

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

January 7, 1886

"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1, p. 4.

THE peace which Constantine forced upon the Gothic nation in A.D. 331, continued for a period of thirty years. For the proper understanding of the further progress of our subject, it now becomes necessary to clearly define the distinction that existed between the two great divisions of the Gothic nation—the *Ostro* [Eastern] Goths, and the *Visi* [Western] Goths. As a matter of fact this distinction existed from the earliest times of which we have any knowledge of the nation.

"The *Ostro* and *Visi*, the eastern and western Goths, obtained those denominations from their original seats in Scandinavia. In all their future marches and settlements they preserved, with their names, the same relative situation."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 10, par. 8, note.*

Although this distinction was ever observed amongst them as a people, yet in all their wanderings and in all their expeditions, from the time they left the Baltic till the period of which we now treat, A.D. 361,—they were united and acted as one people. Now, however, we shall find them separated, and with the exception of a short interval, never more united.

During the thirty years' peace with the Empire (A.D. 331-361), and under Hermanric, the last king of the united nation, the Gothic power was spread from the River Danube and the Black Sea to the Baltic. Of this we read:—

"During a peaceful interval of thirty years, the Romans secured their frontiers, and the Goths extended their dominions. The victories of the great Hermanric, king of the Ostrogoths, and the most noble of the race of the Amali, have been compared, by the enthusiasm of his countrymen, to the exploits of Alexander; with this singular, and almost incredible, difference, that the martial spirit of the Gothic hero, instead of being supported by the vigor of youth, was displayed with

glory and success in the extreme period of human life, between the age of fourscore and one hundred and ten years. The independent tribes were persuaded, or compelled, to acknowledge the king of the Ostrogoths as the sovereign of the Gothic nation: the chiefs of the Visigoths, or Thervingi, renounced the royal title, and assumed the more humble appellation of *judges*; and, among those judges, Athanaric, Fritigern, and Alavivus, were the most illustrious, by their personal merit, as well as by their vicinity to the Roman provinces.

"These domestic conquests, which increased the military power of Hermanric, enlarged his ambitious designs. He invaded the adjacent countries of the north; and twelve considerable nations, whose names and limits cannot be accurately defined, successively yielded to the superiority of the Gothic arms. . . . His dominions, which extended from the Danube to the Baltic, included the native seats, and the recent acquisitions, of the Goths; and he reigned over the greatest part of Germany and Scythia with the authority of a conqueror, and sometimes with the cruelty of a tyrant. But he reigned over a part of the globe incapable of perpetuating and adorning the

glory of its heroes. The name of Hermanric is almost buried in oblivion; his exploits are imperfectly known; and the Romans themselves appeared unconscious of the progress of an aspiring power which threatened the liberty of the North, and the peace of the Empire.

"The Goths had contracted an hereditary attachment for the imperial house of Constantine, of whose power and liberality they had received so many signal proofs. They respected the public peace; and if a hostile band sometimes presumed to pass the Roman limit, their irregular conduct was candidly ascribed to the ungovernable spirit of the barbarian youth. Their contempt for two new and obscure princes [Valens and Valentinian], who had [A.D. 366] been raised to the throne by a popular election, inspired the Goths with bolder hopes."

"The splendor and magnitude of this Gothic war [A.D. 367, 368, 369] are celebrated by a contemporary historian; but the events scarcely deserve the attention of posterity, except as the *preliminary steps of the approaching decline and fall of the Empire*. Instead of leading the nations of Germany and Scythia to the banks of the Danube, or even to the gates of Constantinople, the aged monarch of the Goths resigned to the brave Athanaric the danger and glory of a defensive war, against an enemy, who wielded with a feeble hand the powers of a mighty state. A bridge of boats was established upon the Danube; the presence of Valens animated his troops; and his ignorance of the art of war was compensated by personal bravery, and a wise deference to the advice of Victor and Arintheus, his masters-general of the cavalry and infantry. The operations of the campaign were conducted by their skill and experience; but they found it impossible to drive the Visigoths from their strong posts in the mountains; and the devastation of the plains obliged the Romans themselves to repass the Danube on the approach of winter.

"The incessant rains, which swelled the waters of the river, produced a tacit suspension of arms, and confined the emperor Valens, during the whole course of the ensuing summer, to his

camp of Marcianopolis. The third year of the war was more favorable to the Romans, and more pernicious to the Goths. . . . Athanaric was provoked, or compelled, to risk a battle, which he lost, in the plains; and the pursuit was rendered more bloody by the cruel precaution of the victorious generals, who had promised a large reward for the head of every Goth that was brought into the imperial camp. The submission of the Barbarians appeased the resentment of Valens and his council; . . . and the same generals, Victor and Arintheus, who had successfully directed the conduct of the war, were empowered to regulate the conditions of peace. . . .

"Athanaric, who, on this occasion, appears to have consulted his private interest, without expecting the orders of his sovereign, supported his own dignity, and that of his tribe, in the personal interview which was proposed by the ministers of Valens. He persisted in his declaration, that it was impossible for him, without incurring the guilt of perjury, ever to set his foot on the territory of the empire; and it is more than probable, that his regard for the sanctity of an oath was confirmed by the recent and fatal examples of Roman

treachery. The Danube, which separated the dominions of the two independent nations, was chosen for the scene of the conference. The Emperor of the East, and the judge of the Visigoths, accompanied by an equal number of armed followers, advanced in their respective barges to the middle of the stream. After the ratification of the treaty, and the *delivery of hostages*, Valens returned in triumph to Constantinople; and the Goths remained in a state of tranquillity about six years; till they were violently impelled against the Roman empire by an innumerable host of Scythians, who appeared to issue from the frozen regions of the North."—*Dec. and Fall, Chap. 25, par. 31-33.*

"The invasion of the Huns [A.D. 376] precipitated *on the provinces of the West* the Gothic nation, which advanced, in less than forty years, from the Danube to the Atlantic, and opened a way, by the success of their arms, to the inroads of so many hostile tribes, more savage than themselves.

"The Huns, who under the reign of Valens threatened the empire of Rome, had been formidable, in a much earlier period, to the empire of China. Their ancient, perhaps their original, seat was an extensive, though dry and barren, tract of country, immediately on the north side of the great wall. Their place is at present occupied by the forty-nine hordes or Banners of the Mongous, a pastoral nation, which consists of about 200,000 families. But the valor of the Huns had extended the narrow limits of their dominions; and their rustic chiefs, who assumed the appellation of *Tanjou*, gradually became the conquerors, and the sovereigns of a formidable empire. Towards

the East, their victorious arms were stopped only by the ocean; and the tribes, which are thinly scattered between the Amoor and the extreme peninsula of Corea, adhered, with reluctance, to the standard of the Huns. On the West, near the head of the Irtysh, in the valleys of Imaus, they found a more ample space, and more numerous enemies. One of the lieutenants of the Tanjou subdued, in a single expedition, twenty-six nations; the Igours, distinguished above the Tartar race by the use of letters, were in the number of his vassals; and, by the strange connection of human events, the flight of one of those vagrant tribes recalled the victorious Parthians from the invasion of Syria. On the side of the North, the ocean was assigned as the limit of the power of the Huns. Without enemies to resist their progress, or witnesses to contradict their vanity, they might securely achieve a real, or imaginary, conquest of the frozen regions of Siberia.

