6-17. Various committees of arrangements have been appointed, and it is the design to have the best arranged camp-meeting ever held in this State. We confidently expect, also, that the attendance will be the largest that has ever been seen at any camp-meeting in California. May the good that shall be done, be in proportion.

Hon. Washington Bartlett, Governor of California, died in Oakland, Monday evening, September 12. He was sixty-three years of age, and the immediate cause of his death was paralysis, brought on, it is said, by too close application to the details of the business of his office. This is the first time that a Governor of California has died in office. Lieutenant-Governor Waterman has taken the oath as Governor, and has entered upon his duties.

A London dispatch of September 16 speaks as follows concerning the European outlook:-

"One of the most discouraging signs of the European horizon, which promises no permanence of the present peaceful state of affairs, is the fact that all the great newspapers here and on the Continent are gathering together large staffs of war correspondents, and by buying serviceable horses, and in other ways, are preparing for the great struggle they seem confident is coming. In the meantime statesmen are puffing so ostentatiously the pipe of peace, that suspicion is excited that under the friendly cover of the smoke they are preparing for war."

A week ago we listened to a sermon against the Sabbath, which differed, of course, in no respect from the average sermon against the Sabbath, having the usual number of contradictory statements. As a specimen, we note the following: The speaker claimed that the observance of the seventh day is anti-christian. Then he went on and applied Paul's words in Rom. 14 to the matter of Sabbath observance, claiming that the Sabbath question is not a matter for controversy, but that everybody should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and do as he pleases. The query arises, If the Bible tells people to choose for themselves which day they will keep, and says that it is a matter of no consequence which they observe, how can there be anything unchristian in the observance of the seventh day? Again, after stating that everybody should decide the matter for himself, and that no man should judge another, the speaker proceeded to plead for a law which should compel everybody to rest on Sunday! And yet we hear grave and learned men eulogize the sermon as a logical effort!

There is nothing to which the human mind more readily turns than making excuses. Many find it difficult to believe that the professed church of Christ can ever fall to the depth of depravity portrayed in 2 Tim. 3:1-5. But they forget the facility with which people can persuade themselves that *their* course is all right, and in perfect harmony with the Bible. When Saul had directly transgressed the divine command, he boldly met the prophet, and said, "Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord." And we have known a man who by his own admission was an adulterer, to quote the seventh commandment, and claim that he had done no wrong. It is the easiest thing in the world for a person to deceive himself. Many persons of professed piety, who have been discovered in a crime, are entirely unconscious that they have been acting the part of a hypocrite. Their moral sensibility has become blunted, and their conscience seared, till they imagine that they really are as good as their profession would indicate. As a matter of fact, it will be found that when the church falls to the position indicated in 2 Tim. 3:1-5, its profession will be higher than at any previous time in its history.

The latest argument against any law that shall in any way control the liquor traffic, appeared in the *Tribune* a few days ago. The writer says:-

"Besides lessening the number of drinking houses, the law lessens the number of opportunities for the development of self-sustaining moral capacity. What a truly ingenious device it is to institute conditions for the purpose of enabling men to confess in the bosom of their families that their presence at

home results only because there remains no place open wherein to make beasts of themselves!"

All we have to say about this is, that it is a fact that there are hundreds of men who, whether they will confess it or not, cannot or will not refrain from making beasts of themselves, so long as there is any chance for them to do so; and we submit to all candid minds that it would be far better for a man to confess that he is sober from force of circumstances, than to have the circumstances altered so that he will be a brute. His family would say so, at any rate, and their comfort ought to count for something.

And then the writer has the unblushing impudence to say:-

"It is extremely unwise to attempt to subvert the natural and terrifying conditions under which life has been raised to its present height, and by which it is from day to day sustained."

The next thing we shall hear will be that the liquor traffic is the only true religion.

As a fair specimen of the stories which are periodically gotten off at the expense of those who have not advanced so far as to be wise above that which is written, but who are simple enough to believe the truths of the Bible, we present the following, which we clip from the *Golden Gate*:-

"A preacher of the old school, a Scotch Presbyterian, who held to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, once announced as the subject of his next discourse, 'Interesting Events in the Life of Noah,' giving also the chapter he would read illustrative of his subject. A mischievous young man got hold of the kirk Bible and pasted two leaves together, so the minister read on the bottom of one page: 'When Noah was one hundred and twenty years old he took unto himself a wife, who was'-then turning the page-'140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide, built of gopher wood and covered with pitch inside and out.' He was naturally puzzled at this. He slowly read it again, verified it, and then said: 'My friends, this is the first time I ever met this in the Bible, but I accept it as evidence of the assertion that we are fearfully and wonderfully made!'"

Doubtless many people have read this story and believed every word of it, have laughed over the simplicity of the honest Scotsman and thereby have imagined themselves wondrous wise. We might believe that such a thing happened, if it were not for two or three little *inconsistencies*: 1. There is no place in the Bible where mention is made of anything "140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide," etc. 2. The Bible nowhere states that Noah was one hundred and twenty years old when he took unto himself a wife. There is no statement made anywhere in the Bible as to what Noah did when he was one hundred and twenty old, nor is there any mention made of the one hundred and twentieth year of his age. 4. The Bible says nothing at all about Noah's taking a wife. Because of these things we are forced to discredit the story. These inaccuracies may be explained by a knowledge of the simple fact that people who know enough about the Bible to avoid them, do not give up stories in connection with it.

At a birthday reception recently given in San Francisco to W. J. Colville, a noted Spiritualist "inspirational" lecturer, the speaker who gave the address of welcome, said:-

"In olden times they stoned the prophets that were sent unto them, but we propose to help our young prophet with flowers and benedictions."

If the speaker had read his Bible more carefully he would have learned that only the prophets of the Lord were stoned,-those who brought reproofs for sin, and threatening of coming judgments. But the false prophets, the prophets of Baal, those who assisted in the devil worship, and the professed prophets of the Lord, who spoke smooth things, and prophesied deceits, and told the people that they were all right, were always received with flowers, and were lauded to the skies. Times have not changed at all.

The *Christian Advocate* tells of a preacher who "was translated." But by reading the notice through we find that he fell off a train of cars and was killed. And this is how he "was translated." Now this is not exactly the way in which Enoch and Elijah were translated. Neither Enoch nor Elijah ever saw death, whereas this man was killed outright. If therefore this man "was translated," then where has there ever been a person, from Abel to this day, who has passed from this life who was *not* translated. Neither the method or the idea of translation has very materially changed since Bible times. As to which it is that has undergone the change, the person who has respect to the Bible will have no difficulty in deciding. The truth is that it would be difficult to conceive how anything could be farther from the truth of the Bible than are the leading ideas of the theological world of to-day.

The question is asked, "Was it not cruel for God to send Jesus to die for us?" That question could not be asked by one who had any experimental knowledge of the Bible. "For God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. God did not "send" Jesus in the sense that he compelled him to die; Jesus was a willing offering. Paul says that he "gave himself for our sins" (Gal. 1:4), and Christ himself said "I lay down my life for the sheep." John 10:15. The Father and Son are one. The sacrifice was equal on the part of each. The Father loved the Son with a love as much greater than the love of an earthly parent for his son, as God is greater than any man. Yet his love for the creatures of his hand was so great that he allowed his Son to come to earth to die. There was only love in the whole transaction,-love so great that poor selfish mortals fail to comprehend even the faintest shadow of it.

**September 29, 1887**

**"Is There Such a Thing as Death?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

We find on our desk a letter from a professed "holiness" man, the editor of a "holiness paper", taking us to task in no measured terms for teaching that man is not alive when he is dead. The writer thinks that such teaching is "scientifically devilish," and says that if there is not a hell there ought to be one for people who will thus deceive the people, which charitable statement he makes for our special benefit. We pass this by as but the natural result of the Pharisaism which says,

"Come not near to me; for I am better than thou," and notice the question at issue, for there is no doubt but that some people do honestly stumble over some of the points which our critic mentions. For the benefit of such we write.

We will repeat the statements which appeared in the SIGNS, with which fault is found; "Life and death are exactly opposite terms. Life means existence. So long as a man has breath, he has life, no matter what his circumstances may be," etc. This we reaffirm. For Scripture proof that "life" and "death" our terms exactly opposite in the meaning, we quote the following: "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." Isa. 28:1.

Here we find life and death directly contrasted. If Hezekiah had died, he would have ceased to live. Again, read Deut. 30:19:-

"In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live."

Also Deut. 30:15:-

"See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil."

Here is life and blessing promised to the good, and death and cursing promised to the evil. Inasmuch as good and evil and blessing and cursing are directly opposite terms, it follows that death and life are also placed in contrast. The contrast is the same as in Rom. 8:13: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if the true the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

Read also Rev.20:4, 5:-

"I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reign with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years were finished."

Note that some who had been dead now "lived," and more than this, they "lived again," showing that there had been a cessation of life. There are two periods of living brought to view, separated by an interval of death, or of not living. Here again we seen death placed in contrast to life. Now know what it is that causes life or death. When God formed man of the dust of the ground, he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 2:7. It is the presence of breath that continues life. Job said: "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wicked this, my time tongue utter deceit." Job 27:3, 4. That which is here called the "spirit of God" is, as the margin says, "the breath which God gave him." Job's assertion was that he would not utter deceit as long as the breath which God gave him remained with him; in the other words, as long as he lived. He knew that after the breath left him he could not utter either deceit or truth, the same Spirit that inspired Job, also moved another holy man to say: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath go forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:3, 4. Another

writer also said: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." Eccl. 9:5.

So then that is the exact opposite of life, in that the living have breath and consciousness, while the dead have no breath, and do not know anything. But now the objection is urged that there are places in the Bible where the word "dead" or "death" is used without the meaning of non-existence or unconsciousness. As a sample objection, we quote the words of our "holiness" critic. He says:-

"Will you please inform me if the apostle meant non-existence when he said, 'Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God'? Did the prophet mean that he was speaking to non-existence when he said, 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light'? And the word of God said to Abimelech, 'Thou art but a dead man,' he meant to say that he was speaking to a *non-existence*? When the father said, 'This my son was dead' (Luke 15:24), he meant he was non-existent? he had been in a state where 'he had no breath'?-and the apostle meant they had no 'breath,' when he said, 'who were dead in trespasses and sin'?" Eph. 2:1."

The trouble with our critic is that he does not seem to know that words may have a secondary meaning, or that there is such a thing as a figure of speech. We have known people to argue the same way about the word "day." They would deny that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours, because the term "day" is applied to the whole time in which the gospel is preached,—"now is the day of salvation." That is, because the word "day" is sometimes used for a long period of time, they would deny that it is ever used with reference to a period of twenty-four hours; because a word is sometimes used in a secondary sense, they would deny that it could have any primary application! If our objector should ask us what a stone is, I might answer in the words of Webster's Dictionary: "A mass of connected, earthy, or mineral matter." And then he would reply, "Are you not ashamed to try to deceive people with such half truths? When Paul says that Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone, does he mean that Jesus Christ is a mass of concreted, earthy, or mineral matter?" And then he might go on to argue that because Jesus is called a stone, it is utterly misleading to speak of a stone as being a mass of earthy matter. But would he claim that nothing can be called a stone unless it is like our Lord? Of course he would not. Everybody knows what a stone is, and its characteristics. And so when Christ is spoken of as being the chief corner-stone, they recognize at once that the idea meant to be conveyed is that he is something enduring, one upon whom it will do to build.

Now would the objector claim that when the Lord said to Abimelech, "Thou art but a dead man," he meant that he was in the same condition that Lazarus was in when the Saviour said of him, "Lazarus is dead?" Or that when Paul says, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God," those to whom he is speaking are in the same condition as were the Assyrians after the angel of the Lord had smitten them, when it was said of them, "They were all dead corpses?" Of course he will not; for the most rabid Spiritualist, who denies that there is any such thing as death, will admit that the man who is in the condition commonly called death,



is in a different condition from the one to whom that change has not come. Then it is admitted that there is such a thing as death, and that the dead are not alive.

Now let us consider each passage that is quoted above. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Note here that the word "death" indicates the absence of life. And so is the primary idea of death,-absence of physical life,-that the apostle uses in his figure. An entire article would be needed to properly explain the gospel truth here referred to; it would be sufficient here to say that the death is the same as in Rom. 6:2, 7; 4, 6, namely, that the person is dead vicariously. He was a sinner under sentence of death, Christ has actually died,-ceased to exist,-for sin; and the sinner has accepted the death of Christ in his behalf, and has indicated such acceptance by baptism, and now the law considers him as though the penalty had been executed, justice is satisfied; the man has been put to death, in Christ, has "risen with Christ," and is now considered as another man.

Again, take the texts, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give the light," and, "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. Those who are sinners are condemned already; they have sentence of death in themselves. Their death is sure, unless they repent, and so, by anticipation, they are called dead. The same explanation applies in the case of the word that came to Abimelech: "Thou art but a dead man." The thing which he had started to do, if persisted in, would surely result in his death, and so he was counted the same as dead already. But notice that these words mean nothing unless there is a fixed, definite meaning to the word "death."

In the parable of the prodigal son, the father is represented as saying, "This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." The son had been absent from home for a long time, and his father had had no word from him, nor any trace of him. He had been as completely separated from his father as though he had really been dead. And his father had mourned for him as dead. Therefore the father speaks of him as having been dead. So far as any communication between them was concerned, he was the same as dead. And this again makes prominent the condition of the dead-they are separated from their friends, and are silent; there can be no communication between them. This is the idea that is naturally conveyed by the word "death;" then so common is it that when the father in the parable would convey the idea of utter separation and the long silence that had existed between him and his son, he could best indicate it by saying that he had been dead.

It is only the fact that words have a fixed, definite meaning, that enables us to use them in figures of speech. If they had no fixed meaning, there would be no meaning conveyed by the figure. The reason why we have no difficulty in understanding the passages of Scripture that are quoted in this article, is because there is a fixed meaning to the word "death," to which the mind involuntarily recurs.

And so we adhere to our scriptural statement that death is the opposite of life; that life is existence, and that death is the absence of existence. He who does

not accept this, is in duty bound to tell what death is, and to give the texts which we are to depend on as giving the primary idea of death. W.

**"Baptism, According to Liddell and Scott" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Greek Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, has always been recognized as a standard lexicon of the Greek language. The work has passed through several editions, and the seventh edition has lately been issued by the Harpers, of New York. The work has been enlarged, and has been carefully revised, not only by the authors, but by some of the best Greek scholars of America. It may therefore be considered as representing the best scholarship of the world. It has occurred to us, therefore, that it would be of interest to our readers to know the definition that is given to the word *baptism*, the Greek form of our English word baptize. Messrs. Liddell and Scott are both professors in Oxford University, England, and therefore cannot be accused of being biased in favor of immersion. We give not only the word *baptize* but also kindred words.

*Baptize*, "a dyer or dipper."

*Baptize*, "to dip in or under water." The following instances of its use are given (we omit the Greek

599

terms, and give only the translation): "of ships, *to sink* or *disable* them;" "*to the drenched*;" "*soaked in wine*;" "*over head and ears in debt*;" "*being drowned* with questions, or *getting into deep water*;" "*to draw wine, by dipping* the cup in the bowl;" etc.

*Baptisis*, "a dipping; baptism."

*Baptisma*, "*baptism*, the usual form in the New Testament."

*Baptismos*, "a dipping in water, ablution; *baptism*."

*Baptistarion*, "a bathing place, swimming bath; the baptistery in a church."

*Baptistas*, "one; a baptizer;" "*ho Baptists*, the Baptist."

*Baptos*, "dipped, dyed."

*Bapto*, "to dip in water, Latin *immergere*." The word is used by Homer, of a blacksmith who tempers steel by plunging it into water.

From this we can see that to talk about the "mode of baptism" is absurd, if reference is had to sprinkling or pouring. The term, "the mode of baptism," can only have reference to whether the individual shall be baptized forward or backward. It would be as proper to call sprinkling *diving* into the water, as it would be to call it baptism. We have seen little children run about in water two or three inches deep, and say that they were *swimming*; that was childish imagination, but it was no more absurd than for one man to sprinkle a few drops of water on another's head and then say that he has baptized him.

But strong as is the etymological argument for immersion, it is surpassed by the argument from the nature and object of baptism, as set forth in the Scriptures. When once the design of baptism is understood, the absurdity of calling sprinkling baptism is very apparent. In fact, sprinkling has no significance

whatever, and there is not the slightest ground upon which it can be defended, except that it is the custom of the people. But "the customs of the people are vain." W.

### **"Another View of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Only last week we answered at some length a letter which was written for the purpose of showing that Sunday is the Sabbath. How far short the letter came from showing anything of the kind, our readers can judge. This week we have a somewhat similar task. From a Congregationalist pastor in Wisconsin we have received a very courteous letter stating the reasons why he cannot see that the seventh day is the Sabbath. The ground covered is entirely different from that covered by the letter and answer of last week, and so we present it at once. Certainly no apology is needed for giving line upon line, and repeated explanations, upon so important a subject as that of the Sabbath. Here is the letter:-

"EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES-*Dear Brother*: Your paper was sent to me for several months, and among many articles on the Sabbath question I noticed one in the issue of January 20, entitled, 'Why Don't They See It?' Now I assure you that it is just as wonderful to me why you *do* 'see it' as you do. I should like to state a few points, as briefly as I can, in answer to that article and others like it:-

1. The commandment does not say that we are to keep the seventh day *of the week*, but work six days and keep the seventh, *i.e.*, one-seventh of our time, as one-tenth of our income belongs exclusively to the Lord.

2. Because the Jews had a *certain day* as the Sabbath is no reason why we should keep that day any more than we are bound to keep it just as they did, or observe any other part of the ceremonial law.

3. The Lord blessed the Sabbath day *by making it a blessing to mankind to keep it*. Those who keep as the Sabbath the first day of the week are just as truly and greatly blessed as those to keep the seventh day of the week. Both keep the 'seventh day' and obey the fourth commandment.

4. Even if there was no other reason for retaining the day that we now observe, and there are most excellent ones, it can be shown from the Bible (our only guide) that Saturday is the day the Jews kept. It is not sufficiently true to warrant a division in the church of Christ.

5. A man is no better, morally, for keeping the seventh instead of the first day of the week. Obedience to any of *God's* commands, including the *fourth* in the decalogue, *does* make a man a purer, nobler, better man; but not so with this requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

We will take up these five points in the order in which they are given:-

1. For the sake of bringing out a point, we will suppose for the moment that the commandment does not specify which day of the week should be observed. Our brother admits that the ten commandments are all binding, so that the fourth commandment is authority for observing Sunday. But if it does not designate the particular day to be observed, it follows that every man may decide that matter for

himself. If it be true that the commandment requires the observance of only an indefinite seventh part of time, then there is certainly no authority for Sunday-keeping any more than there is for keeping Monday or Tuesday. We do not know just what position our brother would take, but we do know that all Sunday advocates whom we have heard or read on the subject, are quite agreed that it is necessary that all Christians should observe Sunday. Indeed, our brother himself deprecates a division in the church of Christ, on this point. But why should there not be a division? What is there to call for unity? If the only place where Sabbath-keeping is enjoined does not tell us *what day* to observe, what reason is there for being united? Why should not every day in the week be kept by different ones if they feel so inclined? Oh, it is urged, and very justly, too, if everybody should choose his own day, there would be confusion, and it would be utterly impossible for either public or private business to be carried on. Well, then, if it is necessary that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, and we fully agree that it is necessary, then it is necessary that someone having authority should decide which day of the week shall be observed. Now there is no man or body of men that has this authority. If God, in giving the commandment, has given every man the liberty to choose the particular day upon which he will rest, no man has any right to coerce another in the matter. It is self-evident that the only one who has any authority in the matter is the One who gave the commandment. If, as all agree, it is quite essential that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, then to say that God did not recognize this necessity, and provide for it, is to charge him with shortsightedness. The fact that unity is essential (and Christ himself declared that Christians should all be one), shows that God has provided for unity; and where can we find that provision if not in the commandment?

Now we claim that the fourth commandment itself very definitely specifies which day of the week shall be observed: "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Where shall we begin this round of seven days,-six days of labor and one of rest? Evidently at the beginning of the only division of time which consists of seven days, that is, of the week. Any child who knows that "seven days make one week" would, on reading the commandment without comment, say at once that Saturday is the day which it enjoins.

But we have an inspired comment on the commandment, which is sufficient to end all controversy. Luke, after giving the account of the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath true on." Luke 23:54. Then he says when the women saw the sepulcher, and how the body was laid, "they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher," etc. Luke 23:56; 24:1. From Mark 16:1 we learn that "the Sabbath was past when" the women came to the sepulcher; and from Matt. 28:1 we learn that this "first day of the week," upon which they came to the sepulcher, was immediately following that Sabbath day they kept "according to the commandment." But the day before the first day of the week is the seventh day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as words can

make it, that to rest upon the Sabbath day "according to the commandment," we must rest upon the seventh day *of the week*.

Remember, the question is not as to whether we should keep the seventh day because those women or anybody else did, but simply as to what the commandment requires. Our brother has admitted that the fourth commandment is the sole authority for Sabbath-keeping, and we have shown from the Scriptures that the commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath, and requires all men to keep it. Who can fail to see it?

We might stop right here, and consider that all the points have been noticed; for since the commandment clearly implies the observance of the seventh day of the week, all questions of custom, etc., amount to nothing. But we will briefly reply to be other points of the letter.

600

2. Of course the practice of the Jews is of no authority with us; neither is the practice of the Christian church. If we do not keep the seventh day because the Jews did, but because the Lord commands us to. This is an authority that may not be lightly disregarded. Perhaps our brother is unconscious of the fact, but in his implied statement that the requirement to keep the seventh day is only a ceremonial precept, he is discrediting all the other nine precepts of the decalogue. We should not like to have the opinion become prevalent that the sixth commandment was only a ceremonial precept for the Jews; for in that case this country would not be a safe place to live in.

3. We have already shown that the commandment requires the observance of just one particular day of the week. The statement that those who keep the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and those to keep the first day of the week, both keep "the seventh day," is a self-evident absurdity. The statement contradicts itself, and needs only to be repeated to be refuted. The Lord "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;" and so far as blessing to mankind is concerned, we have no warrant for expecting a blessing except in obedience to the commandment of the Lord. See Deut. 11:26-28. A truly humble person will be blessed even though he is *ignorantly* violating some precept; but the blessing is not for his disobedience, even though it is unintentional, but for his obedience of every known duty. But no one can be blessed because of disobedience; he who has the light, and does not walk in it, may *claim* to be blessed; but he only is blessed whom the Lord approves.

4. Notice the fallacy of our brother's fourth point. He claims that it cannot be shown that Saturday is the seventh day, and then says that this is a reason why we should keep Sunday! Mark, he does not say that Saturday is not the seventh day, but only claims that it cannot be shown to be the day that the Jews kept. But that proves nothing for Sunday. Even if it could be positively shown that Saturday is not the seventh day, that would not prove Sunday to be the day to be observed; it would not prove a thing concerning Sunday. Truly the Sunday-sabbath rests on nothing at all, else its friends would give some *reason* for its observance.

Can our brother show that the Jews are keeping a different day now from the one they kept in the time of Christ, or for two thousand years before that time?

Will he dare intimate that they have changed their day of rest? Of course he will not. The Jews who observe any day, still keep the same day, that has always been kept by the Jews. They now keep the day which we call Saturday, and that is the day that they always have kept. Then Saturday is the day that the women kept "according to the commandment," which Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John call the Sabbath, and which our Lord himself observed "as his custom was." There is nothing in this world more sure than that the seventh day of the week is the day which God commanded all men to keep holy, and it is equally certain that the day which is commonly called Saturday is that seventh day. To say that God has ever allowed it to become impossible for men to tell why they should obey one of his fixed precepts, is to charge God foolishly.

5. All we have to say to this is, that a man *is better* morally for obeying the moral law; and the fourth precept of the moral law declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and requires men to keep it holy. As well might Jonah have said that he would not be any better morally for going to Nineveh than to Joppa. What difference did it make where he went, so long as he went somewhere? Just this difference: the Lord told him just where to go, and when he did not go there he disobeyed the Lord. That was an immoral act, because it was an act of disobedience to the plain command of the Lord.

We trust that what has already been written shows clearly upon what basis the observance of the seventh day of the week rests. It is not a requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. This paper has no requirements. But it does have an interest in trying to induce men to obey the requirements of the Lord. We heartily agree with our brother that "obedience to any one of God's commandments, including the fourth in the decalogue, *does* make a man purer, nobler, better man;" and we are sure that that command cannot be obeyed except the individual does just what the requires. We know that obedience does not consist in doing one thing when the Lord has required another; observance of the first day of the week cannot by any possibility be construed as obedience to a commandment which requires the observance of the seventh day of the week. We submit this as a self-evident proposition. He who thinks that it can be so construed, must settle the matter with the Lord, and not with the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It is He that has made the requirement, and not us. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have an interesting communication from Elder C. L. Boyd, Cape Town, S. Africa, which will appear next week. Lack of space prevents its publication this week.

The Youngstown (O.) *Daily Telegram* of September 9 contains an account of the Spiritualist Camp-meeting at Cassandaga, N.Y., which says: "The attendance has been so large on Sundays as to entirely overflow the amphitheater. If Spiritualism should be proven false, the fool killer would have to employ a large force of deputies, for it seems as though the majority of people nowadays believe in it."

It is stated on good authority that of the 2,500 suits begun in the Circuit Court of St. Louis, Mo., during the past twelve months, 700,-nearly one-third,-were divorce proceedings. The worst feature of the case is stated in the following words, by the same paper that furnishes the above information: "No longer can it be said that the ban of social ostracism is the award of the divorced man or woman, and the world appears to place them on a part with other people relatively situated financially and socially."

The *Presbyterian* says:-

"Men convince themselves that a thing is so because they would have it so. They sit in judgment upon the plans and purposes of God himself, and, by a 'helpful treatment of sacred Scriptures' supply what they conceive to be wanting in God's administration of the universe himself hath made."

This is a serious charge to bring against the "leaders of religious thought," but the most serious thing about it is that it is well deserved. The Bible is fast losing its hold upon the professed Christian church. When men take it upon themselves to "help" the sacred Scripture, they become judges of it; "but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law but a judge." To add a single thought or doctrine to the Scripture is virtually to deny the inspiration of the entire book.

The *Independent* makes the suggestion that every reader make it a standing rule to commit two verses of the Bible to memory, the first thing that he does in the morning of each day, and that during the day he repeat three verses to himself so frequently as to fix them strongly in his memory. We heartily second the suggestion. The task would not be a difficult one, and in the course of a year a good amount of precious matter would be stored in the mind. One who pursues such a course need never be lonely, for no matter where he is, he has something to think about; and we know of nothing else that will so effectually drive away evil thoughts. Try it.

We commend, also, the *Independent's* suggestion that the book of Romans be committed to memory in this manner. Seven months would suffice to accomplish the task, which would be performed so easily as to seem no task; and when learned in that way, the constant repetitions would insure that it would never be forgotten.

Some people decry the committing of scriptures to memory, urging that is better to have an understanding of the sense of a passage than to have the exact words in the mind. Just as if the committing of the exact words would make it impossible to understand the sense! As a matter of fact, we know that having the text in mind, where it can be meditated upon any time, is the very best way to have the full force of it impressed on the mind. And we are equally certain that some portions of the Scriptures and especially the greater part of Romans, and its companion book, the Epistle to the Galatians, cannot be appreciated until they are in just that way. No mere reading will ever unfold their treasures to any mind.

"When a wicked men dieth his expectation shall perish; and the hope of unjust men perisheth." Prov. 11:7. Thus saith the Scripture, and yet grave and learned Doctors of Divinity will persist in telling the people, from the pulpit and through the religious press, that the Scriptures give no intimation that any man's probation closes at death, and because the doctrine is a pleasing one, and

because the assertion is made by men who *claim* that they know all about the Bible, thousands of people are accepting it without taking the trouble to read for themselves what the Bible says. A terrible awaking awaits those who, having intelligence, and the light of truth within their reach, are content to let somebody else to do their thinking for them.

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Pacific Methodist* which contains a communication "on the Sabbath question," and suggests that we may want to answer it. An answer is not necessary, for it kills itself. As evidence of this we quote one item. The gentleman, who prefixes "Rev." to his name, denies that the word "day," in any place in Genesis 1 or 2, means a period of twenty-four hours, and offers "in proof" the following profound argument:-

"The six days of Genesis 1, are each closed by the words evening and morning. According to Dr. Young's Analytical Concordance, the same Hebrew words, translated the evening and the morning, are used to mark the periods of time both before and after the creation of the sun and moon. With Dr. Young agreed many other competent authorities on this point. The evening and the morning were certainly not measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun before the creation of the sun!"

Astonishing! But we would like to ask if the day has been measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun at any time since the sun was created. If we are correctly informed, the day is measured by the revolution of the earth on its own axis, without reference to the sun, and that could be done before the sun was made as well as afterwards. The sun was made to rule the day that already existed; but the earth would revolve on its axis once in twenty-four hours, forming the day, if the sun did not shine at all. Who has the next astro-geological "reason" to bring against the commandment of the Lord?

Quite recently Dr. Lyman Abbott published a "Confession of Faith" in the *Christian Union*, in which he took the position that there is no close of probation at death any more than at any other time. A Congregationalist pastor in Massachusetts wrote to Dr. Abbott, thanking him for expressing so perfectly his own eschatological views, and added: "I wish such a Confession of Faith could be infinitely manifolded and distributed among those who are cobwebbed with the faith which dwelt in 'grandmother Lois.'" This faith which dwelt in grandmother Lois, is the faith which was in the Timothy, and which caused the apostle Paul to be filled with joy. See 2 Tim. 1:4, 5. But the "new theology" which counts Doctor Abbott as one of its ablest champions, proposes to emancipate people from all such faith! Could there be a more open confession that the theology which is becoming so popular is contrary to the Bible? To some this may not seem a very serious matter, because, as they say, the issue is simply one of doctrine, and is not practical. But we know that the real question is whether or not the Bible shall be accepted by a professed Christians as of final authority in matters of faith. It is fact being decided that it shall not be. But the Bible is the only thing which gives light in matters of morality, and when it is cast aside, and human reason substituted, what is going to hinder the people from plunging into all manner of immorality? Isn't it time poor somebody to "cry aloud"?



The annual killing of hunters in California and Oregon has begun and is going on at the usual lively rate. Almost every other day the dispatches announce the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or else of a man killing himself by crawling through the brush, or through a fence, or getting out of a boat or wagon, and pulling his gun after him. of course it is all "accidental," but for none of it is there a particle of excuse. As for the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or for any other piece of game, it ought to be made a crime with a heavy penalty attached. If such hunters were made to realize that the penitentiary stood before them, they would be more careful to see, before shooting, whether the object of their aim was a man, or some other game. It is true that if this were so, there might occasionally a deer escape. But it seems to us that it would be better to kill fewer deer than more men. This may be old foggyish but so the thing appears to us.

As for those who kill or maim themselves by dragging their guns after them, as they themselves pay the penalty of their own senseless carelessness, of course no laws are needed on that point. But to people who want to go a-gunning without killing themselves, it may be in order to suggest that it is just as easy to put your gun ahead of you and crawl up to it, as it is to put yourself ahead and drag your gun after you. It is just as easy, and *a good deal safer*. Yet it is altogether likely that for the present generation of gunners, this suggestion is gratuitous; because those who have sense enough to handle a gun will keep it before them, and those who have not sense enough will hardly profit by any suggestion that might be made.

The following item, from the dispatches of September 17, should be published everywhere. If the crime-condoning juries everywhere were treated as were these who so richly deserved it, there would soon be a much more wholesome atmosphere about the criminal jurisprudence of the country. The case occurred in Kansas City.

"Judge White's charge to the jury in the case of John Snyder, charged with attempting to assault Ruth Rollard, aged seven years, was strongly in favor of conviction. After being out about five minutes, the jury return a verdict of guilty and fixed the punishment at six months in the county jail. The clerk had scarcely finished reading the verdict when Judge White, frowning angrily, thumped violently on the desk and exclaimed: 'Mr. Clerk, read that verdict again.' The verdict being read, the Judge inquired: 'So say you all, gentleman of the jury?'

"The answer was in the affirmative and the judge said: 'Gentlemen, I shall take the liberty to set your verdict aside. If you had found the defendant not guilty I should have nothing to say, but when you find him guilty and assess his punishment at six months, you perpetrate an outrage. If you think men may take female children from the cradle for the purpose of gratifying their lustful desires, and then escape on an imprisonment of six months, you are a disgrace to the civilization of the day. You will all now be discharged from attendance and forever disqualified as jurors in this court.'"

**October 6, 1887**

## **"Why Will They Say So?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York correspondent of the *Michigan Christian Advocate* recently gave an account of the funeral of Bishop Harris, in the course of which he said:-

"He is not dead. God's saints don't die; they only change their modes and forms of life."

As soon as we read that, certain texts of Scripture came to our mind, and we jot them down for the benefit of those who may have given a hasty assent to the *Advocate* correspondent's assertion.

"And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years of; and *he died.*" Gen. 9:29.

Noah was certainly a saint, for we read that he was "a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God" (Gen. 6:9); and that by his favor and obedience "condemned the world." Heb. 11:7. Yet the inspired declaration is that "he died."

Of Abraham we read:-

"Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years." Gen. 25:8.

Of Moses, who was honored of God more than any other man that ever lived, and he was faithful in all the Lord gave him to do (see Num. 12:6-8), the record says:-

"So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord." Deut. 34:5.

Again we read of another great and good man:-

"And it came to pass after these things, that Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, been an hundred and ten years old." Josh. 24:29.

Samuel was one the whowas consecrated to the service of the Lord at a very early age. While yet a small child he was employed by the Lord to perform a very delicate task, and his whole life was marked by piety and strict devotion to duty. Of him the record is:-

"And Samuel died; and all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah." 1 Sam. 25:1. And again: "Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city." 1 Sam. 28:3.

Of the prophet Elisha the simple record is:-

"And Elisha died, and they buried him." 2 Kings 13:20.

This list might be lengthened indefinitely, for of all the thousands of millions people who have lived on this earth, there have been but two of whom it could be said, "And he died." These are the words which closed each of the biographies (with one exception) in the fifth chapter of Genesis. But we have selected only a few of whom it could not by any possibility be denied that they were saints.

Now what shall we conclude? Shall we say that the correspondent of the *Advocate* is correct? If we do, then we contradict the record concerning all those holy men. This we dare not do; so we shall have to conclude that the writer whom we quoted is misinformed.

But why should he be misinformed? And why should thousands of others coincide with him in his disagreement with Scripture? For there is not a doubt but that more than nine-tenths of the professed Christians of the world, including theological professors and ministers of the gospel, would never think of questioning his statement. We repeat, Why should they be misinformed? What excuse can they have for flatly contradicting the Bible? We confess that we cannot frame any excuse for them. They can read and the ability to do that is all that is required in order for one to know that both good and bad do die. Nay, it is not even necessary to be able to read, to know this fact, for observation teaches it to everyone. "For he seeth that wise men I, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others." Ps. 49:10. And there is no man so powerful that he can redeem his brother "that he should live forever, and not see corruption." Verses 6-9.

Then why will they persist in using such language? If they were blatant infidels, denying the Bible, and even in their mad blindness denying their own existence, we should not be surprised. But it is astonishing that men who profess to love the Bible as the inspired word of God, should so squarely contradict it. The only explanation that we can give is that, not heeding the warning of the apostle, they have been spoiled "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. 2:8. Can anybody give a better explanation? W.

### **"A Superstitious Practice" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The religion journals and teachers of the day have much to say about a slavish obedience to forms, urging that the observance of forms is utterly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Such language is heard especially whenever anything is said about keeping the Sabbath "according to the commandment," being "*buried* with Christ by baptism into death," and sometimes even in regard to the Lord's Supper. The keeping of the seventh day of the week, as the Lord enjoins, is said to be a Judaistic regard for mere form; and whenever it is shown that nothing but immersion is baptism, they will say that to put so much stress upon mere form savors of superstition. We notice, however, that those who thus deprecate form connection with Sabbath observance and baptism, are very zealous sticklers for Sunday observance, and for sprinkling in place of baptism. The natural conclusion is that they have no objection to forms, so long as those forms are of their own choosing.

Not only is this conclusion just, but it may also be shown that those who thus insist that the form is of no consequence, are indeed most superstitious in their observance of certain forms that are not commanded, and that they regard a mere ceremony much as the heathen regards a charm or an amulet.

That this is true of the entire Catholic world, needs no proof. It is only necessary to remind the reader of the "relics" which is claimed are possessed of such wonderful healing properties, and of the sign of the cross and the *Ave Marias* which alone are said to ward off all evil spirits. And instance of this

superstitious trust in a mere form recently came to our notice in Oakland. A laborer was caught in the shaft of a mill, and was fatally injured. He was carried to the hospital in an unconscious condition, from which he never recovered. A priest was summoned, who administered the "sacrament" of extreme unction to the unconscious man, who died soon after. If that "sacrament" had not been administered, all Catholics would have entertained at least a doubt as to that man's future; but having received it, the priest can assure them that he is sure of Heaven!

Now no intelligent, candid person would dare affirm that "extreme unction" or anything else performed over a man who is really dead so far as consciousness is concerned, could have the least effect on his spiritual condition. Even Catholics themselves, when pressed, will admit that the performance of rites and ceremonies, or the repetition of prayers, is of no avail if unaccompanied by faith. And yet thousands of professed Protestants, who talk so glibly about the slavish obedience to mere form, show themselves to be as superstitious as their Catholic brethren from whom they have borrowed those forms. In proof of this, we will cite only the so-called baptism of infants.

As a matter of fact, infants are never baptized except in the Greek Church; they are only sprinkled; but if we did not know how easy it is to be inconsistent, we should wonder that people who argue against immersion, on the ground that the form is of no consequence, and that baptism is simply "the answer of a good conscience," should be so scrupulous in regard to a mere form where it is impossible that there should be any conscience at all. Two instances will suffice to show that infant baptism is simply the result of gross superstition that is not exceeded among Roman Catholics.

In a recent note on "Children's Day," the editor of the *Congregationalist* said:-

"The rite of infant baptism can be made most impressive. Last year a young man of more than twenty, witnessed this ordinance for the first time on Children's Day. As he watched the pastor take one dear little one after another in his arms to bless them, he said, with deep emotion, 'If my father and mother had done that when I was a baby, I might have been a different boy.'"

If the intelligence indicated by that remark was a fair sample of the product of the brain of that "young man of more than twenty," we should say that he was even then a proper subject for the administration of "infant baptism." But we must remember that he simply echoed the sentiments of the church people around him, and that his remark is indorsed by the editor of the *Congregationalist*. Now we ask, What would have been the difference if that young man had been "baptized" when he was a baby? If that ceremony had been performed, and he had been a model youth, to what would the *Congregationalist* attribute his goodness? It could not be to any volition on his part, but simply to the magic charm of the few drops of water sprinkled upon him, or to the words uttered by the pastor.

But we have another case in which the element of superstition is so prominent as to be laughable. In the *Advance* of September 22, A. L. Frisbie, D. D., has an account of a "Sunday with the Stonies," a tribe of Indians on their reservation near the line of the Canadian Pacific, who have been civilized by

missionary effort. He tells of the crowds that flocked to church, of the good order, of the reverence during prayer, and of the enthusiasm with which they sang "Old Hundred," and continues: "A baby was presented for baptism after the benediction. Fortunately he was asleep, so that he could not express any disapprobation of the proceeding." And then in all seriousness he goes on to say that mothers and nurses might learn a lesson from the way in which this baby was "put up," because he was placed in a casket shaped to the tiny form, the whole wrapped and bound, and his limbs, body, and head so snugly cased and held, that he "could not kick if he wanted to." If he had been awake, he could not have objected to the proceeding except by yelling. "Fortunately he was asleep," and so the beautiful ceremony was not marred.

Will anybody tell us how much more solemnity or efficacy there was in that ceremony than in the incantations of the heathen Indian "Medicine Man"? If it is said that this was done in the name of Christ, then we reply that it was simply taking the name of Christ as a charm, and differed not a particle from the act of the seven sons of Sceva. See Act 19:13, 14. We may add, also, that the mere calling of the name of the Lord Jesus over a person, will have no more effect if done by a Christian minister than if done by a Jewish exorcist.

In the instance quoted from the *Advance* the climax of absurdity was reached. There was an intent without power to discern between its right hand and its left; added to this it was bound hand and foot, and then while it was *asleep* the minister surreptitiously sprinkled a few drops of water upon it, and, behold, it was a Christian baby! This fairly surpasses the method by which the Jesuit missionaries in California converted the Indians a century ago. It is said that the Jesuits which would mount their horses, lasso an Indian, force him into the mission building, and "baptize" him, and henceforth he was a child of the church. If sprinkling an unconscious infant is productive of any good, we cannot see what argument can be brought against the forcible "baptism"

615

of adults. No one can fail to see that the element of faith is entirely excluded.

But it is urged when the child is thus baptized, the parents pledge themselves to train it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and to bring it up in the full fellowship of the church. This is not true. The parents may indeed make the pledge, but it is not the so-called baptism that seals the pledge. If it had anything whatever to do with the pledge, then the parents themselves should receive the ceremony in token thereof. Would not the pledge be just as valid if the ceremony of sprinkling was not performed? Certainly; the sprinkling of the infant can by no means affect the parents; so we see still that the act is one of conformity to a superstition. To make this still more emphatic, we have only to cite the numerous cases that are related, where the child sought the company of the vicious as soon as it arrived at years of understanding, and at an early age left home and parents for a wild career, yet after many years he was converted, because he had been sprinkled in infancy. In such a case the same virtues is attributed to the so-called baptism that the savage attributes to the spell of the sorcerer.

But again, it will be said that in such a case the prayer of the parents fail to bring the erring one into the fold, even though he be absent from them. Very

good; we know that "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," and we are willing to accept that explanation and the cause of the young man's conversion; but that explanation nullifies the theory that the sprinkling in infancy was of any virtue. Would not the prayers of the parents be just as effectual without the mockery of "baptizing" an unconscious babe? The assumption on the part of the Pedobaptists who relate such cases, is that they would not be; and so again we see that some mysterious magic charm is attributed to the ceremony performed in infancy.

We have before us an article from the *Advance* of July 7, which tells of a very godless man whose wife had died, leaving two very young babes, twins. Two neighboring children became interested in the twins, and desire to have them "baptized," but the father refused his consent. Finally, as he was about to go to the far West, he gave a grudging consent to have the ceremony performed, but said that it should not be done in a church, and that no clergyman should come into his house. The writer relates the brother's delight at the consent gained, and says:-

"Hurrying home, the young churchman told his sister of his success, adding, 'And you and I must be sponsors.' The sister, though sharing his delight and the prospect of bringing these little ones into the fold, shrink from the responsibility of a god-parent where there seemed so little opportunity to fulfill the duties of the office. '*We can pray for them,*' was the brother's answer."

Accordingly the ceremony was performed at the home of the brother and sister, and a few days later the babies were taken away, and were not heard of again until twenty years later, when the brother and sister learned that they were active church workers. The writer closes his narrative with the following moral:-

"We who are god-parents may not always be able to use personal influence, or make direct appeal to those for whom we are to take care. But these means failing our honest effort, there remains one mighty resource: *We can pray for them.*"

Of course you can; and you could pray for them just as well if they had not been sprinkled. To say that this is not so is to say the sprinkling acts as a charm.

We have said that this anxiety for the "baptism" of infants, so that they may be sure to be saved, is a superstition. To show that this is the correct term for it, we quote Webster's definition of superstition: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded." Some may claim that their scruples for infant "baptism" are not extreme or unnecessary; but we hold that the observance, to any extent, of rites not commanded, is unnecessary, and that if stress is laid on them, as though they were necessary to salvation, then it is superstition.

We believe that baptism is necessary, for the Lord has commanded it. We would not dare tell any individual that he could be saved without it; indeed, we should tell him that he could not, if, knowing the commands and having the opportunity, he should refuse. But while it becomes us to be baptized, thus to fulfill all righteousness, we remember that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" that there can be no righteousness without belief, and that only "he that *believeth and is baptized*, shall be saved." We do not decry the

observance of forms, if those forms have been commanded. There is no element of superstition in humble obedience to a divine command, no matter how trivial the required act may seem. But when there is no obedience, because there is no command; when, even if there is a command, the act is done by proxy; and when there cannot by any possibility be either belief or obedience, then we say that devotion to a form is gross superstition, and can result only in evil, for no superstition is harmless. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Tennessee camp-meeting will be held October 18-25, at Springfield.

The Seventh-day Adventist General Conference for 1887 will convene in Oakland, Cal., November 15.

As the California camp-meeting begins the day this number of the SIGNS goes to press, and continues eleven days, there will be no paper next week. The next number will be dated October 20.

Wong Chin Foo has contributed an article to the *North American Review*, entitled, "Why Am I a Heathen?" The article is very long, but we have read it through, and are sure that it could all have been answered in one sentence, namely, "Because I don't know any better."

Doesn't it seem strange that almost the first thing a man does when he sets out to prove that the first day of the week is the Sabbath, is to argue that there isn't any Sabbath at all, and that it doesn't make any difference what day a person keeps, or whether he keeps any and all makes no difference whatever, provided he is only fully persuaded in his own mind? Can anybody wonder that Sunday is losing its hold, and that the ministers are loudly clamoring for a State or national law to compel people to keep that day?

One Mrs. J. B. Rideout has been *riding out* and around, the past summer, in California; and through the columns of the *Occident* is telling about it. Of the size of the towns, she gives exceptionally definite information: as for instance, Cloverdale is a "thrifty little village," and "Healdsburg is considerable larger than Cloverdale." Of the people her estimation is equally definite, and as charitable as it is definite. Writing of Healdsburg she says:-

"Here the Seventh-day Adventists have their stronghold. Disregarding the sanctities of the glorious Lord's-day, they, like the Jews-who do not believe in the divinity of Christ-keep Saturday instead of Sunday."

How beautifully the grace of charity shines through some people, especially if they be "orthodox!"

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Association was held in Pittsburg, September 15. The Pittsburg *Times* of the 16th give us the following notice of the meeting:-

"The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in the afternoon and evening yesterday at the Y.M.C.A. rooms. Several reports were read and accepted and arrangements were made to continue not less than seven district secretaries in the field. It was also decided to employ a secretary to

instill into the foreign population a due regard for Sunday observance. Professor McAllister, who will visit Europe next year, was empowered to use his efforts to bring about an International Congress of the friends of Christian civil government. Arrangements were also made to hold a National Reform Training School at Lakeside next summer, under the direction of Dr. McAllister."

We have no doubt that Professor McAllister will meet with a cordial reception from the officials of the national churches of Europe. But the most cordial of all receptions received there we expect will be that which will be given to him by the Pope; especially as he goes carrying the commission of Dr. Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and their *conferees* of the Saratoga Conference, to bring to the attention of Roman Catholic authorities the matter of using the Catholic Bible in the public schools of the United States, wherever the Catholics are in the majority, and to secure "such a basis of agreement *if possible*." Of course, as they are to bring this to the attention of the "Roman Catholic *authorities*," the proper thing to do is to go to the Pope at once. For isn't he the sole Catholic authority? Dr. McAllister may possibly get the Pope to send a legate to preside at the proposed International Congress.

One of the most disgusting things we have read lately is the *Christian at Work's* article on "How Do You Treat the Minister," in which it roundly scolds those particular people who object to having the minister smoke in the house. It would have people invite the minister to smoke even in the guest chamber or the parlor, because the poor man needs all the solace he can get after his arduous labors! The next request will probably be for entertainers to complete the bar-room arrangements, by freely furnishing beer for the tired minister to sip between his whiffs.

By the way, we notice in the proceedings of the California M. E. Conference, a resolution asking the General Conference to declare that one who uses tobacco shall not be eligible to the office of bishop. That seems to imply that a smoker may now occupy any position in the M. E. Church. We are glad to see that there is a growing sentiment in that church against the use of tobacco by ministers, but why is it tolerated at all? And if it is desired that bishops shall not use tobacco, why should the use of it by anyone be allowed? Ought a bishop to be better than an ordinary minister?

The Pope is a king. He said so himself. And doesn't that prove it? for isn't he infallible? In view of his approaching jubilee Leo XIII. has had struck a number of medals bearing the inscription: "Pope Leo XIII., Pontifex *et* rex." Now *rex* is Latin for king, and that inscription means Pope Leo XIII., Pontiff and king. The Roman police found some of these medals on sale in a shop in the city and promptly confiscated them. At this the Vatican makes a decided protest, and argues that the "law of guaranties" recognizes the Pope's right to the title of the sovereign; and support this argument with the fact that Bismarck in his letter to the Pope about two years ago plainly address him as "sire." Now in the language of courts, "sire" means "sovereign"; and as a king is a sovereign, as Bismarck called the Pope "sire," therefore the Pope is king. Don't you see? But in the argument there is vastly more of spiritual pride, religious despotism, and political arrogance, than there is of logic.



The following dispatch from Chicago, dated September 24, tells the story as well as may be:-

"This city has to-day, it is asserted, broken the record in divorce cases. From morning until evening five judges were at work, and over one hundred cases were disposed of. Over two hundred persons, martyrs to wedlock, wanted their matrimonial existence judicially murdered, and four hundred or five hundred sympathizing friends were on hand to witness the executions. It was the biggest day's work the divorce mills have had in a long time. Marriage knots were shattered with more than the usual celerity of the Chicago divorce courts, and for every possible reason. One of the gray-haired judges, after the adjournment of court, shook his head and said that something was surely wrong these days. He didn't know what the world was coming to."

Well might the judge ask what the world is coming to. We think it is fast coming to the state recently desired by the correspondent of an Eastern Spiritualist paper, when the way out of marriage should be as easy as the way in. and that will be a repetition of the times just before the flood, when "they took them wives of all which they chose."

Right in this line was a case which the dispatches relate as recently occurring in Paris. A boy scarcely fifteen years of age, stole 500 francs from his employer, and eloped with a girl of fourteen, with whom he began living in another city. Soon however, a former lover of the girl, aged thirteen, appeared on the scene, when the fifteen-year-old Lothario, thinking that his mistress was unfaithful to him, stabbed her three times, probably fatally. Isn't it time to ask, "What is the world coming to?"

At the celebration of the centennial of the adoption of the Constitution, at Philadelphia last month, the service was opened with a prayer by a Bishop Potter, of the Episcopal Church, and closed by a prayer and the benediction by Cardinal Gibbons. Because Cardinal Gibbons was invited too, and did, perform this part of the ceremony the *Presbyterian Journal* says that its "Protestant blood boils." But if Cardinal Gibbons had not been chosen at all, and Bishop Potter had both opened and closed the ceremonies, then it is altogether likely that the "Protestant blood" of the *Presbyterian Journal* would not have been increased in temperature to any perceptible degree. While if the Presbyterian preacher had only been chosen in the place of Cardinal Gibbons, it is safe to say that the "Protestant blood" of the *Journal* would have been so perfectly cool that we might fairly conclude that it was actually reduced below the normal temperature. But the Commission had just as much right to choose Cardinal Gibbons as it had to choose Bishop Potter, or anybody else, to pray. This was a celebration of the adoption of the Constitution. The Constitution recognizes no one profession of religion above another, therefore the Commission had perfect right to choose whom they please, or to choose nobody, to pray, and nobody has any business to object. The boiling of the Protestant blood of our Presbyterian contemporary is only a tempest in a teapot. But even this small tempest shows the excellent wisdom of the makers of our Constitution, in forbidding forever the application of any religious test by the nation to its employees, and in forbidding the National Legislature to make any "law respecting an establishment of religion or

prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is a happy thing for the nation that there is no constitutional channel through which the Protestant blood of the *Presbyterian Journal* may pour its boiling zeal. And it will be a woful day whenever such a channel shall be created.

Dr. McGlynn's influence is growing. September he delivered an address, of an hour and a half, before the New York Association of Methodist ministers. There were five hundred ministers present beside others. The report further says:-

"He presented the Henry George land theories and defended them as representing the cause of humanity. When the speaker had concluded, a resolution of thanks to Dr. McGlynn was offered for his able, eloquent, and instructive address, and wishing him God-speed in his efforts to diffuse the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This created great confusion, and after a turbulent scene, which one clergyman characterized as resembling a beer garden, the resolution was amended by a clause that allowed the members to reserve the right of individual opinion concerning the land theories. The resolution was then adopted."

With the fast-growing creed of the worldly power and political preference already displayed by Protestant preachers, we should not be surprised to see yet the Henry George land theories adopted by them, especially in the National Reform compact.

**October 20, 1887**

**"Short-sighted Reasoning" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

Quite recently we read an article entitled "Keeping the Sabbath-day Not a Success," written by one who was himself once a Sabbath-keeper. The writer spoke of the greater number of Sunday-keepers, and mentioned the other points of a superior prosperity on the part of Sunday-keepers over Sabbath-keepers, and said:-

"If, now, keeping Saturday is so highly pleasing to God, why does he not prosper it more? If Sunday observance is such a sin in the sight of God, why does he so remarkably bless those who persist in it?"

This is one of the most common arguments against the Sabbath-keeping and in favor of Sunday observance, and it is an argument that doubtless carries more weight with than any other. The reason for this is that it is more easily comprehended than any other; it does not require a logical mind to grasp it. But the style of the argument is by no means new, and we would like to refer our readers, who may be troubled over it, to an instance of the use of exactly the same argument about twenty-five hundred years ago. The circumstances were these:

A number of the Jews, disregarding the express command of the Lord, had gone down to Egypt to live, and had fallen in with the customs of the country, and were burning incense to the Egyptian gods. Jeremiah, being divinely inspired, expostulated with them for their wickedness, reminding them of the judges that

had been brought upon Israel in the past, for departing from God, and saying that God would bring similar punishments upon them.

"Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, as for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee. But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine." Jer. 44:15-18.

This is a fair specimen of worldly reasoning,-of the reasoning of those who think that all accounts must be settled as they go along. The psalmist came very near making the same mistake once. Said he:-

"But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked." Ps. 73:2, 3.

And then he goes on to tell how that they have no bands and death, they are not in trouble as other men are, and they have more than heart can wish. But when he went into the sanctuary and understood their end, he learned that God does not settle up his accounts with people as they go along. The people who seemed the most prosperous may be in the greatest danger.

If prosperity in Sunday-keeping proves that God is pleased with that practice, then the prosperity of the Jews, when they were worshiping idols, proved that God was pleased with such practices. But everyone will say that God was not pleased with them, even though they enjoyed a temporary prosperity. How did they know that? Because God said so; the first commandment forbids the worship of other gods, and the second commandment declares that he cannot endure idolatry. In the same way we know that God is not pleased with Sunday-keeping, even though those who practice it may have prosperity. His commandment enjoins the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord,-the seventh day of the week, the only Lord's day,-and he is pleased only when his commandment is obeyed.

The fact is, that wealth and numbers are not real success and prosperity. It cannot be known in this life whether or not any man has made life a success. The successful life is that one which is crowned with life eternal. Only when the Lord comes, and brings to light the hidden things of darkness, and makes manifest the counsels of the heart, will it be known who has made a success of life, or what course of action has been crowned with success. But we may know now what course of action, if faithfully persisted in, will be crowned with success, for God's word tells us: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Therefore, let no one be turned aside from this course by the prosperity of those who are walking in a way of their own choosing. There prosperity is not real, only seeming. "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" W.

## **"The California Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting began Thursday evening, October 6, and is just drawing to close as we write this report, Monday night, October 17. By unanimous vote of the congregation the meeting was held one day longer than the original appointment, and yet it seemed too short for all that needed to be done. In some respects this was one of the most successful camp-meetings ever held in California. The weather was all that could be desired. A hot north wind, the first three days of the meeting, caused some discomfort; but we have never attended a meeting where the weather was more uniformly fine.

The meeting was the largest one ever held on the Pacific coast. Besides the large preaching pavilion, there were three hundred and ten tents pitched. Of this number one tent, 50x77 feet in size, was used for children's meetings, and for the primary divisions of the Sabbath-school; another, 50x70 feet in size, was divided into twenty apartments for lodgers; a sixty-foot tent served as a bookstand. When the vote was taken last year to purchase a tent 100x150 feet in size, many thought that the move was a little wild, but this meeting proved that it was bought none too soon. On the second Sunday, when Sister White spoke from Matt. 6:24-34, the tent was filled to its utmost capacity, and a large crowd stood outside. A census taken in the early part of the meeting. Showed that twelve hundred and fifty people were encamped; but it afterwards transpired that a few tents have been missed, and quite a number came to the ground afterward.

The presence of Brother and Sister White, right after the meeting had been in progress four days, added much to the interest of the meeting. Indeed, the large attendance was mostly due to the fact that it had been announced that Sister White would be present. On this account many came who had never attended a camp-meeting before.

We have never before held a meeting in California which was so well advertised, nor one which was so well planned in all its arrangements. The restaurant tent was arranged so that the helpers could perform their work with less inconvenience than usual; and the healthful food which was prepared was highly appreciated. Two electric lights in the preaching tent, and three more at convenient places outside, afforded all the light that was needed, and saved much trouble that is usually spent in caring for lamps.

The spiritual interests of the people were looked after as being the main object of the meeting. The large amount of business connected with the Conference, Tract Society, and Sabbath-school, gave less time for this, and for instruction in various branches of work that was desired, yet there were some precious seasons. On each Sabbath of the meeting several hundred came forward in response to a call for those who wished the prayers of God's people, and the work for them was carried on in the various districts into which the campus was divided. Thirty-nine were baptized, and nearly as many more candidates will be baptized at their home churches. Twice each day a meeting was held for the children, in which many sought and found the Saviour.

There was a seeming a break in one portion of the meeting, owing to dissatisfaction which the devil had been planting in the minds of some of the brethren; but a thorough investigation resulted in establishing the confidence of the people and the work to a degree probably never before felt; so that although there was some time seemingly lost, all felt that great advancement had been made.

Sister White eloquently presented the needs of the missions in Europe, and the difficulties under which the work there is struggling, and the people responded with pledges and cash donations to the amount of over \$8,500 beside, a goodly amount of jewelry.

The Sabbath-schools held on the ground were most interesting. The membership the first Sabbath was 1,156, but on the second Sabbath there were 1,307 in the school, and the number of classes was 181. The class contributions the first Sabbath amounted to \$207.75, and the second Sabbath to \$213.65, making a total of \$421.40, which all goes to the South Africa Mission. It being seen that the \$1,000 pledged to the African mission by the Association at last year's session, would be more than doubled by the close of the present year, it was voted by the association to donate at least \$2,500 of the Sabbath-school contributions for 1888 to the city mission recently started in London, England, provided the International Association would consent.

The camp was thoroughly canvassed, and many subscriptions were taken for the various periodicals, but the number has not been ascertained at present writing. The cash sales at the bookstand amounted to over \$850, besides the orders which were taken.

The secretary's report showed a marked increase in the amount of tithes paid in the Conference, there being more than \$12,200 more this year than last year. If the brethren and sisters shall remember the earnest exhortation that was given them on the matter of bringing all the tithes into the storehouse, and also resolutions which they made, as we believe they will, we may see a much greater increase next year.

It was with regret that the Conference and Tract Society dropped Elder Haskell from the presidency, but it was felt to be imperative, as his full attention will be taken up for the next year at least with the work in England. He has labored long and faithfully for the cause in California, and has taught the people how to work. He will ever be held in loving remembrance, and will be heartily welcomed back whenever his duties will permit him to return. Our prayers shall go up for him and the work in which he is engaged, and we know that he will not forget the work here, even if he is not officially connected with it. The brethren and sisters leave for their homes with good courage in the Lord, determined to gain daily victories by his help. W.

### **"Bible Study" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a vast difference between reading and studying. A person may read the Bible through a hundred times and still know really nothing about it, and may

not be able to quote a single verse correctly. To learn a passage or chapter by heart, even, is not necessarily studying; it may be simply parrot work. To study means to closely examine; to apply the mind to a certain thing; to read and examine for the purpose of learning or understanding. A person may be able to relate, when questioned, everything that is recorded in a certain chapter, without

631

having given it any real study. He may learn the bare facts without that close examination that is required to understand the lesson which they are designed to convey.

A person has learned a thing only when he has made it his own—a part of himself; when he can add to things which he has previously learned, and see the relation between them; or when he has it fixed in his mind as a nucleus, around which to gather other facts. The Bible is a book in which the writings of many individuals, covering many hundreds of years, unite to form one harmonious whole. All the different Bible writers have one common object in view; there is a oneness of purpose seen in all their writings. No one portion of the Bible can be isolated from the rest, and its meaning be fully grasped. It is only when we compare Scripture with Scripture, that we get the full benefit of Bible study. If the text of a Sabbath-school lesson is found in a certain chapter, and the pupil confines his attention to that chapter alone, he has not thoroughly studied his lesson. The texts bearing on one subject should be treasured up in the mind, and others added to them, and woven together like the various threads of a fabric, till the whole subject stands out clear and distinct. Then the relation of different subjects should be kept in mind.

In this way a given amount of study will accomplish vastly more good than the same amount of study without any definite purpose. Of course it will take time to arrive at even a moderate understanding of all the great truths of God's word, and for this very reason the time should be improved to the best advantage. With persevering study, however, and the wisdom which is promised to those who pray in faith, even the most unlearned may become acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, which alone are able to make us "wise to salvation"—"thoroughly furnished unto of good works." W.

### **"Brief Comments" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

#### **THE CHARGE TO JOSHUA**

The number of times that the Lord tells Joshua to be strong and of good courage is worthy of note. After telling him that he will be with him even as he was with Moses, and that he will not fail him, the Lord says, "Be strong and they could courage" (chapter 1:6) then follows the assurance that he shall divide the land among the Israelites. In the next verse he says again, "Only be thou strong and very courageous." Then follows an admonition to do according to all that was written in the law, and to meditate upon that day and night; and then exhortation

is again given: "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed."

The Lord does not desire that his people should give way to discouragement. The same exhortation that was addressed to those who were about to enter into the earthly Canaan, is applicable to the Israel of God, who are striving for an inheritance in the heavenly Canaan. "Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed." Why not to be discouraged? Are we not weak? and is not our enemy powerful? Would it not be presumptuous in us to feel strong and confident? Yes; it would if we depended only on our own strength; but unfortunately we have also the same promise that was made to Joshua. It is this: "For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." And he has also said, "I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." The Christian should ever realize this glorious truth: "The eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." Knowing this, how can he become discouraged? The apostles exhortation is, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." Eph. 6:10.

### **HOLY THINGS**

It is sometimes claimed that there is no such thing as holy time; that is absurd to think that one day is really any better than another; that men can make any day a holy Sabbath by resting upon it. It would be interesting to hear such ones explain Josh. 5:15. The case is similar to that of Moses at the burning bush. Joshua had seen the man standing by Jericho, and had learned that he was the "captain of the host of the Lord." "And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest holy. And just what did so." Now did the ground become holy because Joshua took off his shoes, or was it holy before? The answer is, It was holy before, for the Lord said so. Then it seems that there may be a difference between things of the same kind. There was no outward difference between the ground on which Joshua was standing and the ground in other places, yet there *was* a difference. One was holy, on account of the presence of the Lord, the other was not. The ground on which Joshua stood would have remained holy even if he had not removed his shoes. So it is with the Sabbath. The Lord has made it holy, and it will remain holy whether man regards it or not. The failure to discriminate between the holy and the profane is that which brings the judgments of God upon mankind.

### **THE MIRACLE AT GIBEON**

"Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies." "So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day." Some, in their eagerness to overthrow the Sabbath of the Lord, have found in this occurrence a loss of time. But there was no time

lost. It was simply a lengthening of the day. If such a miracle should occur on the Sabbath, it would simply lengthen the Sabbath. Two days were not combined in one, but it was one long day. "And there was no day like that before it or after it."

Skeptics find an abundance of food for caviling in this miracle, as, indeed, they may in any. But the Bible student need not be troubled about it. To say that it could not occur, is in reality to deny that God is the creator of the heavens and the earth; for if God made the planets it is certain that he can control them. It is said that God instituted fixed laws by which they should be governed. Very true; but did he put those laws out of his own power? The maker of a threshing machine designs that it shall work according to a certain plan; yet he can stop the machine without altering the plan. One thing is certain; the universe did not create itself. Although the mind of man cannot conceive of its extent, nor fathom the laws by which it is governed, there must be a Creator who is infinitely greater than the universe. "He taketh up the isles as a very little thing." It is evident that the Creator can do as he pleases with what he has created.

To disbelieve in miracles is to deny the existence of God, for God would cease to be God if he did not work miracles. Do you inquire how this can be? Simply thus: A miracle is a wonder,- something beyond the comprehension of those who witness it. It is entirely contrary to any laws of nature of which we have any knowledge. Even with this definition there are miracles constantly taking place around us, for no man can explain the one-hundredth part of the physical phenomena which are matters of common observation. Now to say that God cannot perform a miracle is equivalent to saying that he cannot do anything that finite men cannot understand. In other words, it is saying that God is altogether such an one as ourselves. It is a deplorable fact that many professed believers in God and his word will throw discredit upon both by attempting to "explain" miracles. We know not which to pity the more, their ignorance or their presumption.

If it is asked how it is possible that such a miracle as the stopping of the sun could be performed without disarranging the whole planetary system, I would reply, "I do not know; I cannot imagine; if I could, it would cease to be a miracle." The disbelieve in miracles arises from the fact that men are too proud to acknowledge that there is anything which they cannot understand. He who believes only what he can comprehend and explain will have a very short creed. It is no shame for man to confess that he cannot by searching by about God. W.

### **"Thoughts on John 10:27-29" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

"My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." This Scripture should fill every follower of Christ with encouragement. So long as they hear his voice, and follow where it leads, they are safe. No one, not even Satan, can snatch them away. God is "greater than all." Though trials and temptations become, "God is



faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." 1 Cor. 10:13. Christ also says: "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." John 16:33. And to strengthen the assurance, he adds: "I and my Father are one." When both the Father and the Son unite for man's salvation, what confidence may we feel!

But while we gain courage from the fact that he is "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him," we are not to be presumptuous. Jesus said, "No man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand," but he did not say that no man could take himself out. This Scripture has been perverted, and made to teach that no follower of Christ can fall away. That this view is incorrect, is shown by many passages. We are exhorted thus: "Hold that fast which thou hast, at no man take thy crown." Rev. 3:11. We are told also, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matt. 24:13. For a positive testimony, see Heb. 6:4-6. Our Lord says also: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." John 15:6. See also Rev. 4:2-5; 3:16.

The case, then, stands thus: So long as we hear the voice of Christ, and are content to follow him, trusting him humbly and implicitly, no harm can befall us; his strength will enable us to repel all attacks; but when we begin to trust ourselves, we take ourselves out of his hands; or, if refusing longer to listen to his voice, we are cast out. Let us all heed the words of the apostle Paul: "Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear." W.

### **"Not a Prophet, But an Angel" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a Spiritualist contemporary we find the following:-

"Did not the angel that appeared to Saul declare that he was one of his brethren the prophets?"

We once heard of a hackman who attempted to pass himself off as a Quaker at the time of a convention of Friends, in order that he might secure their patronage. He succeeded so far as to give his carriage filled with the visiting Friends, but when he came and asked, "Where's thous baggage?" they saw that he was unfamiliar with the language of Quakers, and, disgusted with the attempted deception, at once sought another conveyance. In like manner the question above quoted shows that the writer, in attempting to prove Spiritualism from the Bible, has no knowledge of the book. We don't remember that we ever saw in an infidel or Spiritualist paper a correct reference to any biblical event.

But the substitution of Saul for John is not so bad as is the statement that the angel declared himself to be one of the prophet's brethren; and in this version of Rev. 22:9 he who finds himself in a company with a great many professed Bible Christians. And just because there are hundreds of professed Bible Christians who actually taken the Spiritualist ground that the angel who talked with John

was one of his fellow-prophets, we will tell just what the angel did declare himself to be. The following is a literal translation of the Greek of Rev. 22:9:-

"And he said to me: See (thou do it not) for I am a fellow-servant of thee and of thy brethren the prophets," etc. The revised version has it: "For I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets." The simple meaning is that he was not one to be worshiped, but was a fellow-servant not only of John, but of all the prophets, and of those also who should keep the sayings the book.

We cannot accuse the Spiritualist editor of knowing better than to quote the text the way he did, for he did not know where the passage is, nor to whom the words were spoken. But we are sometimes forced to question the honesty of ministers of the gospel, whose title of "D.D." ought to signify that they have at least read the Bible through, and that they know how to translate easy Greek, who will refer to the angel of Rev. 22:9 as one of the old prophets.

Our Spiritualist editor will no doubt say, "Well, the text doesn't amount to anything anyway, because we are not dependent on the Bible for our knowledge." Then why try to make it appear that it teaches Spiritualism? The reason is, that by so doing some professed Christians may be led to wholly accept that delusion, thinking that the Bible favors it. As a matter of fact, there is not a text in the Bible which gives the slightest countenance to Spiritualism; noonday sunlight and midnight darkness are not more opposite than are the Bible and that the doctrine.

### **"Too Significant to Be Pleasant" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following protest we clip from the *Christian Union*, which says that it was written by "a leading Protestant divine." The protest is just and timely, but that it will have any effect, there is no reason to hope. What indicates this, and also makes the necessity for a protest the more urgent, is the general indifference that is manifested over the matter. The *Christian Union's* report, in the same issue that contains the protest, makes no mention of the occurrence; and the protest itself is put in the most obscure portion of the paper, as though the editors were ashamed or afraid to have it seen, but inserted it out of courtesy to the "leading Protestant divine." Are there not more who will vigorously protest against American subserviency to Romish intrigues? or is Protestantism dead?

"The celebration of the centennial of the adoption of our Federal Constitution in Philadelphia was an imposing occasion, and no doubt also a very profitable one for the City of Brotherly Love. All the exercises were on a scale commensurate with the greatness of the occasion, and were all successfully carried out. The appropriateness of the monster industrial and military parades, the reception of the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania and of the President of the United States, appealed to everyone's patriotism. But there was one feature of the celebration made unduly prominent, that impressed many as utterly incongruous and out of place, and that was the place taken by the Roman Catholics as a religious denomination.

"The formal reception given by Cardinal Gibbons placed him and his co-religionist in a false position before the American people. Why should he have assumed or been granted a more prominent part than any Presbyterian minister or Episcopalian or Methodist bishop? Why should he have had *any* part as the express representative of a religious denomination, especially on such an occasion, when the adoption of an instrument was celebrated, one of whose chief glories is that it acknowledges no ecclesiastical distinctions, and accords absolute religious equality to all?

"The whole affair looked very much as if Cardinal Gibbons appeared as the head and representative of a distinct power on a plane with that of the

639

Governors of the several States; in fact, it made the impression that the Roman Catholic Church was, or aspired to be, an organization political in its character, because putting itself on a part and level with other such organizations-the President representing the Union, Governor Beaver, Pennsylvania, and Cardinal Gibbons, the Roman Catholic Church!

"Is the last-named organization a State within the State? Is it at all analogous to a State of the Union or in the Union? Why was the distinction made for this one denomination more than for any other? Why should it have been made for any? That it appeared very plainly as if some special civil or political significance attached to Cardinal Gibbons and his church no one can doubt who saw the Cardinal in all the glory of his sacred vestments, like a Governor in his uniform, and marked how Mr. Cleveland formally attended his reception just as he did Governor Beaver's. It was very significant to behold on such an occasion 'the head of the nation shake hands with the prince of the church,' as one of the daily papers described the scene. The whole thing was a little too significant to be pleasant."

### **"Confessing Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

Notes on the International Lesson.

(November 6.-Matt. 10:22-42.)

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." What is it to confess Christ? This is a most important question, for upon it depends our future happiness or woe. In the parallel passage in Mark 8:38 we read: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." These texts show the importance of confessing Christ.

Confessing Christ is something more than acknowledging his existence, or that he is the Son of God. Even the devils do this (Matt. 8:29), but it does not

affect their character, nor will it avert their punishment. Neither does confessing Christ consist in making a high profession of Christianity. For, says Jesus, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have

640

cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7:21-23. Here we learn that those who have not only made a high profession, but who have been apparently shining lights, and have done much work, will be denied by Christ in the last great day. Then it must be because they have not confessed him; for all who confess him will be acknowledged by him. But he who does not confess Christ, denies him, (see Matt. 12:20), so that our Saviour's words show us that a man may deny Christ while bearing the Christian name, and being what is called "a pillar in the church."

If now it is desired to know in brief what it is to confess Christ, turn and read Rom. 10:9-11: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."

Confessing the Lord Jesus is the outgrowth of a heart belief in him. And what is heart belief in Christ? It is such a belief as produces righteousness, "for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." The belief that does not produce righteousness, is no belief at all. Righteousness is right-doing. It is the opposite of sin, for *unrighteousness* is sin. 1 John 5:17. But sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John 3:4. Therefore righteousness is obedience to the law of God. So Moses said, "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. 6:25. Therefore we may understand that true belief in Christ leads invariably to keeping the commandments of God; and true confession of the Lord Jesus Christ is the utterance of one who has such a living, acting, practical faith in Christ.

What a wonderful promise, that if we confess him, he will confess us! And what will he confess concerning us when he comes? Here is the answer: "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." Heb. 2:11, 12. Then when he comes in the glory of the Father, with all the holy angels, Christ will not be ashamed to greet as his brethren all those who have confessed him before men, by their lives of obedience, as well as by their words. He will claim such as members of his own family, heirs of God, and joint heirs with himself. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." We are now members of the family of Christ. If so, let us heed the apostle's injunction to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. Let us not disgrace the family, and cause the Head of it to be ashamed of us.

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. Matt. 10:34-36.

Notwithstanding the above statement, it is true that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a "gospel of peace;" and this loving exhortation should be most carefully heeded: "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. 2:23-25.

And this: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Matt. 5:39, 44.

Then how can there be strife and a sword, as the Saviour said, if these injunctions are followed? They exist just because these injunctions are followed. He does not say that it will be the Christian man who will be at variance with his father. This could not be, for variance is one of the things the possession of which will shut a man out of Heaven. Gal. 5:19-21. But men are naturally prone to evil; and they resent anything which condemns their course. So the sinful son will be at variance with his pious father; the father himself will be at peace with all men. "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." The man will not be a foe to those of his own household, but they will be his foes because of his goodness, just as Stephen was stoned because he was a Christian; just as Daniel was cast into the den of lions, because he prayed to God; just as "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," because "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The camp-meeting at Los Angeles, Cal., will begin October 26, and will continue twelve days.

We read in an exchange that "Yankton has been selected as the Roman Catholic sea for Dakota." We suppose it is called a sea because the errors which will be propagated there will drown men in destruction and perdition.

On page 634 will be found an interesting report from the Central European Mission, by the former editor of the SIGNS, who is now connected with that mission. The laborers in that field have difficulties to contend with of which we in this country realize but little.

In the *Independent* of August 25, Prof. Norman Fox has a review of Dr. Armitage's "History of the Baptists," in which he says: "As to infant baptism, scores of the ablest Pedobaptist scholars admit that it was unknown in apostolic times, while all know that it was not universal till some centuries after the death of the apostles."

This number of the paper is one day late, owing to the fact that nearly all the work done upon it was done during the camp-meeting, which editors, proofreaders, and compositors attended. It was gotten out under high pressure, much of the work being done in the night after meeting; so we beg the indulgence of our readers if it is not up to the usual standard.

Something must be done for Iowa. Why? Because since the Prohibition amendment was adopted, the supply of convicts for the penitentiary is diminishing, and the contractors of prison labor at Fort Madison are much embarrassed; they don't know how to fill their contracts. There" nothing like an unlimited supply of whisky to keep state prisons full, and to make prison labor contractors happy.

A correspondent of the *California Christian Advocate* writes to know if the rule of the church requiring members to kneel during prayer in church cannot be changed so as to allow them to sit. He says that only a few old Puritans kneel before the congregation and that he had supposed they do so only out of respect to the rule; also that kneeling has been found to be a great deal of trouble, and there is often more or less damage to the valuable clothing. The tendency seems to be to make even the *form* of worship which is retained as easy as possible.

Here is a little story that may be read with profit by a good many:-

"When Livingstone visited England after his great exploring tour, he was much praised for his sacrifices. It was true he had labored much, but what did he reply to this praise? 'People talk of the sacrifices I made in spending so large a portion of my life in Africa. Can you call that a sacrifice which is only a small payment on that great debt to God which can never be fully discharged? Say, rather, that it is a privilege. I have never made a sacrifice.'" -*Spirit of Missions*.

And who has made a sacrifice? When we consider the sacrifice of Christ, who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich; and remember that "our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;" who can talk about sacrifices made, much less to boast or mourn over them?

In his recent address to the Boston Evangelical Ministers Association, Dr. Josiah Strong related the case of a minister who was pleading with his people for a larger manifestation of sympathy to the poor and destitute around them, when an influential church member rose, and said he wanted none of that class in his pew. The bold rejoinder came at once from him who believed he had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the poor: "I will not cease my plea, till the door of this church swings and to the slightest touch of the needy." As a consequence of the pastor's determination to preach the gospel to the poor, he was dismissed from the church. And yet the members of that church doubtless think that they are followers of Christ; they certainly call themselves Christians.

A call is being circulated for a conference of all evangelical Christians, at Washington, D. C., December 7, 8, 9, 1887, to study principally the following propositions:-

"1. What are the present perils and opportunities of the Christian church, and of the country?

"2. Can any of them be met by a hearty co-operation of all evangelical Christians, which, without detriment to any denominational interests, will serve the interests of the whole church?

"3. What are the best means to secure such co-operation, and to awaken the whole church to its responsibility?"

The call is signed by William E. Dodge, John Jay, C. A. Stoddard, Philip Schaff, Josiah Strong, James McCosh, R. S. Storrs, D. C. Gilman, Timothy Dwight, Howard Crosby, Gen. O. O. Howard, J. H. Vincent, Lyman Abbott, W. M. Taylor, and about seventy other ministers and representative laymen. It is expected that at least two thousand delegates will be present.

We have frequently been accused of a lack of charity, because we have said that Sunday laws are in no sense temperance laws; that the enactment of such laws is solely in the interest of somebody's special religion, and not all in the interest of temperance; and that, in fact, they tacitly admit that the liquor traffic is alright except on Sunday. The following, which is a portion of a much lauded address recently made before the Young Men's Christian Association of Oakland, by the Rev. J. H. Hector, pastor of the African M. E. Church of San Francisco, shows that we have not overstated the case in the least:-

"There is needed to tune up the gospel trumpet so that its tones shall sound unmistakably to the world. One thing, and I have noticed it particularly since I came to California, that this gospel trumpet should proclaim is that we must have the Sabbath, and a holy Sabbath. We want you Jews to stop selling second-hand clothing on Sunday. We want you Germans to stop selling your beer and running your beer gardens and picnics on Sunday. We want you Frenchmen to stop selling your wine and strong drink on Sunday. We want all of you who are now raising the devil and destroying our children on Sunday to stop it right off. We want to say to you, that while you may raise the devil and destroy our children six days in the week, you've got to rest on the seventh day [first day] and keep it holy."

We have always known that Sunday laws were not in the interests of morality or good order, but solely to gratify prejudice and bigotry; but we never before saw it so directly admitted.

In his letter to the Corinthians, Paul said: "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." 1 Cor. 1:22-24. And again he said: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." Chap. 2:2. These words were brought in very forcibly to our mind, by contrast, when we read that two ministers in Oakland, who have the largest congregations of any in the city, preached on a recent Sunday evening to young men upon the "Lessons to be drawn from the life of Governor Bartlett." We do not know anything about the private life of Governor Bartlett; but we do know that if he had been the best man that has lived in the United States since it became a nation, he would not have been good enough to warrant a minister of the gospel in holding him up as a model for young men. Jesus Christ is the only being who ever lived on this earth, whose life

is worthy to be taken as a model for men, either young or old, and "Jesus Christ, and him crucified," is the only thing that can draw men to a nobler life. But the trouble is, that the preaching of Jesus Christ and him crucified is not the kind that "takes" with the people, and fills the churches on Sunday nights.

### **"Humbug Legislation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Saturday half-holiday created by the New York Legislature last winter, has proved a failure. Several of the leading papers have referred to it as such. The *Independent* calls it outright, "a legislative humbug," and a "silly law," which is all that it is. The *Observer* says:-

"The indications are that the observance of the Saturday half-holiday as a particular institution will have to be abandoned for the present, or postponed until the world has more leisure than it has now. Business men and trades-people generally are revolting against the custom and refusing to observe it any longer. The fact that Saturday afternoon was constituted a legal holiday by the last legislature makes no difference in the aspects of the case except in banks and exchanges. The enactment of the law was plainly a piece of folly and was done simply as a bid for the favor of the so-called 'laboring class' and not from any humane or philanthropic motives."

The same Legislature, and for the same reason, also made September 5 a State holiday under the title of "Labor-Day," that is, a day for doing no labor. Of its celebration the reports all show about one way, of which the following account by the *Congregationalist* will give an idea of what Labor-Day amounts to:-

"Labor-Day, so called, because so many people quit labor to parade and drink beer and stronger fluids, didn't seem practically to amount to much here. Most of the real workers were at work. A large number of men and boys (some have estimated them as high as 25,000), in a go-as-you-please fashion, to the sound of music, carrying banners and various devices; but people generally showed little interest. A good many employers, pressed for those to fulfill their contracts, were irritated over the loss, and very few of the operators seemed very joyful. They had the air of men doing an uncomfortable duty. There was no violence, and little work for the police; but the lager beer and whisky dealers had all they could do to keep the procession up to the proper marching point, and their arms ached sometime after the show was over."

Of both these laws the *Independent* says:-

"The motive prompting the enactment of the Labor-Day Law, like that promoting the enactment of the Saturday Half-holiday Law, was purely political. Governor Hill and the Republican Legislature were fishing for labor votes. This is the whole of it. The next Legislature of this State would do a sensible thing if it were to repeal both of these laws."

Of course it would, but it is safe to say that the New York Legislature will do no such sensible thing. It will be much more apt to do more of just such like, "fishing for votes." Nor is the New York Legislature the exception.



**October 27, 1887**

**"Information Wanted" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Herald of Truth* in noticing a new addition to Sunday literature, said: "Our belief is that the Sabbath or seven-day worship is an institution as old as creation, yet lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days. This we believe to have been the position held by the apostle Paul."

Now that the good Doctor who presides over the columns of the *Herald* has begun to making his "confession of faith," we would like to have him go on, and also make more clear a few points in his article, for a confession of faith must of all things be most clear.

1. "We believe that the Sabbath or seventh-day worship is as old as creation." We will accept that, because we read that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:11. Also in Gen. 2:3 we read "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." If the Doctor had done what we have done for him, viz., given authority, the first part of his statement would have been perfect. Now for the second part.

2. "Yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days." We will quote the statement again in full, that the connection may be seen: "The Sabbath or seventh-day of worship is as old as creation, yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, about the formality of days." That is, "the Sabbath or seventh-day worship" has no connection with such formal things as days! Our knowledge of either theology for science is insufficient to enlighten us as to how the Sabbath, requiring seventh-day of worship, can be celebrated on no day at all. We doubt if even the learned editor of the *Herald of Truth* can make this appear.

This, we are told, is what is accomplished by "the highest Christian thought." Its seems, then, that the office of "the highest [modern] Christian thought" is to lift things from the real to the unreal; from plain common sense into absurdity. Let us try it on the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This is the language of Jehovah, and teaches us that the worship of one God, Maker of heaven and earth, as an institution is as old as creation, and much older; but "the highest Christian thought" would lift this above the formality of any specified object of worship. And so the Hindu, whose highest aspiration is to become lost in contemplation of an idea, is the ideal Christian.

Try it on the seventh commandment. That commandment guards the marriage relation, which, as an institution, is as old as creation (see Gen. 2:21-24); but in "the highest Christian thought" it is lifted above the formality of persons! That is, in "the highest Christian thought" we have seventh day worship without any day at all; we have the worship of one God, without regard to any

Being; and we have marriage, without anybody being married! If this be the "highest Christian thought," we will have none of it.

Why does the Doctor take a position concerning the Sabbath which involves him in such absurdities? Because he doesn't know what else to do. His knowledge of the Bible, and his honesty, will not let him make the claim that Sunday was the original Sabbath, and something else will not lead him to acknowledge the fact that seventh-day worship, which is as old as creation, is to endure as long as creation lasts. So he takes a position which involves the keeping of no day at all, and thus stultifies himself in his strict observance of Sunday. We know that he has plenty of company in that position, but we can't imagine how that can help him. If we were on the rack, the fact that a multitude of others were undergoing the same tortures would give us no relief.

In the same paper from which we extract this partial confession of faith, there is a clipping from the *Occident*, descriptive of the so-called "baptism" of six infants, who, so says the *Occident*, were thus "numbered with the 'household of faith.'" On this is we find the following comment, which we heartily endorse:-

"The *Herald of Truth* wants to know how much faith these six little ones required to belong to the 'household of faith'? The information would be valuable to its readers in this increasingly intelligent age. Or was it *sponsor* faith on the part of parents or guardians? If so, where is the warrant for it in God's word? No twisting of Scripture, brother editors of the *Occident*, no '*suffer little children to come unto me,*' is wanted. We are sick of this straining of Scripture 'clean from the purpose' of the text itself. Rise up, brethren of the Presbytery of San Francisco, like men, and give us your '*Thus saith the Lord*' for 'infant baptism,' or else we will give you a '*Mum Social*,' without the possibility of broken silence."