"The *Northern Sea* was fixed as the remote boundary of their empire. But the name of that sea, on whose shores the patriot Sovou embraced the life of a shepherd and an exile, may be transferred, with much more probability, to the Baikal, a capacious basin, above 300 hundred miles in length, which disdains the modest appellation of a lake and which actually communicates with the seas of the North, by the long course of the Angara, the Tongusha, and the Jenissea. The submission of so many distant nations might flatter the pride of the Tanjou; but the valor of the Huns could be rewarded only by the enjoyment of the wealth and luxury of the empire of the South. In the third century before the Christian era, a wall of fifteen hundred miles in length was constructed, to defend the frontiers of China against the inroads of the Huns; but this stupendous work, which holds a conspicuous place in the map of the world, has never contributed to the safety of an unwarlike people. The cavalry of the Tanjou frequently consisted of 200,000 or 300,000 men, formidable by the matchless dexterity with which they managed their bows and their horses; by their hardy patience in supporting the inclemency of the weather; and by the incredible speed of their march, which was seldom checked by torrents, or precipices, by the deepest rivers, or by the most lofty mountains. They spread themselves at once over the face of the country; and their rapid impetuosity surprised, astonished, and disconcerted the grave and elaborate tactics of a Chinese army."—*Id.*, chap. 26, par. 8.

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul Subversive of the Truth.–  
No. 5" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1 , p. 7.**

"FOR the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin," and "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." But when man had sinned, and thus brought himself under the doom of death, then Christ, the only begotten Son of God, presented himself, and was accepted of God, in man's behalf. God had before pronounced the penalty of death against transgression. And Adam would have died the day he sinned, had not the Son of God interceded in his behalf, and presented himself in satisfaction of the demands of the broken law of God. But by the love of Christ and the mercy of God, man was given a second probation, a second opportunity to attain to righteousness. Only for the mediation of Christ, the race of man would have ceased the day that Adam sinned. Only for Christ there never would have lived a man after Adam. So that every man who has ever lived, or who shall ever live, from the sin of Adam to the end of the world, owes that life to the fact that Christ, the Son of God, offered himself when Adam sinned.

This is shown in the words of Christ, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have

8

it more abundantly." John 10:10. Christ offering himself in behalf of Adam, is the only means by which men have life at all,—"I am come that they might have life." But this life is only temporal. It is only extended as an opportunity for man to approve himself worthy of eternal life, that he may show himself worthy of having life *more abundantly*; for as Christ said, he is come that they might have life, "*and that they might have it more abundantly.*" The way in which men use the life which is already given, will decide whether they shall have life at all. The man who shows himself abusive of the trust of God, and ungrateful for his favor shown in granting this life, only shows himself unworthy of that which he already has, and much less can he be intrusted "more abundantly" with anything pertaining to life.

In this view is contained the very basic principle of the lesson inculcated in the parable of the unjust steward. "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?" Luke 16:10-12. And also in the lesson of the parable of the talents: "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." Matt. 25:29. If men will turn to purposes of iniquity, and transgression, and sin, a life which is committed to them for a time, how can the Lord commit to them this gift for eternity? If this life, which is not their own, they will devote simply as an instrument of unrighteousness unto sin, to rebellion, and unfaithfulness to Him who giveth it, how shall he give to such immortal life—a life, which, being not subject to cessation, may properly be called

their own? To do so would be only to subvert his own authority and the principles of his government. Such a thing he will never do. But such as devote this life to the honor of Him who giveth it, and to righteousness before Him, to them will be given life "more abundantly," even eternal life, in which to honor and glorify Him; while from all who do not so, shall be taken away even that which they have. "Of a truth . . . God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10:34, 35.

The righteousness which is acceptable with God is the righteousness "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." Rom. 3:22, 23. "HE became the Author of eternal salvation *unto all them that obey him.*" Heb. 5:9. And "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. Christ's coming to this world was not in vain. He came for a purpose, and that purpose is that those who will believe in him may not perish, but have eternal life; and as surely as those who believe in him shall have eternal life, just so surely those who do not believe in him shall perish. If not, if those who do not believe in him do not perish, then this record which he has given cannot be true. If, by virtue of the immortality of the soul, those who do not believe in Christ live as long as those who do, then where is there any point in these scriptures? We know full well the meaning that is put upon the word "perish" by those who believe in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul; that is, that it means eternal life in misery. But no such idea is contained in the Scripture. Eternal life is the heritage of those who believe in Christ, and of those along. Nor will language allow any such meaning to be put upon the word "perish." That word is defined thus: "To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence; to die; to lose life." This is Webster's definition of perish, and every part of it can be duplicated time and again from the Scriptures. But no single particle of this definition can be true if the soul be immortal.

In Psalm 37:10 we read: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Again, in Isaiah 41:11, 12 we read a promise of what the Lord will do with those who contend with the "seed of Abraham," "the friend of God;" "Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee: they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of naught." But to the meek, to those who learn of Christ, it is promised: "But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." "The seed of the wicked shall be cut off. The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever." Ps. 37:11, 28, 29. All is summed up by the Lord Jesus in once sentence, as follows: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and *he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.*" John 3:36. And again: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you.*" John 6:53.

If these scriptures, from the first of this article to the last, do not show that future life is obtained only in Christ, then it would be impossible for the Lord

himself to put words together that would show such a thing. If the Lord wanted to tell men that without believing in Christ they could have no life; that without believing in him they should perish; if he wanted to tell them that the gift of God is eternal life *through Jesus Christ*, how would it be possible to tell them so more plainly than he has already told, in the words quoted? Yet in defiance of these plain, positive scriptures, and in direct subversion of them, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which gives to all men immortal life irrespective of Christ, is held by the majority of professed Christians as a veritable article of Christian faith. Why is it that men will not believe the record that God has given on this subject? Why is it that they will not believe that future life is given alone through Christ? It is no light thing to disbelieve this. Many seem to think, and will even so express themselves, that it makes no difference. We state it as the simple truth, that to not believe that eternal life for man is in Christ alone, is one of the greatest insults that can be offered to the God of Heaven.

Please read carefully the following scripture, and see whether we have stated more than the exact truth:—

"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." 1 John 5:10-12.

Here is the plain statement that to believe not a certain "record" is to make God a liar. *That record* is just as plainly stated to be, that the eternal life that is given us "is in the Son" of God; and that "He that hath not the Son of God *hath not life*." Now the doctrine of the immortality of the soul causes men to not believe that record. They who believe the doctrine of the immortality of the soul do not believe that they who have not the Son of God have not life. Therefore the doctrine of the immortality of the soul "hath made God a liar," because it causes men to "believe 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*." Therefore we say that to not believe that future life is given us in Christ alone, is to insult the God of Heaven by making him "a liar." It *does* make a difference how we believe on this question; for when God is made a liar, he ceases to be Jehovah, he ceases to be God.

Nor is that all; for when the Lord is thus removed from his throne, Satan is put into his place. See here: In the event of man's sinning:—

GOD SAID,

SATAN SAID,

"Thou shalt surely die."

"Ye shall not surely die."

Which of these told the truth? It is impossible for both to be true. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul teaches that the devil told the truth. For that doctrine teaches that there is no death. And if there be no death, then every man has life independent of belief in Christ, which, as we have read from the Word, makes

God a liar. Therefore the doctrine of the immortality of the soul sets God aside as a liar, and exalts Satan as the one who tells the truth, and as the one who is to be believed.