Suppose we administer to the Doctor a dose of his own medicine. The SIGNS OF THE TIMES wants to know how much "Christian thought" there is in an argument for a practice which takes the Sabbath of the Lord, which was declared by Jehovah himself to be "*the seventh day*," and lifts it "above formality of days," and then lets sit down again upon the first day? Where is the warrant for it in God's word? We cannot accuse the *Herald* of "twisting Scripture," for it has not made mention of any. But when it does quote, we want the full force of the text. We, too, are "sick of this straining of Scripture 'clean from the purpose' of the text itself." Hitherto that has been almost the sole dependence of the Sunday cause. Rise up, brethren of the Baptist Church of California, and give us your "*Thus saith the Lord*" for Sunday keeping, or else unite with the Presbytery of San Francisco in their "Mum Social" over infant baptism. W.

### **"Who Is Responsible?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a catechism of the Episcopal Church we find the following question and answer:-

"Q.-What did your sponsors do for you?

"A.-They did promise and vow three things in my name:-

"First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life."

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great that responsibility is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, "in newness of life;" or, as the catechism has it, to "renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh," and to "keep God's holy will and commandments, and walking in the same," all the days of his life. Now is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God's holy will and commandments. This is well understood, and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make the promise for him. These persons are then called that child's sponsors.

The question now arises, Suppose at the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted "the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," and reveled in "all the sinful lusts of the flesh." It is barely possible that they nominally believed the "articles of the Christian faith;" but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of "God's holy will and commandments." Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them-"sponsors"-indicates that they are.

A sponsor, according to Webster, is "one who holds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default." Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, "I bind self as the surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself or will suffer the consequences of such failure." But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome.

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child proved faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty, that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17:10.

2. "The wages of sin is death;" since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves: (a) What is to become of the one in his stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for he has never accepted Christ, and "there is none other name under heaven

given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Then two men must die for the offense of only one. This would be an injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (b) The sponsor has, perhaps, lived a life of a humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then, according to the promise (Rom. 10:9; Rev. 22:14), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible.

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: "Behold, all souls our mind; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth *it* shall die." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Eze. 18:4, 20.

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they may make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for "every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment," much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows?

The conclusion which anyone can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. "But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?" Wait until he has sin to forsake, and then he will be old enough to make the promise to forsake it if he wishes to. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he is not old enough to know what sin is, and consequently he needs no baptism. When he is old enough to choose, then he is old

647

enough not to act on his own responsibility, and no others need take the responsibility which they cannot by any possibility discharge.

"But the Saviour says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and how dare we disobey that command?" You need not. "*Suffer*," that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come, but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come. But the very word "suffer," that is, "permit," "allow," "refrain from hindering," shows that the "little children" referred to are old enough to make a move on their own account, if no obstacle is thrown in their way. Moreover the "baptizing" of infants is in no sense obedience to the Saviour's command, because the infants do not and cannot come to Christ. When Christ says, "Suffer little children to come unto me," he does not mean infants who cannot come to him for the reason that they cannot know and appreciate him.

The inconsistencies herein shown up should convince all of the folly of what is called infant baptism. But the practice is not simply foolish, it is absolutely

wicked. It makes people satisfied that they have complied with the divine requirement when they never have, and it fills the professed church with unconverted persons. In fact, the evils that spring from this perversion of the sacred rite are legion. For all of these, we ask, who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall ask, "Who hath required this at your hands?" W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Church of the Advent of San Francisco which last year invested \$25,000 in a "paper carnival" to get a return of \$6,500, is just now engaged in another paper carnival, for "charity's sake." We shall see if possible, how the finances if this one will balance.

Ex-Governor St. John is now lecturing in California on his favorite subject, "Prohibition." One evening last week he addressed a large and intelligent audience in Oakland, and made some telling points in favor of constitutional prohibition. Although a church member, he unsparingly scores professed Christians who give any quarter whatever to the liquor traffic. As the late John B. Finch used to say, "A thing is never settled until it is settled right," and "A compromise with evil is a victory for the devil."

Some time ago we received a copy of the *Popular Science Monthly*, accompanied by a postal card stating that the magazine contained some good points which we might be able to use, and requesting that we should return it if we did not use the article. We had already used the article, but we cannot return the magazine, because the sender forgot to sign his name to his postal card, which was mailed from New Orleans. If he will send his name, with the necessary stamps for the return of the *Monthly*, we shall be most happy to comply with his request.

"Fierce" is one of the epithets which the apostle Paul uses in describing the characteristics of the people of the last days, and there is not a daily paper published in the land which does not in every issue record some of the outcroppings of this trait. It is not simply that men are fierce in battle, or for revenge when they have been injured, but that they exhibit their ferocity without any provocation. Even in childhood is being developed to a marked degree as is indicated in the Academy in Alabama, where an extra force of police is found necessary to protect the Jewish pupils from the causeless abuse of their companions.

On Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit College in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: "We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail." If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the political press is

any justification, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled.

A Catholic speaker said the other day in Buffalo, N.Y., that the Baltimore Plenary Council declared that "to turn the Lord's Day [Sunday is meant] into a day of toil is a blighting curse to a country." When the National Reform Association secures its coveted close alliance with the Romish Church, the decrees of the Baltimore Council will be excellent campaign material. And just as we are writing this note, a grand Catholic procession of military companies, with three brass bands in full blast, is passing,- a part of "the largest demonstration of 'the Church' ever held in Oakland"-it is Sunday too. Yet we are sure that a solitary Seventh-day Adventist who should go quietly about his work of to-day would "disturb" the peoples of Sunday rest more than all this Catholic parade.

Unbelievers often charge the Jews with having been the most cruel and blood-thirsty people of all ancient times. It is easy enough to disprove this by a comparison with the doings of the other nations of those times. But on this point we have contemporary evidence, and on such a question that is the most valuable evidence. We have it, too, at a time when, if ever, it might be supposed that the change might be well grounded.

Of Omri king of Israel the Bible record is that he "did worse than all that were before him." Ahab was Omri's son, and of him the inspired record is that, "Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him." 1 Kings 16:25, 30. Ahab it was who married Jezebel, consented to Naboth's death on the evidence of false witnesses, and persecuted Elijah and his kind. Yet at this very period the kings of Israel were so much better than other kings, that among the surrounding nations they were famed for their mercy. And here is the proof: On a certain occasion, "Ben-hadad king of Syria was defeated by the army of Israel under Ahab. He lost nearly all his army and was himself about to be captured. "And his servants said unto him, Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings; let us, I pray thee, put sackcloth on our loins, and ropes upon our heads, and go out to the king of Israel; peradventure he will save thy life." 1 Kings 20:31.

This one point is sufficient to silence forever this charge of cruelty. The evidence is unimpeachable, and proves that the most wicked and cruel kings that Israel ever had were so much better than their contemporaries of surrounding nations that they were famed for being merciful kings. The truth this that the people of Israel from the day that they left Egypt, instead of being the worst, were the best people of all ancient times.

"But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 3:18. This is often incorrectly quoted, "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth," an expression which is not found in the Bible. But Christ is the truth, as well as the way and the life; and he who grows in the knowledge of Christ, must necessarily grow in the knowledge of the truth. The trouble with many is that they think that growing in the knowledge of Christ, will be accepted as a substitute for growing in the knowledge of the truth; or, rather, professing to believe that Christ is the truth, they make their own feelings the standard of whether or not they know him. The Bible is the only standard of truth, that has

ever been given to man, and a summary of all the truth of the Bible is contained in the ten commandments; so that the only standard by which it may be known that we are really growing in the knowledge of Christ, and therefore in knowledge of the truth, is the law of God. The more one grows in the knowledge of Christ, the more perfectly will he keep the commandments of God.

**"Not According to Law and Order" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

There has been for some time quite a contest in Oakland over the saloon business, and many sharp words have been said on both sides. At an indignation meeting held to protest against the course of some councilmen who had violated their pledges to the people, the Rev. Dr. Horton arraigned the saloons as foes of order and good government, which drew out a response through one of the dailies, from an apologist for the saloons. Following is a part of the defense:-

"I will only mention one instance as a reason I respect a man that keeps a brewery, a liquor store, a saloon, a restaurant, or a hotel. Some twenty odd years ago, a brewer came into my place of business and said: 'A certain official is \$500 short in his accounts. To-morrow he will be exposed. He is a good man, as you know, a man of family. Ruin and San Quentin stare him in the face. I have a plan of getting him out of this difficulty. Here are ten names on this piece of paper, and yours is one of them; each of us pay \$50 by to-night.' The \$500 came forth. One of that syndicate, a brewer, one a liquor man, a hotel keeper, six in all were men with foreign names, ideas, and characters. Four were native-born Americans. So was the one saved, and did not belong to their lodge or church, but he belonged to the human family; he was a man worth saving.

"Most of that syndicate have passed over the river, whence there is no return. Their lips are closed, never to reveal the secret, and mine have been closed on it that even my own family will first know of it when they read these lines, but never shall I reveal names.

"This is part of the religion I believe in. I hope Mr. Horton will read this to his hearers at the next indignation meeting, and give them a chance for a tremendous applause, for that act was not according to law and order."

If this is the best defense that could be made for brewers and saloon keepers, thinking people will say that their case is a hard one. Silence would be better than such a defense. It simply shows that they are opposed to law and order; that their sole claim for recognition from the people is that they will combine to save a thief from just punishment. This is exactly in keeping with the nature of the business; it tends only to crime, and to the making of criminals. It is never according to *order*, and is in accordance with *law* only when the law makers, under pressure from the traffic, think to gain a little "revenue" by legalizing sin.

**November 3, 1887**

**"The True Standard" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

The apostle Paul said: "For not he who commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." 2 Cor. 10:18. There are innumerable people who will commend themselves, and a great many who can get others to commend them; but the number who are commended by the Lord is very small. And commendation by the Lord is the only commendation that amounts to anything. Self-commendation is in itself an indication of lack of real worth, for true merit is always accompanied by humility. "If any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." 1 Cor. 8:2. Commendation from friends is often liable to be insincere, and even if it is sincere, it represents simply the judgment of those friends, who can know nothing of another's real character. But while man can judge only from outward appearances, God looks upon the heart, and the one whom he commends is blessed indeed.

The number of whom we have any record that they were approved of God is very small. Of Enoch it is said that "he pleased God." Of Noah it is said: "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God." The Lord himself bore this witness concerning Job: "There is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil." What a degree of moral excellence must have been attained by Job, to merit such words of commendation from the Lord! The prophet Daniel was told by an angel sent direct from Heaven, "Thou art greatly beloved." Zacharias and Elizabeth, the parents of John the Baptist, are said to have been "both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." The inspired record says of Stephen that he was "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost;" the same record says that Barnabas was "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith."

This is not the complete list of those who are commended in the Bible, yet it comprises the greater portion of such persons. Barnabas and Joseph of Arimathea are the only men to whom the epithet "good" is applied in the Bible, although the same thing is in effect said of the others to whom we have referred. We are inclined to regard these persons as almost a different order of beings from ourselves, and endowed with superior natural gifts; but such is not the case. They were all men of like passions with ourselves, and all the righteousness to which they attained was not due to greater natural endowments, but to their faith. Moreover there is not a person who will ever enter Heaven, of whom the same thing will not be said by the Lord, that is said of these worthies. When the Master returns to reward his servants with an eternal inheritance in his kingdom, he will say to each, "Well done, good and faithful servant." And all may rest assured that this commendation will not be given where it is not deserved.

What will be the standard by which God will judge of the worthiness of people for this commendation? It will be his own perfect righteousness, for he says: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." And how may we know whether or not we are reaching out and longing for the righteousness of God? How can we know that our aspirations are not for something which would not please God? Are we left to grope in blindness after something far beyond our knowledge, in our attempt to attain to the righteousness of God? Not by any means. No man hath seen God at any time,



so that no one can from personal observation judge of his character; but God has given us a law which is the transcript of his character, so that we may know what we must do in order to be approved of God. The righteousness of God is the law of God. See Isa. 51:6, 7. That law is a perfect law, and the man who keeps it will be a perfect man.

But while no man has seen God, we have on record, for our example, the life of One who kept the law in all its fullness. Christ's life was the law of God personified. His life was a perfect interpretation of the law. Whoever is in any doubt as to whether or not the law of God will sanction a certain action, has only to ascertain whether or not Christ ever did such a thing, or if it would be consistent with his character. Whatever is unlike Christ is contrary to the law of God.

Christ is the only one who ever lived on earth who never did an act that was contrary to the law of God; and he is the only one through whom others may attain unto like perfection. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." There is much talk in certain quarters to the effect that we are to look to Christ for instruction, and not to the law. Just as though there were antagonism between Christ and the law! Did not Christ say, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart"? People who talk about leaving the law and accepting Christ, have very limited ideas of the character and work of Christ. They who leave the law, forsake Christ; and they who are out of Christ are far from the law. And so those who at last stand "without fault" before the throne of God, will be complete in Christ; and although the Lord himself will commend them before the assembled hosts of Heaven and earth, they will never commend themselves, but will ever say: "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood [not by absolving us from obedience to the law], and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." W.

### **"A Question of Principle" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

From Roswell, D. T., we have received the following question:-

"Is the use of tea and coffee forbidden by your church? If so, is it Bible doctrine, or doctrine of man?"

In answer to this we can say that the Seventh-day Adventist Church does not *forbid* the use of tea and coffee, nor does it either *forbid* or *command* any other practice. It has no authority to make commandments and impose restrictions. "There is one lawgiver," and "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is king." Isa. 33:22. There is none other than God that has authority to give commands. True, the parent may command his child, but only insofar as God has gone before in giving commandment; and in that case he is only in the place of God to the child. But even the parent has no right to issue commandments that originate with himself alone, and which are outside of the commands of God. So we may say truly that the Seventh-day Adventist Church does not forbid stealing, Sabbath-breaking, or murder, although it does not admit to its fellowship anybody

who is addicted to any of these sins. The Lord forbids murder, Sabbath-breaking, stealing, etc., and all the church has to do is to conform to his requirements; none who disregard the requirements of God are followers of Christ.

But that we may not be misunderstood, we will state plainly the status of tea, coffee, and tobacco among Seventh-day Adventist. The use of the two former is discouraged, so that it is very rare in the denomination; but it is not considered a disciplinary offense to use them; but the use of tobacco is regarded as a disciplinary offense; none who use it could be received into the church, any more than one could who is addicted to gambling. The reasons for this will appear in this article. Which will serve to answer several questions that we have received.

In the first place, why should not the tobacco-user be received in the Christian fellowship? The Bible does not say anything about tobacco; then why should any church presume to say that its use is not consistent with pure Christianity? These questions are often asked concerning tobacco, and still more often concerning tea and coffee; but we prefer to consider tobacco first, in order to bring out a principle. The very same questions might also be asked in regard to whisky. The Bible nowhere says anything about whisky. "But," someone will say, "it does say that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven, and that shuts out the habitual user of whisky." Exactly; but while the strict etymology of the word will not allow the word "drunkard" to be applied to one who does not drink, it is a fact that the use of tobacco is fully as injurious and degrading as that of whisky.

The use of tobacco is also forbidden by the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." There never was a Hindoo devotee who was more of an idolater than is the confirmed tobacco-user; or an African slave who was held in more degrading bondage. When a man will spend more for tobacco than for bread for his family; more for the vile weed by which he makes himself disgusting to all clean people, than he does for the support of the gospel, we affirm that he is an idolater, although he may profess to be a Christian. He allows his pipe or plug to come before God. And we venture this further assertion, that there is not in this whole world a devotee of the weed who does not think more of tobacco than of any other one thing, not excepting his family or his God. If that assertion be true, all will admit that the tobacco-user is an idolater; and we propose to show not only that it is true, but that it cannot by any possibility be otherwise; so that the habitual tobacco-user must necessarily be an idolater, and consequently a sinner in the sight of God.

One fact alone is sufficient to prove the assertion, and that is that the habitual tobacco-user *cannot* think of anything but tobacco, if he is deprived of it. The caresses of his wife, the prattle of his children, the appeals of the ambassador for Christ, even the demands of his business, or the condition of stocks,-all are alike unheeded if he has been deprived of tobacco for twenty-four hours. Not only are they unheeded, but he cannot by any possibility fix his mind upon them, no matter how hard he may try. The longing for his idol, tobacco, crowds out everything from his mind. Let him have his tobacco, and he feels all right. Men think that they do not make an idol of tobacco, because they scarcely ever think of it. When they feel a craving for it, they supply that craving almost mechanically; but the fact that when deprived of it they can think of nothing else,

and that they depend upon it as a stimulus to their faculties, shows that it is before everything else; it is the god upon which they depend.

Is it possible that a man who is bound with such fetters is a Christian? We say, No. He may say, "Lord, Lord," but he is not a Bible Christian. The Christian must seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; he must hunger and thirst after righteousness; his condition is described in the words of the psalmist: "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." Ps. 84:2. But the habitual tobacco-user seeks first his tobacco; his flesh cries out for tobacco, above everything else. If he is a professed minister of the gospel, he depends upon his cigar even for the inspiration to make a fervent prayer to write or deliver an elegant sermon; so that even in his professed service for the Lord he depends, not upon the Lord, but upon his tobacco. We say that it is the worst form of idolatry, when tobacco is depended upon to help to do the work of the Lord. And everyone who is addicted to the use of tobacco is held in the same kind of

663

bondage. No man can have the Lord, nor even his family or his business, first in his thoughts, if he uses tobacco. The vile stuff will assert and maintain its claim to have the first place.

Once more. The apostle Paul exhorts us to "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear God." 2 Cor. 7:1. Certainly this includes tobacco; for all the other filthiness of which the flesh is capable cannot outrank the filthiness which comes from tobacco-using. Again we are told of those who expect to see Christ as he is, and be with him when he comes, "every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John 3:3. The Christian must be like Christ; but can anyone imagine Christ using tobacco? The very thought is abhorrent, and seems almost blasphemous. But if tobacco-using were not a sin, it would not be difficult to associate it with thoughts of Christ, for sin is the only thing that is foreign to Christ's nature.

Finally, we have the express injunction: "Whether therefore ye, or drink, or the whatsoever ye do, to all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. 10:31. But the man who can tell how smoking or chewing tobacco glorifies God, has never been born. All these things plainly show that the use of tobacco is a sin, and utterly inconsistent with a Christian life, although the weed is never once mentioned in the Bible. The Bible nowhere says that we should draw a man out of a well if he should be so unfortunate as to fall in; but the man who should refuse to perform such an act, would once be set down as no Christian. The Bible does not say that you must help a man out of a well, but it does say that you must do to others as you would have them do to you; and that rule has a broad application.

But what about tea and coffee? Well, they are not mentioned in the Bible, any more than is tobacco; but everything that has been said about tobacco may be said about them, with the exception of the charge of filthiness. The confirmed tea or coffee drinker is as a veritable a slave as the tobacco devotee. How many thousands of women there are who cannot (at least they think they cannot, which is just the same in effect) do anything in the morning until their nerves are toned

up by a drink of tea or coffee. They depend upon it as much as the whisky sot does upon his dram. Thousands of men are more morose and fretful, and unable to fix their minds upon their work unless they have their coffee. This is not because the tea or coffee is absolutely essential, any more than the whisky or tobacco, for thousands of other people do the same work, and do it better, without any narcotic war stimulant. Those who depend upon the stimulant would do better work without it, if they would break loose from the habit; but the tea, coffee, tobacco, and whisky create a fictitious want, and the user depends upon the stimulus which they give, instead of upon his own strength, or the help which he should get from God. Now we insist that this is idolatry, no matter what the stimulant. A person cannot at the same time be both bond and free. He who is the slave of appetite cannot be the servant of Christ. When a person cannot even offer an intelligent prayer for help in service or in worship, without first having the stimulus of tea or coffee, we say that the drink, and not God, is the first and even the sole dependence. And as the case of tobacco, so with tea; it demands for itself the first place, and will not allow its slave to perform any work until it has been consulted.

Again, the statement that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven, shuts out the tea inebriate as well as the whisky sot; for although tea is extolled as "the cup which cheers, but not inebriates," it does have intoxicating properties, and a person may as surely become drunk upon it as upon beer. But it is unnecessary to carry the argument farther. Anyone can see that a practice that is wholly unnecessary, that is enslaving, that demands the expenditure of money that should be given to the cause of God, and that thrusts itself even ahead of God, cannot be a thing that is done to the glory of God.

The question will then be asked, why the use of tea is even tolerated in the church, when the tobacco-user is excluded. Strictly speaking there is no difference; but we suppose the difference is made partly because the injury caused by tea or coffee is not so great as that caused by tobacco, and that the former are not filthy, as is the latter. It is a sort of concession made to the hardness of people's hearts, as in the case of divorce in the days of Moses. But that the general rule, "Whether therefore ye, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," would exclude the habitual use of tea and coffee, we do not see how anybody can doubt.

In this article we have aimed simply to cover general principles. There are many questions that might be raised, and that are even suggested by this discussion, and there are exceptions, etc., which cannot be considered now. But we are confident that no questioning can shake the principle that we have brought out, and that although a practice may not be specifically mentioned in the Bible, it cannot be considered as consistent with an enlightened Christianity if it usurps the place that should be given to God. W.

**"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

The President has appointed Thursday, November 24, as a day of general thanksgiving.

We learn that a Seventh-day Adventist Church of thirty-four members has been organized in the Caucasus, in the southeastern part of Russia, and that about fifty are keeping the Sabbath. Thus the light is spreading. May this little company be a center from which rays of light will go to many others.

The delegates to the General Conference, who live east of Chicago, will leave that city Saturday night, November 5, and will arrive in Oakland Friday, November 11. The first meeting of the session, will be held Sunday, November 13, at 9 A.M. Further particulars have been sent to the churches in California by circular letter.

A drug clerk at Wichita, Kan., who pleaded guilty to 2,080 counts charging him with illegal sales of liquor, was fined ten dollars on each count, of \$20,800 in all, besides being sentenced to seventeen years and four months' imprisonment. At that rate it will not take long to cause liquor-sellers to believe that prohibition does prohibit.

Some time ago several hundred printers in New York struck for higher wages, at the command of the labor union. After having been out of work several weeks, with no prospect of any wages at all, the strike committee has kindly allowed the men to go to work again at the best terms they could make, providing they could get work at all. And yet people tells us that slavery is abolished in this country. Of all classes of laborers, printers ought to be too well informed to allow themselves to be driven to and from work like slaves, at the command of men to whom they are under no obligation whatever.

The *Golden Gate* has an anonymous correspondent who assumes to know all about Adventism, and who waxes indignant at the way that Adventists use the Bible to expose the Satanic origin of Spiritualism. But through his ignorance of the Bible, he unintentionally tells one truth in the following words: "They deny. . . that man has no soul or spirit." That is so; whenever Seventh-day Adventists hear anybody claiming that man has no soul or spirit, they deny the statement. They believe in the soul, body, and spirit, because they believe the Bible. See 1 Thess. 5:23.

It is with pain that the *Congregationalist* notices an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctity of Sunday. It cites "for example" an account of "a great train load of the Grand Army which drew out of one of the Chicago stations on a Sunday morning, on its way to St. Louis;" and then says:-

"Doubtless there was a considerable sprinkling of church members among these Sunday travelers, whose consciences were not quite at ease over what they were doing."

Yes "doubtless" that is so. Therefore, by all means let the civil authority of the nation come to the rescue, and entirely ease the consciences of these Sunday Christians by the enforcement of a rigid, uncompromising Sunday law, that shall compel these church members to do, as church members, what they have not conscience enough to do otherwise. Only let the civil law supply the place of conscience in all these people, then they will all serve the Lord.

The devil's agents are doing missionary work a thousand-fold faster than are the ambassadors for Christ. As an instance we cite the statement that 1,500,000 copies of "Peek's Bad Boy" have been sold. The *American* only feebly represents the case when it says: "What Canada thistles are to agriculture, this class of literature is to moral improvement." And this book is only one of thousands that have an immense sale, all of which are nauseous with the fumes of the bottomless pit. We often hear of missionary societies that are in debt, but the devil's missionary society always has funds on hand, for it can dispose of all its literature at full price. No matter how dull the times are, the devil's work goes on without diminution.

The editor of the *Christian Church News* (Oakland) quotes from the report of our camp-meeting the statement of the Sabbath-school secretary that "sixty-one Sabbath-schools and two Sunday-schools are now in active operation in California," and says:-

"This language would puzzle nine-tenths of the people throughout this country, but they are right in not calling a school a *Sabbath-school*, in the Bible sense of the word Sabbath."

Quite true; but now a question arises. The "Disciples" profess to make the Bible the standard of their faith and practice, and to use Bible language. Now since "in the Bible sense of the word Sabbath" a "Sabbath-school" can be held on no other day than the seventh day of the week, -Saturday, -then they must admit that that day is the Sabbath, according to the Bible; and, if so, why do they not call it so? If they are consistent, they must call it the Sabbath, and then consistency would demand that they should keep it as such.

The following question was lately asked the *Christian Union*:-

"What explanation can be made of the biblical statements in the fourth commandment and elsewhere, that God *rested* from the work of creation on the seventh day, as viewed in the light of the revelations of his works made by science?"

And it was answered thus:-

"The phrase 'God rested' is to be interpreted in the light of the usage of oriental literature, in which poetry, law, and philosophy were all intermingled. It is a poetic figure, to be interpreted, if at all, as indicating that the work of creation was ended, *and the work of redemption*, fit for the Lord's rest day, *began*."

That is to say that the work of redemption was begun before there was any sin, and consequently before there was anybody to be redeemed! And this idea we suppose is to be interpreted in the light of the usage of occidental religious literature, in which science, theology, and nonsense are all intermingled.

In the *Congregationalist* of October 20, Professor Pratt, of Hartford Theological Seminary, has an excellent article on "The Selection of Hymn Tunes," from which we clip the following:-

"I think that there ought to be enough likeness between the musical worship of the Sunday-school and that of the church, to engage heartily and intelligently in the latter. Nowhere in the church establishment is there room for the use of foolish tunes, for adapted street melodies, for anything that ministers to a

frivolous or rollicking mood. Untold injury has been done in many churches by the use of such tunes, not only to sacred music, but to music in general."

But exactly the opposite sentiment seems to be the prevailing one nowadays. The Sunday-schools and the Sabbath-schools and the churches seem to have accepted the idea that "the devil has the best tunes," and have adopted tunes which, whether rightfully or not, have the devil's mark upon them; and instead of taking them out of the devil's hands, they have simply educated both young and old to love the devil's music in preference to purely sacred music.

Now we don't believe a word of the statement that "the devil has the best tunes." He has the best tunes for his purpose, but not for the Lord's work. Satan could not use the tunes which are charged full of reverent devotion, such as Old Hundred, Rock of Ages, Coronation, Ortonville, Ames, Dundee, Day, Boylston, Dennis, and scores of similar ones. These wouldn't serve the devil's purpose at all. They don't have the jingle that he wants; there is worship in them.

It is true that the hand-organ tunes that have become so popular as "Gospel" hymns, take with the people, and awaken a great deal of enthusiasm. But the enthusiasm is of the same nature as that inspired by a lively waltz, and is not real religious fervor. It is that sort of good feeling that characterizes the members of the Salvation Army, and which the devil would fain have men believe is religious. We know that the sentiment of the age is against the standard music by which people may worship the Lord; but we think that in the matter of music, as well as in other things, it would be far better to educate the people, both young and old, to an appreciation of that which is sacred, than to pander to their natural fancy.

The Pope, last spring, sent Mgr. Ruffo to England on a mission. Mgr. Ruffo made such good use of his opportunities, and was so well received there, that on his return to Rome he reported that the prospect was very good for the complete restoration of diplomatic relations between the Papacy and the throne of Great Britain. At this the Pope was highly pleased. But now he is very much displeased, and he makes "no secret of his displeasure." The reason of this is that Mgr. Persico, who was sent to Ireland at the same time that Ruffo was sent to England, has returned with nothing definite accomplished. The dispatch says that "the Pope hoped that a favorable result of Persico's mission would have contributed much toward rendering easy negotiations for the renewal of diplomatic intercourse with England." Persico did nothing of the kind, and so the Pope is "much displeased." Well, well, the infallible, the Pope, has his ups and downs, as well as all of us common folks.

The Sunday-law movement has received a new impetus, especially in New York and Pennsylvania. The liquor traffic, under the title of the Personal Liberty League, has made a strike in the political field to secure a law under which saloons may be kept open from 2 o'clock P.M. till midnight on Sunday. This of course has stirred up the Sunday-law advocates-Protestants of all denominations heartily joining with Catholics-to renewed efforts and louder demands for the protection of the Sunday. If we did not understand the secret of the whole Sunday-law movement, it would seem to us very singular indeed that there should be such unanimous and hearty co-operation in favor of Sunday prohibition and yet such diffident and divided efforts in behalf of prohibition absolute. There

is no use in trying to deny it, there are thousands of professed religionists who care little or nothing for the cause of prohibition except on Sunday. They use the Sunday prohibition as a sort of "high-license" dodge, virtually saying to the liquor traffic, "You let us have Sunday free from liquor-selling, and we will say nothing about it during the rest of the week."

### **"Judgment and Mercy" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

#### The Commentary.

(November 20.-Matt. 11:20-30.)

"Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you." Verses 20-22.

Before passing to the main subject, we may note that we have no record of any miracles that were performed in Chorazin, nor is there in the Bible any other reference to that place, except in the parallel passage in Luke. The Scripture is silent concerning those "mighty works" that were done there, and but for this incidental allusion, we would not know that any such place ever existed. This is one of the things that proves that the gospels are not fictitious tales. A writer of fiction would have referred only to Capernaum, or to some other place already mentioned as the scene of mighty miracles; he would not have brought in Chorazin without first recording some miracles wrought there. But Matthew writes as one who deals with things of common report, and that were not done in a corner.

The question has sometimes been raised, "If Tyre and Sidon would have repented, if the works done in Bethsaida had been done in them, why were the works not done, and they thus given a chance to repent?" Dean Alford answers this question thus: "Because every act of God for the rescue of a sinner from his doom is purely and entirely of free and undeserved grace, and the proportion of such means of escape dealt out to men is ruled by the counsel of his will who is holy, just, and true, and willeth not the death of the sinner, but whose ways are past our finding out." But there seems to be an answer that is more satisfactory. First we must remember that God "is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Peter 3:9. See also 1 Tim. 2:4; Ps. 103:8; Ex. 34:6, 7. He himself says, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live." Eze. 33:11. Therefore it may be set down as a fact that God never brings judgments upon people without first giving them sufficient warning, and time for repentance. Whenever the wicked are destroyed, it is their own fault, and not because God has not given them enough chance to repent. See the case of the antediluvians. Gen. 6:3; 1 Peter 3:20.



In order fully to understand the matter, we must read also these verses, which immediately follow: "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt. 11:25, 26. Here the same principle is involved, but in such a way that the answer is suggested. We are not to understand that Jesus rejoiced because any had failed to receive light and knowledge, but rather because there were some to whom it could be revealed. And we are to understand that "these things" were hid from "the wise and prudent," not because God willed that they should not know them, but because they refused to receive them; and here is the proof:-

Paul says, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. 4:3, 4. Here we are told that "these things" are hid only from those whose minds Satan has blinded; but Satan cannot blind the minds of any who do not willingly yield to him. See Rom. 6:16. Of the Jews the Lord said: "For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Acts 28:27. See also 2 Thess. 2:11, 12.

These texts conclusively show that the truths of the gospel are hidden only from those who close their own eyes. When Christ said that "these things" were hid from "the wise and prudent," he referred to those who were wise in their own conceit, and not to the truly wise. Of the heathen we are told that "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Rom. 1:22. They were so wise in their own estimation that they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; they felt,

667

like modern Spiritualists, that their reason was fettered so long as they held to "the God-idea;" and so they were left to a mind void of judgment, to do all manner of iniquity.

The "wise and prudent" are the worldly wise, of whom Paul said: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." 1 Cor. 1:21-27.

It is very common to hear people speak of men who "know so much that nobody can teach them anything." It is not meant that the men are really wiser

than anybody else in the world, but that they think themselves so very wise that they will not receive instruction from anybody. So with the "wise and prudent" ones of this world. They imagine themselves to be so wise that they need not listen to the teaching of Christ, and so the glorious light of the gospel is hid from their eyes. But one who doesn't think he knows it all already may be taught. So David says: "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way. The meek will he guide in judgment; and the meek will he teach his way." "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant." Ps. 25:8, 9, 14. The man who nurses his pride, shuts himself off from receiving the light which if received would guide him to life.

Thus it was with the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, and with Sodom. If the mighty works that were done in Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had been done in them, they would have repented; but the mighty works could not be done in them. They themselves made it impossible for the mighty works to be done, because in their wicked pride they would not receive even the first principles of truth. It was just so in Nazareth, of which place it is said: "And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." Matt. 13:58. Nazareth was proverbial for its wickedness (John 1:46), and as soon as Jesus began to teach there, the people rejected his words. See Matt. 13:53-58; Luke 4:16-20. Before Jesus left them, however, he emphasized the point which we have noted, namely, that unbelief and hardness of heart will shut out the help that God is willing to give, by referring to the cases of the widow of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian. There were many others as needy as these two, but they were not as willing to receive help. In the city of Sodom everybody was saturated with wickedness. They were wholly abandoned to their own depraved lust, and therefore they were so hardened that the moment the message came to them from God, they mocked and tried to kill the messenger. If their hearts had been submissive enough to listen quietly to truth, mighty works might have been done, and many might have been converted, and the city thereby saved from destruction. But the works were not done, because they would not allow them to be done.

The Saviour closed his discourse with the following most beautiful and tender appeal: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

There are two yokes and two burdens. The burden of sin is indeed heavy; if it is not lost at the foot of the cross, it will sink the bearer into perdition. To all who are heavily laden with sin, Jesus says, "Come unto me, . . . and I will give you rest." There is no doubt about this. If they come, he says, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls." Then why not go? Why carry a heavy burden, when somebody freely offers to carry it for you? In exchange he will give his own burden, which is light. The "yoke of bondage" is a galling yoke. From this Christ will set all free who will come to him, and he says, "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:36.

A yoke implies service. Those who are entangled in the "yoke of bondage," are the servants of sin; they carry the heavy load. Christ's yoke is easy, but the fact that those who come to him must take his yoke upon them, shows that those who come to Christ must engage in his service. They must be workers. But Christ's service is not slavery. It is a pleasure to work when the yoke fits the neck. None can be followers of Christ unless they learn of him to do his work. The earlier one becomes used to work, the more efficient will he be; so the prophet says: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth." Lam. 3:27. W.

**November 10, 1887**

**"Is There any Excuse?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

"If the sin of ignorance is a sufficient excuse for Christians when endeavoring to live up to the gospel light, why not a sufficient excuse for the heathen who have not the light, and never did have? a fact which is easily proved in many instances. "G. I. H."

Our correspondent doubtless meant to say, "If ignorance is a sufficient excuse for sin," etc., instead of, "If the sin of ignorance is a sufficient excuse;" for certainly no sin could excuse itself. But in either case, our answer would be this:-

1. There is no excuse for any sin whatever. Sin is inexcusable in any person; and there is no authority for saying that God will *excuse* any sin in anybody. True, Paul says of his career as a persecutor, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. 1:13), but this shows that Paul was not excused for his sin which he committed in his ignorance. If he had not repented, he would not have found mercy. His sin of ignorance had to be pardoned. He says further: "And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." Verse 14. If it had not been for the exceeding abundance of the grace of God, through faith in Christ Jesus, his sin of ignorance would have caused his ruin.

2. Again, the following provision for the people in ancient times, shows that sins of ignorance are not excused, but that they must be atoned for:-

"And if ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses, even all that the Lord hath commanded you by the hand of Moses, from the day that the Lord commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations; then it shall be, if ought be committed by ignorance without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour unto the Lord, with his meat offering, and his drink offering, according to the manner, and one kid of the goats for a sin offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them; for it is ignorance; and they shall bring their offering, a sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord, and their sin offering before the Lord, for their ignorance; and it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the children of Israel, and the stranger that

sojourneth among them; seeing all the people were in ignorance." Num. 15:22-26.

3. In Ps. 19:12, 13 we read the following words: "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression." This is part of a prayer which David offered to God. This brings to view a case different from that supposed in Num. 15:22-26. There the people were directed to offer sacrifices indicative of repentance, when the sin committed in ignorance came to their knowledge; but David's prayer is for cleansing from sins of which he was ignorant at the time. He knew that he must have committed sins of which he was not aware, and he recognized the fact that they were sins, and that he needed forgiveness for them as well as for those sins of which he was conscious. These instances show clearly that God does not excuse sin. Every sin whether known or unknown must be atoned for by the blood of Christ; there is no other way by which anybody can be freed from its guilt.

4. The above conclusion does not militate against the statement that men are judged according to the light that they have received. No man will be condemned for not doing what he did not know, and had no means of knowing, was commanded. Both are judged by the light which they have received. If they have conscientiously lived up to that, it will be well with them, for their secret sins will be forgiven. But it is claimed that the heathen have no light at all. This is a mistake, as will be seen from certain scriptures which we shall quote.

In Rom. 1:18-20 we read: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." From this we learn that there are no people who may not know that there is one God, of infinite power and goodness; that "he giveth to all life and breath and all things;" and that for this reason they ought to worship him. And from Acts 17:27, and context, we learn that if men would thus recognize the power of God, and seek to know more of him, they would find him, because he is not far from every one of us. See also Rom. 10:6-8. The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith.

Again, in the second chapter of Romans, Paul shows exactly by what every man is judged, and condemned or justified. He speaks of those who have the revealed word of God, and of those who have it not, saying: "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;" "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." Verses 11, 12, 16.

But lest someone should question the impartiality of this, and should ask how men who have not the written word of God, could be justly condemned, the apostle throws in an explanation in verses 13-15, as follows: "For not the hearers

of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another."

The meaning of the passage is simply this: There is nobody who does not know the difference between right and wrong, to some extent. The heathen who have never heard of the Bible or the gospel, know that there are some things that they ought not to do. This is shown by the fact, to which Paul refers, that their consciences condemn or approve, according as they have done ill or well, and they also accuse or else excuse one another for their deeds. Now if the heathen have a little knowledge of right and wrong, no matter how little it may be, and do not live up to even that little, it is manifest that justice demands that they should be condemned, just the same as it demands the condemnation of the man who had greater light but has not lived up to it.

But what if the heathen should live up to all the light that he has by nature? Then he certainly cannot be condemned. The one who lives up to all the light that he has, will receive more light, as did Abraham, who feared God, although he had been surrounded by heathen from his infancy; and because he lived up to that light which he had, God revealed himself to him in a more marked manner. And as with the Christian, so with the heathen who does every duty of which he has any knowledge; his sins of ignorance will be forgiven. But it must be evident that sins of ignorance do not figure in the case at all, so long as a person is sinning against light, no matter how small that light may be. That is to say, it is not necessary to bring the whole law against a man who knows but part of the law, when he does not live out that part. The part that he knows and does not perform is sufficient to condemn him.

The idea suggested by the question of our brother, namely, that many of the heathen "have not had a fair chance," is becoming quite popular. The inevitable result of entertaining it is either to impeach the justice of God, or else to claim that another probation will be provided for those heathen. And from this the transition is easy, and many people are making it, that for people in so-called Christian lands there will be another probation; and this speedily runs into universalism. But there is no excuse for any of these errors; God is just; he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him;" and he gives to every man that comes into the world sufficient knowledge to enable him to fear God and keep his commandments. W.

### **"The Testimony of the Dying" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

The so-called testimony of the dying is one of the strongholds into which the advocates of no actual death for man retreat, when they have been driven from every position which they have taken from the Bible. When it is demonstrated that the Scriptures teach that man does really die and go to the grave, and that

the moment he dies he loses all consciousness and power of thinking, and that until the resurrection he remains in the grave, where there is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom," they will cite instances where the dying have declared that they saw Jesus, or the angels, or even some of their friends who were already dead, and who were coming to welcome them, and have said that they were going directly to Heaven; and then the question will be asked, "Can't you accept the testimony of the dying? Do you think that a dying man would tell a lie about where he is going?" This appeal, made in such confidence, and in a pathetic told, very often satisfies people that the dead are conscious, and that they go to Heaven immediately upon their death, even when these same people know that the Bible emphatically contradicts such ideas.

We wish to examine this testimony, and see just how much weight it is entitled to. In the first place, we must rule out all the cases in which the dying person is or has been delirious, for certainly no one would wish to base any theory upon the statement of a person not in his right mind. But allowing that there has been no delirium, we must even then take the ecstatic ejaculations of the dying with a great deal of allowance, although the veracity of the individuals may be beyond question. The reason is, that although the mind may not wander, it is from the very nature of the case weakened. It is exceedingly rare, perhaps impossible, at the close of an illness which is about to result in death, when all the physical organs are relaxed, that the mind should retain its full vigor and clearness. It is often said of people that they retain all their senses to the last, and this is undoubtedly true, but that they retain their mental faculties to their fullest extent, is impossible. And so many of the broken statements of the dying as to what they see and hear, may be set down as a result of hallucinations. Proof of this may be found in the cases of those who have been nearly dead from drowning or freezing, or from some other cause, and who have recovered. Such ones relate the happy sights which they saw, and the blissful sounds which they heard, and state that to be called away from them to real consciousness seemed a rude awakening.

There is no reasonable doubt, therefore, but that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the cases in which the dying are said to have seen and heard wonderful things must be ruled out altogether from the so-called testimony of the dying. And even the other one-hundredth is very doubtful testimony, since in no case can it be *known* that anything has actually been seen. We will proceed on the supposition,

679

however, that there are some cases in which certain forms are actually presented to the dying person, and will consider in their order the cases where the dying person has said that he was going immediately to Heaven, and were Jesus and angels, or the forms of dead friends, are said to have been seen.

But first and continually let it be remembered that the testimony of the Bible is emphatic upon the point that the dead know not anything; that they are sleeping a dreamless sleep, from which they can be awakened only by the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God at the last days; that their thoughts perish as soon as their breath leaves the body; and that none can go to Heaven until Christ comes for them in the glory of his Father, with his angels. If this is constantly

borne in mind, then no one who believes the Bible can be moved in the least by the testimony of anybody, whether dying or in the full possession of all his powers. The Bible must be the decisive standard of appeal in all cases. If we give up the plain declarations of the Bible for the statements of individuals, then the Bible is no longer to us a sacred book, and we virtually deny its inspiration. Let the word of God be held as true, even though every man is thereby proved a liar.

Now who are they who say upon their death-beds that they are going at once to Heaven? Why, it is those who all their life-time have been taught that men go to Heaven as soon as they die. Nobody ever heard of such a thing as that a believer in eternal life only through Christ, to be received at the resurrection of the just, has upon his death-bed seen visions of angels coming for him to take away to Heaven. But why not? It will not be denied, even by the most earnest advocate of the natural immortality of man, that many very good men have held to the doctrine of conditional immortality. Then if the angels do come for the dying, whose eyes and ears are often unable to catch their forms and voices, why are not such visions granted to the believers in conditional immortality? The question suggests the answer, which we have already given, that such visions are hallucinations, which naturally follow the bent of the person's mind. And so the statement of a dying man, to the effect that he is at once going to Heaven, is of no more value than the statement that the righteous go to Heaven at death, made by the same man in health. The fact that a man is dying, does not add one whit to the force of the statement that he may make concerning the future. He will say just what he has been taught to believe, and we must go to the Bible to find out whether or not the statement is true.

In the adherence of the so-called testimony of the dying, in spite of the testimony of the Bible, the thoughtful person will see the leaven of Spiritualism working. Spiritualists ignore the Bible, for the testimony of those who claim to be the spirits of the dead. But this is in reality but little different from taking the statement of the living, in contradiction of the Bible. When people base their belief as to the condition of man after death, upon what a dying man says, notwithstanding the fact that the dying man's statement contradicts the Bible, it will not be long before they will accept the testimony that is given by what appears to be the same person after his death, and which tells them that the Bible itself is but a fable. In short, when one sets aside the testimony of the Bible for any cause whatever he is on the high road to Spiritualism, with all that implies.

We have, indeed, the record of one man who shortly before his death saw Heaven opened and the Saviour standing at the right hand of God. But the case of Stephen is entirely different from that of a dying man that is brought forward, because, (1) Stephen was not a dying man when he saw this. It was his statement of what he saw that caused the Jews to stone him to death immediately. (2) Stephen did not say that he was going to Heaven or anything of the kind. He had been arraigned before the Sanhedrim for preaching Christ, and this vision of heavenly things was to vindicate the truth of his words, to confound the opposition, and to give him courage for the ordeal just before him; and (3) the

record says that after Stephen had had this view of heavenly things, he was stoned by the Jews and "fell asleep." He did not enter at once upon the enjoyment of those heavenly scenes, but the vision faded from his view as he fell asleep and lost all consciousness of things either earthly or heavenly. As with Paul, so with Stephen, the crown of life was laid up for him, to be given at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ.

It need not be concluded that no good person ever has visions of heaven; that no one has, like Stephen, a view of heavenly realities to strengthen him in the power of death. But that is no evidence that the one who sees such things is going at once to enjoy them. "But," says one, "what a disappointment it would be to the good soul who has been taught that he will go to Heaven at death, if he should see heavenly things, as Stephen did, and should not go at once to enjoy them!" Not at all. How can there be any disappointment when there is unconsciousness? When the approach of death causes the scene to fade from the sight, and the person sinks into the unconscious repose of death, it is the same to him as though he had seen nothing. There is no disappointment, for there is no knowledge. The time spent in the tomb, whether it be days or centuries, is to the unconscious sleeper as no time at all, and if his last conscious moment was brightened by a view of Heaven, the first moments after his awakening will usher him into the reality; so that there is no chance for disappointment though centuries may have intervened between his death and the resurrection.

There remains only for our consideration the case of those who, when dying, say that they see their friends who have died before, and that they beckon them to come. Of course much, and perhaps all, of this may be set down to hallucinations. When people have been taught to believe that the dead are conscious and in Heaven, and have thought much of meeting them in death it is very natural that the hallucinations of their weakened minds should take such a form. But we will allow, although it can never be proved, that there are cases in which the dying do actually see what appear to be their friends to have died before them; and the question will arise, "How do you dispose of such testimony?" We reply that we dispose of it just as we would dispose of similar testimony given by any person in full health. We know that many persons have attended Spiritualist sÉances, and have seen what appeared to be the forms of their dead friends, and that they have received from them messages. Now what do we conclude in such a case? Simply that the spirits of devils have assumed the appearance of those dead friends in order to strengthen the living in their belief in the inherit immortality of the soul, and to weaken their faith in the plain testimony of the Bible. And if such forms should appear to the dying outside of a Spiritualist sÉance, we should say the same thing, for we know both from reason and revelation that it is impossible for dead people to move or talk or think.

It will be objected that Satan could have no object in thus deceiving those who are at the point of death, and that if he had an object, it would be cruel for the Lord to allow either the dying or the living to be so deceived. To this double objection we reply: (1) Since Satan is a deceiver, and his whole aim is to cause men to disbelieve the word of God, it would be the most natural thing for him to



take advantage of the erroneous opinions of the dying, to confirm the living in the same erroneous opinions. (2) As to the justice of God in allowing such deceptions to take place, we have only to say that God is in nowise responsible for them, for he has given sufficient warning against them. In the Bible he has again and again warned men against such deceptions, and has given us the truth by which we may detect error. Now if men neglect or despise the warning which God has given men, who dare lay it to the charge of God if they are deceived? They need not be deceived if they heed the words of God. But if they choose to listen to their own imaginations, or to heathen speculations, or to any statement that contradicts the word of God, they invite deception, and have only themselves to blame if that deception results in their ruin.

It is possible, of course, that certain ones may have, just as they are about to die, a vision of the resurrection, and, if so, this would account for their seeing their friends who had died before them, and who would appear in the first resurrection. But this would not, of course, add anything to the claim that the good go to Heaven at death. Whether those who might have such a vision, would understand that it represented the resurrection, or would think that their friends have actually come from glory to meet them, would make no difference with the fact. Even though, if such a vision were given, the one who had it should declare that his friends were coming from heaven to meet him, that would not make it so. The Bible furnishes all the knowledge that we have or can have on the state of the dead, and its evidence is unequivocal.

The object of this article is to emphasize the words of the prophet: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:19, 20. Remember that God's word is true, and that outside of that there is no truth, and that conscientiousness on the part of the speaker does not add any force to his words if they are contrary to the teaching of the Bible. W.

### **"The Sabbath, the Lord's Day" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are those at the present time who tell us that the fourth commandment does not require the observance of the seventh day of the week, but of simply one day in seven, no matter which day of the week. Now this is either so or else it is not so. It is certain that Jesus knew what the commandment requires, and it is also certain that the day on which the disciples passed through the field and ate the grain was the seventh day of the week, familiarly known in the Bible as the Sabbath day, the day which the Jews kept, and do still, in obedience to the fourth commandment. Now if it were true that the fourth commandment does not require that the seventh day of the week be kept, what a good chance there was here for Jesus to tell the Jews so. He could justify his disciples, by informing the criticizing Jews that "in the higher Christian thought, Sabbath observance is listed

above the formality of days." But he did nothing of the kind; he recognized that day as *the Sabbath day*, and never on any occasion was there any question

683

between him and the Jews as to the day of the Sabbath.

The only question on this occasion was as to whether or not the disciples had properly kept the Sabbath. Jesus did not set aside the Sabbath, or seek to lower the Sabbath in any way whatever, but he showed them something about Sabbath observance that they had entirely missed. They made the Sabbath a hardship, a thing which God did not design. If they had heeded the words of a great prophet who wrote more than seven hundred years before, they would have regarded the Sabbath as "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." Isa. 58:13. But then, if they had heeded the words of Isaiah at all, they would have accepted Christ when he came. And so they would, in fact, if they had really regarded the words that Moses wrote. In those unbelieving Jews was exemplified the fact that may be verified to-day in thousands of instances, that a false idea in regard to the law, and lack of real appreciation of Christ, go together.

Jesus recognized a law for the Sabbath, when he said: "It is lawful [agreeable to law; conformable to law; allowed by law] to do well on the Sabbath day." Now there is only one law concerning the Sabbath, and that is the fourth commandment; therefore we must conclude that to do well on the Sabbath day is conformable to the fourth commandment. And who could think otherwise, since "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and a good"? We are forbidden only to do our own work, but commanded to do the Lord's work, and this presupposes the taking of the food that is necessary for strength. God does not desire any of his creatures to suffer. His law was not given as a yoke of bondage, but just the contrary. It was in love that was given, as Moses said: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea, he loved the people; all his saints are in thy hand; and they sat down at thy feet; every one shall receive of thy words." Deut. 33:2, 3.

We are told of the Sabbath, by some commentators, that Jesus came "to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it into the Lord's day." He did indeed own it, as he had a right to, for he made it. We read that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17. Then it was he who created the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested the seventh; it was he who blessed and sanctified the seventh day, so that that day was emphatically his day; and he owned it, saying, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Let no one forget for a moment that Jesus was speaking of the seventh day of the week, the day which is sometimes contemptuously spoken of as the Jewish Sabbath, and that he claimed as his day. Then since the seventh-day Sabbath was the Lord's day; how was it possible to "merge the Sabbath into the Lord's day"? It was such already, and had been such since creation.

But someone will suggest that after the crucifixion the first day of the week became the Lord's day. Query: Will not someone show *proof* that the first day is or ever was the Lord's day, instead of suggesting or asserting? But notice: Jesus here stated a fact concerning the Sabbath. He fully agreed with the Jews as to the day of the Sabbath, and he claimed it as his own day. He differed with the Jews only in the way it should be kept. Now since, when Christ was teaching, the fourth commandment required the observance of the seventh day of the week, it must require it ever since the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, unless some change was made in the wording of it; for it is too evident to need argument that a given set of words cannot mean one thing at one time and another thing at another time. So, then, the seventh day of the week, the day which the Jews ever have observed, although not very strictly in these days, is still the Sabbath, is still the Lord's day. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is said that more than \$140,000 has already been contributed toward the celebration of the Pope's jubilee mass. What a wicked man the Pope must be, since it requires so much money to obtain pardon for him.

From an article in the *Winsted Press*, extolling Bethlehem, we extract the following, which may be of interest to those who are inclined to think that there is really something good in Buddhism:-

"Theosophy, mental science (sometimes called 'Christian science'), esoteric Christianity and Buddhistic metaphysics are, we believe, substantially one and the same thing, and we may also include their intimate relative, known here as Modern Spiritualism, the difference between them being no greater than that which invariably arises from different interpretations of the same idea by different individuals under differing environment."

Says, the *Congregationalist*:-

"We have never liked the separation of the ministry into the two classes of pastors and evangelists."

Well now we do like it. And the one grand reason that we do like it is because the Scripture has made the separation. In naming the gifts which Christ gave "for the work of the ministry" Paul says, "He gave some, the apostles; and some, prophets; and some, *evangelists*; and some, *pastors* and teachers." Whether the *Congregationalist*, or anybody else, likes it or not, it is right. It is according to the word and work of Christ.

A writer in the *Advance* says:-

"One of the worst results of the speculative mania seems to be the growing demoralization of the public conscience. Men, high in the church, as well as in respectable society, engage openly and unblushingly in these transactions, till the term 'Christians at work' was not inaptly applied to them by a Jewish dealer. How many young men were there who did not follow the career of Jim Fisk or H. S. Ives with a secret admiration, till startled by their fall? And how much truth is there in the following 'instantaneous photograph' of public sentiment:-

"\$1-"Thief!" \$50,000-"Defaulter!" \$100,000-". . .!" \$500,000-"Canadian Tourist!" \$1,000,000-"Brilliant Financier!"

"Is it an exaggeration to say that we are fast becoming a nation of gamblers?"

Yet people will shut their eyes to these facts, and will delude themselves with the idea that the world is growing better.

Nearly everybody has heard of the lesson which a priest is said to have given to a woman who was addicted to evil gossip. Giving her a small sack full of feathers, he bade her go along the road and let them out as she went. She did so, and then returned. Then he told her to go over the ground and gather up the feathers; but she found this an impossibility. Some of the feathers had been caught by the wind as soon as they were released, and many of those that had lodged on the ground, had afterward been carried by the wind to other places. This is an apt illustration, and one that ought to have more consideration than it does. It is the easiest thing in the world to start a false report; a person may do it thoughtlessly, with no evil intent, by carelessly repeating a story which he has heard, without waiting to see if it is true. But it is an impossibility to counteract the effect of a false story once started. The one who maliciously invented it, or the one who thoughtlessly spread it, may sorely repent of the evil he has done; the wrong may be confessed, the slander publicly retracted, and each to whom he has told it may be privately visited. This may secure him pardon, but it will not heal the wound made. Somebody will still believe the story or will at least think that there must be some ground for it. There will be some who will not hear the correction, or, hearing it, will be less willing to accept the correction than they were to receive the original story. The wind will have blown the feathers of untruth to some place where they cannot be found. Evil is more easily believed of any man than good. Let a man be charged with being a thief, and though it be demonstrated that the charge is malicious, and without any foundation, yet there will be some who will always look upon the man with suspicion. They will argue that the story would not have been started if there had not been some cause for it. "No smoke without some fire," they will say. True enough; but they forget that the tongue is set on fire of hell, and that it alone is responsible for most of the smoke which blinds the eyes of men to the good that it is in their fellow-men.

The *Christian World* (London) congratulates the members of the recent Church Congress on their liberality, and the "frank and tolerant spirit" which they manifested. This liberality was indicated by their allowing a Mr. Champion to champion Socialism, and "the Rev. Canon Taylor" to "vindicate the claims of Mohammedanism." It thinks that there can be but little question as to the correctness of Mr. Taylor's observation that "over a large portion of the world, Islam as a missionary religion is more successful than Christianity." Archdeacon Hamilton, who followed Mr. Taylor, "freely acknowledged that over the inland portions of North Africa Christianity hitherto had not been able to compete with Islam." How many more Church Congresses will convene before Mohammedanism will be recognized as an ally of Christianity? According to the National Reform idea that majorities ought to rule in matters of religion and conscience, Christianity ought to step out of Africa, and leave the field to Mohammedanism. In a world's congress of religions, many countries could be

represented only by Mohammedans. Why not by Mohammedans as well as by Roman Catholics?

**"Arbitration or War?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

Considerable is now being said about settling disputes by arbitration. There is at the present time in this country a deputation from Great Britain, of twelve members of Parliament, for the purpose of working up a treaty between that country and the United States, which shall provide for the settlement of all disputes by arbitration. They were received by President Cleveland, who cordially indorsed their mission and wished them abundant success. He did not, however, feel sanguine that they would succeed in abolishing war at once. But there are others who expect soon to see war as a thing of the past.

It is worthy of note that the next column but one to that which gives the account of the arbitration delegation, contains the recommendations of the Board of Engineers, concerning the coast defenses necessary in the United States, and their probable cost. The plan recommended, which will probably be adopted, involves an annual expense of about \$2,000,000, to be apportioned among the principal sea-ports of the United States. This is a very moderate sum, considering the amount expended by other powers. This goes to show that while certain ones may talk enthusiastically over peace, and the settlement of all disputes by arbitration, no nation has any confidence in such talk. The spirit of war is in the air, and every nation on earth is feeling its influence.

We do not favor war; we would be glad to see all disputes amicably settled, or, better still, to see no disputes at all; but we have no hope of seeing any such state of things until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he has destroyed them that corrupt the earth. Wars grow out of the lusts of the human heart, and so long as men's hearts are unchanged, wars will not cease. So long as men show no disposition to settle their private disputes by arbitration, but appeal to the courts, and to the far baser methods, so long may we expect nations to settle their disputes by an appeal to arms. Not only do we see no progress towards peaceful settlements of private difficulties, but we see disputes and quarrels increasing; and we see men fighting for the mere love of fighting, to a degree scarcely equaled in the feudal times when fighting was the sole occupation of men. The Bible says that in the last days man shall be fierce, and fierce men do not settle their disputes by arbitration. The only way to have no fighting is to have no disputes, and that condition of things will exist only in the new earth, where the inhabitants will all be of the same mind.

**"Entirely Too Familiar" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate* says:-

"An ill-constructed school-house in New York City collapses before its completion, burying its builders in its ruins and causing much of death and

suffering. The Roman Catholic priest for whose parochial uses it was being erected is among the victims. Blame is laid on the 'building inspector,' by whose connivance or oversight illegal expedients were resorted to which brought about this terrible accident. What is his defense? Simply this: He knew the priest had sufficient political influence to obtain a permit for any constructive irregularities he might choose to indulge in. Whether this be true or not is of less importance than the appalling fact-which none will deny-that such a charge may be brought against a priest without astonishing anyone. Roman Catholics justify the employment of all forces-moral and immoral-for the advancement of 'the church;' and Protestants are so familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics that they are no longer shocked by them."

Yes, Protestants are becoming entirely *too* familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. In California one of the foremost preachers of the Methodist Church on the Pacific coast-C. C. Stratton, D. D.-goes on a mission to Archbishop Riordan, to gain the co-operation of the Catholic Church in a matter entirely political. In New York City the leading Protestant divines organize for political work, and propose to ask Archbishop Corrigan to serve on the committee which they appoint, to make their move politically effective. In the same State the fashionable watering-places preachers gathered at Saratoga, get together in a meeting in pass a motion commissioning the National Reform Association to secure if possible a basis of agreement with the Roman Catholic authorities, by which the public schools of the nation shall be given into the control of the Roman Church where ever the Catholics are in the majority.

Yes, indeed, Protestants are becoming decidedly familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. As greedily as these Protestant leaders are of political power, it is evident that they will be apt pupils, and under the tutorship of Archbishop Riordan, Archbishop Corrigan, Cardinal Gibbons, and "Roman Catholic authorities" generally, we may rest perfectly sure that this familiarity will be rapidly and vastly increased. Nor does this familiarity at all seem to breed contempt on the part of these Protestant preacher-politicians; it seems rather to increase their admiration for the "well-favored harlot."

**November 17, 1887**

**"The Sabbath of Antiquity" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading, Rev. George S. Mott, D.D., has an article in the New York *Observer*, of October 27, which all who are engaged in teaching the claims of the Sabbath would do well to preserve, to show to them who claim that no Sabbath was known until the law was spoken from Sinai. Speaking of the Sabbath law as antedating the formal giving of the Decalogue, Dr. Mott says:-

And so the Sabbath law holds a similar position. It is one of the primal laws. It even antedates marriage. And now a question arises: Was a day of rest recognized in the youth of the human race, while as yet the traditions of Adam were only a few centuries old? The silence in the book of Genesis regarding the

observance of the Sabbath, has led to the inference that the day was never held as sacred. But the light thrown upon those early ages by modern discoveries in Assyrian and old Chaldean lore has disclosed the fact that the Sabbath had its place for many centuries after the fall of man. These clay tablets, some of which may be seen in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, covered with that strange cuneiform character, have been translated. And they tell us of a people called the "Accadians," or "Mountaineers," who came down toward the mouth of the Euphrates. Already they were an organized nation, possessing a peculiar form of writing, and a systematized legislation and religion. These were conquered by Nimrod. They were probably the first people that consolidated themselves into a nation. their writings are not preserved; but on these

683

clay tablets are found extracts from their records and their traditions. And we find that the seventh day, by a tradition handed down from Eden, was holy at that early age, and was honored by a cessation of all work on it. A series of tablets on the creation have been translated, and one of them thus describes the divisions of time:-

"The moon he appointed to rule the night,  
And to wander through the night, until the dawn of day.  
Every month, without fail, he made holy assembly days.  
In the beginning of the month, at the rising of night,  
It shot forth its horns to illuminate the heavens.  
On the seventh day he appointed a holy day.  
And to cease from all business he commanded."

Such was the tradition respecting the Sabbath. But was any respect given to this tradition? Was the Sabbath observed? Here the Assyrian tablets give us most welcome information. Some 2,300 years before Christ, a race inhabited that region who were given to reading and writing. There were large libraries located at different points, and voluminous records were made of all occurrences. These records described with minute particularity the manners and customs, the civil and religious regulations, and the laws of those early ages; and we learn that the seventh day was known and observed as a day of rest. In 1869 the eminent Assyriologist, George Smith, discovered a religious calendar of the Assyrians in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days, or Sabbaths, are marked as days on which no work should be undertaken.

Other tablets, referring to the Sabbath, have been discovered and translated. On them the day itself has almost the same name as we have received from the Hebrews-it is called *Sabbata*. It is spoken of as a "day of repose of the heart," a "day of joy." Its observance was enforced by law. Regulations as to this observance are laid down. And they are such as these: It was a day "when the shepherd of men must not eat meat; must not change the garments of his body; when white robes are not worn; when sacrifice is not offered; when the king must not go out in a chariot, and must not exercise justice wearing the insignia of his power; when the general must not give any commands for the stationing of his troops." (Lenormant's Beginnings of History, pp. 248 and 249, American Edition.) What precisely all these specifications denote we may never learn; but certainly

they signify that on this *Sabbatu*, certain things were omitted which could be done on other days.

Now this was the Sabbath law under which Abraham grew up, because Ur of the Chaldees was in this same region. A sad degeneracy from the pure monotheism of the fathers already had shown itself, yet he would hear the seventh day spoken of as a "day of rest for the heart." He was accustomed to weekly assemblies for public worship, to hymns of adoration, and to prayer, although much of this was rendered to idols. Also the Sabbath was an institution in the home of the emigrants at Haran; and when Abraham journeyed on to Canaan, the seventh day was still observed as holy. Under this Sabbath influence Isaac grew up, and so he trained his two boys to observe the day. Jacob continued the same in his large family, and when that family went to Egypt they did not leave the Sabbath in Canaan. It was handed on through following generations. For we find this fact in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, that before the children of Israel came to Sinai, when as yet they were in the wilderness between Elim and Sinai, the manna was given to them, and respecting it they were told that they must gather on the sixth day so much as would be needed to last through the morrow, because none would be bestowed on the seventh day. And the reason given was, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." This expression is repeated several times, and finally in these words: "The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." This was no new thing, and when the fourth commandment was formulated the time-honored regulations for the observance of that day were incorporated into it. The people were as familiar with its requirements as they were with those of the other precepts of the decalogue.

And so we conclude that the Sabbath has existed from the beginning. But as the true knowledge of God was displaced by the false, to that degree did the observance of the Sabbath wane, until it finally disappeared in the depths of a degrading idolatry. Yet I believe no Sabbath has come and gone since man was created, but that somewhere precious souls have kept it holy unto the Lord.

### **"Analogy Not Proof" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent article, Prof. R. A. Proctor reviews at some length a so-called argument by Dr. Phillips Brooks, on immortality. Mr. Proctor quotes and answers Dr. Brooks as follows:-

"I have before me a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Brooks, Doctor of Divinity, in Boston, in which he speaks of a man immediately after death. 'That man is dead,' he says; 'what is it that has come? A minute ago I was talking with him; he was speaking to me of the loves and dreams and imaginings with which I have been familiar, as I have known him these forty years. Now that is stopped. Shall I believe that an has come to that vitality? The spiritual life is in the powers of the soul, not in the accident which linked them in association with this body in which



the physical change has taken place. Shall I believe that they have ceased because it has ceased to be their minister?' To which he answers: 'No, because what has passed away is merely the bodily life, not the inner life with its thoughts and emotions.'

"He does not deem it necessary to show that the power of conceiving thoughts or feeling emotions is not as essentially a quality of that which has been destroyed by death, as the power of making fine cloth is a quality of a weaving-machine, and presumably brought to an end by death as the weaving powers of the machine by its destruction. What he says of the man might equally be said, and with about as much reason, of the machine. 'A minute ago that machine was weaving beautiful cloth; now it has done its last work, and all its parts will presently be applied to other uses. Shall I believe that the powers of working charming patterns it possessed so short a time since are gone because its mere material structure is to be destroyed? Never; for only the merest accident linked those powers with the machinery!'

"No answer is needed to one argument any more than to the other. The destroyed machine lives no longer as a piece of mechanism; it can never more produce the delicate textures or the charming patterns which it produced when it existed as a machine. It will live only in its products, direct and indirect. And in like manner, it seems reasonable to believe (though none can say it has been approved) the dead exist no longer as beings capable of feeling or expressing emotions. They live only in their work-in the influences, direct and indirect, which they have produced on those around them during life, or on those who are to come hereafter."

The Professor's reasoning is correct, not because of the analogy which he draws, but because it is in accordance with reason, and most of all, because, whether he knew it or not, it is in accord with divine revelation. The dead, so far as their present condition is concerned, are perished from the earth. The statement, however, by no means indicates a disbelief in immortality, although it is possible that Professor Proctor may not look beyond the grave. But Paul, who says: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (1 Cor. 15:16-18), thus teaching that the dead are so far as present existence and capacity are concerned, the same as though they had not been, also says: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. 15:20-22.

That which may be drawn from Paul's argument, concerning the state of the dead, is, in brief, this: The resurrection of the dead depends upon the resurrection of Christ; if Christ is not raised, then the dead will not be raised; and in that case those who have fallen asleep (died) in Christ, have perished. To perish means, "To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence." Now it is evident that the condition of those who died before Christ first at the end, was not changed in the least by his coming and his death and resurrection. Adam and Abel died and returned to dust

hundreds of years before the first advent; if that coming of Christ had not taken place until the present time, their condition in the grave would not have been altered in the least; and if Christ had never died and rose again, their condition; would remain the same to all eternity that it is now. But Paul says that in that case they would be perished. Therefore it is evident that the dead are not in existence, and that only the promised future resurrection saves them from being forever perished from the face of the earth.

That this does not argue a disbelief in immortality is further shown by Paul's words which follow: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. 15:51-54. We believe in immortality, although we do not believe that men have it by nature so that they cannot die. Immortality will be bestowed, according to the Bible, which is our only source of information, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But the *Interior*, ignoring these plain declarations of the Bible, assume that if men are not conscious in death there can be no immortality, and that he who argues that death is a cessation of existence-in other words, that death is death-denies the possibility of immortality, and proceeds to "prove," by an analogy, that men are conscious in death. It says that the weaving-machine could not have produced the fabric unless there have been some controlling power, a weaver, who was independent of the machine. Then it concludes:-

"Now we are ready to discover whether the analogy makes for, or makes against, the independence of mind for its existence over matter. And as we know to a certainty that mind, which is the prime essential of the weaving machine-without which it would be nothing but formless wood, iron, brass, leather, and fibers of hemp-that the animating and directing mind is not in the least dependent upon the weaving-machine for its existence, so we may know as certainly as we can know from an analogy, that the animating and directing mind is not dependent for its existence upon the human machine. The analogy flatly contradicts Mr. Proctor's theory that the machine produces the mind, and is necessary to its existence."

That is to say, that because the mind that runs the weaving-machine is independent of it, therefore, the mind must be independent of the body. (It must be so, you see, or else the analogy wouldn't work.) And it still further concludes, that since the man loses none of his skill when his machine is destroyed, therefore the mind loses nothing of its force when the body is destroyed. Very pretty analogy, isn't it? But the analogy should have been carried a little further, and it should have been shown that, even though the man retained his skill after his machine is destroyed, he cannot leave without a machine, so the mind, even allowing that it could exist without the body, can accomplish nothing after the body is destroyed. To be sure this analogy does not teach us anything, but from the Scriptures we learn that it is a correct one, and that the mind cannot act

independently of the body, for the psalmist says: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:3, 4.

Analogies prove nothing, yet they are all that can be adduced in favor of the natural immortality theory. We once heard Joseph Cook deliver one of his famous lectures, the point of which was to prove the immortality of the soul. In the beginning of his lecture he told a story of the war ship *Cumberland*. He said that as she went down under the blows of the *Merrimac*, a sailor who was down in the hold saw a glimmer of light through the open hatchway, and swam up through the water toward that point of light, until he reached the surface and escaped. This he compared to the soul leaving its tenement of clay, and soaring heavenward; and this illustration was the only "proof" of the immortality of the soul that was given in the entire lecture! This incident was often referred to, and because the man escaped from the sinking ship, it was taken as a natural consequence that the soul survives the body, and leaves it at death. And the greater part of the man's audience seemed to think that he had "proved" his point! When even the philosophical Joseph Cook is driven to such ridiculous makeshifts for arguments to prove the inherit immortality of the soul, the thoughtful reader can readily see that the theory itself is inherently weak.

The fact is, as before stated, that analogies and illustrations prove nothing, not even the truth. When a truth has been demonstrated, then an illustration is valuable for the purpose of impressing the truth already demonstrated, but it is not the proof. Not only can no illustration prove anything, but no illustration can perfectly illustrate any biblical truth. As Dr. Clarke has expressed it, "No parable can go on all-fours." Then how much more feeble must illustrations be when they are used as proof of error. They serve simply, when closely examined, to make the error more apparent. The trouble is that too many persons wish to believe the pleasing fable that they are by nature immortal, and thus allied to Deity, and therefore an *assertion* to that effect will have more weight with them than scores of plain declarations from the Bible to the contrary. W.

### **"The Relation of the World to God" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

The relation which men sustain to God is the thing that above all others should be understood, and which is understood the least. Not only does the world in general fail to understand the matter, and feel perfectly indifferent over it, but many professed Christians, and even teachers of religion, have very crude ideas upon the subject. This thought was brought to mind very forcibly by a sentence in a sermon by Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., which was published in the *Christian Union*. It was this: "The world is not under law, but under grace." The context showed that this statement was meant to be taken literally, and not to convey the idea that the grace of God is held out to the world. It is a parallel to the teaching which is so common, about "the Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man." We propose, therefore, as briefly as possible, to show just how the world does stand related to God.

In the first place, we will say that God is not the Father of all people who are in the world. God is the Creator of all, the Judge of all, and if sin had not entered into the world, he would be the Father of all; but now the mass of mankind have a far baser parentage. Adam was the son of God. Luke 3:38. While he was sinless, God was at once his Father and his King. But when he listened to the voice of the tempter, and deliberately (for he was not deceived, 1 Tim. 2:14) did the bidding of Satan, he yielded to Satan the principality-the earth-which had been intrusted to him, and forsook his allegiance to God.

It is sin that separates from God. Isa. 59:12. In John 8:44 Jesus said to the wicked Jews who claimed God for their Father, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Again in the explanation of the parable of the wheat and tares, Jesus said, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one." Matt. 13:38. In these two texts sinners are directly charged with being the children of the devil. In Eph. 2:1-3 the apostle Paul makes the same point, and says that he himself was once a member of the same family. He says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience;

695

among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."

"By nature the children of wrath." This fact answers the cavil that people often make against the destruction of the wicked, saying that God will not destroy his own children. No, he will not. The wrath of God comes only on the "children of disobedience" (Eph. 5:6), and all are by nature the children of disobedience, and consequently of wrath, since it is in the nature of man to sin,-to obey Satan rather than God. Said Christ: "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness." Mark 7:21, 22. And Paul says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." 1 Cor. 2:14.

Then since this is the nature of, not one man or a few men, but of all mankind; since "the whole world lieth in wickedness," and the children of disobedience are the children of wrath, how can any escape the wrath of God, which brings destruction? Simply by becoming the children of God, since God will never destroy his children; for "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." Ps. 103:13. In the family of God there is no wrath, for only the peace-makers shall be called the children of God. Matt. 5:9.

But that which proves most conclusively that men are not by nature the children of God, is the fact that they become such by adoption. Says Paul: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba,

Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." Gal. 4:4-7.

Read the same thing in Rom. 8:14-17: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together."

Natural children are heirs without adoption; therefore we say that the fact that all who are the children of God become so only by adoption, shows that there are no natural children of God. And how do men become the children of God? By receiving the Spirit of God, which is also the Spirit of Christ, which makes them like Christ, and consequently heirs with him. This Spirit is given through the mercy of God, to those who exercise faith, as Paul says: "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Titus 3:4-7.

But what has this to do with deciding whether the world is or is not under the law? It has everything to do with it, settling the question completely, and showing that all men are by nature under the law, and that only the sons of God are under grace. Notice carefully: The Spirit of God is the pledge of our adoption as sons of God (Rom. 8:16); it is "the Spirit of adoption;" "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Verse 14. With this read Gal. 5:18: "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." The obvious conclusion from this text and the context is that those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law; and since only those who are led by the Spirit are sons of God, it follows that all who are not children of God are under the law. And since the children of God are few in comparison with the children of the wicked one, it follows that the greater part of the world are under the law.

Now what is meant by "under the law"? Does it mean, as most commonly supposed, subject to the law? in a state of obligation to keep the law? Our investigation concerning the sons of God furnishes the answer. Remember that only those who are not led by the Spirit, who are not children of God, are under the law. Then the children of the wicked one are under the law. Remember also that those who are not led by the Spirit, who are not children of God, are under the law. Then the children of the wicked one are under the law. Remember also that it is only sinners that are the children of Satan; as Paul expresses it, they are "children of *disobedience*." It is because they are disobedient that they are strangers from God, children of the wicked one, under the law. And this is corroborated by the words of the apostle. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

All men are under obligation to keep the commandments of God. "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. But all men are not under the law; those who are led by the Spirit are not under the

law; therefore we conclude that it is simply the disobedient,-those who do not do their duty, in keeping the commandments,-who are under the law. All others are under grace, since it is only by the grace of God that anybody can keep the commandments.

Read also Rom. 6:12-16: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" In this passage we have the fact emphasized that those who are not under the law are the ones over whom sin has no dominion, and that those who are under the law are the servants of sin.

But sin brings condemnation; those only are free from condemnation, who walk according to the Spirit,-are led by the Spirit,-and who consequently are the sons of God. And the condemnation under which the sinner rests is a condemnation to death; "for the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Remember also the idea in verses 14-16, that those who are under the law, servants of sin, are servants "of sin unto death."

Man's relation to God, then, is simply this: By nature all men are sinners,-servants of sin,-children of Satan,-under the law,-condemned to death. By the righteousness of Christ, through faith in the blood, men may be made righteous,-servants of obedience unto righteousness,-children of God,-delivered from the condemnation of the law. Only those who are in Christ attain to this high honor; but this does not free them from obligation to keep the law. This can be seen from the very fact that it is sin that brings condemnation. Now if those who have been freed from condemnation,-have been taken out from under the law,-should transgress the law, they would thereby show their lack of appreciation of the grace of God, and would bring themselves into condemnation,-would bring themselves under the law.

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." Titus 2:11. To all men "the Spirit and the bride say, Come." With every man that enters into the world, the Spirit strives to cause him to renounce the service of Satan, and to become a child of God. But, alas! with the exception of a few who esteem the reproach of Christ, "the whole world lieth in wickedness." Reader will you place yourself on the Lord's side? If so, you must come to Christ, who is the way (Ps. 119:1), the truth (Ps. 119:142), and the life,-the one in whose heart is the law of God,-that you may become changed into the same image, having, like him, the law of God completely formed in your own heart. W.

**"The Lord's Prayer" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

## The Commentary

The Sabbath-school lesson for November 26, being on the Lord's Prayer, we know not what better we can do for the Sabbath-school scholars and the general readers than to reprint the following, which we wrote as a comment on the International lessons, when the Lord's Prayer was the subject:-

Verses 9-13 of Matthew contain the model prayer. In introducing it the Saviour said, "After this manner therefore pray ye." This indicates not that the prayer which follows is to be invariably used, although it is very often fitting to use it, but that it should serve as a model for our petitions. Since it is the model petition, framed by divine wisdom, it must necessarily, and does, cover everything which man needs, both temporal and spiritual. It is because of this comprehensiveness that the Lord's Prayer may be repeated by all of people, both young and old, in all time. It never grows old. It is the only prayer ever written which was worthy of being repeated by others than the one who composed it. This is because it is the only prayer ever composed for man by a divine being. Prayer in which petitions made by men are used, must necessarily be largely mechanical, and therefore destitute of the real essence of prayer, which is the sincere desire of the individual at the present time. When a man is in extremity he will have no difficulty in forming his own petition, and he would have no use for a petition made by someone else. A prayer-book would have been of very little use to Peter when he was sinking in the Sea of Galilee.

From this prayer we learn that we are to come to God not as to a judge or a governor who is to be appeased, but as to a father who is all sympathy and love. Many people have entertained a wrong idea from the parable of the unjust judge, recorded in Luke 18:1-7. The unjust judge at first refused to grant the request of the poor widow, yet he finally granted it because of her importunity. The idea too commonly drawn from this is, that if we persevere in prayer God will relent and answer our petitions; but the parable is not designed to compare God with the unjust judge, but to make a contrast. If the unjust judge who neither feared God nor regarded man, would grant the widow's petition, because of her importunity, then most surely God will avenge his own elect who cry earnestly unto him, this parable and the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are sufficient in themselves to give Christians the most perfect confidence when they pray. Add to this the fact that we have a merciful and faithful High Priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and "was tempted in all points like this we are," and we may "boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

We have seen it stated that the term "Our Father" implies that all men are brethren, because children of the same Father. But this is a mistake. All men are not children of the same father. Paul says that we are all by nature the children of wrath "because we are" the children of disobedience. Eph. 2:2, 3; 5:6. And as the devil is the author of sin, Christ directly charged the disobedient Jews with whom he was talking, with being the children of the devil (John 8:44); and in Matt. 13:38-42 he expressly states that those who do iniquity "are the children of the

wicked one." The apostle John also speaks of those who keep the commandments, and of those who transgress them, and says, "by this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (1 John 3:10), thus showing a direct contrast between those who have God for their Father, and those whose father is Satan. Moreover, we learn in Rom. 8:14-17 and Gal. 4:4-7 that people become the children of God by adoption, and that the mark or seal of adoption is the Holy Spirit; but if they were by nature the children of God, they would not need to be adopted. Paul also declares that "if any man have not the Spirit Christ, he is none of his."

"Thy kingdom come." This is nothing less than a prayer for Christ's second coming, for his coming and kingdom are associated together. 2 Tim. 4:1. When he was on earth, Christ told his disciples, who thought that his kingdom should immediately appear, that he was like a noble man who "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return" (Luke 19:11, 12), thus indicating his return to Heaven to receive his kingdom, and his second coming to gather the subjects of it. In harmony with this we find in Dan. 7:13, 14 a prophetic description of Christ appearing before the Father, and receiving "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And Christ himself said that when he should come in his glory with all his holy angels with him, then would be the time that he should sit on the throne of his glory, and that he would then say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:31-34. This kingdom is entirely distinct from the kingdom of grace, upon the throne of which God the Father sits, and before which Christ ministers as priest. *That* kingdom has already come, and if that were the kingdom referred to in the Lord's Prayer, it would be out of place to use that petition. But the kingdom referred to there is the one of which the faithful followers of God are at present only heirs, waiting for the promised possession.

"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." The will of God is simply the law of God, see Ps. 40:8 and Rom. 2:17-20, where we learn that those who know the will of God are they who are instructed out of the law. How the will of God is done in Heaven is told in Ps. 103:20: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harken unto the voice of his word." When the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven will be when all the works of the devil had been destroyed, and when the new heavens and the new earth have been given, wherein righteousness shall dwell. Then will be fulfilled the words of the prophet: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." Isa. 60:21. Therefore the uttering of this part of the Lord's Prayer, if the petitioner is sincere, indicates a complete submission to the will of God, and an earnest desire to keep every portion of the ten commandments.

"And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." In this is implied what is plainly stated in Matt. 6:14, 15: "For if ye men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if he forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Therefore it is utterly useless for anyone to use this prayer, or to expect God to pardon his sins, unless he freely forgives all



who have trespassed against him. Paul says (Eph. 4: 32), "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake have forgiven you."

This is the merest glance at the Lord's Prayer, but it is all that we have space for. To give it any adequate study, not less than an entire lesson should be spent upon each clause of the prayer. But perhaps even with this glance some may see a depth of meaning in the prayer which they have never before realized, and may be led to study it more carefully until they can pray it "with the spirit and with the understanding." W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

For two or three years it has been the custom of our people to hold a week of prayer near the close of the year. This year it has been appointed for December 17-25. We think that for many reasons this date is preferable to holiday week; but it is probable that the brethren in Europe, Africa, New Zealand, and Australia will find it convenient to hold it between Christmas and New Year's. A large committee appointed by the General Conference is working diligently to prepare a programme, which it is designed shall reach the most distant fields in ample time.

Here is the suggested item which we clip from a pastor's report to his church paper:-

"On Tuesday, August 16, the ladies of the church gave a jubilee social. The lecture-room was crowded, refreshments were abundant, and the spirit of Christian love and fellowship seemed to animate every heart."

Is it not becoming too common to suppose that the good feeling produced by pleasant company and "abundant refreshments," is the manifestation of "the spirit of Christian love and fellowship"? Even in acts of devotion, religion is getting to be very much a matter of feeling, and many people suppose that when they feel well and happy they are Christians. This is the outgrowth of the teaching that "religion was designed to make people happy." Happiness, in the common acceptance of the term,-that of freedom from care and anxiety, or pain,-may never be the lot of the true Christian; but he will have peace and joy even under the most untoward circumstances. The time for perfect happiness and fullness of joy to the Christian, is when he stands in the presence of God. "In the world," said Christ, "ye shall have tribulation."

The German Empire wastes no time in talking about arbitration, and evidently does not believe in it. In fact, we do not think that there is any nation that believes in it, but there are some that talk it, seemingly as a blind to cover their war preparations. But Germany makes no secret of her war preparations. Only last spring a new magazine rifle was perfected, and the whole German army has been supplied with the new weapon, and has just learned how to use it; and now it must be abandoned, because it is found to be inferior to the rifles in use by the armies of France, Russia, Austria, England, and Holland. The report says:-

"The chief fault of the German repeater is its too great caliber of eleven millimeters, as against eight in French and most other models. Germany could not accept a small caliber at first, because it is only recently she has succeeded in producing powder of six times the strength of the older description, and in inventing a steel coating for bullets which will prevent the present rapid leadening of the barrel. The chief advantage of the new powder, in connection with the new small caliber bullets, is its superior penetrating effect. The bullets will pierce three horses, one behind the other. They will penetrate steel plates of thirty millimeters in thickness. Whereas the present rifle pierces only five millimeters of steel plate. The German military administration therefore consider it absolutely necessary to introduce improved weapons as soon as possible.

"The expense will be enormous, as the existing rifles cannot be adapted, as was the case with the magazine rifles. Not only new frames, but also new barrels, will have to be made. The Government hopes to have a rifle superior to the new French one, especially as the caliber will probably be a little less than eight millimeters."

Think of a nation being burdened with so great an expense; and just as likely as not, when the new rifle has been distributed, it will be found that the French or the Russians have one still better, so that it in turn will have to be thrown away to make room for another. but the burden upon the people is not taken into account. The nations are in a mad race for supremacy, and each is fearful of being left behind. How long can such a state of affairs last?

We believe that all good citizens will agree that nothing but the simple ends of justice have been met, by the execution of the murderous Chicago anarchists. It has been attempted to make it appear that the sentence and execution are a blow against the right of free speech, and a good deal of misplaced sympathy has resulted; but the fact is that they were executed for murder and conspiracy to murder, and not for what they said. Many other people have uttered as treasonable and blood-thirsty sentiments as did these men, and have not been executed, because they did nothing more. It is a terrible thing for a man to be hanged, even by the decree of a court, but it is also a terrible thing for a man to be murdered, without a moment for preparation; and the Bible plainly declares for capital punishment, by saying, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Concerning the widespread sympathy that was manifested in behalf of these convicted men, and that is always expressed to a greater or lesser extent when in the red-handed murderer is condemned to death, we shall have a few words to say next week. It is a notable sign of the times.