Here we close our investigation of this subject for the present. We believe we have made good our promise to show that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the truth of God. We have proved by logical deduction from sound Scripture premises, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; that it is subversive of the doctrine of the coming of the Lord; that it is subversive of the doctrine of the Judgment; that it is subversive of the mission of Christ; that it supplants Christ in the honor of opening the way from this world to another, and bestows that honor upon Satan; and finally that it puts God aside as a liar, and exalts Satan to his place as the one who tells the truth. The logical summary of all this is contained in one word—SPIRITUALISM. The immortality of the soul is the foundation of Spiritualism; and through the already prevalent belief of that doctrine, Spiritualism will yet lead the world to the active acceptance of every point which we have charged. Therefore we pray all to flee this thing, and *believe* "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."

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The Faithful Rechabites.  
Jeremiah 35:12-19" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1 , pp. 10, 11.**

(January 17. Jeremiah 35:12-19.)

THE Rechabites were of the people of the Kenites, and of the house of Rechab. The Kenites were the descendants of Moses's father-in-law. When the children of Israel were in the wilderness, Moses's father-in-law came with Moses's wife and his two sons to visit him in the wilderness, shortly after they had left Egypt. After remaining a while with Moses he departed, and "went his way into his own land." Ex. 28. But "Moses said unto Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses's father-in-law, We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you; come thou with us, and we will do thee good; for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel. And he said unto him, I will not go; but I will depart to mine own land, and to my kindred. And he said, Leave us not, I pray thee; forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes. And it shall be, if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what goodness the Lord shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee." Num. 10:29-32.

BY this Moses prevailed on Hobab to go with them; for when we come down to the book of Judges, we read: "And the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law, went up out of the city of palm trees with the children of Judah into the wilderness of Judah, which lieth in the south of Arad; and they went and dwelt

among the people." Judges 1:16. In 1 Chron. 2:55, we have the first mention of Rechab, the father of the Rechabites. "And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came of *Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab.*" The next mention we have of any of the house of Rechab, is in 2 Kings 10:15, 23. When Jehu was on his way to execute judgment on the house of Ahab, "he lighted on Jehonadab the son of Rechab coming to meet him; and he saluted him, and said to him, Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? And Jehonadab answered, It is. If it be, give me thine hand. And he gave him his hand; and he took him up to him into the chariot." After this there is no more mention of any of the house of Rechab till this time which is the subject of the lesson for to-day,—a period of about two hundred and seventy-seven years,—but here we find that this Jehonadab who accompanied Jehu was the one who had given the directions which the Rechabites had observed all these years, which the Lord adopts as the meaning of teaching an important lesson to his people.

THE date of the events connected with this lesson is about 607 B.C. Jehoikim [*sic.*] was king of Judah, having been made king by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt. About 610 Necho had gone out against the king of Assyria; but he went no farther than the River Euphrates, being delayed there by the siege of Carchemish. As he was on his way toward the Euphrates, Josiah, king of Judah, went out to stay him. Necho tried to persuade him to let him pass unmolested, as he was not the one against whom Necho was going. Josiah would not listen, but persisted in his resistance to Necho, and a battle was brought on, in which Josiah was killed, and thus perished the last good king, and the last stay, of the nation of Judah. "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah." By the death of Josiah, the nation of Judah fell into the power of Pharaoh-Necho, and when the people of the land made Josiah's son, Jehoahaz, king in his father's stead, he was suffered to reign only three months, when Necho "put him in bands at Riblah," and made Eliakim, another son of Josiah's, king, and changed his name to Jehoiakim. Shortly after he began to reign, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came to Carchemish, and defeated Pharaoh-Necho's army, and drove him back to his own country. "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the River Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt."

AT this time, wickedness was rife in Jerusalem, and Jehoiakim showed no disposition to check it. "He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." And when the Lord sent him a message direct by the hand of Jeremiah, when Jehudi had read to him "three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth." Jer. 36:23. Then the Lord said to him, "He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David; and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost." It was to this man, and to a people who were scarcely better than he, to whom the Lord sent the lesson that forms the subject of our lesson to-day. When Nebuchadnezzar had come over the Euphrates against Pharaoh-Necho, the Rechabites had bundled up their tents and equipage, and had gone into Jerusalem for fear of the Chaldean army. The Lord

told Jeremiah to go to the house of the Rechabits, and bring them into the house of the Lord, and set wine before them to drink. Jeremiah did so.

"BUT they said, We will drink no wine; for Jonadab the son of Rechab our father commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye, nor your sons for ever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents. . . . Thus have we obeyed the voice of Jonadab the son of Rechab our father in all that he hath charged us, to drink no wine all our days, we, our wives, our sons, nor our daughters; . . . and have obeyed, and done according to all that Jonadab our father commanded us."

"THEN came the word of the Lord unto Jeremiah, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Go and tell the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Will ye not receive instruction to hearken to my words? saith the Lord. The words of Jonadab the son of Rechab, that he commanded his sons not to drink wine, are performed; for unto this day they drink none, but obey their father's commandment; notwithstanding I have spoken unto you, rising early and speaking; but ye hearkened not unto me. . . . Because the sons of Jonadab the son of Rechab have performed the commandment of their father, which he commanded them; but this people hath not hearkened unto me; therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring upon Judah and upon all the inhabitants of Jerusalem all the evil that I have pronounced against them; because I have spoken unto them, but they have not heard; and I have called unto them, but they have not answered."

THIS lesson is of just as much importance to us as it was to the men of Jerusalem; because Paul in writing specially of this time says that the people's ears will be turned away from the truth, and turned unto fables—made-up stories, the sayings of men, the traditions of our fathers—and in view of this it was that he gave that solemn charge to the ministry: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom: Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1-4. There is a disposition in man

11

to follow the precepts and example of men, rather than to obey the word of God. For the reason, no doubt, that the precepts of men are not so straight as are those of God; for not all the precepts of men are as righteous as this one of Jonadab, that his people should drink no wine. The precepts of Mahomet are obeyed by thousands where there is one to obey the precepts of Christ. The doctrines of the papacy are honored likewise by thousands where there is one who will follow faithfully the word of God.

A. T. J.

**"Written for our Learning" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 1 , p. 11.**

THE apostle says that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." We may draw a very useful lesson from the case of the Rechabites, who were commendably tenacious of the commandment of their father.

There is always a disposition in man to do as his ancestors did, without ever inquiring whether it is right or wrong. If among professed Christians there was the readiness to obey strictly what the word of God commands that there is to be content with barely doing what our fathers did, or what is enjoined by tradition and the precepts of men, it would be only a little while till the earth would be full of the glory of God. God commands that we shall be baptized, but the majority of professed Christians are willing to do almost anything in the world but to render faithful obedience to the word. The Lord commands that men shall do no work on the seventh day, but the great majority of professed Christians are willing to do anything at all but to obey the plain commandment of God in this matter. In honor of a wholly man-made institution, they are willing to do all that would be required by the Lord in honor of his own Heaven-born institution. This choice has been made, and is being made, by thousands as the days go by. If there were about this man-made institution the merit of the precept of Jenadab, there might be some shadow of excuse, but about this there is no one redeeming quality; it is wholly iniquitous, created in defiance of the commandment of God. And the children of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, will arise in the Judgment with this generation and condemn it, because they obeyed the commandment of their father, and these will not obey the plain commandment of God.

The Lord has given his commandments, precept upon precept, and line upon line; he now sends a message to all nations 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. . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

How many of the people of our day are going to be condemned by "the faithful Rechabites," as were the people of Jerusalem of old? How many will still refuse to obey the commandments of God? And upon how many in our day will come all the evil that the Lord has pronounced, "because I have spoken unto them, but they have not answered"? "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith." A. T. J.

**January 14, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 2, p. 20.**

THE power of the Huns in China continued nearly three hundred years, till "the Sienpi, a tribe of Oriental Tartars, retaliated the injuries which they had formerly sustained; and the power of the Tanjous, after a reign of thirteen hundred years, was [A.D. 93] utterly destroyed before the end of the first century of the Christian era."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 9.*

"The fate of the vanquished Huns was diversified by the various influence of character and situation. Above one hundred thousand

persons, the poorest, indeed, and the most pusillanimous of the people, were contented to remain in their native country, to renounce their peculiar name and origin, and to mingle with the victorious nation of the Sienpi. Fifty-eight hordes, about 200,000 men [A.D. 100, etc.], ambitious of a more honorable servitude, retired towards the South; implored the protection of the emperors of China; and were permitted to inhabit, and to guard, the extreme frontiers of the province of Chansi and the territory of Ortous. But the most warlike and powerful tribes of the Huns maintained, in their adverse fortune,

the undaunted spirit of their ancestors. The western world was open to their valor; and they resolved, under the conduct of their hereditary chieftains, to conquer and subdue some remote country, which was still inaccessible to the arms of the Sienpi, and to the laws of China. The course of their emigration soon carried them beyond the mountains of Imaus, and the limits of the Chinese geography; but we are able to distinguish the two great divisions of these formidable exiles, which directed their march towards the Oxus, and towards the Volga."

"It is impossible to fill the dark interval of time, which elapsed, after the Huns of the Volga were lost in the eyes of the Chinese, and before they showed themselves to those of the Romans. There is some reason, however, to apprehend, that the same force which had driven them from their native seats, still continued to impel their march towards the frontiers of Europe. The power of the Sienpi, their implacable enemies, which extended above 3000 miles from East to West, must have gradually oppressed them by the weight and terror of a formidable neighborhood; and the flight of the tribes of Scythia would inevitably tend to increase the strength or to contract the territories, of the Huns. The harsh and obscure appellations of those tribes would offend the ear, without informing the understanding, of the reader; but I cannot suppress the very natural suspicion, that the Huns of the North derived a considerable reenforcement from the ruin of the dynasty of the South, which, in the course of the third century, submitted to the dominion of China; that the bravest warriors marched away in search of their free and adventurous countrymen; and that, as they had been divided by prosperity, they were easily reunited by the common hardships of their adverse fortune. The Huns, with their flocks and herds, their wives and children, their dependents and allies, were transported to the west of the Volga, and they boldly advanced to invade the country of the Alani, a pastoral people, who occupied, or wasted, an extensive tract of the deserts of Scythia.

"The plains between the Volga and the Tanais were covered with the tents of the Alani, but their name and manners were

diffused over the wide extent of their conquests; and the painted tribes of the Agathyrsi and Geloni were confounded among their vassals. Towards the North, they penetrated into the frozen regions of Siberia, among the savages who were accustomed, in their rage or hunger, to the taste of human flesh; and their southern inroads were pushed as far as the confines of Persia and India. The mixture of Samartic and German blood had contributed to improve the features of the Alani, to

whiten their swarthy complexions, and to tinge their hair with a yellowish cast, which is seldom found in the Tartar race. They were less deformed in their persons, less brutish in their manners, than the Huns; but they did not yield to those formidable barbarians in their martial and independent spirit; in the love of freedom, which rejected even the use of domestic slaves; and in the love of arms, which considered war and rapine as the pleasure and the glory of mankind. A naked scimitar, fixed in the ground, was the only object of their religious worship; the scalps of their enemies formed the costly trappings of their horses; and they viewed, with pity and contempt, the pusillanimous warriors, who patiently expected the infirmities of

age, and the tortures of lingering disease. On the banks of the Tanais, the military power of the Huns and the Alani encountered each other with equal valor, but with unequal success. The Huns prevailed in the bloody contest; the king of

the Alani was slain; and the remains of the vanquished nation were dispersed by the ordinary alternative of flight or

submission. A colony of exiles found a secure refuge in the mountains of Caucasus, between the Euxine and the Caspian, where they still preserve their name and their independence. Another colony advanced, with more intrepid courage, towards the shores of the Baltic; associated themselves with the Northern tribes of Germany; and shared the spoil of the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain. But the greatest part of the nation of the Alani embraced the offers of an honorable and advantageous union; and the Huns, who esteemed the valor of their less fortunate enemies, proceeded, with an increase of numbers and confidence, to invade the limits of the Gothic Empire.

"The great Hermanric, whose dominions extended from the Baltic to the Euxine, enjoyed, in the full maturity of age and reputation, the fruit of his victories, when [A.D. 375] he was alarmed by the formidable approach of a host of unknown enemies, on whom

his barbarous subjects might, without injustice, bestow the epithet of barbarians. The numbers, the strength, the rapid motions, and the implacable cruelty of the Huns, were felt, and dreaded, and magnified, by the astonished Goths; who beheld their fields and

villages consumed with flames, and deluged with indiscriminate slaughter. To these real terrors they added the surprise and abhorrence which were excited by the shrill voice, the uncouth gestures, and the strange deformity of the Huns.

"These savages of Scythia were compared (and the picture had some resemblance) to the animals who walk very awkwardly on two legs and to the misshapen figures, the *Termini*, which were often placed on the bridges of antiquity. They were distinguished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes, deeply buried in the head; and as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the manly grace of youth, or the venerable aspect of age. ^57 A fabulous origin was assigned, worthy of their form and manners; that the witches of Scythia, who, for their foul and deadly practices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits; and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjunction. The tale, so full of horror and absurdity, was greedily embraced by the credulous hatred of the Goths; but, while it gratified their hatred, it increased their fear, since the posterity of daemons and witches might be supposed to inherit some share of the preternatural powers, as well as of the malignant temper, of their parents.

"Against these enemies, Hermanric prepared to exert the united forces of the Gothic State; but he soon discovered that his vassal tribes, provoked by oppression, were much more inclined to second, than to repel, the invasion of the Huns. One of the chiefs of the Roxolani had formerly deserted the standard of Hermanric, and the cruel tyrant had condemned the innocent wife of the traitor to be torn asunder by wild horses. The brothers of that unfortunate woman seized the favorable moment of revenge. The aged king of the Goths languished some time after the dangerous wound which he received from their daggers; but the conduct of the war was retarded by his infirmities; and the public councils of the nation were distracted by a spirit of jealousy and discord.