### **"The General Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

The twenty-sixth annual session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists assembled in the church on the corner of Brush and Twelfth Streets, Oakland, Cal., at 9 A.M., November 13. The president, Elder Geo. I. Butler, called the meeting to order, and Elder O. A. Olsen led in prayer.

That our readers may understand the spread of the work of the Third Angel's Message, we give the following list of delegates and the fields which they represent:-

### **LIST OF DELEGATES**

CALIFORNIA-E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, N. C. McClure, C. H. Jones, J. N. Loughborough, M. J. Church.

COLORADO-J. D. Pegg.

DAKOTA-A. D. Olsen.

IOWA-J. H. Morrison, L. McCoy, L. T. Nicola.

ILLINOIS-R. M. Kilgore.

INDIANA-J. W. Covert, J. P. Henderson.

KANSAS-S. S. Shrock, Oscar Hill, A. G. Miller, J. W. Bagby.

KENTUCKY-J. H. Cook.

MICHIGAN-A. R. Henry, U. Smith, W. C. Sisley, E. S. Griggs, C. Eldridge, D. H. Lamson, H. W. Miller. Wm. Ostrander, J. Fargo, F. E. Belden, J. H. Kellogg.

MINNESOTA-G. C. Tenney, H. P. Holser.

MAINE-J. B. Goodrich.

MISSOURI-D. T. Jones.

NEW ENGLAND-A. T. Robinson.

NEW YORK-M. H. Brown.

NEBRASKA-A. J. Cudney, J. P. Gardiner.

NORTH PACIFIC-J. Fulton, J. E. Graham.

OHIO-R. A. Underwood, D. E. Lindsey, Wm. Chinnock, J. F. Robbins.

PENNSYLVANIA-L. C. Chadwick, J. W. Raymond.

TEXAS-Henry Hayen.

TENNESSEE-J. M. Rees.

UPPER COLUMBIA-H. W. Decker.

WISCONSIN-A. J. Breek, P. H. Cady.

The following persons having labored in mission fields, or having been under the employ of the General Conference during the whole or part of the past year, were received as delegates:-

SCANDINAVIA-O. A. Olsen.

CENTRAL EUROPE-W. C. White.

AUSTRALIA-J. O. Corliss.

FLORIDA-Samuel Fulton.

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS-A. LaRue.

PACIFIC ISLANDS-J. I. Tay.

BROOKLYN MISSION-J. F. Hansen.

Elder E. W. Farnsworth was received as a delegate at large, and Elder H. Shultz to represent the German work in America.

The meeting was occupied in organizing, and in listening to an interesting address by the president, concerning the progress of the work, and outlining the matters to be considered at this session. In the afternoon some very interesting questions were presented, but no final action was reached.

Next week we shall give our readers all the points of interest in the proceedings of the Conference.

**"Words of Faith and Soberness" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the last regular monthly meeting of the Clerical Association (Episcopal) of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, which was held in Oakland last week, the Rev. Mr. Lee read an exhaustive paper on "Church Entertainments," which concluded as follows:-

"Doubtless the world and the church would be better off if many an edifice, which has God's name upon it, had never been built, and if many a man who, though speaking in Christ's name, but at the same time living on spurious charity, were forced to work and earn, by the sweat of his brow, what it is a scandal and a shame for him to make use of.

"What is required, it certainly seems to me, is not more comfort or more money, to make religion powerful, but a better use of the means we already have—a more earnest and uncompromising opposition to any union of the followers of Jesus Christ with the servants of sin, and the thoughtless pleasure-seeker. Of course the church must in one way come into contact with the world, for it otherwise could not carry out its mission; but let it beware how it accepts or employs worldly methods to extend its influence, or to strengthen its existing institutions. Every dollar which it obtains by any enterprise which is unquestionable, must, in the nature of things, tend to its weakness and humiliation. Every surrender to the demands of a mercantile age, and of a careless, pleasure-loving people, will add intensity to the rebuke. 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth.' Rev. 3:15, 16.

"In view of the prevalence of the practice here in question, and of the frequent occurrence of 'church entertainments' in this diocese, and especially in view of the fact that several have been recently held, and that others are in prospect, it may seem foolish and Quixotic to oppose what has evidently the voice of the majority in its favor; but let us not hesitate, or fear, to look such questions fairly in the face. We should not ask, What is fashionable or common? but, What is right and best for Christian people to do? We should not ask, How can money be more easily collected? but, How would God have us to about the work which he has given us to do? Let us endeavor to view it in this way, and may the merciful Saviour give us grace, so to act as to avoid the open scandal of making his house a 'place of merchandise,' or, worse than that, 'a den of thieves.'"

We commend this to the careful perusal of all who try to carry on church work by any other means than by pure Christian benevolence. In view of the "paper carnival" that has just been held by the members of a church of his own denomination, we think Mr. Lee's paper is very timely. Let no one hereafter accuse us of a lack of charity, when we denounce church fairs, lotteries, carnivals, etc., for by the testimony of one who ought to know, they make the

church a "den of thieves." No more severe arraignment could be brought against them.

## November 24, 1887

### "General Conference Proceedings" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The General Conference has now (Thursday evening, November 17) been five days in session, and the interest has been steadily increasing. There have been six meetings of the conference, one of the International Sabbath-school Association, one of the Health and Temperance Association, one of the Health Reform Institute Association, and one of the Educational Society. An outline of the work transacted and the measures proposed is here given. After the organization of the Conference, the Norway Conference made a request through Elder O. A. Olsen to be received into the General Conference. There are four churches in Norway, containing 205 members in all, with 40 Sabbath-keepers who are not yet connected with any church. Elder Olson gave an interesting account of the work in Norway.

On recommendation of Elder Underwood, the West Virginia Conference, with five churches and upwards of 150 members, was received into the Conference.

The President then made an extended address, outlining the progress of the work during the past year, and suggesting matters for action at this session of the Conference. He stated that the paper in the Dutch language was started in February, in accordance with the vote taken at the last session of the Conference, and has met with remarkable success, having already upwards of 2,000 paying subscribers. Calls for reading matter are coming in from the Dutch in various parts of the world.

Following the address, the President named the standing committees as follows:-

Nominations-J. Fargo, J. B. Goodrich, J. Fulton.

Resolutions-U. Smith, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen.

Auditing-A. R. Henry, D. T. Jones, H. W. Decker, J. P. Morrison, H. W. Miller, J. W. Raymond.

Credentials and Licenses-R. A. Underwood, R. M. Kilgore, S. H. Lane.

Religious Services-J. N. Loughborough, L. McCoy, William Ostrander.

On motion of Elder Underwood, it was voted that a committee of nine be appointed to consider the week of prayer and holiday gifts, the President to be chairman of the committee. The committee was named as follows: G. I. Butler, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood, C. H. Jones, W. C. Sisley, J. H. Cook, J. O. Corliss, A. J. Cudney.

It was voted that a committee of five be appointed by the chair, to act with the members of the General Conference Committee, as a committee on distribution of labor. The following persons were appointed: G. C. Tenney, E. S. Griggs, J. M. Rees, A. D. Olsen, Samuel Fulton.

Meeting then adjourned to the call of the chair.

At 2:30 P.M. the Conference assembled at the call of the chair. Prayer by Elder R. M. Kilgore.

The minutes of the preceding meeting were read, and after some minor corrections, were accepted.

The President then named the following persons as members of a committee to consider the training of canvassers and Bible-workers: G. I. Butler, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood, A. T. Robinson, Clement Eldridge, F. E. Belden, H. W. Miller, H. P. Holser.

On behalf of the California delegation, Elder A. T. Jones introduced to the Conference the following preamble and resolution, which was passed by the California Conference at its late session:-

WHEREAS, We believe that the third Angel's message must go to every *nation, kindred, tongue, and people*; and,

WHEREAS, The Islands of the Pacific, as well as other parts, demand attention from our people; and,

WHEREAS, It is difficult to reach them at all by present means of transportation, therefore,

*Resolved*, That the brethren of this Conference favor the purchase of a missionary ship adapted to the wants of the work among these islands, and that we request the General Conference to take the matter under consideration in its coming session.

He then read the following resolution, and moved that it be referred to a committee of five, who should consider it and make recommendation to the Conference:-

*An Act to Provide for the More Efficient Transportation of Missionaries to the Islands of the Pacific Ocean-*

WHEREAS, The professed faith of Seventh-day Adventists requires them to carry the message of truth for this generation to all *kindreds, tongues, and people*; and as the islands of the Pacific Ocean are people with many thousands who have never heard the tidings of this soon-coming King; and there are no regular means of transportation whereby missionaries may be sent to these islands; and,

WHEREAS, It is thought by many that the time has fully come in the history of this work when these Islanders should receive that consideration which shall result in an organized effort to carry them the truth for these days; and believing that our people everywhere stand ready to give substantial assistance to every legitimate project for the spread of truth; therefore,

1. It is recommended by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists assembled, that a vessel of suitable size and construction for missionary purposes be purchased, or built, and equipped for missionary work among the islands of the Pacific Ocean.

2. That the cost of building and equipping said vessel for a two years' cruise shall not exceed the sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000).

3. That such a vessel be made ready for service early in the year 1888.

4. That the duly elected officers of this body for the coming year constitute a committee who shall be empowered to put in execution the provisions of this bill,

and also to appoint other persons, as their judgment may dictate, to act with them in carrying out the project.

The motion was carried, and C. H. Jones suggested that as Elder Corliss had given the matter considerable thought, and was well acquainted with the situation, he be asked to address the meeting at length upon the subject. This suggestion was favorably received, and Brother Corliss was requested to occupy the time, when Brother C. Eldridge stated that it is an important matter, and one in which all the people are interested, and suggested that he be asked to speak on it Monday evening, provided it would not interfere with the plans of the Committee on Religious Exercises. This suggestion was carried out, and on Monday evening Elder Corliss spoke to a large congregation, concerning the Pacific islands as a missionary field.

## SECOND DAY

At 9 o'clock A.M. the first meeting of the tenth annual session of the International Sabbath-school Association was held, President C. H. Jones in the chair. The president gave the following interesting statistics of the work of the association:-

The first session of this association was held in Battle Creek, Mich., October 11, 1878, Elder S. N. Haskell being president. The number of schools at that time was 177. The number of schools June 30, 1887, was 977, being a gain of 800 schools in less than nine years. The Sabbath-school contributions for 1878 were \$25; the contributions for the year ending June 30, 1887, were \$13,440.61. The number of schools that reported for the quarter ending June 30, 1887, was 915, having 61 unreported. The total membership of the schools reported was 25,294, and the average attendance for the quarter was 17,978, a little over 71 percent of the membership. The number of *Instructors* taken by the schools reported is 11,330.

The amount of contributions received during the quarter ending September 30, 1886, was \$2,222.22; the amount for the quarter ending December 31, 1886, was \$2,830.61; for the quarter ending March 31, 1887, it was \$3,710.55; and for the quarter ending June 30, 1887, it was \$4,577.25. Thus there has been a steady increase in this respect. The total contributions for the year ending June 30, 1887, were \$13,440.61. The total amount donated to the African Mission for the first six months of the present year was \$4,708.16. This does not include the large donations taken up at the camp-meetings.

The following standing committees were appointed by the chair:-

Nominations-R. A. Underwood, M. H. Brown, A. T. Jones.

Resolutions-E. J. Waggoner, G. C. Tenney, H. P. Holser.

Lessons-W. C. White, E. W. Farnsworth, A. T. Robinson.

Auditing-A. R. Henry, W. C. Sisley, C. Eldridge.

Reports from the various fields were then called for. Elder W. C. White spoke for Central Europe, J. O. Corliss for Australia, S. H. Lane for England, G. C. Tenney for Minnesota, L. C. Chadwick for Pennsylvania, A. T. Robinson for New England, M. H. Brown for New York, A. J. Culney for Nebraska, W. C. Sisley for

Michigan, A. J. Breed for Wisconsin, R. A. Underwood for Ohio, J. B. Goodrich for Maine, J. D. Pegg for Colorado, H. W. Decker for Upper Columbia; and all gave encouraging reports of the work of the Sabbath-schools in these places.

The third meeting of the General Conference was held at 3 o'clock. Additional delegates were received from Indiana, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, and California. The following report of the Committee on the Week of Prayer was the presented by J. O. Corliss, the secretary of the committee:-

Your committee recommend that this Conference indorse the action of its Executive Committee in appointing a week of prayer to be held December 17-25, and offer the following suggestions:-

*First*, That an address be sent to the officers of the churches, Sabbath-schools, and Missionary Societies, setting forth the importance of the week of prayer, and urging them to work for a large attendance at the meeting appointed on fast-day, when they will also have plans to unfold before the brethren, that will secure the co-operation of all the members, so that the following meetings of the week may be a success, and that the Christmas offerings may be liberal. In order to accomplish this, we recommend that the address mentioned shall urge that a special meeting of the officers of the church, Sabbath-school, and Missionary Society be held on Sabbath, December 10, in which they may pray together and consult as to the best method of procedure.

*Second*, We also recommend that a circular letter be published in the *Advent Review*, and be read in the churches on December 10, setting forth the objects and importance of the week of prayer.

*Third*, We further recommend that articles on the following subjects be prepared to be read in the churches during the week of prayer:-

1. Reading for fast-day, Sabbath, December 17, setting forth the importance of devoting the week of prayer to the special work of seeking God.

2. Sunday, December 18. The steps by which we place ourselves in a condition where God can accept us.

3. Monday, December 19. The blessing of God brought to us through faith. the value of such an experience.

4. Tuesday, December 20. The object of God's blessing and how it can be retained.

5. Wednesday, December 21. Missionary work in the home, church, and neighborhood-Mrs. E. G. White.

6. Thursday, December 22. Foreign Mission work, Great Britain, Scandinavia-Elders Olsen and Lane.

7. Friday, December 23. Foreign Mission work, Central Europe, Russia, etc.-Elder W. C. White,

8. Sabbath, December 24. The obligation, privilege, and blessing of giving, and also setting forth the branches of the work most in need.

*Fourth*, We still further recommend that the delegates of this Conference do all in their power to enlist the interest, and secure the co-operation, of the ministers, in their several fields of labor, to help forward this work.

Moved by S. H. Lane to adopt the resolution by considering each item separately. Carried.



### THIRD DAY

At 9 o'clock A.M. a meeting of the American Health and Temperance Association was held, the president, Dr. J. H. Kellogg, in the chair. Reports were called for from various parts of the field. Elder

711

S. H. Lane reported for England, and gave a most interesting account of the temperance cause there. He said that in order to break down the influences of the public houses, the temperance people have started vegetarian restaurants, which had sprung at once into popular favor. In these lemonade is the strongest drink that can be had, and no meat at all. The *Good Health* has been placed in these restaurants, and has met with the greatest favor. Health literature has been sold in large quantities, and the influence of our health publications is most favorable in opening the way for the reception of the other parts of present truth.

Elder O. A. Olsen reported the same influence being exerted by the health literature in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. There are seventeen colporteurs in Sweden, who are so successful as to be able to support themselves on the commission which they receive from the sale of health publications alone, and the commissions are not so large as in America. One young man, not of our faith, read the Swedish health journal and liked it so well that he subscribed for 400 copies to circulate among the public schools in that country.

Sister E. G. White, who had just arrived from St. Helena, then spoke for a few minutes on the importance of improving every opportunity to set ourselves before the people as a temperance people. The temperance work must go with the Bible doctrine. As our first parents lost Eden through indulgence of appetites, a way has been opened by the sacrifice of Christ whereby we may gain it by denial of appetite.

Our people do not take the extensive view of this work that they ought to. She then drew a parallel between Paul's time and ours. He would labor for a long time, drawing arguments from the types and shadows, showing an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, and would thus gain the favor of the people. Then he would teach them that this Christ prefigured by the types had already come. So we should begin to work with the people from a standpoint where we can gain the favor of the people. How shall we leaven the world, unless we have something with which to lift them up? We must labor unselfishly for humanity.

Conference assembled at 3 o'clock. Reports from foreign fields were called for. Elder W. C. White spoke for Central Europe, and said that the workers were all of good courage, and the work prospering. Germany is really a more promising field than England.

Elder O. A. Olsen spoke for the Scandinavian work. The Denmark Conference has 9 churches with 230 members. The Swedish Conference has 10 churches and 288 members, besides 97 Sabbath-keepers who are not joined to any organization, making 365 in all in that country.

Elder Matteson held a four months' mission school in Stockholm, Sweden, and although the material upon which he had to work was most unpromising,

some of the young people being ignorant to the very extreme, the result was excellent. They soon began to take subscribers for health journals, besides selling books. In nine months they took 2,335 subscribers for the Danish-Norwegian health journal, and received \$3,500 on subscriptions and book sales. There are some difficulties but none which cannot be overcome by the grace of God.

Elder Lane said that there had never been a time when he was discouraged over the work in England. In one city he began meetings, speaking to eight people, but the congregation soon increased so much that another place had to be secured. There are four churches in England, and their donations and tithes have reached \$625. Ere long a church will be organized in London. A room for a book depository has been secured in Paternoster Row, and the foundation is being laid for an extensive work in that city.

Elder Corliss spoke of the work in Australia. There are now 3 churches there and 150 members. The church at Melbourne numbers 90, and the one at Ballarat about 50. There is a church in Adelaide, and a few Sabbath-keepers in Sydney, and some in other places. Between 300 hundred and 400 people have embraced the truth in Australia, but some have given it up. It is impossible for a man to get work after he begins to keep the Sabbath, and so some of them, after holding on for a while, give up.

It costs very much to carry on tent work there. Lumber comes from California and Oregon, and lumber suitable for seating costs \$100 per thousand. To avoid the expense, chairs were bought. It cost \$200 to seat a fifty-foot tent, but the advantage is that chairs can be shipped at moderate cost.

W. C. White, A. R. Henry, and C. H. Jones were appointed a Committee on Year Book.

W. C. White then requested to be released from the Committee on Resolutions. His request was granted, and the President appointed E. J. Waggoner in his stead.

#### **FOURTH DAY**

At 9 A. M. the annual meeting of the Sanitarium Association was held. Dr. Kellogg gave an interesting sketch of the growth of the institution, from its organization in 1866 until the present. The net profits last year were \$40,000, and this year nearly as much. The net worth of the institution is now over \$200,000, and the amount of charity work done is more than twice as much as the amount of the original capital.

Sister White followed with remarks touching the necessity of broader plans for a judicious charity work. She also spoke of the Rural Health Retreat, as did also Elder Loughborough. There is now represented in the Health Retreat an investment of \$60,000.

Conference assembled at 3 o'clock. Elder S. Fulton spoke of the work in Florida. The cities and towns are largely inhabited by Northern people. Some people from New York City who were visiting in Florida attended the meetings and began keeping the Sabbath. One of the ladies told him that she never would

have attended the meetings if the tent had been pitched in New York City, and would never have heard and accepted the truth if it had had to find her in that city.

The president stated that Brother C. W. Olds, of Wisconsin, who went south to canvas, had sold \$1,500 worth of books in Birmingham and vicinity, in Alabama.

The Committee on Resolutions presented the following:-

WHEREAS, There has been during the past year steady and tangible progress in all departments of our work, notwithstanding increased obstacles thrown in its way, and more active opposition than heretofore, on the part of those who desire to hinder its progress; therefore,

1. Resolved, that we recognize in this prosperity and evident token of God's willingness to respond to the prayers and efforts of his people, and a prophecy that his counsel will guide and his hand defend and sustain this his work in the future; and,

WHEREAS, The increasing demands of our publications have rendered it necessary that both the Central and Pacific Publishing Associations should increase their facilities by enlarging the offices of publication at Battle Creek and Oakland, to nearly double their former capacity,

2. Resolved, That we commend the prompt action of the managers of both these associations in making their provision to meet the demand for our books and periodicals; and we regard this great increase in the circulation of our literature as a cheering evidence that this message is soon to arrest the attention of this generation.

3. Resolved, That we hail with pleasure the addition to our other periodicals, of a paper in the Holland language, and we are peculiarly grateful to God for the success which has so far attended its publication, and for the marked progress of his work among the people.

WHEREAS, the great religio-political crisis, in which will be involved last conflict between truth and error, is even now overshadowing our land; and,

WHEREAS, In these troublous times the Lord by the prophet (Dan. 12:1) Has assured protection to those only whose names are written in the book of life, and whose robes are washed and made White in the blood of the lamb; and,

WHEREAS, the success of the cause of truth depends not upon human efforts, but solely upon the power of God, which power can be secured only by bringing ourselves into such harmony with his will that we may become partakers of the divine nature, therefore,

4. Resolved, that we will, by the help of God, strive as never before to heed the injunction of the Scriptures, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," and so separate ourselves from all sin and impurity of heart and life, that the divine counsel may guide, and the divine power attend, all our efforts.

WHEREAS, The General Conference Association is a legally incorporated organization, capable of holding property and transacting business in any part of the world, and is therefore the proper body to look after the financial interest of our missions and other pioneer enterprises; and,

WHEREAS, This association, in order to do the important work it is designated to accomplish, and must have funds; therefore,

5. *Resolved*, That we recommend to those who have means to donate for the general advancement of the cause, or money which they can loan temporarily without interest, to deposit such means with this association, rather than with any institution which is more local in its operations.

*Whereas*, The opening of missions in foreign lands involves much expense, and is attended with many difficulties, therefore,

6. *Resolved*, That we hail with much gratitude the progress of the work in the different countries of Europe, as seen in the organization of four Conferences, the establishment of three offices of publication, and a large interest that has been awakened all over Europe.

7. *Resolved*, That we approve of the efforts made in England, Central Europe and Scandinavia, in holding mission schools for the purpose of educating canvassers and colporteurs; and we hereby express our gratitude at the success of the canvassing work in those countries as a potent means of bringing the truth before the masses.

8. *Resolved*, That we approve of the removal of the office of publication in England from Great Grimsby to London, and the opening of a depot for our publications in Paternoster Row; and we bid the mission workers there Godspeed in their efforts to establish the cause on a firm basis in the very heart of the English-speaking world.

9. *Resolved*, That a standing committee of five be appointed by the Chairman, to confer with other committees which should be appointed in the various Conferences, in reference to the defense of those who may suffer persecution under repressive Sunday laws, and also to direct in efforts that may be needed in various States to oppose the passage of such Sunday laws.

These resolutions were all carefully considered, and with the exception of resolutions four and nine, were adopted. The two resolutions excepted were referred to a special committee of nine, who should consider the whole subject broached by them, and should frame a resolution defining our relation to the work of National Reform and the Sunday laws. The committee were also to plan for a daily class for instruction in National Reform principles and how to oppose them. U. Smith, A. T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, L. McCoy, D. T. Jones, J. M. Rees, J. N. Loughborough, E. W. Farnsworth, and A. R. Henry were named as said committee.

Later items of interest will be found on the last page.

### **"Dreary Times" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Jewish Times* (San Francisco) will apply to any city:-  
xxx

"The community is treated to a series of scandals, rotten enough for ancient Babylon and Rome. The growth of vice in a young city, not yet forty years of age, is a strong argument against a pious belief that we are better than our fathers,

and that the millennium is nearer than it has been. The catalogue of sins that infest the city of San Francisco is so appalling that one turns with disgust from the daily accounts in the newspapers. Whether the publication of these accounts will tend to diminish crime is an open question. It will surely, if nothing else, pervert the morals of the innocent, for it is unwholesome food, and excites a morbid appetite for literature that is none the less obscene because it is a presumably truthful account of the happenings in society. We live in dreary times. The churches of San Francisco are to-day mute witnesses of the fact that religion has to battle harder than ever, and our schools are on the witness stand to prove that knowledge has not barred the progress of vice. It is enough to cause hypochondria. Will humanity ever remain the same? Will Satan ever retain the upper hand?"

Yes, vice is rampant, and on the increase; but Satan will not always triumph. Evil will soon be rooted out, and the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. Isa. 11:9. It will not be, however, by the increase of education, or by the conversion of the world, but by the coming of Christ in his kingdom, who shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall slay the wicked. It will be by the destruction of Satan and all his works-the burning up, root and branch, of all that do wickedly-and the renovation of the earth, so that in it righteousness may dwell. Until that time "wicked men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;" but when that time comes there will be such a revolution as the universe has never yet be held. Happy will it then be for those who resist the tide of evil that is carrying so many willing victims to ruin. Yes, these are drear times, but better times are coming for those to whom these times are indeed dreary.

### **"The Ministers Aroused" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The religious papers of New York are very much agitated over the matter of Sunday observance. About three weeks ago a large meeting of leading clergymen of New York and vicinity was held to consider the propriety of taking concerted action against the opening of the liquor saloons on Sunday. The Rev. Dr. John Hall was chairman of the meeting, and at his suggestion a committee was appointed to draw up resolutions expressing the sense of the meeting. They recommended that all the pastors be urgently requested to present to their people their duty regarding the maintenance and the enforcement of the laws regarding the sale of liquors on Sunday; that a public meeting be called for the purpose of calling attention to the advantages to be derived by the whole community from the preservation of Sunday as a day of periodic rest; that the position of every candidate for election to the Senate or Assembly be definitely ascertained, and that they take steps to secure the defeat of any candidate who declines to pledge himself to defend Sunday laws; and that a committee be appointed to secure the dissemination of English and German reading matter upon the subject. All the denominations were represented on the committee that was called for in the last resolution, and it was stated that an effort would be

made to get either Archbishop Corrigan or Mgr. Preston to represent the Roman Catholic Church in the committee.

The above facts are abridged from a report in the *New York Observer*, under the heading, "The Ministers Aroused." The concluding paragraph of the article is as follows:-

"Several of the ministers present made brief remarks, Dr. Hall suggesting that there should be special preaching on the matter in all the churches on the following Sunday. The tone of the meeting was one of intense earnestness. It is evident that the action of the liquor men in endeavoring to secure a repeal of the Sabbath laws has awakened a sentiment among the Christian people of the State that will make itself felt at the coming election."

If anything more were needed to show that the Sunday movement is simply a movement in favor of an establishment of religion, we find it in an expression in the *Christian Union's* account of the same meeting. It says of the effort to have saloons open on Sunday: "The clergy can halt this movement for the destruction of the most sacred and imminent symbol of their holy religion, if they will."

This is a fair sample of all the movements to make Sunday laws. They take the guise of shutting up the saloons, and then those who do not believe in enforced Sunday observance, and do not join the movement, are denounced as enemies of temperance. We say emphatically that there is not the shadow of temperance principle in the effort to close saloons on Sunday. It is simply an entering wedge by the clergy to preserve "the most sacred and eminent symbol of their holy religion." It is an effort to secure by civil law that which "their holy religion" has not vitality enough to do. Now we are staunch friends of temperance; we are foes to the saloons, and would gladly and enthusiastically unite in any movement to close them altogether, seven days a week. But no lover of religious liberty can join a pseudo-temperance movement, whose sole object is to force a religious custom (an unwarranted one at that) upon the people, leaving the saloons as much power as before.

While we place ourselves on record as uncompromisingly opposed to saloons, we wish to emphasize the statement that the Sunday movements are in the interest of the liquor traffic rather than against it. For (1) if there is power among the clergy to close the saloons one day in the week, there is power to close them every day in the week; and the fact that, having that power, they do not use it, shows that they are not really concerned over the ravages of the liquor traffic, provided it does not encroach upon the symbol of "*their* [not God's] holy religion;" and (2) the formal action of the clergy in taking steps to close the saloons only on Sunday, when they have the power to close them every day, gives the saloons standing in society; it is a sort of indorsement by the highest profession of the saloons for the last six days of the week.

Let it not be forgotten that in this effort to secure the preservation of "the most sacred and imminent symbol of their holy religion," the clergy are anxious to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church. They need not fear, for the Sunday institution is the most imminent, and indeed the only real symbol of the power of the Catholic Church, and she will guard her own. How complacently

she must look upon the Protestants who are making themselves her willing servants. W.

### **"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

In 1 John 4:1-3 we find the following inspired warning and declaration:-

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

Again to 2 John 7 we find a similar statement: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. This is a deceiver and an antichrist."

"Antichrist" means "opposed to Christ." The great antichrist, therefore, is Satan himself, for he is the instigator and abettor of everything that has ever come up in opposition to God and Christ. In Rev. 12:7-9 we find the following description of the first opposition to the Son of God, and its result:-

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." Rev. 12:7-9.

Michael is the archangel (Jude 9), that is, the chief or prince of the angels; and the archangel is Christ, for it is the voice of the archangel that will be heard at the last great day, when the dead shall be raised (1 Thess. 4:16); and Christ declared (John 5:26-29) that his own voice would be the one that should penetrate the graves, and called forth the dead. Therefore this war in heaven was between Christ and his angels on one side, and Satan and his angels on the other side. It was the beginning of the great controversy which has been going on till the present time. When Christ was on earth he again met the devil in person, and again vanquished him; but still the warfare is kept up; Satan still opposes Christ by seeking to blind the minds of men so that the light of the glorious gospel of Christ may not shine unto them (2 Cor. 4:3, 4); and the contest will cease only with the utter destruction of Satan and all his works.

The apostle, however, in the text first quoted, does not speak of antichrist himself, but of the "spirit of antichrist;" that is, not of Satan in person, but of the doctrines which he disseminates in order to blind the minds of them that believe not. This spirit of antichrist is declared to be a denial that Jesus is come in the flesh. It is commonly supposed that this refers to Roman Catholicism. This is probably because in 2 Thess. 2:3, the Papacy is spoken of as the one, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worship." There is no question but that Roman Catholicism is antichrist; but we propose to demonstrate that what is known as modern Spiritualism is essentially the spirit of

antichrist, being the direct mouth-piece of Satan himself, and that Roman Catholicism and other forms of error, whether of greater or lesser degree, are only outgrowths of the principle which is the very heart of Spiritualism.

Our first business is to inquire what it is to deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. Of course the most direct method of denying that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is to deny the entire narrative contained in the gospels, to say that the whole thing is a fabrication, and that there never was such a person as Jesus Christ. But there are comparatively few in enlightened lands who deny that such a person as Jesus Christ ever lived on this earth. Many who will admit that such a person lived, and that he was a very good man, possibly the best man that ever lived, will still deny his divinity; they will not admit that he was *the Son of God*. Such persons do most emphatically deny that Jesus Christ is come the flesh, and are therefore deceived by the spirit of antichrist. But there is still another way in which the spirit of antichrist may be manifested, and that is by denying some essential part of the work of Christ, while still professing, to believe on him. Representatives of this class are brought to view in Matt. 7:21-23. This working of the spirit of antichrist is the most insidious of all, and is that which will wreck the greater part of those who will be lost. Let us examine it.

In the first chapter of John we have undoubted reference to Christ, under the title of "the Word." "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In the fourteenth verses we read of him: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." Grace means favor. Therefore the statement is that the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of favor. That is the same as saying that Christ came in the flesh as an exhibition of the favor of God to man. And in harmony with this are the words of Paul, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. 1:13); he was "full of grace;" and so the apostle declares that the grace of God brings salvation. Titus 2:11. Now go back again to the statement that when Christ was made flesh and dwelt among us, he was full of favor. This favor was the favor of God, for his fullness was the fullness of God (Col. 1:19; 2:9), and God was manifest in him, reconciling the world to himself. Now we read in Ps. 30:5 that "in his favor is life." Therefore we conclude that Jesus Christ was made flesh and dwelt among us full of favor, in order to give life to men doomed to death; and this conclusion is strengthened by the statement, "In him was life; and the life was the light of man." John 1:4.

The following texts show plainly that Christ's sole object in coming to this earth was to give life to those who otherwise would not have had it: John 3:16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The obvious conclusion is that if he had not come, all men would have perished, and that although he has come, and none will have life except those who believe in him. And this conclusion is stated in so many words, in John 3:36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth



not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

1 John 5:10-12: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

John 10:9, 10: "I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

These texts abundantly prove that to give life was the sole object of the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. Therefore we say that to deny that he alone gives life,-to claim that without Christ man may have life-even under the most distressing conditions-is virtually to deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and is consequently the spirit of antichrist. For to deny the essential part of Christ's work,-to deny the very thing and the only thing for which he was manifested in the flesh, full of grace and truth,-is the same as denying that he ever was manifest in the flesh at all. If men may have life without Christ, then his words, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life," they might have responded, "We don't need to, for we can have life, without coming to you." And this they did say in effect.

The spirit of antichrist which is in the world is, therefore, when traced to its very simplest form, merely a denial that man is dependent upon Christ for life; it is the claim that all men will have life, whether they believe in Christ or not. This spirit is pre-eminently exemplified in modern Spiritualism. The fundamental principle of Spiritualism, and, indeed, the whole sum and substance of it, is the doctrine of the natural immortality of man. We will let Spiritualists define it in their own words. N. F. Ravlin, formerly a Baptist minister, and now one of the leading Spiritualist lecturers in California says:-

"The very central truth of Spiritualism is the power and possibility of spirit return, under certain conditions, to communicate with those in the material form."

Mrs. E. L. Watson, a noted "inspirational" lecturer, in an address in San Francisco, in the *Golden Gate* of February 6, 1886, said:-

"Spiritualism *per se* is a science; it is the demonstration of certain facts relative to the nature of man; it explains the psychical phenomena which have transpired in the past, and the mysteries which have surrounded us as spiritual beings. It demonstrates the fact of man's continued existence after death, and enlightens us in regard to the manner of that existence."

The standing motto of the *Spiritual Magazine*, for many years the leading Spiritualist publication in England, was this:-

"Spiritualism is based on the cardinal fact of spirit communion and influx; it is the effort to discover all truth relating to man's spiritual nature, capacities, relations, duties, welfare, and destiny, and its application to a regenerative life. It recognizes *a continuous divine inspiration* in man. It aims, through a careful, reverent study of facts, at a knowledge of the laws and principles which govern the occult forces of the universe; of the relations of spirit to matter, and of man to

God and the spiritual world. It is thus catholic and progressive, leading to true religion as at one with the highest philosophy."

In an article entitled, "Spiritualism and Religion," in the *Golden Gate* of July 9, 1887, John Weatherlee said:-

"The central idea of modern Spiritualism is the key-stone of the religious arch. That is, a continued existence."

But the central idea of Spiritualism is diametrically opposed to the Bible, for that declares that there is no such thing as continued existence for man unless he is one of the righteous ones who shall be alive when the Lord comes, and who will be translated.

The patriarch Job said: "But man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 14:10-12. And he adds: "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Verse 21.

The psalmist says: "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. 6:5. Again: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither in the that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17. Again, still more positively: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to the earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:3, 4.

Solomon wrote: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun."

No matter how poor or how ignorant a man may be, he is infinitely richer and knows infinitely more than a dead man. The man who has barely conscience enough to know that he is going to die, and who knows not another thing, knows far more than a dead man; for the dead know not anything,-their thoughts have perished.

The dead are represented as dwelling in the dust, asleep. Thus Isa. 26:19: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." And Dan. 12:2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

All the Scripture declarations, and many more of like import-for the Bible teaches nothing different on this point-are contradicted by Spiritualism, which declares that man has a continued existence, and that there is no death. But this contradiction of the plain declaration of the Bible shows Spiritualism to be inspired by the spirit of antichrist; for the prophets spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter 1:21), and the Spirit of Christ was in them dictating all that they wrote. 1 Peter 1:10, 11. W.

## **"The Sunday and the Saloon" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The action of the "Personal Liberty League" of New York and Pennsylvania in demanding open saloons on Sunday from 2 P.M. till midnight, has given to the Sunday cause such an impetus as it probably has not had since the days of Constantine; and the reason of it is that the impetus is wholly political. The religious papers with one voice advocate decided and positive political action, and so do many of the secular papers. Principles have no place. All consideration of principle is given to the winds, and everything is rallied to the political protection of Sunday. This demand of the liquor interests does not seem at all to have enlarged the genuine prohibition sentiments of the public; it is only Sunday prohibition that is demanded. The following from the New York *Observer* is a sample of the general discussion of the subject:-

"It may be thought by some that the personal liberty movement will not materially affect the business portion of our communities, or, in other words, that it will not touch the pockets of our reputable business men, and therefore can hardly be expected to interest them as much as if that were the case. Of course this is a very important point,-the pocket,-and a very tender one. But the movement. . . Sabbath, a saloon day, may affect that particular spot quite seriously. If the Legislature should pass a law opening the grog-shops on Sunday it may be followed by a considerable exodus from the State of respectable, law-abiding, Sabbath-loving people. In this city, for example, which lies within easy distance of two other States, the question of choosing a suburban residence might be determined for many by this Sunday-saloon business."

Oh, yes! the saloon, with all its abominable evils, can run day and night six days in the week, and the "respectable, law-abiding, Sabbath-loving people" can stand it all without a murmur, and can choose their suburban or other residences without any special thoughts of an exodus. But, oh! oh! oh! the Sunday saloon is an awful evil. At the mere suggestion of the *Sunday* saloon, there is danger of an exodus of these exemplary people. So the evil is not in the saloon itself, it is only in the *Sunday* saloon. We verily believe that if the Sunday elements throughout the country would with one consent agree and faithfully stand to the agreement to shut all the saloons during the whole of Sunday, they could go on unquestioned during the other days and nights of the week, and there would not be enough prohibition element in the nation to cause a ripple on the surface of public affairs. The force that can abolish the Sunday saloon can abolish the saloon altogether. Then why is it not done?

The truth is that it is not the prohibited liquor traffic, but the *enforced Sunday*, that they want.

## **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

When we talk against sympathizing with a criminal, some people will accuse us of a lack of charity. Such persons do not know the meaning either of sympathy

or charity. We pity a criminal condemned to death; we may pity him because of his fate, and because of his lawless disposition. But we may not sympathize with him, for that implies a fellow-feeling; it indicates that we are at heart partakers of his crimes. Any feeling which leads one to try to save a criminal from just punishment, does not arise from charity. Such a feeling argues disregard for the law, but charity rejoices not in iniquity, but exalts law.

It is customary for the Methodist ministers of San Francisco to meet together every Monday morning, to compare notes, discuss questions of varying degrees of importance, etc. From the report of the last one held we extract the following:-

"Rev. Dr. Wythe, of Oakland, then read a very interesting paper to prove that the brain is not, as is generally supposed, the special seat of the mind. He maintained that the mind is an independent organization which may operate at any part of the body, and preside at any given time where its action is required. There are, he said, three grades of organization-physical, psychical, and spiritual. The first is the lowest, embracing the sensuous, then the psychical, embracing all mathematical and purely intellectual forms, while the highest grade is the spiritual, embracing all religious conceptions and moral ideas, and being in fact itself the basis of morality. The practical effect of this view, Dr. Wythe remarked, would be to do away with materialism by showing that the mind can act independently of the brain."

We would like to know the arguments by which these remarkable propositions were "maintained." How did the Doctor find out that the brain is not the seat of the mind? If the brain does not do the thinking, what does? Is thought itself an entity? and if so, of what is it made? Is it gathered from the air? These are a few of the many questions we would like to ask. And one more: If it is all as Dr. Wythe says, will he tell us what the brain is good for anyway?-his own, for instance.

The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation. Rom. 1:16. Salvation has reference to sin, for Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (1 Tim. 1:15), and that is why he was called Jesus, which means Saviour. Matt. 1:21. If there were not for sin there would be no need of the gospel; therefore wherever and whenever God authorizes the preaching of the gospel, it must be that there is sin. What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. What law? The law which says, "thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. And what law is that? The ten commandments, which God spoke with his own voice from mount Sinai, and wrote onto tables of stone. See Ex. 20:3-17; Deut. 10:4. Then since the gospel is preached only where there is sin, and sin is the transgression of the ten commandments, it must be that wherever and whenever the gospel is preached, the ten commandments must be in existence as the rule of life. And how extensively and how long is the gospel to be preached? "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness under all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14. What is the "end" here spoken of? The end of the world. See Matt. 24:3. Then just so surely as the Bible is the word of God, the ten commandments must be of binding obligation at least until the coming of Christ, and the end of the world. Whoever denies this, denies the gospel. Let anyone gainsay this reasoning and conclusion who can.

Last week we promised that we would speak further concerning the Chicago anarchists, and the sympathy that was shown them. It is well known by all who have given the daily papers even a cursory examination, that sympathy almost without stint was lavished upon the anarchists while they were under sentence of death. Now many people see in this nothing alarming, but we say that it indicates a moral condition that will eventually be disastrous to this country. Now many people see in this nothing alarming, but we say that it indicates a moral condition that will eventually be disastrous to this country. These men were red-handed murderers; they had caused the death of seven men, and the severe injury of many more. It was not their fault that they did not kill hundreds for the bombs were thrown into a crowd. These men, who were actually guilty of killing seven men, and constructively guilty of killing hundreds received attention from thousands, while their victims and their families were passed by with scarcely a thought. Why? Because there is a widespread sympathy with lawlessness. Let the most commonplace man commit a heinous offense, and straightway he becomes a hero; and the worse his offense, the more attention he will receive.

It is claimed that this country is in no danger whatever from anarchists. The newspapers are congratulating themselves and the people that anarchy is now stamped out of this country. Not by any means. Anarchy is simply a lack of law; the spirit of anarchy is the spirit of lawlessness; sympathy with lawlessness is sympathy with anarchy; and sympathy for a lawless person in his lawless acts is sympathy with lawlessness. We say that the widespread sympathy that was aroused for those men who were willing to slay hundreds in order to overturn law and order, shows that in "free America" there is a disregard for the sacredness of the law, and that is the spirit of anarchy.

A good many people imagine that they love law and order, when they do not. It is a fact that many, indeed the great majority of men, are perfectly indifferent as to whether or not the laws are enforced, so long as they themselves do not suffer by their violation. Laws are enforced in this country principally from selfish motives, and not from a love of justice. There is not an abhorrence of evil because it is evil. Men will make an outcry against a crime which involves their interests, and will excuse the same if they are in no way concerned. This is evidence that the law is not considered sacred and it is a necessary consequence of the teaching that the law of God does not now have any claims upon men. When men have become accustomed to seeing God's law trampled underfoot with impunity, it is the most natural thing in the world that they should esteem human laws lightly. The greater portion of the inhabitants of the earth, including many professed Christians, are anarchists so far as the law of God is concerned, and if they are not open anarchists in relation to human laws, it is not through any virtue of their own. There is no nation on earth that is to-day more in danger from the assaults of anarchists than the United States.

The spirit of anarchy is just what the students of prophecy would expect to see rife at the present day, and the fact that it is so prevalent as shown by the sympathy for crime and criminals, even among what are called the "best classes," is an evidence that we are in the last days. Hear the words of the apostle Paul: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For

men shall be lovers of their own selves." There you have a clear sign of the last days. The ground both of the Decalogue,-the one which. . .