"His death, which has been imputed to his own despair, left the reins of government in the hands of Withimer, who, with the doubtful aid of some Scythian mercenaries, maintained the unequal contest against the arms of the Huns and the Alani, till he was defeated and slain in a decisive battle. The Ostrogoths submitted to their fate; and the royal race of the Amali will hereafter be found among the subjects of the haughty Attila. But the person of Witheric, the infant king, was saved by the diligence of Alatheus and Saphrax; two warriors of approved valor and fidelity, who, by cautious marches, conducted the independent remains of the nation of the Ostrogoths

towards the Danastus, or Niester; a considerable river, which now [A.D. 1780] separates the Turkish dominions from the empire of Russia.

"On the banks of the Niester, the prudent Athanaric, more attentive to his own than to the general safety, had fixed the camp of the Visigoths; with the firm resolution of opposing the victorious barbarians, whom he thought it less advisable to provoke. The ordinary speed of the Huns was checked by the weight of baggage, and the encumbrance of captives; but their military skill deceived, and almost destroyed, the army of Athanaric. While the Judge of the Visigoths defended the banks of the Niester, he was encompassed and attacked by a numerous detachment of cavalry, who, by the light of the moon, had passed the river in a fordable place; and it was not without the utmost efforts of courage and conduct, that he was able to effect his retreat towards the hilly country.

"The undaunted general had already formed a new and judicious plan of defensive war; and the strong lines, which he was preparing to construct between the mountains, the Pruth, and the Danube, would have secured the extensive and fertile territory that bears the modern name of Walachia, from the destructive inroads of the Huns. But the hopes and measures of the Judge of the Visigoths was soon disappointed, by the trembling impatience of his

dismayed countrymen; who were persuaded by their fears, that the interposition of the Danube was the only barrier that could save them from the rapid pursuit, and invincible valor, of the barbarians of Scythia. Under the command of Fritigern and Alavivus, the body of the nation hastily advanced to the banks of the great river, and implored the protection of the Roman emperor of the East. Athanaric himself, still anxious to avoid the guilt of perjury, retired, with a band of faithful followers, into the mountainous country of Caucauland; which appears to have been guarded, and almost concealed, by the impenetrable forests of Transylvania."—*Id.*, chap. 26, par. 10-12.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The Captivity of Judah. 2 Kings 27:1-12" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 2 , pp. 26, 27.**

(January 24. 2 Kings 27:1-12.)

THE lesson drawn by Jeremiah from the obedience of the faithful Rechabites, was unheeded by the king and people of Judah and Jerusalem. Jehoiakim died, after a reign of eleven years, and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his stead; but his

reign contained only three months, and Nebuchadnezzar came again again to Jerusalem and besieged it. "And Jehoiachim the king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he, and his mother, and his servants, and his princes, and his officers." The king of Babylon, at that time, took the treasures of the house of the Lord, and all the golden vessels of the temple; and all, with king Jehoiachin, and all his family, and all the mighty of the land, and the craftsmen and siths, carried he captive to babylon, leaving only the "poorest sort of people" in the land. Jehoiachin was kept in prison at Babylon till the death of Nebuchadnezzar, a period of thirty-seven years. Then Evil-merodach became king of Babylon, and took Jehoiachin out of prison, and "spake kindly to him, and set his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon;" thus he remained all the days of his life. See 2 Kings 24:8-16; 25:27-30.

WHEN Nebuchadnezzar took Jehoiachin prisoner, he chose Mattaniah, another son of Josiah, and made him king, and changed his name to Zedekiah. The reason that the name was changed was this: When Nebuchadnezzar chose Mattaniah to be king, Mattaniah entered into a solemn covenant; gave his hand, and took an oath before God that he would be a faithful subject, in all things, to the king of Babylon. Then it was, and upon this covenant and this oath, that Nebuchadnezzar changed the name, and gave him that of Zedekiah, that is, "The judgment of Jehovah;" thus placing upon him a constant reminder of his obligation before God, and that, if he violated his oath, he would incur the judgment of God. If Zedekiah had kept this covenant, the kingdom would even then have stood; for the Lord had said to Zedekiah, "Bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people, and live." But the sin of Judah was "written with a pen of iron and with a point of a diamond;" it was graven upon the tablets of their hearts and upon the horns of their altars; and Zedekiah only "helped forward the affliction."

HE broke his covenant; he violated his oath; he rebelled against his king; and he sent "ambassadors into Egypt that they might give him horses and much people." Then came upon him the judgment that was implied in his oath, and in his acceptance of the name Zedekiah—the judgment of Jehovah. For said the Lord: "Shall he prosper? shall he escape that doeth such things? or shall he break the covenant, and be delivered? As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon he shall die. . . . Seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when, lo, he had given his hand, and hath done all these things, he shall not escape. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; As I live, surely mine oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head." Eze. 17:11-20.

FROM that day forward there was but one message for Zedekiah, and that was, This city shall be given into the hand of the king of Babylon. Jeremiah was in the city all the time with his message from the Lord. Always, he was telling the people that the city would be given up; and when Nebuchadnezzar came and laid siege to the city, the prophet declared that he that remained in the city should die by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence; "but he that goeth out, and falleth to

the Chaldeans that besiege you, he shall live, and his life shall be unto him for a prey." Jer. 21:8-10. Yet the people refused to believe the prophet of God, and steadily resisted the siege. Then at Zedekiah's request Pharaoh sent an army out of Egypt to draw away the king of Babylon. This gave Zedekiah renewed confidence, and he sent to ask Jeremiah for a word from the Lord, and he got it. The Lord said: "Deceive not yourselves, saying, The Chaldeans shall surely depart from us: for they shall not depart. For though ye had smitten the whole army of the Chaldeans that fight against you, and there remained but wounded men among them, yet should they rise up every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire." Jer. 37:9, 10.

THE Chaldean army suspended the siege to go and meet the Egyptian army, and then Jeremiah started out of the city to go into the land of Benjamin; and when he was passing the gate of Benjamin, the captain of the ward arrested him, and accused him of going over to the Chaldeans; for which "the princes were wroth with Jeremiah, and smote him, and put him in prison" in a dungeon in the house of Jonathan the scribe. While he was there Zedekiah again sent and had him brought secretly to the king's house, and asked it there was any word from the Lord. "And Jeremiah said, There is; for, said he, thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon." Then Jeremiah asked the king not to allow him to be committed again to the dungeon, which was granted, and orders were given that he should remain in the court of the prison, and have a piece of bread daily as long as there was any in the city. Jer. 37:11-21.

NEXT, the princes came to Zedekiah and said: "We beseech thee, let this man be put to death; for thus he weakeneth the hands of the men of war that remain in this city, and the hands of all the people, in speaking such words unto them: for this man seeketh not the welfare of this people, but the hurt. Then Zedekiah the king said, Behold, he is in your hand; for the

27

king is not he that can do any thing against you. Then took they Jeremiah, and cast him into the dungeon of Malchiah the son of Hammelech, that was in the court of the prison; and they let down Jeremiah with cords. And in the dungeon there was no water, but mire: so Jeremiah sunk in the mire." Jer. 38.

THE Babylonian army soon returned and renewed the siege of Jerusalem, and in the eleventh year of "Zedekiah, and on the ninth day of the fourth month the famine prevailed in the city, and there was no bread for the people of the land. And the city was broken up, and all the men of war fled by night by the way of the gate between two walls, which is by the king's garden (now the Chaldees were against the city round about); and the king went the way toward the plain. And the army of the Chaldees pursued after the king, and overtook him in the plains of Jericho; and all his army were scattered from him. So they took the king, and brought him up to the king of Babylon to Riblah; and they gave judgment upon him. And they slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes, and put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and bound him with fetters of brass, and carried him to Babylon."

THEN the fifth month, the seventh day of the month, "came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem; and he

burnt the house of the Lord, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire." And he broke down the walls of Jerusalem; and all the remnant of the people did Nebuzar-adan carry away to babylon; and all the vessels of gold, of silver, and of brass; and the two great pillars of brass which Solomon had made; and the brazen sea and the bases; "the brass of all these vessels was without weight." (See 2 Kings 25:8-17.) And so was completed the captivity of Judah. A few of the very poor of the land were left to be vine dressers and husbandmen, and over these the king of Babylon appointed Gedaliah the son of Ahikam, governor, but he was murdered soon afterward, and then all the remainder arose and fled to Egypt for fear of the king of the Chaldees; and thus the land was left desolate, "to fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath, to fulfill three-score and ten years." 2 Kings 25:22-26; 2 Chron. 36:21.

A. T. J.

**January 21, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 3 , pp. 36, 37.**

*(Continued.)*

"AFTER Valens had [A.D. 376] terminated the Gothic war with some appearance of glory and success, he made a progress through his dominions of Asia, and at length fixed his residence in the capital of Syria [Antioch]. . . He was informed, that the North was agitated by a furious tempest; that the irruption of the Huns, an unknown and monstrous race of savages, had subverted the power of the Goths; and that the suppliant multitudes of that warlike nation, whose pride was now humbled in the dust, covered a space of many miles along the banks of the river. With outstretched arms, and pathetic lamentations, they loudly deplored their past misfortunes and their present danger; acknowledged that their only hope of safety was in the clemency of the Roman Government; and most solemnly protested, that if the gracious liberality of the emperor would permit them to cultivate the waste lands of Thrace, they should ever hold themselves bound, by the strongest obligations of duty and gratitude, to obey the laws, and to guard the limits, of the republic.

"These assurances were confirmed by the ambassadors of the Goths, who impatiently expected from the mouth of Valens an answer that must finally determine the fate of their unhappy countrymen. The emperor of the East was no longer guided by the wisdom and authority of his elder brother, whose death happened

towards the end of the preceding year [A.D. 375, Nov. 17]; and as the distressful situation of the Goths required an instant and peremptory decision, he was deprived of the favorite resources of feeble and timid minds, who consider the use of dilatory and ambiguous measures as the most admirable efforts of consummate prudence.

"The prayers of the Goths were granted, and their service was accepted by the Imperial court: and orders were immediately dispatched to the civil and military governors of the Thracian diocese, to make the necessary preparations for the passage and subsistence of a great people, till a proper and sufficient territory could be allotted for their future residence. The liberality of the emperor was accompanied, however, with two harsh and rigorous conditions, which prudence might justify on the side of the Romans; but which distress alone could extort from the indignant Goths. Before they passed the Danube, they were required to deliver their arms: and it was insisted, that their children should be taken from them, and

dispersed through the provinces of Asia; where they might be civilized by the arts of education, and serve as hostages to secure the fidelity of their parents.

"During the suspense of a doubtful and distant negotiation, the impatient Goths made some rash attempts to pass the Danube, without the permission of the government, whose protection they had implored. Their motions were strictly observed by the vigilance of the troops which were stationed along the river and their foremost detachments were defeated with considerable slaughter; yet such were the timid councils of the reign of Valens, that the brave officers who had served their country in the execution of their duty, were punished by the loss of their employments, and narrowly escaped the loss of their heads. The Imperial mandate was at length received for transporting over the Danube the whole body of the Gothic nation; but the execution of this order was a task of labor and difficulty.

"The stream of the Danube, which in those parts is above a mile broad, had been swelled by incessant rains; and in this tumultuous passage, many were swept away, and drowned, by the rapid violence of the current. A large fleet of vessels, of boats, and of canoes, was provided; many days and nights they passed and repassed with indefatigable toil; and the most strenuous diligence was exerted by the officers of Valens, that not a single barbarian, of those who were *reserved to subvert the foundations of Rome*, should be left on the opposite shore. It was thought expedient that an accurate account should be taken of their numbers; but the persons who were employed soon desisted, with amazement and dismay, from the prosecution of the endless and impracticable task;

and the principal historian of the age most seriously affirms, that the prodigious armies of Darius and Xerxes, which had so long been considered as the fables of vain and credulous antiquity, were now justified, in the eyes of mankind, by the evidence of fact and experience.

"A probable testimony has fixed the number of the Gothic warriors at 200,000 men; and if we can venture to add the just proportion of women, of children, and of slaves, the whole mass of people which composed this formidable emigration, must have amounted to near a million of persons, of both sexes, and of all ages. The children of the Goths, those at least of a distinguished rank, were separated from the multitude. They were conducted, without delay, to the distant seats assigned for their residence and education; and as the numerous train of hostages or captives passed through the cities, their gay and splendid apparel, their robust and martial figure, excited the surprise and envy of the provincials.

"But the stipulation, the most offensive to the Goths, and the most important to the Romans, was shamefully eluded. The barbarians, who considered their arms as the ensigns of honor and the pledges of safety, were disposed to offer a price, which the lust or

avarice of the Imperial officers was easily tempted to accept. To preserve their arms, the haughty warriors consented, with some reluctance, to prostitute their wives or their daughters; the charms of a beauteous maid, or a comely boy, secured the connivance of the inspectors; who sometimes cast an eye of covetousness on the fringed carpets and linen garments of their new allies, or who sacrificed their duty to the mean consideration of filling their farms with cattle, and their houses with slaves. The Goths, with arms in their hands, were permitted to enter the boats; and when their strength was collected on the other side of the river, the immense camp which was spread over the plains and the hills of the Lower Mesia, assumed a threatening and even hostile aspect."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 13, 14.*

This immense body of people was the nation of the Visigoths. And although the historian simply speaks of them here by the general title of Goths, it is evident from the previous context that they were the Visigoths. However, in the words which immediately follow, the historian himself makes the point clear and positive that these were the Visigoths alone. He says:—

"The leaders of the Ostrogoths, Alatheus and Saphrax, the guardians of their infant king, appeared soon afterwards on the Northern banks of the Danube; and immediately dispatched their ambassadors to the court of Antioch, to solicit, with the same professions of allegiance and gratitude, the same favor which had been granted to the suppliant Visigoths. The absolute refusal of

Valens suspended their progress, and discovered the repentance, the

suspensions, and the fears, of the Imperial Council.—*Id.*, par. 14.

From this it is plain that the positions of the two peoples are now thus: The whole nation of the Visigoths is within the empire, and the nation of the Ostrogoths is yet beyond the Danube. And to resist the reader in keeping the distinction between them clear, we would remark that *Fritigern* and *Alavivus* are the united leaders, or judges, of the *Visigoths*; while *Alatheus* and *Saphrax*, the guardians of their infant king, occupy the same position as the leaders of the *Ostorgoths*. The historian now continues the account of the Visigoths:—

"An undisciplined and unsettled nation of Barbarians required the firmest temper, and the most dexterous management. The daily subsistence of near a million of extraordinary subjects could be supplied only by constant and skilful diligence, and might continually be interrupted by mistake or accident. The insolence, or the indignation, of the Goths, if they conceived themselves to be the objects either of fear or of contempt, might urge them to the most desperate extremities; and the fortune of the state seemed to depend on the prudence, as well as the integrity, of the generals of Valens. At this important crisis, the military government of Thrace was exercised by Lupicinus and Maximus, in whose venal minds the slightest hope of private emolument outweighed every consideration of public advantage; and whose guilt was only alleviated by their incapacity of discerning the pernicious effects of their rash and criminal administration.