### **"Laborers for the Harvest-field" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the seventh meeting of the Conference session the Committee on the Distribution of Labor made a partial report, of which the following are the chief items: It was recommended that Elder S. H. Lane take charge of the work in Georgia and Florida, and that those two States be organized into a Conference as soon as consistent; that Elder O. C. Godsmark, of Indiana, go with Elder Lane to the South; that Elder J. P. Henderson, of Indiana, go to Arkansas to labor; that Elder Victory Thompson make Indiana his field of labor; that Elder G. G. Rupert, who has been laboring in South America, go to Michigan; that Elder G. C. Tenney, of Minnesota, after spending a few months at the office of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, proceed to Australia, to work upon the *Bible Echo*; that Elder A. D. Olsen take the presidency of the Minnesota Conference, and W. B. White of the Dakota Conference; that Elder E. H. Gates go to Colorado and take the presidency of that Conference, and that C. P. Haskell, of Colorado, take the place on the Ohio Conference Committee made vacant by Elder Gates; that J. M. Erickson make Sweden his field of labor; and that H. R. Johnson take the oversight of the Scandinavian work in Iowa and South Dakota. All these recommendations were adopted.

The officers of both the General Conference and the International Sabbath-school Association have been elected for the ensuing year, and are as follows-  
Conference officers: President, Elder Geo. I. Butler; Secretary, Elder U. Smith, Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Chapman; Treasurer, A. R. Henry; Committee: Elders Geo. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, O. A. Olsen, W. C. White, R. A. Underwood, U. Smith, R. M. Kilgore. The General Conference constitution was so amended as to provide for three more secretaries: One for Foreign Missions, one for Home Missions, and one for the educational work. These have not yet been elected.

The officers of the International Sabbath-school Association, as elected, are: President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, W. C. White; Secretary, Winnie Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, W. C. White, E. W. Farnsworth, E. J. Waggoner, F. E. Belden, Winnie Loughborough, and R. S. Owen of California. A motion to so amend the constitution as to provide for a corresponding secretary has been referred to a committee.

From the publishers of the *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich., we have received a copy of the well-known book, "Thoughts on Daniel," in the Dutch language. It is unnecessary for us to say anything concerning the contents of this book, for it has been before our readers for a long time; but we can recommend the style of the book in the (to us) unknown tongue. There are a great many Hollanders in different portions of this country who would gladly read this book if it were presented to them; and while there is no doubt but that a canvasser would succeed better if he could talk with them in their own tongue, yet experience has

shown that a canvasser who speaks only English may have good success in canvassing among the Dutch. We confidently expect that this work will have the circulation both in this country and in Holland, which its merits demand. Order from *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich., or from Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. Price, \$1.50.

**December 1, 1887**

**"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The next point to be considered is what is actually involved in this claim that all men are by nature immortal. We state as a proposition, that the claim that man are by nature immortal actually implies nothing less than that they are equal with God, and independent of him. This proposition we shall now approved.

1. Immortality belongs to God alone. Paul speaks of "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." 1 Tim. 6:15, 16. Christ, as the only begotten Son of God, shares this attribute with the Father: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26. Angels are immortal, but only because God has given them immortality; men may obtain immortality, but only as the gift of God, bestowed on them through Christ, only, however, to those who seek it by patient continuance in well-doing. Rom. 6:23; 2:7. Now for a man to claim one of the attributes of God, is virtually to claim all of them. Especially is this true if the attribute claimed be immortality; for the possession of life involves everything else. To claim immortality is to claim the very highest attribute of a Deity. God's most sacred name is Jehovah,-the One who is,-and when he would give Moses the highest possible credentials, he said, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." Ex. 3:14. So for a man to claim immortality as his own by right is to claim for himself equality with God, or at least to claim that he is a part of God.

2. The great, and, indeed, the only reason why we should serve the Lord with all our heart, and with all our power, is because he has created us, and we live only by his favor. Said the holy angels in Heaven, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things." Rev. 4:11. And Paul, in proving to the Athenians that God alone should be worshiped, used only the argument that "he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things," and that "in him we live, and move, and have our being." Acts 17:25, 28. Now if it were true that we are immortal, and that our life, either present or future, is not dependent on the special favor of God, but that we shall continue to exist for ever, no matter what our character or condition, then it would be true that we would owe no allegiance to God nor to anyone else but ourselves. The claim that man is by nature immortal is virtually a claim that he is independent of God. So again we see that for man to claim immortality for themselves is to make themselves gods, or, at least, a part of God.

3. If man were immortal, like God, then, as stated above, he would be independent of God, owing no allegiance to anybody but himself; and in that case he would, necessarily, be his own law-giver and his own judge. Each man would determine for himself what his course of action would be, and *right* would be for each individual whatever his nature should prompt him to do. These conclusions are self-evident, and prove the main proposition, that the claim of natural immortality for man is a virtually a claim that men are gods, having all the attributes that the Bible ascribes to the one only true God. And this again shows that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is inspired by the spirit of antichrist, for Christ is God. John 1:1. Whatever dishonors either the Father or the Son dishonors the other.

Having thus briefly but positively shown that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is of the very essence of the spirit of antichrist, we shall proceed to show (1) that modern Spiritualism, the foundation-stone of which is continued existence for man, does most positively deny both God and Christ; (2) that all teaching having natural immortality as its basis has ever been opposed to God; and (3) that the teaching that man is by nature immortal always leads directly and surely to immortality,-that it is indeed because of all the wickedness that has ever disgraced this earth. We quote first the statements of leading Spiritualist writers.

The editor of the *Golden Gate*, which is probably the ablest and most respectable Spiritualist journal in the United States, in his issue of November 27, 1886, said:-

"As Spiritualists repudiate the horrible doctrine of election, as taught by certain branches of the churches; as they believe in no Satanic personality, and have no use for an eternal hell in an orthodox sense, they would naturally be regarded by those who still adhere to those old traditions as outside the pale of redemption,-as indeed they are, vicariously, but not in reality; for they realize that if they ever attained happiness in this life or the next it must be through their own efforts, in response to the aspirations of their own souls.

"When a man learns that the only Satan in the universe is his own ignorance and the evil propensities and appetites engendered thereof; and when he learns that in all of God's great plan of creation there is no one but himself to answer for his own inequities, it would seem, if he stops to think, that he would 'seek the better way,' and cease to do evil."

In this passage the editor makes reference to "God's great plan of creation," yet he claims for man absolute independence of God, making man and not God the judge of right and wrong. Again, in the *Golden Gate* of July 2, 1887, we find the following editorial statement:-

"The spirits also teach us that there is no atonement or remission of sin except through growth; that as we sow, so also must we reap. They have not found God, and never will, except as they find him in their own souls."

Still more direct is a statement made by a correspondent of the *Golden Gate*, in the issue of September 10, 1887:-



"When the truth was made known to me that 'God is life, love, truth, intelligence, substance, omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient, and there is no evil,' I became glorified in myself as a part of that God."

*Light in the West*, a spiritualist paper published in St. Louis, Mo., contained the following, August 14, 1886:-

"Man is a part of God, a spark thrown off from the Great Spirit."

W. J. Colville is considered one of the greatest of Spiritualist lecturers. He lectures wholly by "inspiration," and is held in as high esteem by Spiritualists as Christ is by Christians. In a lecture delivered in Oakland, Cal., June 19, 1886, he used the following language in answer to the question, "Where and what is Heaven, and where and what is hell?"

"The mind of man is the original creator both of that heaven and that hell which your own individual mind or spirit may realize; and no matter what your theological premises may be, the creed you espouse or the doctrines you favor, you cannot obliterate human conscience; and so long as you cannot obliterate human conscience, you will know hell until you are *reconciled with conscience*, and as soon as you are reconciled with conscience you will know heaven. There can be no heaven unless there be a perfect reconciliation between the impulses of man's highest soul and his outward life; there can be no heaven until your individual life is *guided by the divine within* you, that ever points out to you the road which is the perfect way."-*Golden Gate*, September 3, 1887.

In a lecture delivered by the "inspirational lecturer," J. J. Morse, at the Spiritualist camp-meeting held in Oakland, June, 1887, the following statement was made:-

"Truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul."

Now take the gist of all these statements, and we find it to be that man himself is God, and that every man is a law unto himself. Recall the statement of the *Spiritual Magazine*, that Spiritualism "recognizes a continuous divine inspiration in man;" the utterance of the editor of the *Golden Gate*, that man cannot find God except as they find him in their own souls; and that of Mr. Colville, that a man is in Heaven only when he is "reconciled with conscience," and "guided by the divine within;" and the last one quoted, namely, that "Truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul," and what must we conclude? Simply that Spiritualism teaches that man must follow the impulses of his own nature, and that, wherever they may lead him, he is answerable for his actions to no one but himself. To show that this conclusion is warranted, we make a few more quotations. In a Spiritualist paper called *Lucifer*, published at Valley Falls, Kansas, in an article entitled "Marriage and Free Love" (July 15, 1887), we find the following:-

"I acknowledge the presence of a power which we call Nature, and whatever Nature approves I encourage, and whatever Nature punishes I tried to avoid, such rewards and punishments being measured by the increase or decrease of personal happiness. It matters little to me whether moralists or reformers approve or condemn free love or marriage; the only question before me is to find out if Nature rewards one more than the other."

Hon. J. B. Hall, in a lecture reported in the *Banner of Light* of the February 6, 1864, says:-

"I believe that man is amenable to no law not written upon his own nature, no matter by whom it is given. . . . By his own nature must he be tried-by his own acts he must stand or fall. True, man must give an account to God for all his deeds; but how? Solely by giving the account to his own nature-to himself."

Now in order to know the consequences that will result from holding that man is the sole judge of his own actions, and that a man's natural inclinations are but the voice of God, and are to be followed, we have only to ascertain what is the nature of man. Christ, who "knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man" (John 2:24, 25), spoke as follows concerning what men are by nature:-

"For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." Mark 7:21-23.

Solomon says of the heart, that "out of it are the issues of life." Prov. 4:2. Therefore when Jesus mentioned "all these evil things," and said that they proceed "from within, out of the heart of man," he meant that man naturally exhibit just such traits in their lives. The apostle Paul bore witness to the same thing when he wrote:-

"There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. 3:10-18.

This is the uniform testimony of the Scripture concerning all men, for Paul simply quoted what had been written by other inspired men. One more quotation will suffice to complete the picture of the natural tendencies of mankind. The man who is unrenewed by the Spirit of God is said to be "in the flesh;" and the "works of the flesh" are thus enumerated:-

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Gal. 5:19-21.

This is a picture of the natural impulses of the human heart. It is a description of what will be done by all who, unrestrained, follow the leadings of their own nature. And this is not spoken of one man or of any particular set of man, but of mankind universally. The king on the throne, the beggar

in the hovel, the learned scientist, and the ignorant peasant, the pious Doctor of Divinity, and the blasphemous ruffian, all have one common human nature. The natural impulses of the heart are essentially the same. A godly ancestry will often

give one less of evil to contend with than another, but this does not disprove the general statements; it is simply one of the restraints that God has provided, only the restraint operates before the individual is born, instead of after.

It is true that all who believe that they are their own judges do not exhibit in their lives all the vices above enumerated; but it is only because there are certain restraints imposed upon them. But let them be in a country where the authority of God was wholly disregarded, and where all believed in the following their own impulses, and they would prove the truth of the words of the Bible.

Now let us trace our argument backwards: 1. The tendency of the human heart is evil, and only evil. 2. Spiritualism teaches that each man is to follow the leadings of his own nature, and is to be the sole judge of his own actions. 3. This teaching of Spiritualism is a legitimate and necessary consequence of its teaching that there is "a continuous divine inspiration in man," and that man himself is God, or a part of God. 4. And the idea that man is a part of God, necessarily goes hand in hand with the idea that he is possessed of an immortal, indestructible nature. So we say that the natural tendency of the teaching that man is by nature immortal is toward unrestrained vice. When Spiritualists teach that all the god that men will find is in their own natures, they directly deify vice and crime. But Spiritualism is simply the doctrine that men have a continued existence without any break at what is called death. Therefore we repeat that the doctrine that man is by nature immortal, tends directly to immortality, and to that alone. If many who believe in that doctrine do love truth and right, and do live moral and upright lives, it is only because they have not yet followed that doctrine to its legitimate, ultimate results. God grant that such may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil before it is too late. W.

### **"Items from the General Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The last edition of last week's report was the election of the officers of the Conference for next year, which took place Sunday, November 20, the seventh day of the meeting. The next day the constitution of the Conference was amended so as to allow the election of a home missionary secretary, a foreign missionary secretary, and an educational secretary. These officers have not been elected at present writing. Their duties will be to have a general oversight of the work in their respective branches.

A very interesting meeting of the International Sabbath-school Association was held on Sunday afternoon. At this meeting the following-named persons were elected officers of the association for the coming year: President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, W. C. White; Secretary and Treasurer, Winnie E. Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, W. C. White, E. J. Waggoner, F. E. Belden, E. W. Farnsworth, Winnie Loughborough, R. S. Owen. At a subsequent meeting, the constitution was changed so as to make unnecessary the election of a Publishing Committee, and to allow of the election of a corresponding secretary. Mrs. Jesse F. Waggoner gave an interesting talk upon the subject of "Teachers and Teaching," the following synopsis of which may be

as interesting and profitable to the readers of the SIGNS as the talk was to those who listened:-

"A teacher," she said, "is one who causes another to know something that he did not know before. A Sabbath-school teacher is one who causes another to know the way to Heaven; and the successful teacher will also cause others to walk in that way. But in order to do that, the teacher must himself be walking in the way to Heaven." She suggested that some might be discouraged because of their imperfections, but said that we need not be discouraged. She said that while crossing the Sierras recently, she had noticed flumes for conducting water for mining and irrigating purposes. In many places these flumes were so imperfect that they leaked badly, and she wondered how any of the water ever reached the destination, but concluded that it was because it flowed so swiftly over the bad places. The application was this; though imperfect, if we receive the waters of divine truth fresh from the Fountain-head, and are constantly conveying them to others so that the stream does not become stagnant, we may by the blessing of God accomplish much good notwithstanding our imperfections. We must be constantly receiving supplies from the Fountain-head. We sometimes notice the hills when they are all dead and dry and there is scarcely a green spot to be seen anywhere, and again we see lawns that are constantly green; the former have not received a supply of moisture; the latter have water every day. Just so if we teachers would be green and fresh we must be watered by divine grace daily.

Perhaps the most interesting facts presented were those upon the model teacher. The successful artist studies his model, so the successful teacher must study Christ, for he is the model Teacher. He was in love with his work, and so the successful Sabbath-school teacher must be in love with his work. Christ studied his scholars and knew all about them, and so we must study our scholars and learn all we can of their disposition and surroundings. All must not be treated alike. What would be good for one would spoil another, and if we would be successful we must adapt ourselves to each child and use illustrations which each will understand.

Christ always had something important to say. The way for us to have something important to say is to read, *study*, think, and PRAY. Anciently the sacrifice had to be prepared before God would accept it, and so we must be prepared if we would have divine help and sustenance.

Christ always gained the attention of his scholars; we, too, must follow our Model in this. To do this, we must be prompt, quiet, and reverent. The teacher should get close to his scholars, and make them feel that he is not afraid of them.

Christ was careful to make himself understood. Just so the successful teacher must make himself understood. The teacher should crack the nuts at home, and bring only the kernels to Sabbath-school. Do not use big words, and do not use any words that the children do not understand. Sometimes very simple words have to be explained to children; for instance, a child who has always lived in the city may not know anything about wells, springs, and woods, while the country child knows nothing about those things that are familiar to those in the city. It was also suggested that care be exercised in asking questions. Questions should be plain and definite, and yet not leading. For instance, the question, "What was

David?" would admit of a dozen correct answers, and yet no one of them be the one that the teacher had in mind and wishes to draw out, while the question, "Was David a good man or a bad man?" admits of but one answer, and yet requires the child to exercise some thought.

Christ made use of all helps in his reach. He used illustrations and gave object lessons. The world is full of objects that may be used as illustrations. In every lesson have a point, stick to your point, and make your point.

The following import resolutions were passed by the association at this and a subsequent meeting:

WHEREAS, The existence of many of our small churches depends largely upon the interest created by the Sabbath-schools; and,

WHEREAS, Experience have shown that where earnest personal labor has been devoted to the schools, by some judicious, practical Sabbath-school worker, the interest has greatly increased; therefore,

*Resolved*, That this association request each State Conference to employ some one of the officers of the Sabbath-school Association within its bounds, to devote the greater part or the whole of his time to building up the interests of the Sabbath-schools.

WHEREAS, There has been a difference of custom in the different State associations, in the matter of tithing their contributions, some tithing the whole, and others tithing only one-fourth, and it is desirable that there should be uniformity in this matter; therefore,

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this association that, beginning January, 1888, every Sabbath-school should pay a tithe of all its contributions to the treasury of the State association with which it is connected, and that after paying the necessary running expenses of the school, it should donate the remainder to whatever mission may be recommended. But this resolution shall not be construed as shutting off the members of any school from paying a part or the whole of the running expenses of their school out of their own pockets, leaving all the contributions, less the tithe, to be donated to missions.

*Resolved*, That we recommend that all the Sabbath-schools in the association make the London City Mission the recipient of their contributions for the year 1888.

*Resolved*, That we recommend to our Executive Committee such a reconstruction of the system of primary lessons as will naturally lead the young mind to a knowledge of God, to our need of a Saviour, and to the compassionate love of God as manifested in the life and mission of Jesus Christ. This to be followed by lessons upon those portions of the Old Testament history which illustrate these all-important themes.

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this association that when ministers being tent-meetings in any locality, they should at once, whenever it is practical, begin a Sunday-school, which shall be continued until it can be converted into a Sabbath-school, and that a short series of lessons on the life of Christ should be prepared for use in such Sunday-school.

*Resolved*, That we recommend that our State associations hold Sabbath-school Normals in connection with general meetings and camp-meetings,

especially local camp-meetings, for the instruction of officers and teachers in the various branches of the Sabbath-school work; and further,

*Resolved*, That we request our Conference officers to provide opportunity, and to aid in procuring the necessary help, for such conventions.

WHEREAS, In the providence of God we have in the past year seen a good work opened in South Africa, our workers have enjoyed the divine blessing and favor, and souls are already rejoicing in the truth, and a good prospect seems open for labor there; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we express our sincere gratitude to God, under whose blessing and guidance all true success is attained.

*Resolved*, That it is a satisfaction to us, as an association, that we have been permitted to be in a measure instrumental in forwarding this work during the past year, and that we would hereby assure the dear brethren in that far-off land of our continued prayers and interest.

W. C. White, chairman of the Committee on Lessons, then submitted the following report, which was accepted:-

Your committee appointed to consider plans for future lessons recommend for the Senior Division of our schools-

1. That we have a series of lessons on Old Testament history, and that about six months, beginning with January, 1888, be devoted to the study of lessons from Genesis.

2. That the remainder of 1888 be devoted to the study of doctrinal lessons, including the following subjects: "The United States in Prophecy," and "The Third Angel's Message."

3. That the first six months of 1889 be devoted to a continuation of the study of Old Testament history.

4. That the last six months of 1889 be devoted to the study of doctrinal subjects, selected by the Executive Committee. We also recommend-

5. That the lessons for 1888 be written immediately, and, after approval by the Executive Committee, that they be published in two pamphlets, of twenty-six lessons each, for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers.

6. That the lessons for 1888 be written in time to be presented for examination at the next annual meeting of this association.

7. That there be published a series of fifty-two lessons, on the leading doctrines of the Bible, for the use of those newly come to the faith.

8. That a series of lessons for little children be prepared on the life of Christ.

9. That the Executive Committee employ the best talent within their reach for the preparation of these lessons, at as early a date as possible.

On Monday afternoon, November 21, the second meeting of the International Tract and Missionary Society was held. The principal item of interest at

728

this meeting was the election of officers for the ensuing year. Following is the list of officers with their addresses:-

President, Elder S. N. Haskell, Paternoster Chambers, 48 Paternoster Row, London, England.

Vice-President, W. C. White, Pacific Press, Oakland, California.

Secretary and Treasurer, Maria L. Huntley, Healdsburg, California.

Assistant Secretaries:-

Anna L. Ingels, Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.

Mrs. F. H. Sisley, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Jenny Thayer, 451 Holloway Road, Holloway, London N., England.

H. P. Holser, *Impremerie Polyglotte*, Basel, Switzerland.

Josie I. Baker, *Bible Echo* Office, Melbourne, Australia.

Elizabeth Hare, Auckland, New Zealand.

Mary Heilesen, Christiania, Norway.

Mrs. C. I. Boyd, Cape Town, South Africa.

A. Swedberg, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Executive Board:-

S. N. Haskell, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, A. J. Breed, G. C. Tenney, W. C. Sisley, M. L. Huntley.

On Tuesday, November 22, there were two meetings of the General Conference, at which the following recommendations of the Committee on Distribution of Labor were adopted:-

That we recognize the good services of Brother A. La Rue in the ship missionary work on the Pacific Ocean and its islands, and recommend that he continue the same.

That Brother H. P. Holser go to Central Europe to act as Treasurer of the mission and publishing house, and to take charge of the book sales department and the counting-room; to teach canvassers, colporters, and Bible workers; and to help the German work in the field as he may have opportunity. Also to act on the mission board as alternate in the absence of Elder R. L. Whitney.

That Brother A. Barry, of Kentucky, go to Michigan to labor in that Conference.

That D. A. Robinson go to London to labor in that mission.

That Elder I. J. Hankins go to South Africa, to take the place in the mission there made vacant by the removal of Elder D. A. Robinson.

That William Arnold go to England to help in establishing the mission there.

That Elder John Fulton and wife be requested to spend a year at the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, Cal.

That Elder Samuel Fulton take the place in the North Pacific Conference made vacant by the removal of John Fulton to St. Helena.

That Elder D. T. Bourdeau go to New Orleans and spend the winter in labor in that city.

The committee to whom the matter of a missionary ship was referred, have reported as follows:-

Your committee appointed to consider the matter of securing a ship for missionary work among the islands of the sea, would respectfully submit the following:-

We believe that such a ship is needed; we deem the enterprise a noble one, and well worthy the hearty support of all our people; but in view of the fact that some of our missions are now in actual distress, for the means which they *must have* to do the work properly which must be done;

In view of the fact that the International Sabbath-school Association has devoted its contributions for 1888 to the London Mission, and we think it would be most profitable to our people to have all concerned in the missionary ship when it is decided upon,

We therefore recommend that the enterprise of setting afloat a missionary ship be postponed till the next annual session of the General Conference.

We would further recommend that a committee of five, consisting of three brethren from east of the Rocky Mountains, and two from the Pacific Coast, be appointed to take charge of this matter during the year 1888, and report to the next annual session of this Conference. And further, that donations to this enterprise may be received during the year, from any who feel disposed to make such donations.

Following are the principal resolutions passed in the meeting of the Health Reform Association:-

*Resolved*, That we see reason for devout gratitude to God that the efforts made in our various Conferences the past year to awaken a deeper interest in the cause of health and temperance, have met with such marked success, the tangible evidence of which is apparent in the greatly increased number of subscribers to *Good Health*, and the sale of so many thousands of health and temperance publications.

*Resolved*, That we hail with delight the news which comes to us through our representatives from Scandinavia, that the Danish-Norwegian and Swedish health journals are so rapidly increasing their lists of subscribers through the efforts of canvassers, and that by this means our workers are gaining access to so many homes and hearts in those countries.

*Resolved*, That we consider the cause of health reform as one the world over, and that we extend the hand of sympathy and good cheer to the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, California, in which is inculcated the same principles as in the Sanitarium at Battle Creek, Michigan, and that we are greatly pleased to learn of the progress which the former institution has made since its opening in the spring of 1885.

WHEREAS, The Health Retreat, though desirous to do all it can in giving charity treatment to the sick and worthy poor among us, cannot, while in its comparative infancy, do as is proposed by the parent Sanitarium, erect a charity hospital; therefore,

*Resolved*, That in the sense of this body, it should be aided in its humanitarian work by raising a charity fund to be used for the benefit of the afflicted poor who shall be properly recommended to the care of the institution, such fund to be called for in contributions from those inclined to give for so worthy an object.

WHEREAS, The two journals, *Good Health* and *Pacific Health Journal*, have each their mission to fill, and their appropriate sphere in which to work, the former being like an advanced reader and the latter a primer of simplified lessons; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we deem it expedient that the circulation of both these journals be encouraged as a means of arousing investigation of, and stimulating perseverance in, the cause of health reform.



At a meeting of the International Tract Society, the following resolutions of approval of our papers were passed:-

WHEREAS, The SIGNS OF THE TIMES is our pioneer missionary journal, and finds favor with the people, while it conveys to them the principles of the Third Angel's Message; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we recommend to State Tract and Missionary Societies to take as large clubs as they can use to advantage, and that we urge all ministers, colporters, and the members of local missionary societies, to make constant and strenuous effort to place the paper in the hands of the people.

WHEREAS, The rapid growth of the National Reform Association, and its widespread evil influences, show how dangerously near it is to assured success; and,

WHEREAS, We know the destructive consequences that will surely attend the success of that movement; and,

WHEREAS, The *American Sentinel* is devoted to the work of exposing the evil that lurks in that movement; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we deem it to be the duty of our State and local societies, ministers, missionary workers and our people generally, to bring the *Sentinel* to the attention of all classes of people, but particularly to lawyers, legislators, and other men of public affairs.

Concerning the matter of the first resolution, Sister White related the circumstances under which the SIGNS was started, and why it was started. She stated that it has a work to do that no other paper can accomplish. The *Review and Herald*, which is a church paper, should be taken and read by every church member; but the SIGNS OF THE TIMES is a missionary journal, and should go to every part of the world. She stated that our people could not get along without either one of these papers, but that every family should have them both.

Concerning the *Sentinel*, it was stated that the publishers hoped to see the circulation increased to 500,000 copies during the year 1888. For the year 1887 there has been printed a total of 255,000 copies, which is nearly double the number printed during the previous year. One man, a total stranger to us and to our work, got hold of one copy of the *Sentinel*, and wrote to the office ordering nineteen copies of the November number to be sent to as many different addresses.

Thursday forenoon, November 24, a meeting of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society was held. This is the Battle Creek College Association, having no jurisdiction over other schools or colleges of the denomination. The following resolutions, which were adopted, will give the best idea of the work done:-

*Resolved*, That the increased facilities afforded by our College are a source of renewed gratitude to God, and this action of the managers of the institution deserves our hearty approval.

*Resolved*, That we appreciate the efforts of the managers of the College to place it in a condition to better fulfill the object of its establishment, and pledge ourselves, and ask our people, to sustain our Trustees in their laudable efforts thus far made.

WHEREAS, Efforts have been made by the managers of Battle Creek College and of our other educational institutions to organize a system of manual training in connection with these schools; and,

WHEREAS, We regard this effort as being in harmony with the will of God in relation to these institutions, as well as in harmony with the conclusion reached by the most advanced scientific educators of the age; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we express our approval of the efforts which have been made, and of the results which have already been attained, and urge that these efforts be continued in the same direction, and that advance steps be made as rapidly as experience and the development of this line of educational work may indicate as necessary; and,

WHEREAS, There is general ignorance, and, on the part of many, an entire misconception of the aims and purposes of manual training in the education of the youth; therefore,

*Resolved*, That the Trustees be requested to prepare for general circulation a pamphlet on this subject; and,

*Resolved*, That when this pamphlet is prepared, the Trustees of this society shall make an effort to place a copy in the hands of every Sabbath-keeping family.

WHEREAS, In some cases students, parents, and guardians feel a little inimical to the plan of working a portion of the time, either in domestic affairs or at some trade; and,

WHEREAS, Its object is to better fit all students for the ordinary duties of life as well as the highest Christian culture; and,

WHEREAS, This object can be attained in no better way; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we entreat all our people and the students that may come to the institution to try to realize the great benefit to be derived from the manual training department, and encourage the good work by every proper means.

WHEREAS, We recognize a healthy condition of the body as essential to the best mental and moral development; and,

WHEREAS, It is a recognized fact that a large share of the causes which occasion disease and premature decay of the physical powers in adults originate in childhood and youth,

*Resolved*, That we urge upon the managers of all our educational institutions the importance of giving special attention to the physical training of students under their charge, and that it be considered the duty of managers and teachers to secure as far as possible an improvement in the health and physical condition of the students as well as in their mental and moral conditions.

*Resolved*, That the study of health and temperance principles and of hygiene as held among us should be introduced into all our schools and made compulsory upon all students pursuing a regular course of study and who are not already proficient in these branches.

WHEREAS, Many of our people are located at long distances from any of our denominational schools, involving large expense in sending children to enjoy the advantages of these schools; and,

WHEREAS, It is evidently unwise for parents to send young children away from their care, even though it be to our schools; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we favor the establishment of local or church schools for the purpose of teaching the common branches, and that we recommend the managers of the College to give special attention to the training of teachers for such schools.

The remaining items of interest will be given on the last page.

The Committee on Distribution of Labor made the following additional recommendations at the last meetings, which were adopted:-

That Russel Hart, of Battle Creek, Mich., go to Norway to assist in the Publishing house in Christiania for a year or so, until efficient help be educated.

That Sister Carrie Mills go to Portland to take a position in the school and Bible work.

That Elder Oscar Hill and wife go to Alabama and Mississippi to labor.

That furnishing labor to the Pacific islands be referred to the General Conference Committee, with the recommendation that someone be selected to supply the urgent wants of that field.

The twenty-sixth annual session of the General Conference practically closed at midnight, November 27, although the last meeting, which closed at that hour, adjourned to Saturday evening, December 3, when some special matters will be discussed. The Conference session has been a most enjoyable season to the members of the Oakland church, who have felt it a rich treat to have the privilege of entertaining our good brethren and sisters from the East, and in listening to the proceedings of the various societies. The weather throughout has been most favorable for the meetings, no rain having yet fallen. The deliberations of the Conference and other associations were characterized by great harmony and good feeling, and the discussion on the various points that were considered demonstrated the fact that men may differ in opinion and still retain brotherly love for one another. We believe that the holding of the General Conference in California this year will prove to have been a wise move. We trust that, aside from the measures decided upon in the session, lasting good may accrue, not only to the California Conference, but to all the Conferences that were represented.

The following important resolutions were passed at the General Conference:-

WHEREAS, Our growing publishing interests in different parts of the world are one in purpose, and should ever be united in action; therefore,

*Resolved*, That this Conference appoint a standing committee of thirteen persons for the coming year, to be known as the Book Committee, whose duty it shall be to labor for the improvement and wider circulation of our denominational literature.

*Resolved*, That it shall be the duty of this committee to hold a meeting in the spring and another in the autumn of the year, at the most convenient place for the majority of the committee to meet.

*Resolved*, That questions as to the necessity of establishing new printing offices, the duties and privileges of the smaller offices now in operation, and all questions that may arise between our publishing associations or general agents,

shall be referred to this committee, whose decisions, after receiving the approval of a majority of the General Conference Committee, shall be considered as the voice of this body.

This committee, as elected for the coming year, is composed of the following persons: Geo. I. Butler, U. Smith, W. C. White, J. H. Kellogg, C. Eldridge, F. E. Belden, C. H. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, E. M. Morrison, J. G. Matteson, F. W. Farnsworth, R. M. Kilgore, A. T. Robinson.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

According to the credentials and licenses issued, there will be fifty-seven General Conference laborers in the field next year.

It is the unanimous opinion of the religious papers of the East that the action of the Personal Liberty League in demanding open saloons on Sunday afternoons, has stirred the people in New York and Pennsylvania "as never before." And with every stir the National Sunday-law movement is increased in power and influence.

At the last meeting of the Conference the question was raised as to where the next session should be held. There was quite a lively competition over the matter, several States being anxious for the privilege of entertaining the delegates. After many propositions, and much discussion, it was finally voted to hold the next session at South Lancaster, Mass.

Considerable space in this number of the SIGNS is devoted to the General Conference, but we do not believe that our readers will complain of this. The matter which we present is of general interest, and may be read with profit by all. There is, however, besides the Conference business, a large amount of interesting and valuable matter on Bible subjects; as much, perhaps, as the ordinary reader can well digest before the next issues of the paper.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has decided to make it a special point in their public and private prayers, to pray that the 54,000 preachers in this country "may all become total abstainers and advocates of prohibition." It is a most pitiable thing that there should be any room, and much more that there should be any need, for such prayers. Think of its being necessary to pray in private and in public, that the preachers of the gospel should practice the principles which they profess to preach.

The managers of the Chautauqua studies have done themselves honor and the public untold good by placing upon their list of studies for the present class-year the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation." We heartily commend this action of the Chautauqua managers, and congratulate the students. The use and influence of that book can never be anything but an unmixed good. We wish it might be studied in every home in the nation, or in the world for that matter. We are glad of the increased circulation that will be given to the book and to its sublime philosophy through the work of the Chautauqua circles. The book has been issued in a new edition and smaller size, and is sold at the low price of *sixty cents*. It can be had at the Pacific Press, this city.

Thanksgiving-day has come and gone. It was no doubt observed throughout the country as well as is usual on this annual occasion. The churches assembled in their usual places of worship, and gave thanks to God, and worshiped him from whom all blessings flow. The saloons got in their evil work, and did a flourishing business all day. Games, excursions, and festivities of all kinds went on with great *el/af*. In San Francisco alone, 45,000 people attended the base-ball games. Yet with all this increased saloon traffic, and playing of games, and running to and fro, on this day specially appointed for worship and thanksgiving to God, we have heard not the slightest complaint of anybody's worship being disturbed; while on Sundays there is not nearly so much of this noise, drunkenness, and festivity, and yet the complaints are almost universal from the leaders in the churches, that their worship is most sorely disturbed. Now why is this? Why is it that with all these things nobody's worship is disturbed on Thanksgiving-day, while with not nearly so much of it on Sunday so many people's worship is so much disturbed? Why is it that that which so greatly "disturbs" people's worship on one day has no tendency at all in that direction on another day? We wish that somebody whose worship is disturbed on Sunday would enlighten us on this point. We have no idea, however, that any such will do it. The fact is that it is not at all Sunday worship, but is solely the Sunday *doctrine* that is disturbed. If the Sunday doctrine had any support in the word of God, there would be no complaints of disturbance of Sunday worship.

### **"Where They Draw the Line" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer*, in commenting on the Personal Liberty League Sunday contest, says that the League "has undoubtedly secured enough representatives of its kind to make it certain that an attempt will be made to have a law enacted in accordance with its wishes, that is, a law opening the saloons, museums, and concert gardens on the Sabbath." Yet the *Observer* thinks the League will not succeed in getting such a law, because there are so many who, although they have no regard for Sunday as a religious institution, are "quick to come to the defense of the day when its existence is threatened by the rum power." And then it confesses the very thing which we have often pointed out, that is, that is not the solution itself, but only the *Sunday* saloon that is opposed. The *Observer* says"-

"Many have said, in effect, that they will bear any thing from the saloon but this, the giving up of the Sabbath [Sunday]. They draw the line at that."

Yes, they will bear anything from the saloon but this. They will bear the drunkenness, the murdering, the woe, the ruin, the devastation, and the universal devilry generally wrought by the saloon. They will bear it day and night, year in and year out, they will bear it without a murmur or a word of objection or complaint. In the estimation of these people all these evils can be carried on entirely consistently with the principles of civil and moral right. But if the saloon shall attempt to carry on its work on Sunday, then the saloon, which is all right all other days, suddenly becomes a thing laden with iniquity, and totally unworthy of

any place in the world-till Sunday is passed. With all this the opinion of the *Independent* also chimes. It says:-

"The people of this country want a quiet and orderly Sabbath [Sunday], and in order to have it they must shut up the groggeries."

But they don't propose to shut up the groggeries except on Sunday. "They will draw the line at that." But why? Why? Why do they not draw the line at the *right* point of no solution at all? Ah! they want the saloon and Sunday too, and it is a very worthy companionship.

**December 8, 1887**

**"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

We shall now proceed to show that the teaching of the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, has from the very beginning been accompanied by sin, and that it is the cause of all the sin that has ever cursed this earth.

When God placed our first parents in Eden, everything was perfect and pure. Adam and Eve were sinless. They had full liberty to enjoy the fruit of every tree that was pleasant to the sight and good for food, with the exception of one tree in the midst of the garden, which was a test of their loyalty to God. Into this garden of delight the tempter came. "Now the serpent ["which is the devil, and Satan," Rev. 20:2] was more subtil than any beast of the field, the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Gen. 3:1. In this question we find a covert insinuation against the justice of God. The idea is this: "Is it so, that God has said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Has God been so arbitrary as to thus curtail your happiness?" There was an attempt to make Eve feel that she was being wronged, in being deprived of the fruit of that tree, and that she was not treated with the consideration due to so noble a creature. She replied that God had said that they should not eat of the tree, nor touch it, lest they die. Satan then replied:-

"Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Gen. 3:4, 5.

It is unfortunate for the advocates of the natural immortality of the soul, that the very first announcement of it that was ever made was made by the father of lies. We have already demonstrated from the Scriptures that the teaching that man can have immortality without Christ is the spirit of antichrist, and here we find that the doctrine was introduced into the world by the very antichrist himself. If we study Satan's words a little more closely we shall find that they were identical with the teachings of modern Spiritualism, and that the first Spiritualist lecture ever delivered was given by the devil in the garden of Eden, with only Eve for an audience.

When Satan affirmed that Adam and Eve were by nature immortal, by saying, "Ye shall not surely die," he added, "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good

and evil." This was as much of a lie as the other, and was a companion to it, and a necessary consequence of it. Our common version does not give the full force of the original. We know not why the translators rendered it, "Ye shall be as gods," for the Hebrew plainly reads, "Ye shall be *like God*, knowing good and evil." This lets in new light on the subject. It shows that Satan recognized the fact that immortality is an attribute of Deity, and that the possessor of it must necessarily be his own judge of right and wrong. It was by this lie that Satan deceived Eve, and caused her to sin. Notice that the assertion of immortality and of the power of judging for themselves of right and wrong, constitutes the one deception; and bear in mind that it was this claim of natural immortality for man which "brought death into the world, and all our woe, with loss of Eden." Therefore we have proved the proposition that the doctrine of the natural immortality of man is the cause of all the wickedness that has ever cursed our earth.

We may go back even further than this, to the time when sin first entered the universe, and we shall find that the cause of it was pride, and the claiming of attributes that belong to God alone. In Isa. 14:12-14 we read the following description of the fall of Satan:-

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High."

This gives in plain language the sin of Satan. He aspired to be equal with God; he coveted the position that belonged only to the divine Word the Son of God; and there the spirit of antichrist first sprung into existence. Turn now to Eze. 28:11-19, and read a description of Satan's former position in Heaven, and the cause of his fall. Satan here appears with the title, "King of Tyrus." He is so called because he is "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4), and the one who actually holds the reins of power in all wicked governments, such as that of Tyre. The man who held the position of the king of Tyre is in the prophecy called "the prince of Tyrus" (Eze. 28:1-10), because he was secondary to Satan, who controlled him. Moreover it is certain that verses 13-15 could refer to no one but one who had been in Heaven. Now read the description:-

"Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold; the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned; therefore I will cast thee as profane

out of the mountain of God; and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness; I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee. Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffic; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee; thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more."

Thus we learn that pride, and undue regard for self, forgetfulness of the fact that no one can have anything except from God, and is a desire to be equal, in some respects at least, to God, led to Satan's fall. And this cause of his fall was exactly the same in nature as that by which he fell; and it is the identical principle by which Satan has perpetuated sin in the world until the present time.

From the fall of our first parents, every great system of error has been based upon that first great falsehood uttered by Satan. How natural that it should be so! Error is simply a departure from God, a failure or refusal to acknowledge him as of supreme authority. But just in proportion as men fail to recognize the claims of God, they usurp the place which he should occupy. That is, to the extent that they neglect God, they follow their own ways, and thus to that extent they make themselves gods, and worship themselves. But, as we have already seen, the claim that man is immortal is also a claim that he is a god. Thus the two things go together. The doctrine of natural immortality, being a gross error, leads to the commission of the sins which are natural to man. It was the first cause of sin. But if there should be a people who had no belief of any kind concerning man's nature and his future condition, but who were following their own inclinations, they would soon develop the idea that they were immortal. And this would be because pride, which is *always* present in the natural heart, would lead man to feel that there could be no being in the universe greater than himself. As Gibbon aptly expresses it ("Decline and Fall," chap. 1.), "it must be confessed that in the sublime inquiry [concerning the nature of man], their reason had often been guided by their imagination, and their imagination had been prompted by their vanity. When they viewed with complacency the extent of their own mental powers, when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labors, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of death and of the grave, they were unwilling to confound themselves with the beasts of the field, or to suppose that a being for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration." And so dead man would be deified.  
W.

**"The Link Is Still Missing" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner



A very zealous defender of the first-day sabbath has unearthed the following. It is not new, but it is just as good as new, for its extreme thinness has hindered its being used very much:-

"Consider a few facts as to why the Jewish Christians did not immediately give up the observance of the seventh day. How carefully and gradually Jesus unfolded his new doctrines, even to the chosen apostles. To the multitudes he spoke only in parables, 'as they were able to hear it.' Mark 4:33. Had Jesus at once and plainly told the people the radical change which he had come to make in the Jewish system of worship, they would have killed him immediately. Even the apostles would have been horrified, and doubtless would all have left him. During all the ministry of our Lord, nothing stands out more prominently than the fact that he was gradually but cautiously preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God. . . . Just before Jesus died, he said: 'I have yet many things to say and to you, but he cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.' John 16:12, 13."

Well, now, what a pity that, after spending the three years and a half of his ministry in "cautiously preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God," he did not once even so much as intimate to them what that change was to be! Surely this was an excess of caution. True, indeed, he spoke to the multitude in parables, but to his own disciples he spoke plainly. Many things he said to them that would not have been listened to by the mass of the Jews. But he gave his disciples the following commands and exhortation, which would insure that everything that he said should have the widest publicity:-

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28:19, 20.

"If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not therefore; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops." Matt. 10:25-27.

It is certain that the disciples followed this counsel, for but a few weeks after the resurrection, Peter stood before the entire Jewish Sanhedrim, and boldly charged those men with the murder of Jesus. When threatened with imprisonment and stripes, the apostles plainly told the Jews that they should

743

pay no attention to their commands not to preach, but should obey God rather than men. And that they did proclaim all that they had learned of Jesus, is shown by the words of Paul, who, like the rest, had seen the Lord and learned of him. To the Ephesian elders he said: "I kept back nothing that was profitable until you;" "wherefore I take you to record this day, that I impure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 20:20, 26, 27. This he did in the face of death, showing that he was not deterred by fear,

yet never a word did he say about the change of the Sabbath. Why this silence on so important a subject?

If anything more were needed to show that a disregard for the law of God is always accompanied by a low estimate of Christ's character and work, it is shown in the statement that Christ refrained from telling the Jews about the change of the Sabbath, for fear that they would kill him. Such a base charge could not be made except by one whose disregard for the law has blunted at all his finer sensibilities. The idea that Jesus, who came to earth for the express purpose of giving his life for man, should, through fear of man, keep back part of his message, is too absurd for sober comment. Read the eighth chapter of John, and learn how he called the Jews liars and murderers, and charged them with being children of the devil; read the denunciations in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, and then try to imagine him cowering before their hard looks, to the extent that he would not tell them necessary truth. Such an imputation indicates that the one making it regards Christ as less than man.