"Instead of obeying the orders of their sovereign, and satisfying, with decent liberality, the demands of the Goths, they levied an ungenerous and oppressive tax on the wants of the hungry barbarians. The vilest food was sold at an extravagant price; and, in the room of wholesome and substantial provisions, the markets were filled with the flesh of dogs, and of unclean animals, who had died of disease. To obtain the valuable acquisition of a pound of bread, the Goths resigned the possession of an expensive, though serviceable, slave; and a small quantity of meat was greedily purchased with ten pounds of a precious, but useless metal. When their property was exhausted, they continued this necessary traffic by the sale of

their sons and daughters; and notwithstanding the love of freedom, which animated every Gothic breast, they submitted to the humiliating maxim, that it was better for their children to be maintained in a servile condition, than to perish in a state of wretched and helpless independence.

"The most lively resentment is excited by the tyranny of pretended benefactors, who sternly exact the debt of gratitude which they have cancelled by subsequent injuries; a spirit of discontent insensibly arose in the camp of the barbarians, who

pleaded, without success, the merit of their patient and dutiful behavior; and loudly complained of the inhospitable treatment which they had received from their new allies. They beheld around them the wealth and plenty of a fertile province, in the midst of which they suffered the intolerable hardships of artificial famine. But the means of relief, and even of revenge, were in their hands; since the rapaciousness of their tyrants had left to an injured people the possession and the use of arms.

"The clamors of a multitude, untaught to disguise their sentiments, announced the first symptoms of resistance, and alarmed the timid and guilty minds of Lupicinus and Maximus. Those crafty ministers, who substituted the cunning of temporary expedients to the wise and salutary counsels of general policy, attempted to remove the Goths from their dangerous station on the frontiers of the empire; and to disperse them, in separate quarters of cantonment, through the interior provinces. As they were conscious how ill they had deserved the respect, or confidence, of the Barbarians, they diligently collected, from every side, a military force, that might urge the tardy and reluctant march of a people, who had not yet renounced the title, or the duties, of Roman subjects.

"But the generals of Valens, while their attention was solely directed to the discontented Visigoths, imprudently disarmed the ships and the fortifications which constituted the defense of the Danube. The fatal oversight was observed, and improved, by Alatheus and Saphrax, who anxiously watched the favorable moment

37

of escaping from the pursuit of the Huns. By the help of such rafts and vessels as could be hastily procured, the leaders of the Ostrogoths transported, without opposition, their king and their army; and boldly fixed a hostile and independent camp on the territories of the empire.—*Id.*, par. 16.

A. T. J.

*(To be continued.)*

**"The Commentary. Notes on the International Lesson. Daniel in Babylon. Dan. 1:8-21" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 3 , p. 42.**

(January 31. Dan. 1:8-21.)

DANIEL was in Babylon in fulfillment of prophecy. More than a hundred years before this, a king of Babylon—Merodach-baladan—had sent an embassy to Jerusalem to congratulate King Hezekiah on his recovery from his sickness, and

to inquire about the going backward of the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz. Hezekiah was so elated over such a notice of himself that he showed them all his treasures; "there was nothing in his house, nor in all his dominion, that Hezekiah showed them not." Then came Isaiah and said to Hezekiah: "Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be carried into Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon." 2 Kings 20:12-18.

ACCORDINGLY, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came up and besieged Jerusalem, and took it. "And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, *and of the king's seed*, and of the princes; children in whom was no blemish, but well favored, and skillful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans." Dan. 1:3, 4. We know not how many there were chosen to be thus taught; we only know the names of four who were of the company selected to be taught the learning of the Chaldeans; and we would never have known the names of even these four, if they had not had the courage to stand upon principle and firm conviction of truth and duty.

THEY were to study three years, and then pass an examination for places in the king's favor, and it was to be at the king's expense. "The king appointed them a daily provision of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank." "But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank." It is evident that Daniel was the one who led out in this, and that the other three decided to stand by him. It was Daniel that purposed in his heart that he would not do as was expected by the king, nor as all the students, but his three brethren, were willing to do.

AT this time Babylon was in the height of its glory. It contained between two and three million inhabitants, and all the Babylonian plain was teeming with population. Wealth and magnificence, with their inseparable accompaniments—luxury and intemperance—reigned on every hand, and this too, in heathen manners. It was in the midst of such scenes and such influences, that Daniel was placed when only a mere boy. But boy though he was, he purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself by conformity in any way with any of their customs, nor allow himself to be defiled with any of the evil influences that were around him.

HE refused the king's meat and wine, and asked the he might be given pulse to eat and water to drink. In the Revised Version, margin, we have "herbs" as the alternative reading for "pulse;" and "herbs" conveys the correct idea. It was what would be now called a vegetarian diet, the diet that was originally prescribed for man; and those who, even in this day, conform most closely to it, are in every way the better for it. It was not altogether a miracle, that their countenances were found "fairer and fatter" "than all the children which did eat of the portion of the king's meat." True, it must have been miraculous that so marked a result was

seen *in so short a time*—only ten days; but that result would not have been seen at all if they had not adopted the diet.

GOD works by means which he himself has appointed; and the closer men conform to the Lord's appointed ways, the more wondrously will be work in their behalf. If the church of God to-day would adopt the principles of Daniel, their power and efficiency would be increased manyfold [*sic.*]. Daniel was set there to study the learning of the Chaldeans, that he might successfully pass the appointed examination, and stand in the presence of the king. To accomplish this in the best way, he adopted a vegetarian diet. Those who, with him, did so, were approved of God, and succeeded so well that they were ten times better than all the wise men in the realm.

WE are set in the school of Christ to study the word of God, that we may successfully pass the appointed examination and stand in the presence of the King of kings. If such a course would accomplish such results in the study of heathen learning, why would it not accomplish much more in the study of the wisdom of God, as given in his sacred word? Without hesitation we say that it would. But where are the Daniels of to-day? Where are they to-day, even in the church, who will put themselves upon a strict regimen that they may have clearness and strength of mind to discern the precious wisdom of God. The clearer the brain, the clearer the thoughts; the purer the blood, the clearer the brain; the purer the food, the purer the blood; therefore the purer the food that we eat, the better will be our power to think, and the more clearly we can discern the truth on any point. How many ten thousands are singings, "Dare to be a Daniel"! But alas! how many *tens* can be found who do really dare to be Daniels?

IT is said of these four Hebrews, that by this course their countenances were "fairer" than all the others. In this lesson is a proved prescription which we commend to all young ladies who wish to have a fair complexion. It is better than all the paints and powders in Christendom. We once heard the question asked Dr. Simms, in a large audience, "What is the best means of preserving a fair, beautiful complexion?" He answered, "Avoid tea, coffee, pork, oysters, fish, etc. Use a vegetarian diet." That is the truth, and it is a truth that is taught in this lesson from the first chapter of Daniel. This very lesson in Dan. 1:8-21, is of the first importance to all people in this our day. We say indeed, in every sense, "Dare to be a Daniel."