It is indeed true that Christ said that he had many things to say which the disciples could not then bear; but if the change of the Sabbath was one of those things, how does it happen that the Holy Spirit did not reveal it, so that it could appear in some of the writings of the apostles? Is it claimed that the Holy Spirit did gradually lead the church into Sunday-keeping? Where's the proof? If the church was gradually led to that practice, it must be that at first only a very few were led to that practice. Where are their credentials? What have they to show that *they* were led by the Spirit more than others? Nothing but their own assertion, even as "the church" can give nothing but its own assertion to show that it is led by the Spirit in its practice of Sunday-keeping. But if we are to believe every man who claims to be led by the Spirit, we shall have to accept all the errors that flood the earth. No, we will "try the spirits, whether they are of God," and we can try them by nothing except the law and the testimony.

It would seem as though the frantic efforts of the Sunday advocates to find something to support their cause, ought in itself to be sufficient to show thinking persons its inherent weakness. Never did evolutionists search more eagerly for the "missing link" than do the advocates for Sunday for some direct evidence to show that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. They leave no doubt but that the change was made, only both Jesus and his apostles neglected to say anything about it. We appeal to candid people, who desire to know and obey the truth, if the fact that the Bible nowhere mentions the change of the Sabbath, nor intimates that any change was made, nor commands anybody to keep the first day of the week, is not sufficient evidence that the Sabbath never was changed by divine authority, and that the Lord did not design that anybody should ever keep the first day of the week. Shall we be Bible Christians? If not, can we be Christians at all? W.

**"General Review" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

There being no set lesson for this date, we present a few fragmentary notes on certain portions of the lessons that have been studied during the quarter. Some of the first lessons were records of notable miracles performed by Jesus. These were performed in response to faith exercised by the individual, and should serve to direct our minds to the power of faith. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews gives a list of things that have been done through faith, and the inquiry might naturally arise, Whence does faith derive this extraordinary power? The answer will be found in an examination of what faith is, which we can give only in the briefest manner.

Faith is confidence in another. It is a giving up of one's own ideas and will, to some other who is thereby acknowledged to be superior. It is trust, such as the innocent child reposes in its parents' word. Now anybody knows that whenever such confidence is reposed in any person, it always produces a certain degree of consideration for, or tenderness toward, the trusting one. The traveler who is appealed to for guidance by a fellow-traveler, feels an interest in that other; the fact that a stranger has confided in him makes him feel kindly toward the unknown one. Even the hardened ruffian could scarcely find it in his heart to do harm to one who, trusting to his honor, would unhesitatingly cast himself upon him for protection.

Now whatever good things there are in man, are from above, and exist in the heart of God as much more strongly than in the heart of man, as God is greater than man. So when Abraham, with child-like trust, believed God when he made a promise which to all human appearances could never be accomplished, his simple belief "was counted unto him for righteousness." It is not irreverent for us to say that such trust touched the heart of God, and made him feel especially tender toward Abraham. Faith accomplished what nothing else could. And let it be remembered that there is good reason for this. Perfect faith implies perfect worship. Faith and humility are inseparable. The greater one's faith in another, the lower his opinion of himself. So that perfect faith in God, such as Abraham exhibited, implied perfect willingness to do whatever God required of him. Such faith is as powerful to-day as it ever was. It suffices to secure pardon for sin, even as it did for Abraham, and nothing but such faith will secure pardon. The cleansing of a sinner from the defilement of sin is the greatest of all miracles, and it is one that is daily being performed in response to faith. Whenever God sees such trust and submission in the heart of anyone, nothing that that one can ask for can be denied. Then who would not pray, "Lord, increase our faith"?

Jesus said to his disciples, on one occasion, "Truly the harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few." This suggests the query, Who are the laborers? and how do they stand related to the work of Christ? Their relation to Christ is most intimate. Christ is the great source of light. "In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," and "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." His disciples derive the light from him, and are, in turn, to be the light of the world. See Matt. 5:14. Thus they are sharers in Christ's work. He himself said to the Father: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." John 17:18. Thus the disciples become "workers together with God," and prepared, by the only means possible, to receive the cheering words, "Enter thou

into the joy of thy Lord." Only those who are sharers in Christ's work can be partakers of his joy.

The lesson for November 20 is a most important one. In it occurs these words: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Matthew 11:28-30. There is no freedom outside of Christ. The Christian is the only man on earth who really has his liberty. Sin and lawlessness are a grievous yoke of bondage, and Christ alone can break this yoke from off our necks. Anarchists fight against all law; they feel that something is galling their necks, and they imagine that it is the law, and so they would fain abolish law. But that which galls them is the yoke of sin which they bear. The law of God in Christ Jesus is not a grievous yoke. There is no man so much at liberty as the one who keeps the law of God, and this can be kept only when one is in Christ. The one who perfectly obeys the law never feels it. Said the psalmist: "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45. And our Saviour set forth the whole matter in the following words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:34-36. Before this he had said: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Verse 32. This agrees with the other, for Christ is the truth. John 14:6.

The parables in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew seem to be the most expressive of any in the Bible. The parable of the tares utterly refutes the comparatively modern idea of a temporal millennium. In the parable,

747

the man who owned the field is represented as saying to his servants who asked if they should not pull up the tares: "Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."

In the interpretation of the parable, the field is declared to be the world, the good seed the children of the kingdom, the tares the children of the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. The Saviour then says: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matt. 13:40-43. This declaration is so plain that no comment can make it plainer. It shows conclusively that there is never on this earth a time of righteousness and peace until the wicked have been destroyed, and that the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous do not take place until the coming of Christ and the end of the world.

The parable of the net that was cast into the sea (Matt. 13:47-49) seems to be of a little different nature from that of the wheat and tares. There would be no

object in giving two parables in close connection, to teach exactly the same thing. In this chapter many parables are given illustrative of the kingdom of Heaven, because all its features could not possibly be represented in one parable. The parable of the net is, we think, more limited in its application than the parable of the tares and the wheat. The latter represents the good and bad as living together in the world until the final Judgment; the former represents both good and bad persons as being taken into the church, and remaining there until they shall be separated by the decisions of the Judgment.

Notice that in this parable there is first a gathering out from the sea, which doubtless represents the world. Into the net are gathered a quantity of fishes out from the great mass of fishes. The net contains both bad and good. When it is drawn ashore, the catch is sorted, the good being preserved, and the bad thrown away. Even "so shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; then shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." The company here brought to view by the fishes in the net is a company of supposed good people, of those whom it is proper to expect that they will be good. The church is just such a company. According to their profession, all the members of the church ought to be good; but they are not. Many that say, "Lord, Lord," will be cast out at the last day.

No one has any reason to feel safe, simply because his name is on the church roll. The gospel net gathers in both bad and good. This does not mean that any of those whom it gathers in are good in the sense that they are fit for translation, but that they are composed of good material out of which to make saints. The work of the gospel, after it has gathered them out, is to transform them fully into the divine image. But some are bad; they will not be transformed; they resist the good influences that are cast around them, and so grow worse instead of better.

This parable takes all the point out of the infidel cavils concerning church members who act dishonestly or who fall into gross immorality. Christ has told us beforehand that there will be false professors. Therefore there is no point to the cavil that infidels love to make against religion, when some professors show that they are unsanctified in life. We learn that both bad and good are drawn into the gospel net. The church is Christ's school, and Christians are learners of Christ, striving to follow the divine pattern, until at last they may come "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Who has any right to say that the church is a failure, because it contains some dull scholars, and some who refuse to perform their allotted tasks? We judge a school and a teacher, not by the dull, the lazy, or the obstinate pupils, but by those who follow the instruction given them. If those who obey orders show improvement, we say that the school is a good one, and the teacher competent; and we do not pass sentence of condemnation because those who refuse to obey are not benefited. So we must judge of the church of Christ and of Christianity, not by the lives of false professors, but by the lives of those who heed the example and teachings of Christ, and who yield themselves to the influence of the Holy Spirit. W.

## **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

December 31 is the day of the Pope's jubilee. Great preparations are being made for the celebrations on that day and forward, as long as there is anything to be made out of it. On that day he is to receive "the members of the international committees," who will make him a present of 1,000,000 *lire*-\$51,813.47. On January 4 and 5 he will receive the deputations from foreign countries, who will offer three presents. The United States and Canada send \$200,000. January 6 the jubilee presents will be exhibited, and January 15 the Pope will make ten new Catholic saints.

In the *New Thought* of November 26, Prof. J. S. Loveland says:-

"Nothing more clearly proves the mighty power of modern Spiritualism than the numerous methods in which it is and has been assailed. Open, direct assault has always resulted in victory for it, and defeat to its enemies. But when the assailants have been within the ranks, the result has been far different. The crusade, started some years since, on the plea of morality, against alleged free-love, has done more than all other things combined to cripple the Spiritualistic movement."

This, coming from a Spiritualist, is a damaging admission. If it is true that the crusade against free-love gave Spiritualism a check, it must be that Spiritualism thrives best in a free-love soil. What conclusion, then, must we draw from the fact that Spiritualism is at the present time making very rapid progress?

Although there are no public meetings of the Conference the last week, it was a busy week for the delegates. There was a vast amount of committee work to be done, and this occupied the time of many of the delegates almost constantly night and day. Quite a large number made a trip to the College, at Healdsburg, and the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, having a most enjoyable trip, while they were becoming better acquainted with our work on the coast. We very much desired to have our Eastern friends take this trip, that they might appreciate the situation here, and be able to aid us by their counsel. On the evening of the 3rd there was a meeting of the Conference, to attend to some unfinished business. Our relation to Sunday laws was the principal question of the evening, and a good-sized audience listened attentively to the discussion, which continued to a late hour. Immediately following this there was a final meeting of the Missionary Society. The body adjourned *sine die* about midnight. Some further details will be given later.

And now the delegates have all, with few exceptions, returned to their respective fields of labor. Sunday morning about a car load left, and Monday morning two cars were filled. Others had found it necessary to leave immediately after the practical adjournment one week previous. Thus has closed a most interesting and profitable session of the General Conference. If the work planned at this gathering shall be prosecuted with earnestness and faithfulness, we believe that a long step in advance will be seen all along the line.

Not by any means the least important thing gained by this Conference is the strengthening of the ties that bind the different fields of labor together. We believe

that all the delegates feel more than ever before that the work is one, that natural divisions, as oceans and mountain chains, cannot make divisions among those who are laboring in the cause of God, and that since we are all laboring in one common cause, our various interests are all one. As for the Oakland church, it has enjoyed a rare privilege in entertaining our brethren and sisters from the East, and in thus becoming intimately acquainted with them. We part from them with sincere regret; our prayers follow them as they journey to their homes. And as we resume our accustomed labors, feeling added responsibilities as a consequence of this meeting, we are strengthened with the belief that our brethren are praying for our success, as we are for theirs. Prayers for the success of the general work will be more intelligently offered now than ever before.

A short time ago, among other instances of a like nature, we mentioned the case of Jacob Sharp, the New York briber, how it had been carried up from court to court on appeal after appeal, until it had reached the Court of Appeals, and how preparations were being made to carry it to the United States Supreme Court if the Court of Appeals has rendered its decision, and it reverses all the decisions and actions of the courts below, in the case. The old criminal now walks out of jail on \$40,000 bail, to appear, perhaps, sometime for a new trial, when the whole process must be gone through with again. And all this because he has money enough to warp his wicked way through the courts of the State, and exhaust the course of legal procedure. All that a man has to do now is only to be sure that he steals enough to enable him to follow this process and he is safe. Law now is only applicable to the poor; it is but the plaything of the rich. These things cannot long continue so; at this rate the whole fabric of civil society must soon fall.

The *Interior* says:-

"When George Washington was presented with his little hatchet, his fingers ached to cut something with it. It is admitted that George was a good little boy, and meant no harm by chopping down the cherry tree. It has been so ever since. When power is put into an American parvenu's hands-and we are all parvenus in this country, more or less-his fingers burn to exercise it, and if there is no useful work in sight he is sure to do mischief-and is very liable to anyway. If he has the self-confidence of the combined egotism and inexperience, he is irrepressible in his ugliness of purpose."

This is just the position we take with reference to the National Reformers. There are very many good people among them. There are many well-meaning persons who are anxious to see laws enacted for the better observance of Sunday. They say that they do not wish to infringe in the least upon the rights of those who keep the seventh day, and we give them credit for honesty of purpose. But they don't know what they would do if they had the power. As the boy who has a brand new, sharp knife, cannot rest content until he has tried its edge, so the man who comes into the possession of power to which he is unaccustomed, must needs test his new toy to see how it works. He may not mean any harm, but power is a very dangerous tool in the hands of an inexperienced person. Keep

every semblance of power to persecute for conscience's sake out of the hands of even the best of men, if you would have religious liberty.

### **"A New Book" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Pacific Press Publishing House has just issued a new book that is of special interest to all Bible students. It is entitled "Sacred Chronology," and "The Peopling of the Earth." The "Sacred Chronology" is a revised reprint of "Bliss's Analysis of Sacred Chronology," first printed in 1850. It is the best treatise on the subject of the Bible chronology that there is. It has the advantage of being later than all the others, and the additional advantage that it establishes the dates of the events of the Bible, by the words of the Bible itself. It consists of three parts:-

First, in explanation of what chronology is, with full explanation of the different cycles, epochs, periods, and eras, such as the Julian Period, the Era of the Olympiads, the Roman Era, the Christian Era, etc.

Second, the chronology of the Bible, given in the words of the Bible itself, from creation till the writing of the book of Revelation, A.D. 98. With this also there are given the following tables: (1) A table of dates from Adam to Aaron; (2) a table of the times of the judges; (3) a comparative table of the kings of Israel and Judah from the division of the kingdom at the death of Solomon to the accession of Jehu; (4) a like table from the accession of Jehu to the fall of Samaria. By these tables in addition to the text, the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah are made so plain that anyone can easily understand their relation. To many it is one of the most perplexing parts of the Scriptures to get a clear understanding of the times and the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, as given in the books of Kings. This little treatise with its tables relieves the subject of all difficulty.

Third, is an essay on the chronology of the patriarchal age, vindicating the faithfulness of the Hebrew text as against the claims of the Samaritan and Septuagint versions.

"The Peopling of the Earth" is a little treatise of fifty-two pages, containing a series of historical notes on the tenth chapter of Genesis. Beginning with the text (Gen. 9:19), "These are the three sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread," the sons of Noah and their sons and grandsons, as given in the tenth chapter of Genesis, are sketched in their history as they overspread the whole earth. The matter is given in an easy, running narrative of the nature of which some idea may be gathered from the statement of a gentleman who said that he had read it, and was really interested in it, when he was seasick. And everybody knows who has ever had any experience in that direction, that a thing of any kind must be intensely interesting to find any favor with a person who is seasick.

The book altogether-"Sacred Chronology" and "The Peopling of the Earth"-contains 300 pages and is almost invaluable to any diligent student of the Bible. The price, too, places it within the reach of all. Bound in cloth, \$1.00; sheep,



\$1.50; full morocco, \$1.75. Every minister, mission worker, Sabbath-school teacher, and college student ought to have a copy. Send for one and study it.

**December 15, 1887**

**"The Spirit of Antichrist. No 4" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

If we examine the heathen world, we shall find that the deception by which Eve fell was the same by which they plunged into abominable idolatries. Pride, the exaltation of self to the place of Deity, resulted in degradation; for "pride goeth before destruction," and "when pride cometh, then cometh shame." Paul also is authority for the statement that when one is "lifted up with pride," he is in danger of falling "into the condemnation of the devil." 1 Tim. 3:6.

Although there was heathenism centuries before the time of Plato, we may take the heathenism of his day as a type of all, since it was he who first systematized the so-called philosophy of the heathen. Everybody knows that one of the cardinal points of Plato's philosophy was the theory of the immortality of the soul; but perhaps comparatively few realize that this doctrine of his sprung directly from the idea that the soul of man is itself supreme, a part of God. We quote the following concerning his teaching:-

"There is no doctrine on which Plato more frequently or more strenuously insists than this,-that soul is not only superior to body, but prior to it in point of time, and that not only as it exists in the being of God, but in every order of existence. The soul of the world existed first, and then it was closed within material body. The souls which animate the sun, moon, and stars existed before the bodies which they inhabited. The pre-existence of human souls is one of the arguments on which he relies to prove its immortality."-*Prof. W. S. Tyler, of Amherst College, in Schaff-Herzog Cyclopaedia.*

By the following quotation from Priestly's "Heathen Philosophy," it will be seen that this doctrine of the pre-existence of human souls, upon which Plato built his doctrine of their immortality, is in reality a claim that the soul is self-existent, or, in other words, that each soul is a god:-

"'Every soul,' he says (Phoedrus) 'is immortal. That which is always in motion is from eternity, but that which is moved by another must have an end.' Accordingly he maintained the *pre-existence* as well as the *immortality* of the soul; and in the East these two doctrines always went together, and are always ascribed to Pythagorus; the soul and the body being supposed to have only a temporary connection, to answer a particular purpose. 'The soul existed,' he says (*Dr. Lea*, lib. 10), 'before bodies were produced, and is the chief agent in the changes and the management of the body.' Agreeably to this doctrine, Plato maintained that all the knowledge we seem to acquire here is only the recollection of what we know in a former state."

The heathen philosophy, therefore, was simply a deification of the human. The mind of man was made the "lord of itself and all the world beside," a part of God, and consequently answerable only to itself. Now what was the result of this

self-exaltation? The apostle Paul gives the answer. Speaking of the heathen, he says that they were without excuse,-

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever." Rom. 1:21-25.

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Pride, which caused the fall of Satan, was at the bottom of their degradation. To be sure they had knowledge, and made great progress in the arts, but they attributed whatever knowledge they had to their own innate superiority. They looked within for everything, and began to worship themselves, because in their conceit they couldn't imagine anything else in the universe so worthy of worship as themselves. Thus that which they did know contributed to their folly, because they cut themselves loose from the only source of wisdom. The light that was in them became darkness, and the darkness was very great. Now read a further consequence of their claim that they possessed the attributes of Deity:-

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Rom. 1:28-32.

Quotations from history might be given to any extent, to show that the first chapter of Romans does accurately describe the moral condition of the ancient heathen world; but they are not necessary to our present purpose. We merely wish to show that the working the spirit of antichrist is the same in all ages of the world; that since the elevation of man to an equality with Deity by claiming for him inherent immortality, was the cause of the moral degradation of the ancient heathen, the same thing in this age will result in the same way. Compare the quotation in the preceding paragraph with Gal. 5:19-21, and it will be seen that the two lists of sins are almost identical, and that when men became so swelled up with pride that they fancied themselves gods, and thus cut themselves loose from God, the abominable practices into which they fell were simply the outcroppings of their own human nature which they were worshiping instead of God.

But there are only too great opposing forces,-Christ and antichrist,-and when men cast off their allegiance to God, they necessarily enlist under the banner of Satan. And so while the heathen were exalting self, they were in reality

worshipping the devil. It could not be otherwise. In harmony with this conclusion, are the words of Paul: "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." 1 Cor. 10:20. The psalmist, also, describing the apostasy of the Israelites, says that they "were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." Ps. 106:35-37. From Lev. 17:7 and Deut. 32:15-7, also, we learn that when the Jews forsook the Lord, and practiced heathen worship, they sacrificed to devils.

Heathenism everywhere, and in all ages of the world, is simply some form of devil worship. The ancient heathen, like modern Spiritualists, consulted with "familiar" spirits, as we learn from Deut. 18:9-12:-

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee."

The most noted of these places where the ancients consulted with familiar spirits were the oracles of Apollo, at Dodona, Delphi, and Trophonius, in Greece. The priests and priestesses who conveyed the message of these oracles to the people, would in these days be called mediums, clairvoyants, etc. It is well known that the philosopher Socrates had a familiar spirit, a *demon*, without whose advice he would do nothing.

From the *Gospel in All Lands* (September, 1887) we take the following extract concerning the religion of the inhabitants of Java:-

"The native Javanese. . . are Mohammedans as much as anything. In former times they were Buddhists and Brahmins. They worship their ancestors, and seem to have gathered something from every system of religion with which they have come in contact. The number of the spirits worshiped is almost without limit. In nearly every place there is a patron spirit to whose influence the good or bad fortune of the village is ascribed."

Concerning the religion of the inhabitants of Ceylon, the same authority says:-

"Buddha has a multitude of followers among the Cingalese. But mild and moral as his doctrines are, they have failed 'to arrest man in his career of passion and pursuit,' and many of his so-called followers have stolid indifference to religion of any form. 'Yet, strange to say, under the coldness there are superstitious fires whose flames overtop the icy summits of Buddhist philosophy, and excite a deeper awe in the mind of the Cingalese. Hence it demon-worship, their earliest form of religion, is still extant. Devil-priests, on every domestic occurrence, and in their calamities, are called in, and their barbarous ceremonies performed. Devil-dancers are implicitly relied upon in times of sickness, and before the patient they personate the demon which is afflicting him, and spend the night in performing fiendish rights, and in the morning exorcise the demon

and go away with the rich offering, praying that the life of the sufferer may be spared. Buddhist priests connive at this worship, and even practice it, because they cannot suppress it."

Like the Javanese, Chinese, also, as is well known, worship their ancestors, and their gods, like those of the heathen of Greece and Rome, are simply deified dead men and women, whose fame is thus perpetuated. Anybody who has been in a Chinese "Joss House," has seen, among the images of supposed ancient heroes and sages, a "good devil" and perhaps a "bad devil," whose favor must be gained, or whose wrath propitiated; and one can scarcely pass through a street in a Chinese village without seeing burning papers which are designed to drive the evil spirits away. And so if all the nations of heathendom were passed in review, it would be seen that the Scripture writers were correct in their statements that the heathen sacrifice to devils. W.

### **"A Holy Day, Not a Holiday" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Church News* (Oakland) says:-

"The Seventh-day Adventists believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday of rest now by all Christendom, but they are not willing to affirm it openly and publicly."

Possibly the *News* thinks that it has warrant for such a statement; if so, we are happy to tell it, and others who may be equally misinformed, the exact truth about the matter.

In the first place let it be understood that Seventh-day Adventists hold to no belief which they are not willing to affirm openly and publicly. Such a charge is a little out of the usual order, for they are usually complained of as being too ready to urge their belief upon the attention of others. They hold to nothing which they are not willing to have brought to the light of day, and upon which they do not invite the freest criticism, believing that truth will survive every attack upon it, and will shine brighter for those attacks; and they do not wish to hold any doctrine which is not truth.

Secondly, it is a gross error to say that "Seventh-day Adventists believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday of rest now by all Christendom." Nothing in the world is further from their desire. They do believe that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, ought to be kept as the Sabbath of the Lord, not simply by all Christendom, but by all the world; the obligation rests

759

upon the infidel and the heathen, as well as on the professing Christian, because when God said: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," he addressed the whole world, and not any special class. "The Sabbath was made for man," and therefore the obligation to keep it rests upon all mankind.

But Seventh-day Adventists do not believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday by anybody. It is a *holy day*, made such by the Creator himself, and so it ought to be kept. To observe the seventh day as a holiday, a day of

amusement, joy, and gaiety,-would be to violate the commandment of God, and we not only *believe*, but we *know* that that commandment ought to be strictly observed by every person in the world. This we and all Seventh-day Adventists are willing and anxious to declare openly and publicly, at all times and in all places. Let it be forever remembered, however, that when we say that all men ought to keep the seventh day, we do not mean to intimate that they should be forced to do so, nor that anybody should attempt to force them to keep it. This follows as a natural consequence of the fact that the Sabbath is a holy day and not a holiday. Civil laws cannot make a holy day, neither can they enforce the observance of a holy day. If the State were to attempt to enforce the observance of a holy day, it would at the best succeed in making men hypocrites, but it could not secure the proper observance of the day. And since anything less than the proper observance of the Sabbath is sin, it is evident that for the State to attempt to enforce the observance of the Sabbath would be to strengthen men in sin, by making them believe that the outward observance of the Sabbath, which is all that the State could exact, is all that God requires. It would, in fact, be compelling men to sin. Therefore, even if Seventh-day Adventists were in the majority, which we are sure they never will be, we should be utterly opposed to any movement looking toward the enforced observance of the seventh day.

While we are free to declare our belief in regard to Sabbath, we are just as free to declare our sentiments in regard to Sunday. Sunday was from the beginning of its career only a holiday, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times." The Catholic Church adopted it, along with many other heathen customs, from the pagans, by which she so conciliated them that they gave her their allegiance; and the Protestant churches have received it as a legacy from the Catholic Church.

Since the most that can be said for Sunday is that it is only a holiday of the church, without any divine sanction whatever, there is no obligation resting upon anybody to keep it. It has no more sacredness than Monday or Tuesday, or any other working day of the week. This we are willing to affirm openly and publicly, and we have no fear that our statement will be disproved. But although Sunday is not a sacred day, it is a religious institution, an institution of the church. Therefore when the State makes laws enforcing its observance even as a holiday, it goes beyond its right. To compel men to observe Sunday is to compel them to commit sin; for men will not rest upon two days of the week, and if they are compelled to rest on Sunday, they are thereby forced to labor upon the Sabbath, thus disobeying the command of God. Moreover, even though men would observe both days, if their conscience would not allow them to disobey God, Sunday laws would still be iniquitous, because they tend to elevate Sunday above the other working days of the week.

Therefore we are willing to affirm openly and publicly that we are utterly and uncompromisingly opposed to Sunday laws of every kind and degree. We are opposed to them not because it would interfere with *our* rights as citizens, but because they are against the rights of every citizen. The Gospel gives to every man the fullest liberty of choice as to whether or not he will obey God. "Whosoever will, let him come," is the gospel call, and this invitation carries with

it the negative, that whosoever is not inclined may stay away from the waters of life. Now when the State makes laws concerning any establishment of religion, it cuts directly across this freedom of choice. It compels some to do that which their conscience tells them they ought not to do; it forbids others to change their practice when their conscience shall become enlightened; and compel others to conform to a religious practice, when they have no conscience at all in the matter. If anybody wishes a more explicit declaration of our position upon this matter, we are prepared to give it, and to answer any questions that may be asked. W.

### **"Is It Temperance or Sunday?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent*, in its notice of the recent meeting of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Nashville, Tenn., makes the following comment on the resolution which was passed in favor of Sunday liquor laws:-

"It is our opinion that the great fight against liquor will be made more successfully on a much broader platform than that of a Sunday law. It is possible to make so much of the Sunday feature of the law as to ensure the cause, and of this there is some danger."

The *Independent* is correct; if the fight against the liquor traffic is ever to be successful, it will have to be made on a basis much broader than that of a Sunday law. For although a Sunday liquor law might be secured, the liquor traffic would still be entrenched as strongly as ever, yes, even more strongly than ever. Perhaps this may not be apparent to all, for many imagine that to oppose the so-called Sunday liquor laws is to array one's self on the side of the saloons, and against temperance. This can easily be shown to be an error.

In the first place, the passage of a Sunday prohibitory liquor law gives the liquor traffic a legal status on other days. It is true that it is not expressly declared that liquor selling is right on other days than Sunday; but the natural inference from law declaring it to be wrong to sell liquor on Sundays is that it is all right to sell it on other days. The mother says to her boy, "Johnnie, you must not play with your ball to-day; it is Sunday." The only idea Johnnie would get would be that is wrong to play ball on Sunday; he certainly would never get the idea that it is not right to play ball at other times; and the mother would not expect him to. If the boy were doing anything that is wrong in itself, smoking, for instance, she would use different language. She would say, "You must not do that, my son;" and this she would say on Monday or Wednesday just the same as on Sunday. If she should say, "You must not smoke to-day; it is Sunday," the boy would conclude at once that all the wrong consisted in doing the act on Sunday, but that his mother would not object to his smoking on any other day. Even, so to discriminate, and say that liquor shall not be sold on Sunday, is to say it in effect that liquor-selling is all right in itself on any other day than Sunday.

This idea is strengthened by the fact that those who oppose the "Sunday saloons" also oppose the Sunday newspaper, the Sunday railroad train, Sunday mails, etc., things which are perfectly legitimate in themselves. By classing the

"Sunday saloon" with these other things, the professed temperance people lift it to the same level.

But it is argued by many that the Sunday prohibitory liquor law is a move in the right direction, and that it is best to take what they can get, hoping for more by and by. They say they expect to get prohibition some time, but they cannot get it all at once, and so they will take prohibition on one day. It is strange that the fallacy of this plea cannot be seen by everybody at a single glance. It is right here that we find the plainest kind of evidence that the Sunday liquor law is not a move in behalf of temperance, but is only a movement for the protection of Sunday. Suppose for a moment that the movement in this affair were all true temperance men,-men who believe that the liquor traffic ought to be prohibited because it is an evil, and only an evil, to society,-does anyone suppose that they would be content with closing the saloons on Sunday only? No; when once they had massed their strength sufficiently to close the saloons on one day in the week they would close them every day. If they want total prohibition, there is no reason on earth why they shouldn't get what they want, if they have the power to secure prohibition one day in the week. With their hands once on the monster's throat they would not relax their grasp until it was choked to death.

It matters not that many of those who strenuously favor a Sunday liquor law are honest in their intentions, and are really actuated by temperance principles, the fact remains that there are not enough of such ones to carry the thing, for if there were they would have absolute prohibition. Those who look no further than the protection of Sunday are largely in the majority. We say again that the securing of a Sunday prohibitory law is not a move in the direction of total prohibition, but rather against it; for the fact that a lot of professed temperance men have the power in their hands to prohibit the liquor traffic, and stop short with prohibiting it one day in the week, will give that traffic a prestige that it has never before had.

We conclude, therefore, that the whole thing centers around Sunday, and is prompted, with few exceptions, by no other motive than to protect that day from desecration. If any feel inclined to dispute this proposition still further, and claim that the only desire is to protect the homes of the people-that Sunday is a general holiday, and the saloons are allowed to keep open, the laboring men and the youth, being idle, will be enticed into them more than at any other time, we would call attention to the fact that the working men are at liberty from about 5 o'clock Saturday afternoon, and that from then until midnight they have seven hours' holiday, during which time the saloons are in full blast, and still there is no attempt on foot to abolish the Saturday-night saloons. There is ample opportunity for the laborers to spend all their money in drink before Sunday morning, and too often this is done. If this is a "home-protection movement," then let it cover all the time when homes are in danger. More than this, the youth are usually at leisure the whole of Saturday, yet the "temperance" zeal reaches no further than the suppressing the Sunday saloon. The more arguments men bring to bear to support the Sunday prohibitory law, the more is its real nature disclosed. We repeat, the movement is against temperance, rather than in its favor, and wholly in the interest of the Sunday. The following from the *Christian Statesman*, of

December, 1887, will bear out this assertion. It occurs in the report of a national reform meeting in Philadelphia:-

"The Rev. Dr. Barr showed how a consistent national Christianity would throw open to religious influence large classes of men and women who are now utterly inaccessible. For example, there are from six to ten thousand saloon-keepers in the city, who, from the very nature of their business, cannot be reached with the gospel. A Christian Government would abolish their business, and leave them free to be reached like other men."

This, of course, looks toward entire suppression, but the principle is the same. In a meeting in the interests of a Sunday law, held in Oakland last winter, Rev. Dr. Briggs complained that the churches were charged with the duty of instructing the people in morals, and then, on account of the absence of any Sunday law, the people were free to wander into all places of amusement, so that the churches could not get at them. And whenever any "Sunday temperance" movement is sifted to the bottom, this will be found to be the ultimate object.

The *Independent* is right; if the professed temperance people of the country want to make any real headway against liquor, they will have to build a much broader platform than Sunday laws; for when their Sunday laws shall have been passed, liquor will be here still, and more strongly entrenched than ever. W.

### **"Catholics and Hungarians" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

An assembly of Catholic Hungarians has voted an address to the Pope. It favors granting temporal power to him. Semi-official journals protest against the address, which they say does not represent the genuine opinion of the Hungarian Catholics.

### **"The Week of Prayer" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

We would again call the attention of our readers, especially of those who are in any way connected with the body of the Sabbath-keepers, to the week of prayer, which has already been referred to. December 17-24, inclusive, is the time appointed, and the day or evening following, being Christmas, is designated as the time for special offerings to be made to foreign missions. It is expected that during the week of prayer all the churches will hold meetings every day, or in the evening, if it is not possible for all the members to assemble in the day-time. For each day's meeting a special article has been prepared. The subjects are the following:-

For Sabbath, December 17, which is appointed as a fast-day, "The Importance of Devoting the Week of Prayer to the Special Work of Seeking God;" Sunday, December 18, "Steps by Which We place Ourselves in a Condition Where God Can Accept Us;" Monday, December 19, "The Blessing of God Brought to Us Through Faith;" Tuesday, December 20, "The Object of God's Blessing, and How It Can Be Obtained;" Wednesday, December 21, "Missionary Work-in the Family, in the Neighborhood, and in the Church;" Thursday,



December 22, "The Work in Great Britain and Scandinavia;" a Friday, December 23, "The Central European Mission;" Sabbath, December 24, "The Obligation, Privilege, and Blessing of Giving."

The Christmas exercises are expected to be such as shall harmonize with the spirit of the week of prayer. It is hoped that during that week all will have had such a sense of their dependence upon God, and of his abundant goodness, that they will feel it to be a very feeble expression of gratitude due, to give liberally for the missions, which are now languishing for want of means. It has been proposed that at the Christmas gathering, before the offerings are made, brief sketches of the different foreign missions be given; and a circular letter suggesting a programme for the evening, and giving statistics of the missions, has been prepared and sent out.

Concerning the propriety of making gifts instead of receiving them on Christmas, nothing need be said. The plan has been tested abundantly. Some have thought that the children would be disappointed to see a Christmas tree with nothing on it for them; but our experience is that they are much better satisfied when the donations are for some worthy enterprise, and they are allowed to share in the giving, than when they are the recipients. With the latter plan there is always more or less envy, because some are more highly favored than others, while in the proposed plan there is no chance for envy; a lesson of unselfishness is taught, and the children prove the truth of the saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Sabbath-keepers who are isolated so that they cannot meet with others should spend the week of prayer in seeking God by themselves, following the course of the meetings as nearly as they can from a reading of the subjects. Their Christmas offerings may be sent to either of the Publishing Houses, or to the nearest Tract Society Secretary, and they will all be credited to the Foreign Mission Fund. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* has sent letters to 501 Congregational Churches in New England, asking how they stand concerning the doctrine of probation after death. Of the replies received, 430 express emphatic disapproval of the theory, and the *Observer's* conclusion is that "not more than four to five per cent. of the churches of New England tolerate the hypothesis of *post-mortem* probation."

We have received from the publishing house in Battle Creek, Mich., a pamphlet of fifty-two pages, entitled, "Prophetic History of the World," containing what we conceive to be an exposition of the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in the Dutch language, and also an assortment of tracts in the same language. The tracts are the following: The Law and the Gospel-The Sabbath of the Bible-The Sanctuary of the Bible-The Sabbath made for Man-Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined-Which Day Do You Keep, and Why?-Is Man Immortal?-The Millennium-Who Changed the Sabbath?-The Sufferings of Christ-and two temperance tracts: The Curse of Our Nation, and Alcoholic Poison. We

are glad that the Hollanders may now read the truth in their own language. People who are acquainted with any of that nationality should make a note of this.

The subject of the discourse by Dr. Barrows, pastor of the First Congregationalist Church, San Francisco, a few Sundays ago, was, "The Sunday Question-the Present Needs and Hopes Concerning It." In this discourse he is reported to have said:-

"Catholicity is needed to obtain a true solution to this question. All we can expect is a civil moral law. If the Catholics, the Protestants, and the Jews all ask for it, where is the Legislature that would refuse? A breadth of view is necessary which will drop out of sight all our minor, individual views, and will unite us for the one common cause. This question is of supreme importance in this country at the present time, and we know of no other which equals it, except the temperance question."

We will not at present comment on the anomaly of "a civil moral law," but will ask special note to be made of the fact that Protestants are seriously proposing an alliance with Catholicism in order to influence legislation in favor of Sunday. Leaving aside all question as to whether or not Sunday should be observed as the Sabbath, is it not evident that somebody's rights are going to be infringed when Protestants and Catholics unite to influence legislation? When did Rome ever combine with any power, except to her own advantage? Is it not time for somebody to be aroused?

The following news item we clip from the *Christian Union*:-

"The Rev. Dr. J. B. Fulton is still delivering his series of lectures against Romanism, and was recently attacked by a mob in Biddeford, Maine, which stoned the hall and drove the lecturer away. Dr. Fulton, however, was returned to Biddeford, by invitation of the Protestant clergymen of that city and Saco, and has begun another series of lectures on the same subject."

The story is told that a poor shoemaker used to attend the theological controversies, which were conducted in Latin. When asked what benefit he derived from the discussions, since he knew nothing of the language, he replied that he could always tell which party was in the wrong, because that party always got angry. If we did not have any knowledge of Romanism, we should know that it is a gross error, because it always replies with violence to any attacks upon it. Truth never uses any arguments but those of sober reason. Whenever in a religious body attempts to use physical force in defense of its dogmas, it may be set down as a fact that it is utterly impossible to uphold those dogmas from the Bible. The same principle applies in the case of the attempts of professed Protestants to secure laws enforcing Sunday observance. It is because they cannot uphold it by the Bible as a religious institution, that they wish to have it enforced as a civil institution.

**"Excessive Conscientiousness" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

What the *Independent* terms "a curious case of conscientiousness" has just developed in Dubuque, Iowa. The facts, as given, are these:-

"The ladies connected with the management of the Iowa Home of the Friendless have been in the habit of having a great ball every year, to raise money for their institution. This year, owing to a series of revival meetings in the city, the date of the ball was postponed until it was expected that the meetings would be concluded. As the meetings, however, were to continue, and the excitement of the coming ball was distracting the attention of the young people, several of the clergymen offered to canvass for money for the Home, if the ball should be given up, and expressed the opinion that a larger amount would thus be raised. No notice was taken of this offer. Then a number of ladies, some of them interested in the Home, offered to give it a thousand dollars on the same condition, this being a considerably larger sum than the ball usually netted."

The ladies gave this generous offer "earnest and prayerful deliberation," and then respectfully declined it, and the following is a part of their reason therefore:-

"As a band of Christian women, working for a charitable institution, we cannot consistently, or in justice to ourselves, admit or assume for any consideration that this innocent amusement that we have for years provided as a means to help us in support of our charitable work, can be in any way inconsistent or detrimental to a Christian life or character. . . . We earnestly recommend these young converts and those that may feel that this or any other amusement or recreation will be a blemish on that higher and better life to which all these things must be subservient, to lean not on any human arm for counsel or support, but as individuals to search their own consciences in the sight of their heavenly Father, and he will give them strength to follow its dictates fearlessly and cheerfully. And it was further resolved that it is not too late to abandon the proposed ball, preparations having already proceeded too far in that direction, and in justice to those who have labored hard and given much valuable time in order to make a financial success, we cannot further consider the proposition of the committee."

The *Independent*, with fine sarcasm, says that "the sensitiveness of these ladies for the rights of those of their number who have labored to make the ball a success, is something touching." But it seems as though a little conscientious fear of endangering the salvation of souls, would have given better evidence of the true spirit of Christianity. In this affair we have an instance of how people may delude themselves into thinking that they are conscientiously serving God, when their every act proclaims them "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God."

**"Alden's Manifold 'Cyclopedia of Knowledge and Language" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

To those who wish a cheap cyclopedia, and yet one which is sufficiently comprehensive for all practical purposes, we can heartily recommend this work, the first volume of which is before us. It is more than a mere cyclopedia, as the following extract from the Publisher's Notice will show: "The 'Manifold Cyclopedia' undertakes to present a survey of the entire circle of knowledge, whether of

words or of things, thus combining the characteristics of a cyclopedia and a dictionary, including in its vocabulary every word which has any claim to a place in the English language. It does not especially attempt originality of treatment, but aims rather to give the generally accepted views of the most eminent scholars of the world, upon all the topics discussed." An excellent feature of the work is that the pronunciation of every name is indicated. The first volume contains 630 pages, and covers the ground from A to America. From this some idea can be gained as to the comprehensiveness of the work. The book is four inches by seven in size, single column, well illustrated. The price, 50 cents in cloth, and 65 cents in half morocco binding, with 10 cents additional for postage, places it within the reach of everybody. The volumes will be issued at intervals of about one month, and a specimen copy may be ordered and returned if not wanted. John B. Alden, publisher, 303 Pearl Street, New York.

### **"Lesson Pamphlet" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the late session of the International Sabbath-school Association, the following recommendation by the Lesson Committee was adopted:-

"That the lessons for 1888 be written immediately and, after approval by the executive Committee, that they be published in two pamphlets, of twenty-six lessons each, for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers."

The lessons for the first six months of 1888 are now ready, and orders for the first of the above-mentioned pamphlets may now be sent in. This pamphlet will also contain the lesson that has been prepared for the use of the Senior Division at the camp-meetings. Price, post-paid, 10 cents. Send orders to Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.

It should be borne in mind that this pamphlet is only "for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers." It is not designed for general circulation. Sabbath-school scholars will receive their lesson week by week as heretofore, and that is sufficient for their needs. But the Committee recognized the fact that it is often an advantage to teachers to know what is coming. By means of this pamphlet, moreover, ministers who are traveling from place to place visiting churches, and attending camp-meetings, may always be able to join with the school in the lesson for the day, although they may not have received any *Instructor*. Whenever a minister visits a school, the officers and teachers expect help from him, and valuable suggestions in regard to the lessons, and they have a right to expect this. But very often they are disappointed, because he "didn't have any paper, and therefore couldn't learn the lesson." They will no longer have this excuse, and the schools may hereafter feel free to call upon a minister to teach a class whenever he visits them.

**December 22, 1887**

### **"Explaining Miracles" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

Many very good persons have in the past been zealous to explain the miracles of the Bible. Of late years the number of these zealous souls have been increasing. Their motive is a laudable one, for they think that if they can take out of the way of infidels some of the difficulties of the Bible, and thus remove their objections to that book, many will accept its teachings. But however honest the motive may be, it is certain that they are engaged in a thankless task. If they knew the cause of infidelity, they would not think to cure it by such methods; and if they would stop to consider, they would see that if it were possible to explain the miracles of the Bible, there would be no inducement for an infidel or anybody else to accept its teachings.

Miracles lie at the very foundation of the gospel, and are the principal part of its superstructure. The very existence of God is a miracle; the creation of the world was a miracle; the fact that it is upheld by the same word that brought it into existence, is a miracle; our own existence is a miracle; and the plan of redemption is a stupendous miracle. A belief in miracles underlies all knowledge, and all true science. The first element of knowledge is to perceive that things exist. Before any advancement whatever can be made in science, the fact that things exist must be accepted. And this requires no reasoning, for we cannot help believing it. But the apostle says: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3. We look at the heavens and the earth, and ask, How were they framed? And the answer is, God formed them out of nothing; he created the matter which composes them: "He spake and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." By his own word he caused matter to exist where the instant before there was nothing. Who can understand this? Nobody. It is a miracle; but the acceptance of it by faith underlies all true science.

But the devotee of "science falsely so called," attempts to account for the existence of the worlds in some other way. He says that all these things which we see were evolved from a single particle of matter. But when he has gone back to that atom, which, as he claims, has by repeated self-multiplication, produced the worlds, he is still confronted by the question, How did this atom come into existence? And he can never get back of that "How?" So after all his contempt for miracles, he bases his theories on a greater miracle than does the believer in the word of God. For he assumes that inanimate matter created itself out of nothing; while the Bible brings to view an intelligent Creator.

Suppose that our zealous friends should, by some miracle, succeed in explaining the miracles of the Bible; would the infidel then accept that book? Certainly not; for all reason for accepting it would be taken away. The Bible would then have been brought down to the level of man; it would be nothing more than any man could produce. We might go further, and say that if it were possible to explain the miracles of the Bible, there would be no God in whom to believe. The very existence of God implies the existence of miracles. God could not be God, and not work miracles. An infinite God *must* do things which are above the comprehension of a finite mind. They are not miracles to God; there can be no miracles to him, for he simply does his own will. But the simplest acts of God must necessarily be above the comprehension of man. If it were not so, man

would be equal to God. That the simplest acts of God are beyond human comprehension is demonstrated every day, in the growth of plants, the sunshine, the rain, and a thousand other things which we think we understand, because they are so common, but which no man can explain. We know that under certain conditions, certain results will follow; but why? God alone can answer.

And so it is a mistaken zeal which prompts one to try to explain the miracles of the Bible. No man can do it, but the very attempt to do so tends to lower God and the Bible in the estimation of unbelievers. It tends to make them think that God does not work in so very mysterious a way after all. Moreover, when believers attempt to explain miracles, the world accepts that attempt as an evidence that everything that God has done may be understood; and consequently when they read of something that absolutely defies comprehension, they reject it as false.

The reason why men are infidels is not because of the difficulties in the Bible, but because of the difficulties in their own hearts. When men lost the knowledge of God, it was not because they had nothing to reveal God to them, but "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." Rom. 1:21-23. The fault was all in themselves. It is an evil heart of unbelief that causes men to depart from God, and it is the same thing that keeps them from coming to him.

Says the apostle: "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he *is*." Heb. 11:6. This proposition is self-evident. No one can come to God unless he first believes in the existence of God. And no one believes in the existence of God if he has conjured up in his mind some image to take the place of God, which is totally unlike God. And he who believes that God is, must believe in his power to work miracles. More than this, he must believe in the absolute necessity for the performance of miracles, because from the very nature of the case the infinite God must do things that are too wonderful for man to comprehend.

The fact that God is a wonder-working God is the great source of consolation to the Christian. To be sure the Christian rests in the promises of God, but what would those promises avail if infinite power were not behind them. When Christ commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel, he fortified them with the assurance, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." And thousands have read the promises of God, and have confidently rested in them, because of the words: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." Deut. 33:26, 27.

The miracles of the Bible are not to be explained, but believed. Our belief in them is the measure of our belief in God. We believe that God exists, that he is the Creator of all things, and accepting this fact, we do not find it at all difficult to believe that he caused the shadow on the dial of Ahaz to turn backward; that he caused the sun to stand still in the heavens, so that one day was as long as two; that he divided the Red Sea, and the River Jordan; that he caused iron to swim,

and made the dumb ass speak with human voice; that he preserved Jonah alive three days in the whale's belly; or that he raised the dead. Why should he not do such things? "Our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he would." He made all things; why should we suppose that he has less power to control than he had in creating? No; it is the most natural thing in the world for our God to do wonderful things, because he is a wonderful God.

So we do not seek to explain any miracles; we cannot afford to waste time in so fruitless a task. And we know of no better way to convince infidels of the truth of the Bible than to put before them its plain declarations. The promises of God are not to those who understand them, but to those who believe them. Men may say that they can't believe; it is not so; they can believe; they *must* believe or else be lost; for "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." W.

### **"The Deep Things of God" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

When a man has gazed into the starry heavens through a telescope, he has an idea of depth that he never had before. Let him, for instance, point his telescope toward some portion of the Milky Way, where to the naked eye only a faint haze is visible, and he will see not only countless multitudes of stars, but will be impressed with the fact that there is an infinite depth beyond, which the strongest telescope cannot fathom.

Suppose now that as the enthusiastic astronomer is dilating upon the wonders of the starry worlds, someone should say to him, "Oh! you see more in the heavens than is really there; those little shining specks are not so important as you think they are, but you have been gazing at them so intently for so long a time that everything is magnified to your vision." Almost any intelligent person would tell such an one that it is impossible to overestimate the extent and wonders of the heavens; that the telescope magnifies nothing, but simply helps us to get an approximate idea of the actual size of the heavenly bodies; and that it is just as impossible for any man to comprehend the vastness of the universe as it is for him to comprehend God.

This train of thought was suggested by one who, after a conversation upon the law of God, said: "You have been studying the subject so long that, to you, everything is magnified. It is always the case that when one thinks on a certain subject a great deal, little things assume an importance which they do not actually possess." Is this true? Can a person look into the perfect law of liberty so intently that some portions of it will assume undue proportions? Many who would agree with us in our statement concerning the heavens, will agree with our friend in his statement concerning the law; but it can be shown that the human mind can no more fathom the depths of the divine law, than it can compass the bounds of the universe.

If the law were of human origin it could be fathomed, for what one finite mind has evolved, another finite mind can comprehend. But who can know the Almighty to perfection? And the law of God is the righteous will of God. It is a

transcript of his own character. This fact alone should convince anyone that there is no danger of overestimating any portion of it.

Things of human origin may often be comprehended at a glance, and then if one spends time poring over them, minor points assume undue importance. But the Scriptures, which are a commentary on the law, must be searched in order to be understood. One may imagine that his casual glance has enabled him to grasp all that is contained in a passage, and it may seem to him that there is little in it; but Paul says: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2:14. And he says: "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." Verse 10.

These deep things of God are revealed only to those who have Christ, for in him "are *hid* all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. 2:3. The psalmist David did not think there was any danger of thinking upon the law so much as to unduly exalt any portion of it, for he said: "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Ps. 1:1, 2. And of himself he

775

said "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day."

"God is love;" all men who profess to know God, make much of this fact. His love is infinite, because he *is love*, and he is infinite. But no man can understand any more of the love of God than he does of the law of God, for the love of God runs parallel with his law. The love of God is just as extensive as his law, and no more so. Just consider: His law is a law of love, and we read that it was in love that he gave it to men. Deut. 33:2, 3. He desires that all men should have life; but they cannot have life unless they are like him; for only those who are like God can dwell in his presence, and soon the glory of the Lord is to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Then those who are not like God will be destroyed. But no man can see God, so as to know what it is to be like him, and so God has given us his law,-the transcript of his character,-that we, by conforming to it, may be like him, and so have life. Thus the law was ordained to life. The angels who have never sinned, but who "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word," have life for that reason.

But as for men, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" and "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Why did Christ die? He himself answers: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages of sin is death." Hence we know that all men were doomed to death, because they had trampled upon the law of life, and God in his great love for them gave his only begotten Son, in order that they might, through faith in him, escape that awful fate. We say that this was infinite love; that in that one gift God gave all that Heaven had to bestow; and that the infinite power of God himself could do no more for guilty man than he has done. But would God



take steps that were unnecessary? To give up his own Son was a sacrifice that a finite mind can never understand; would he have made that sacrifice if man could have been redeemed by any easier way? No, indeed; the love of God was no greater than was necessary to satisfy the righteous demands of his broken law. But that love was infinite; therefore the law itself is infinite. The love of God in Christ helps us to understand the law; the law of God, carefully studied, helps us to understand the love of God. Both work together.

The danger with men is that they will take too narrow and too shallow views of the law, and not that they will get too exalted ideas of its breadth and depth. Christ came to earth to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." He did not make it larger than it was before, but exhibited it in his life, so that its hidden beauties might stand out prominent. He was the living embodiment of the law. He who studies the character of Christ, with a longing desire and an earnest purpose to emulate it, is studying the deep things of God,-the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,-that are hidden in him. As we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we learn that the greatest things in the law are those things which to the natural mind appear trivial, or which do not appear at all; and with the psalmist we cry to the Lord, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." W.

### **"The Sure Word" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we commented on the transfiguration scene, showing that it was a miniature representation of the coming of the Lord in glory, to raise the righteous dead, and to translate the living. That this was the intent of that wonderful scene is shown by the words of Christ, which immediately precede the record of that event: "Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Mark 9:1. And also by the words of Peter, who says with reference to that event: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." 2 Peter 1:16-18.

Even after that memorable day, the coming of the Lord must have been a more vivid reality to Peter, James, and John, than it had been before. Jesus said to them, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory," and now these three disciples could realize what that glory would be. They had been eye-witnesses of his majesty, and had beheld the glory of his coming.

Perhaps some may be inclined to say, "If I could have such evidence as that, I would have no doubt about the matter. If I could only see for myself, I should know that these things are so." Well now read what Peter says immediately after his reference to the transfiguration:-

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:19-21.

Here is something that is more sure than anything that man has seen: it is something that comes direct from "the Spirit of truth." Men's eyes may deceive them; but the word of prophecy does not depend upon any human faculty; it "came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Men were simply the unresisting mouth-pieces of the Spirit of God; it spoke the words, and they had no voice in the matter.

An instance of how the prophecy came not by the will of man, is afforded by the case of Balaam. It is true that Balaam was not a "holy man of God;" but the fact that he intended to pronounce a curse makes it more apparent that the prophecy came not by the will of man. Balaam was tempted by the promise of a great reward to go and curse Israel, but God, in his great love for his people, "turned the curse into a blessing." When Balak reproached Balaam for not cursing Israel, the latter replied, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind; but what the Lord saith, that will I speak." Num. 24:13.

While Balaam was thus passive in the hands of the Lord, he uttered this prophecy: "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." Num. 24:17-19.

Here we have one instance of the "sure word of prophecy" concerning the coming of the Lord. Considering the circumstances under which it was uttered, it is a notable instance. It shows most fully that prophecy is something that has in it nothing of the human, but is wholly divine. No human frailty enters into it, but it comes direct from the Holy Spirit. Thus it is "more sure" than human eyesight. For this reason it is that it was said: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

Still more ancient than the prophecy given through Balaam is the one uttered by Enoch. Jude speaks of the destruction of the wicked, and says (verses 14, 15): "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

The well-known prophecy uttered by Job is perhaps more ancient than that spoken by Balaam. After expressing a wish that his words might be graven in the enduring rock, he said: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy

this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Job 19:25-27.

This prophecy brings to view the Christian's hope, namely, the resurrection of the dead at the coming of the Lord, showing that from the earliest times this was the hope of God's people. It was "the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers." Acts 26:6. But more explicit than any yet quoted, as showing "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," is the following by "the sweet psalmist of Israel," who could say, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." 2 Sam. 23:2. The word of the Lord, which was in his tongue, said:-

"The mighty God, even the Lord, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined. Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Ps. 50:1-5.

Again the Lord spoke by him to the same intent: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice Before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." Ps. 96:11-13.

With this we must close for this week. Next week we shall quote further from the "sure word of prophecy" concerning the coming of the Lord, and shall then give further evidence that the word of prophecy is sure. W.

### **"A Desert Place" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

Many persons, anxious to find some excuse for sprinkling instead of baptism, have argued that it was impossible that Philip could have found enough water to immerse the eunuch, because the record says that the way which they went "is desert." Such persons must have a difficulty with the narrative which forms the basis of the present lesson; for the record says that Jesus departed "into a desert place apart," and that "when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send a multitude away, that they may go into the villages and by themselves victuals;" and yet it says that "he commanded the multitude to sit down *on the grass*," before he fed them.

The answer to the objection concerning the eunuch's baptism is, as we see in the latter instance, that "a desert place" does not necessarily mean a place where there is no water and no vegetation. It applies to any uninhabited, solitary place. It may be a sandy, barren waste, or it may be a place where there is vegetation. Even in the great Sahara Desert, which is to most minds a synonym for everything barren, there are cases where there are springs of water, and where vegetation flourishes.

Even supposing that "the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza," which Philip and the eunuch traveled, was a sandy desert like the Sahara, we must allow that the two travelers came across a fertile place where there was water enough for immersion, for that the "baptism" means immerse, and that only, is admitted by the best scholars, even though they practice sprinkling instead. When God commands that a certain thing shall be done, and especially when his word says that it was done, it is hardly worth while for men to argue that it cannot be done. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

The report of the Annual Convention of the National W. C. T. U. say of the one who made the opening prayer:-

"She opened with a prayer that carried all hearts up to God, 'Our Mother God as well as our Father.'"

This is dose enough for our readers at one time, so we forbear giving any more till another time.

A friend and renewing his subscription refers to Rev. 16:13, 14, and also Rev. 17:13, 14, and asks if it may not be that modern Spiritualism is warring with the word of God. Of course it may be. Modern Spiritualism does nothing else. If it was devised by the great enemy of truth, and its sole object is to lead men away from the truth of the Bible. Our friends need not be in doubt on that point.

Let it not be forgotten, to the credit of the ladies of the National Woman's Christian temperance Union, recently assembled in annual convention in Nashville, Tenn., that they passed a resolution deprecating the slaughter of birds in order to decorate ladies' bonnets. Of course this pledges each member of the Union to abstain from the use of such decorations, and we may hope erelong to see the savage custom a thing of the past among civilized people.

There is no question that is growing faster in the United States to-day than is the Sunday question. It is coming nearer and nearer to the point where it will be an essential factor in the political field. And the *Christian Nation* announces the intention of it all, thus:-

"Let those who will remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option."-*Christian Nation, September 28, 1887.*

The *Christian Cynosure* reports the following church item:-

Rev. H. C. Heyser, pastor of a German Evangelical Church, has resigned. He says: "The cause of the disagreement is due to the fact that we have socialists and anarchists among the church members. They want a religion without a Christ and a world without a God. That is a kind of theology of which I have no understanding, and not being able to preach it resigned. The most influential members in the congregation, it appears, are either saloon keepers or proprietors of shooting galleries, and the church is unable to discipline them."

It would seem that a church that had not the power to discipline such members as that, had better cease to be called a church, because it is in fact just anything at all *but* a church.

The National Reformers indignantly deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, but insist that what they want is a union of Religion and State. The Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and author of the well-known book, "Our Country," has expressed himself to the same effect. He, with the National Reformers, wants not Church and State, but Religion and State. Says Dr. Strong, "I distinguish, as some apparently do not, between *Church* and *Religion*."

Now we think we know enough about mathematics to work out so simple a problem as is here presented. The three terms are these, the State, the Church, and Religion. They say that they designed to keep Church and State forever separate and distinct, but that Religion must be closely united. The result of our calculation is that if they succeed in their design they will necessarily have to divorce the Church and Religion. If this solution is not correct, we should be glad if someone would point out the defect in our calculation. We verily believe that when the National Reformers, and their many friends who do not go by that name, shall have accomplished their purpose, no one of acute perception will have any difficulty in distinguishing between Church and Religion. There may be a *form* of Religion but the power will have fled forever.

The following from a correspondent of the *Congregationalist*, is an example of the natural working of the theory of a probation after death:-

"One of our clergymen, not long ago, wrote a paper in defense of the Andover theology. The paper was printed and a copy sent to me. Not far from this time I met the son of this clergyman, and as we were conversing on religious matters, he lightly said: 'Well, if there's going to be another chance in the next world, I guess I won't trouble myself about religion now.'"

Let it be remembered that this "Andover theology" is but another phase of the well-known doctrine of the Age-to-come, and that all Age-to-come teaching tends to directly lull men into security.

### **"Good Words for Rome" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

Quite a sensation was made in one of the meetings of the Christian Conference just held in Washington, D.C., by a reference to the Catholic Church. Mr. Simcon E. Baldwin, of New Haven, Conn., asked what church had best observed and guarded the teachings of the Bible regarding the family and divorce, and replied that no church represented in that conference, but only "the older Christian church with its head at Rome." He said that he was sorry that in this conference he had listened to unkind words respecting the sole Christian church. At this same member cried out, "I object to that; I don't believe it is a Christian church at all." After the buzz of excitement that followed this had subsided, Mr. Baldwin rejoined:-

"That is exactly the sentiment that I have heard uttered from this platform, and against which I protest. In my work with Mr. Dike in the divorce-reform league, I have found no truer friend than the Roman Catholic Church. One of the great friends to the cause of social advancement is the Roman Catholic Church. It guards the home, it guards the family, it guards the child. We ought to make friends with the Roman Catholic Church, and unless we do it, we reject one of the great factors in the cause of the advancement of Christ."

When Mr. Baldwin sat down, Mr. Dodge the President of the Evangelical Alliance, under whose auspices the conference was held, said he was sorry that Mr. Baldwin had so entirely mistaken the sentiment of the Alliance on this question. He said that he knew of no one who had not profound respect for the piety of Roman Catholics, and for the good done by them. The only word that had been uttered was that they did not believe in allegiance to a foreign power, a power that was opposed to our free institutions, especially our public schools, but that for the Catholic Church as a Christian church they had nothing but love and sympathy. Said he: "We will always welcome their assistance, and we will defend with our hearts' blood rights for them that we claim for ourselves." The remarks of Mr. Dodge were interrupted by prolonged applause, and the conference broke out in applause at their close.

Thus we see how the barriers between Catholicism and Protestantism are being taken away, and it is not the Catholic Church that is making the advances. How long will it be before professed Protestants will begin to condemn Luther? The Catholic Church has not changed a particle; and if it is now one of the great factors in the advancement of the cause of Christ and social reforms, it must have been so in Luther's day; and if so, he made a great mistake. The truth is, the great body of professed Protestants have become so intoxicated with the wine of Rome-the desire for "catholicity" and church supremacy-that they are even now scarcely able to distinguish between Christ and antichrist.

**December 29, 1887**

**"The Decline of Civilization" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

The San Francisco *Chronicle* has the following editorial comment on the way that Sullivan, America's champion human bull-dog, has been received by royalty in England. The *Chronicle's* comparison is a just one; but it seems to forget that Sullivan went to England with the official indorsement of the most cultured city in the United States, and that the bloody sports of the arena are fully as popular in this country as in England. Rome's decline began with the introduction of gladiatorial shows; why are we not justified in concluding that England and America are going the same way?

A London dispatch says, "The Prince of Wales, who was very much prepossessed by the American's independent, sent his equerry to a well-known jeweler's in Bond Street and ordered a handsome gold watch to be made,

bearing the inscription, 'To John L. Sullivan, Boston, U.S.A., with best wishes of Albert Edward, Prince of Wales.'

Does this carry the reader back at once to the pages of Suetonius and Gibbon, and to the times when the brawny gladiators were the pets and boon companions of the desolute masters and rulers of the Roman Empire? Can we not, in our imagination, see Domitian, given over to those vices which evoked the merciless satire of Juvenal, not the least of which was the emperor's inordinate fondness for the sports of the arena and the delight at the sight of human blood? Does not this gift from the heir of the British throne to John L. Sullivan, with the best wishes of the giver, unavoidably recall the decadence of the Roman Empire, and conjure up the picture of the times when the sect called Christians were butchered to make a Roman holiday, and when cruelty, luxury, and licentiousness reigned supreme in that city which had been the mistress of the world?

And who is the man whom the future king of England so delights to honor, and to whom he extends a token of his admiration and his best wishes? Simply a man who enjoys the notoriety of being the most powerful brute that walks erect; a creature who can strike a harder blow with his fist than any other living animal except the gorilla and the grizzly; a human being who, so far as the record shows, has never done a kindly or manly or generous act in his whole life, who has never used his vast strength for the protection of the weak and feeble, who has never done his country or his kind one moment's service; but who, on the contrary, has been a rowdy, a bully, a swashbuckler, a terror to women and inoffensive men, a drunkard, and a brawler, and altogether a disreputable and wholly useless member of society. This is the man whom Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, heir apparent to the kingly and imperial throne of Great Britain, honors with his presence, and favors with his best wishes.

### **"The Sure Word" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we called attention to Peter's statement that the word of prophecy is more sure than the testimony of any eye-witness, and quoted a few prophecies that speak of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." We wish now to quote a few more of the many prophecies concerning this same thing, that the reader may see how important a place it occupies. And we offer no apology for making copious extracts from the sure word. Certainly nothing that man can write can equal in interest and importance the words of inspiration.

Turning to the book of the prophet Isaiah, we read as follows, beginning with the tenth verse of the second chapter:-

"Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up; and he shall be brought low. . . . And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be exalted in that day. And the idols he shall utterly abolish. And they shall go into

the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In the day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefs of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake the terrible the earth."

This language certainly gives us a vivid idea of the "*power* and coming" of the Lord. But the holy man of God, whose lips were touched by a coal from God's own altar, was made the mouth-piece of a still more vivid description of the power that shall attend the coming of the Lord. Again the Holy Spirit moved him to say:-

"Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. Therefore shall all hands be faint, and every man's heart shall melt; and they shall be afraid; pangs and sorrows shall take hold of them; they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth; they shall be amazed one at another; their faces shall be as flames. Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger." Isa. 13:6-13.

Once more the Lord speaks through his servant:-

"Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. And it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him. The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word. The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate: therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." Isa. 24:1-6.

Who these few men are that are left from the general destruction that overwhelms those who have transgressed the laws, is told through the same prophet in these words:-

"The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; He shall dwell on high; his place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks;



bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off." Isa. 33:14-17.

That these righteous ones are the "few men" who are left after the day of the Lord has laid the land desolate, and destroyed the sinners out of it, is evident from our Saviour's words, recorded in Matt. 7:13, 14: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

Jeremiah was another "holy man of God," whom the Holy Ghost moved to speak. Like John the Baptist, he was chosen even before his birth to be a prophet unto the nations. When the Lord announced this fact to him (Jer. 1:4, 5), he said: "Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak." Verses 6, 7. And the prophet continues: "Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth." Verse 9. What better credentials could any man have than this?

From lips burning with the touch of the Almighty hand, Jeremiah poured forth the words "which the Holy Ghost teacheth." And here is a portion of his word concerning "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ:"-

"Destruction upon destruction is cried; for the whole land is spoiled; suddenly are my tents spoiled, and my curtains in a moment. How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet? For my people is foolish, they have not known me; they are sottish children, and they have none understanding; they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge. I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end." Jer. 4:20-27.

We next turn to "the burden which Habakkuk the prophet did see," and read the following word concerning the power of the Lord's coming:-

"God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand; and there was the hiding of his power." Hab. 3:3, 4. Compare with these words 2 Thess. 2:8: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." It is the glory of the Lord,-that glory which he received from the Father in the holy mount, and which he had with him before the world was,-that will destroy the winners out of the earth when he comes. But we turn again to the words spoken through Habakkuk:-

"Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth; he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and

the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; his ways are everlasting. . . . The mountains saw thee, and they trembled; the overflowing of the water passed by; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger. Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed; thou woundedst the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering the foundation unto the neck." Hab. 3:5-13. W.

### **"Establishment of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

If there were no other facts given concerning the Sabbath than those contained in the above commandment, we would still have everything that is needed to guide us to its proper observance. Indeed, since it is the law on the subject, we should expect as much, even without reading it, for a law concerning anything must contain within itself all the affirmation necessary to enable one to obey it understandingly. This is the case with the other precepts of the decalogue. They are explicit, allowing no chance for differences of opinion. The only difference between the fourth commandment and the rest is that it is more full and explicit than any of them.

But the wise man has truly said, "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions;" and for no purpose have "inventions" been more persistently sought out than for the purpose of the evading the plain import of this fourth commandment. Many are not satisfied with the simple reading of the law, vainly thinking that somewhere in the record of God's dealings with men, they will find that which will warrant them in disregarding his spoken word. It therefore is necessary to consider everything that has a bearing on the subject.

It is evident that a law can never mean anything more or less than it did when first pronounced. If the conditions on which the law is based change, or the will of the law-giver changes concerning these conditions, then the law itself may be changed; but such change must be clearly indicated. The terms of the law must be changed, or another law enacted with the express declaration that it is to supersede the first. Until this is done, the original law remains in full force, even though the will of the law-making power should change; for how can the people know the will of the power having authority, unless that will is plainly expressed?

Again, if any change in a law is made, the new law must not only be expressed in as clear language as the old, but it must be as widely circulated. All

who are subject to the law and are expected to keep it, must be informed of the change, or else they cannot keep it. To punish a person for the violation of a

791

law with which he had been allowed to become familiar, would be an act of injustice. God does not so deal with his creatures. In every instance when the execution of his judgments is recorded, we are plainly informed as to the command which was violated; and a penalty is never threatened in the Bible without an explicit statement being made of what course of action will make one liable to that penalty. With the statements, we will proceed to dissect, as it were, the Sabbath law, to see if it really means what it appears to; and we will also see if it has in any way been modified, or been superseded by another law.

It is evident from the reading of the fourth commandment that the Sabbath did not originate at Sinai. For we are referred to the creation of the earth, and told that the conclusion of that work God "blessed" and "hallowed" the Sabbath day. It must, therefore, have been in existence at that time; a thing that has no existence cannot be blessed, neither can it be hallowed.

This will be still more evident when we consider the meaning of the word "hallow." Webster defines it thus: "To make holy; to set apart for holy or religious use; to consecrate." The word in the original is defined similarly. It is the same word that is rendered "sanctified" in Gen. 2:3, and "appoint" in Joshua 20:7. The fourth commandment, then, tells us plainly that God commanded the Sabbath to be kept holy in the beginning.

Turning to the first chapter of Genesis we read the record of the first six days of time, in which the heavens and the earth, and all that they contain, were created, the work of each day being specified. At the close of the sixth day God looked for the whole of his creation "and behold, it was a very good." He was satisfied with his work, because it was perfect. The record continues:-

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:1-3.

We have here the record of the first Sabbath commandment. That in Ex. 20:8-11 is the same in every respect, being simply a renewal of the commandment as given at creation. In the institution of the Sabbath there was a three-fold act on the part of God. First, he rested on the seventh day. This made that day Sabbath, for Sabbath means rest. Because the Lord rested, it is called the Sabbath, or rest, of the Lord. But this act did not place man under any obligation to rest on that day. If the record stopped here, we would have no interest in it except as a matter of history. Second, God pronounced a blessing upon the day. It was thus exalted above other days in that it was a Sabbath, and blessed; still these two acts were not sufficient to make its observance obligatory on man. Third, he sanctified the day, that is, set it apart for holy for religious use; he appointed that it should be regarded holy. This was the crowning act which placed man under obligation to keep it.

Let it be remembered that it required these three acts to institute the Sabbath in the beginning. It certainly can take nothing less to institute a new Sabbath, should there be such a thing; and therefore whenever we find men claiming that some other day is entitled to recognition as the true Sabbath, we have only to apply these tests: Did God ever rest upon it? Did he ever pronounce a blessing upon it? Did he ever pronounce it holy, and set it apart for sacred observance? If these three questions in regard to any other day cannot be truthfully answered by a simple affirmation, then that day does not approach in honor and sacredness to the original Sabbath of the Lord. Man may rest upon any other day, and that they will thus become his rest, or sabbath; but men cannot pronounce a blessing upon the day, thus elevating it above other days, neither can he sanctify the day; he cannot make it holy, and he has no right to command anybody else to rest upon it. And since there is no record that God ever did these three things for any other day than the seventh, that day stands alone, distinguished above all other days as being the Sabbath of the Lord.

We will go even further, and say that it is an absolute impossibility that the Sabbath should be changed from the original seventh day to any other day. God himself could not do this. In so saying, we do not place any limit upon the power of God, save this, which inspiration itself authorizes, that "he cannot deny himself." The institution of the Sabbath rests upon facts which God himself established. A "fact" is simply something that has been done; and a thing that has been done can never be effaced, so that it will cease to be true that it has been done. The Sabbath rests upon those three facts: (1) In six days God created the heavens and the earth, and rested upon the seventh day; (2) he blessed the seventh day and (3) sanctified, or set it apart as a sacred day for man's observance. And these last two acts he did "because that in it *he had rested* from all his works which God created and made."

Now if it can ever be true that the world was not created in six days, and that God did not rest upon the seventh day, and afterwards bless and sanctify it; in other words, if the word of God can be recalled, so that it shall be as though it had never been spoken; and if the wheels of time can be made to roll backward six thousand years and more, and their tracks be obliterated; and if matters can be so effectually annihilated that it will be a truth that it never existed, then, and not till then, can the seventh day cease to be the Sabbath of the Lord. But it needs no argument to show that this can never be; God cannot deny what he has once said and done; much less can he make it true that he never did the things which he has done. "He cannot deny himself," and so even Omnipotence cannot change the Sabbath of the Lord from the seventh day of the week. W.

### **"Job and His Friends" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

Human nature in the days of Job was just the same as it is now. We have proof of it in the way that Job was treated by his friends. He himself tells how he was regarded in the days when he was "the greatest of all the men of the East," when the rock poured him out rivers of oil. He says: "The young men saw me,

and hid themselves; and the aged a rose, and stood up. The princes refrained talking, and laid their hands on their mouth. The nobles held their peace, and their tongue cleaves to the roof of their mouth." Still further he shows how ready men were to fawn over him, and how glad to be noticed by him: "Unto me men gave ear, and waited, and kept silence at my counsel. After my words they spake not again; and my speech dropped upon them. And they waited for me as for the rain; and they opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain. If I laughed on them, they believed it not; and the light of my countenance they cast not down."

That was when he was wealthy; but now that he had lost everything, and was afflicted, his friends had changed. He says: "But now they that are younger than I have me in derision, whose fathers I would have disdained to have set with the dogs of my flock." The friends of his prosperity had gone, and the vilest of men heaped contempt upon him. More than this, he says, "My kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me." But this state of things did not always last, for "the Lord turned the captivity of Job;" "also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before." Now read what happened when this turn had taken place in Job's fortunes:-

"Then came there unto him all his brethren, and all his sisters, and all they that had been of his acquaintance before, and did eat bread with him in his house; and they bemoaned him, and comforted him over all the evil that the Lord had brought upon him; every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one an earring of gold."

Plenty of friends now. "All they that had been of his acquaintances *before*" came to see him, "and did eat bread in his house." They had no doubt eaten bread in his house before; they knew how hospitable he was, and what a good table he always set, and so they were wonderfully rejoiced to learn of the restoration of his fortune. "And they bemoaned him." Yes, they were very ready to bemoan him then; but if they had come when Job was suffering the greatest poverty and affliction, their comfort would no doubt have been more acceptable. Doubtless they have a plausible excuse for not coming to his aid when he was in distress; they were "very sorry that circumstances made it impossible for them to come," etc., but they would now show that their affection for him had not waned in the least, by everyone giving him a piece of money, when he had no earthly need of it.

The story of Job and his friends is true to life. Job must have known more of human nature after his affliction than he did before. The friends of his prosperity do not commend themselves to us anymore than do those of his adversity. But we do not read that Job became sour and cynical over this revelation of human fickleness. He didn't jump at the conclusion that there was 'not an honest man in the world.' Many people say that or its equivalent; yet there never was a man who said it, who believed it. Every man who said so mentally accepted himself. But while Job learned much of human nature he had also learned much of the divine nature, and he knew there were many in whom the image of God was not wholly obliterated. So we can believe that since Job had seen that "the Lord is very painful and of tender mercy," he had learned to have a charity for the failings of others. The man who allows affliction to make him sour and morose, fails to

learn a great lesson which affliction is designed to teach. If the love of God is shed abroad in the heart, tribulation works only patience. W.

## **"Creation" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

### THE COMMENTARY.

#### LESSON 1.6 SABBATH, JANUARY 7

1. What did God do in the beginning?

"In the beginning God created the heaven and earth." Gen. 1:1.

2. By what means was this accomplished?

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." Ps. 33:6, 9.

3. Are we to understand from these words that the matter of the earth was not in existence before he spake?

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3.

4. Who was the active agent in creation?

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." Heb. 1:1, 2.

5. Is there anything that the Son did not make?

"For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17.

6. Since it was by the Son that the Father created all things, what is his rightful title?

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1:1, 3.

7. How has the Father addressed the Son?

"But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands friends." Heb. 1:8, 10.

8. Then how should he be regarded by all creatures?

"And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. 1:6.

9. In what condition was the earth when it was first spoken into existence?

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. 1:2.

10. After the creation of the substances of the earth, what was the first thing done?

"And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." Verse 3.

11. What next?

"And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness." Verse 4.

12. What did God call the light and the darkness?

"And God called a light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening and morning were the first day." Verse 5.

13. What do a period of darkness and a period of light together constitute? See verse 5.

14. Which always comes first in the formation of a day? *The darkness*. Can you explain why? See notes.

15. What was done on the second day?

"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day." Gen. 1:6-8.

16. How is this day's work referred to by Job?

"He bindeth up the waters in his thick cloud; and the cloud is not granted under them." Job 26:8.

17. What was done on the third day?

"And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he seas; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day." Gen. 1:9-13.

18. What was made upon the fourth day?

"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years." Verse 14.

19. What were these lights to govern?

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also." Verse 16.

20. Then what kind of days were these days of creation?

21. Does the sun *make* the day, or simply rule the day?

22. Tell what makes the day, and how there could be days before the sun was.

## NOTES

The reverent reader of the Bible, who accepts the historical portion of the Old Testament, as a narrative of what actually took place, and not as a fiction, can arrive at no other conclusion than that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. They were days composed of an evening and a morning,-a period of darkness and a period of light; and there were such days as are governed by the sun and moon. Now in order that there should be any show of reason in the claim that the days of creation were long, indefinite periods of time, those who make such a claim ought to be able to point to some time when the sun ruled such days is that. That, of course, would be an impossibility, and so is it an absurdity to claim that the days of creation were anything other than literal, twenty-four hour days. Nobody can get any other idea from the text.

But the question is presented, "How could there be days before there was any sun?" Such a question implies ignorance, or at least forgetfulness, of what forms the day. The day is made by the revolution of the earth on its axis. Each complete revolution makes one day. As a matter of fact, the sun has nothing whatever to do informing the day. If it should suddenly become a body of darkness, instead of a body of light, it would be days just the same, and they would be just the same length that they now are. So there were days before the sun was appointed to rule the day. This appointment was not made until after the earth had completed three revolutions, or until three days of time had passed. The very statement that God set the two great lights in the firmament, "to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness," shows that there were days independent of the sun. These great lights were to rule in the day and then the night, which had been arranged before they were given their office.

When does the day begin? At evening, according to the record in Genesis 1; and Lev. 23:32 we read that the Jews are directed to celebrate their Sabbaths "from even unto even," and this could not be unless they regarded other days as beginning at the same time. But why is this? Is it an arbitrary requirement? or is there a fixed reason why the day begins at evening? It is not an arbitrary matter, but the natural day begins at evening because it cannot by any possibility begin at any other time. With the earth was created "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The phrase, "in the beginning," marks the beginning of time, as distinguished from God's eternity. The speaking of the matter of the earth into existence, marked the beginning of the first day of time.

But darkness covered the chaotic mass, and consequently the first day of time began in darkness. Before the earth had completed its first revolution, however, light was created. "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening [the darkness] and the morning [the light] were the first day." Gen. 1:3-5. The first revolution of the earth was completed just at the dividing line between light and darkness; and so, just as the first day began in the unbroken darkness, the second day began with the darkness that had been separated, and put within



bounds. And as a matter of necessity, this order must always follow. To make the day actually begin at any other time than evening, would involve a change in the earth's revolution; and in order to count the day as beginning at midnight, a portion of time had to be ignored. Thus it is evident that the present popular mode of reckoning time is not of God's arrangement. W.

### **"Back Page" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

We will send the index of volume 13 to anyone who will send a stamp to pay postage. Of course those who keep their papers on file will want the index.

The President's Jubilee gift to the Pope is a copy of the Constitution of the United States, beautifully engrossed, and richly bound in book form. Now let somebody send him a copy of the ten commandments, and his library will be complete.

We may now expect the Pope to take a more active part than ever in the controversy between England and Ireland. A Catholic priest has been sentenced to imprisonment for one month in Ireland, and a prominent Irish official has gone to Rome expressly to enlist the Pope on the side of Ireland.

In the discussion of the paper on the "Necessity of Co-operation in Christian Work," at the late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, many sweet things were said about union, etc., but Dr. Washington Gladden looked at the matter from the hard common-sense rather than the sentimental standpoint. Said he: "There is too much talk, too much gush, and not enough practice. Profession should halt till practice catches up." He also said that he did not think much of union revival meetings. He compared such "wholesale evangelization" to trying to warm a great city by a bonfire in a public square instead of by fires in the houses. This comparison may be meditated upon with profit.

The *Hebrew Journal*, speaking of the first advent of Christ, says:-

"The Jews of that time, full of the conceit of their own goodness, and contempt for the Gentiles' wickedness, expecting, too, a warrior Saviour, rejected him; but what if he came now, when we can appreciate, understand, and rightly value of the sweetness, usefulness, nobility, and elevation of his teachings?"

Yes, what if he should? Why, they would accept him, of course. No, indeed they would not, if he should come in the same way that he came eighteen hundred years ago. But the National Reformers are planning for a coming of Christ such as they will accept. They are going to have him come just as the ancient Jews wanted him to come, and it will involve no self-denial to accept him. Indeed, all the self-denial that will be called for will be on the part of those who refuse to enroll themselves in the National Reform kingdom.

At the Howard Street M. E. Church, Rev. Dr. Harcourt preached a sermon Christmas-day on the immortality of the soul, which question he settled to his own satisfaction, as follows:-

"The great question that concerns us is, 'Does death end all?' Has man ceased to be, when the physical is destroyed? The conclusions of the materialists we cannot accept. They are neither reasonable nor religious. It is

impossible to account for the existence of an organized brain without a pre-existing mind through and by which it was produced and developed."

From his conclusion we should suppose that the question was not, "Does death end all?" But, "Does birth begin all?" His argument makes solely for the pre-existence of souls, and not only that, but it makes the soul the creator of the physical organism in which it dwells. In other words, it is but the old Platonic theory that men are gods. It is an evidence of the fact that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul cannot be argued without the use of pagan arguments. The doctrine does away with the necessity for one God, the Creator of all things; it tends only to paganism, and to pagan morality, which is immortality.

The *Christian Advocate* (N. Y.) tells of a Presbyterian minister in New Jersey who opposed raffling in church fairs, and "his action made so much disturbance that he announced a few days ago that he should lay his resignation before the Presbytery." We have no doubt that there was quite a disturbance also in the temple when Jesus drove out the money-changers and them that sold doves. But he drove them out nevertheless. And yet their traffic was entirely decent and honorable as compared with raffling. Theirs were legitimate transactions anywhere except in the house of God, while raffling is nothing but gambling anywhere. Query: If that which was legitimate business anywhere else, made the house of God a den of thieves when transacted there, then what does that which is thieving everywhere make the house of God when conducted there?

The following is a translation of an item that appeared in *El Pueblo*, of October 13, a paper published in Chihuahua, Mexico:-

"Last Sunday a bull-fight was given by amateurs for the purpose of devoting the receipts to the interior adornment of the parish church. The assemblage were pleased and satisfied; with reason, if some persons were bruised."

The *Independent* says that this series of performances has been kept up on Sunday afternoons. It says also:-

"A few months ago in Southern Mexico a bull-ring was dedicated with religious ceremonies conducted by a priest. It is by no means an unknown thing for a Mexican priest to live openly with his mistress and his children about him in the residence near the church edifice."

And this is a fair specimen of the morality of Catholic countries. Catholics are fond of pointing to the wonderful educational facilities which they provide for their people in this country, as evidence of the progressive nature of Catholicism, but that proves nothing; the only way we can properly understand what Catholicism is, and what it does for the people, is to look at it in countries where it has full swing. Mexico has been under Catholic control for more than three hundred years; if Catholicism has in it anything of an elevating nature, and is so great an educator and civilizer as is claimed, Mexico ought to be in advance of the United States. But the fact is, Catholicism in the United States is brought in contact with enlightened Protestantism, and is forced to make a show of advancement in sheer self-defense.

While we speak thus disparagingly of Catholicism we say nothing whatever of individual Catholics. There are thousands of honest men in the Roman Catholic

Church, and many of them will yet renounce its errors. But Roman Catholicism, as a system of religion, can do nothing to elevate men, for it is but the "mystery of iniquity," and many men who under other circumstances would have been upright, moral men, have been ruined simply because of their connection with the system.

The White Cross movement is bound to be a prodigious success now! Social purity is now in a fair way to be fully assured to all the world! for the devil has espoused the cause, and nowadays when that very respectable dignitary endorses a thing it is pretty apt to be very generally received. Sunday evening, December 18, in San Francisco, W. J. Colville, one of the leading Spiritualists of the country, *the* leading "inspirational speaker," and the leading teacher of the Spiritualistic "science," gave an "inspirational" discourse on the White Cross movement, in which the author of his inspiration set forth sentiments in which he made himself to appear almost as an angel of light. He said it was intended to become so universal as to reach into every civilized country and people. It is altogether likely that it will, but wherever it may reach, the indorsement of Spiritualism will be its worst curse and the heaviest burden that it will ever be called upon to bear.

### **"The Promoter of Sin" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

The author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" truly says: "All happy obedience must arise from affection, exercised toward the object obeyed. Obedience which arises from affection, blesses the spirit which yields it, if the conscience approve of the object obeyed, while, on the contrary, no being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love. To obey a parent, or to obey God, from interested motives would be sin. The devil might be obeyed for the same reason. All enlightened minds agree to what the Bible confirms, and what reason can clearly perceive without argument, that love for God is essential to every act of religious duty. To tender obedience or homage to God, while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature."

Than this we know of no paragraph in all literature that more clearly reveals the essential wickedness of all enforced conformity to religious duties, and therefore the wicked cruelty of all State interference in religious things. "No being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love." Therefore for Governments to compel men to conform to duty toward God, while bearing in their hearts no love for him, is only to compel men to sin, because, saith the Scriptures, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." While for the State to offer inducements to men, that would lead them to conform to religious duties from interested motives, would also be sin. "To tender obedience or homage to God while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature." Now such is precisely what the National Reform scheme proposes to do to the people of this nation. The National Reformers propose to compel men to tender obedience and homage to God,

while they have no love for him in their hearts. Therefore the direct result of the triumph of National Reform principles will be to compel men to dishonor their Maker and do violence to their own natures, and thus vastly to increase the ratio of sin in the nation and hasten its destruction.