THE following by Dr. Geo. P. Hayes, in "Half Hours with the Lessons," is exactly to the point:—

"When Daniel made up his mind not to defile himself with the king's meat, it was purely a question of principle. . . . It seemed utterly foolish. King Nebuchadnezzar and Melzar both believed that the popular opinion of the day was all right in saying that wine and fat meat were necessary for a clear complexion and a quick brain. The same false notion is widely held now about lager beer and tonics. Is it true? Ask the health records. . . . Gout, liver complaint, and the hundred-faced dyspepsias are Nature's protest against mince-pies, fruit-cakes, brandy-puddings, and gluttony. . . . You may not wish to obey Nature's health-laws, but you cannot defy them and escape. Just now the papers are reviving the discussion of the value of the Mosaic law on food, as a law of health.

The health and brain-power of the Jews would teach the Gentiles a lesson, if the Gentiles were not so heedless. Many will doubt this statement and stick to Melzar's notion, that if they restrict themselves to Daniel's diet they will soon become 'worse-liking' than others which are 'of their set.' Well, why not take Daniel's way of settling it? Just try it."

A. T. J.

**"The Throne of David" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 3 , pp. 42, 43.**

ZEDEDIAH was the last king of Judah and Jerusalem, the last king upon the throne of David. To him it was that the prophet wrote the message from God: "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. There can be no question as to who is the One "whose right it is" to sit upon the throne of David, to put on the kingly crown, and to wear the

43

royal diadem. There can be but one,—He who is the aim of all the prophecies and the subject of all the promises. And when the fullness of the time was come when He should appear in the world, the annunciation was: Thou "shalt call his name JESUS. 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 for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33.

This promise is itself a prophecy of what should be in the future, "the Lord God *shall give*" etc.; but there is nothing in it to signify when this event might be looked for. However, it was said to Zedekiah, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it." It was to be overturned three times, and then, "be no more till he come whose right it is," and *then* it shall be given him. Now by turning to Daniel, who had been carried captive to Babylon with the first that were taken—about B.C. 606—we find that he has recorded in the second chapter what was seen by King Nebuchadnezzar in a dream; and in the seventh chapter what himself saw in a dream. There it is said that there were *four* great kingdoms to be in succession from Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the world; the *fourth* was to be divided into ten kingdoms, "and in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom." These answer to the three overturnings that were spoken of to Zedekiah. The kingdom of Judah was then subject to the kingdom of Babylon; when that was overthrown by Medo-Persia, there was the first overturning; when Medo-Persia was destroyed by Grecia, there was the second overturning; and when Grecia was succeeded by Rome, there was the third overturning, and then it should be no more till He come whose right it is, and it shall be given Him. All these overturnings are in the past; long centuries have gone since the kingdom of Judah was no more; and soon, very soon will He come whose right it is, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be

no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. Isa. 9:7.  
A. T. J.

**January 28, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 4 , pp. 52, 53.**

"UNDER the name of Judges, Alavivus and Fritigern were the leaders of the Visigoths in peace and war; and the authority which they derived from their birth was ratified by the free consent of the nation. In a season of tranquility, their power might have been equal, as well as their rank; but, as soon as their countrymen were exasperated by hunger and oppression, the superior abilities of Fritigern assumed the military command, which he was qualified to exercise for the public welfare. He restrained the impatient spirit of the Visigoths till the injuries and the insults of their tyrants should justify their resistance in the opinion of mankind; but he was not disposed to sacrifice any solid advantages for the empty praise of justice and moderation.

"Sensible of the benefits which would result from the union of the Gothic powers under the same standard, he secretly cultivated the friendship of the Ostrogoths; and while he professed an implicit obedience to the orders of the Roman generals, he proceeded by slow marches towards Marcianopolis, the capital of the Lower Mesia, about seventy miles from the banks of the Danube. On that fatal spot, the flames of discord and mutual hatred burst forth into a dreadful conflagration. Lupicinus had invited the Gothic chiefs to a splendid entertainment; and their martial train remained under arms at the entrance of the palace. But the gates of the city were strictly guarded, and the Barbarians were sternly excluded from the use of a plentiful market, to which they asserted their equal claim of subjects and allies.

"Their humble prayers were rejected with insolence and derision; and as their patience was now exhausted, the townsmen, the soldiers, and the Goths, were soon involved in a conflict of passionate altercation and angry reproaches.

"A blow was imprudently given; a sword was hastily drawn; and the first blood that was spilt in this accidental quarrel, became the signal of a long and destructive war. In the midst of noise and brutal intemperance, Lupicinus was informed, by a secret messenger, that many of his soldiers were slain, and despoiled of their arms; and as he was already inflamed by wine, and oppressed by sleep he issued a rash command, that their death should be revenged by the massacre of the guards of Fritigern and Alavivus. The clamorous shouts and dying groans apprised Fritigern of his

extreme danger; and, as he possessed the calm and intrepid spirit of a hero, he saw that he was lost if he allowed a moment of deliberation to the man who had so deeply injured him. 'A trifling dispute,' said the Gothic leader, with a firm but gentle tone of voice, 'appears to have arisen between the two nations; but it may be productive of the most dangerous consequences, unless the tumult is immediately pacified by the assurance of our safety, and the authority of our presence.'

"At these words, Fritigern and his companions drew their swords, opened their passage through the unresisting crowd, which filled the palace,

the streets, and the gates, of Marcianopolis, and, mounting their horses, hastily vanished from the eyes of the astonished Romans.

The generals of the Goths were saluted by the fierce and joyful acclamations of the camp; war was instantly resolved, and the resolution was executed without delay; the banners of the nation

were displayed according to the custom of their ancestors; and the air resounded with the harsh and mournful music of the barbarian trumpet. The weak and guilty Lupicinus, who had dared to provoke, who had neglected to destroy, and who still presumed to despise, his formidable enemy, marched against the Goths, at the head of such a military force as could be collected on this sudden emergency.

"The barbarians expected his approach about nine miles from Marcianopolis; and on this occasion the talents of the general were found to be of more prevailing efficacy than the weapons and discipline of the troops. The valor of the Goths was so ably directed by the genius of Fritigern, that they broke, by a close and vigorous attack, the ranks of the Roman legions. Lupicinus left his arms and standards, his tribunes and his bravest soldiers, on the field of battle; and their useless courage served only to protect the ignominious flight of their leader. *'That successful day put an end to the distress of the Barbarians, and the security of the Romans: from that day, the Goths, renouncing the precarious condition of strangers and exiles, assumed the character of citizens and masters, claimed an absolute dominion over the possessors of land, and held, in their own right, the northern provinces of the empire, which are bounded by the Danube.'* Such are the words of the Gothic historian, who celebrates, with rude eloquence, the glory of his countrymen.

"But the dominion of the Barbarians was exercised only for the purposes of rapine and destruction. As they had been deprived, by the ministers of the emperor, of the common benefits of nature, and the fair intercourse of social life, they retaliated the injustice on the subjects of the empire; and the crimes of Lupicinus were expiated by the ruin of the peaceful husbandmen of Thrace, the

conflagration of their villages, and the massacre, or captivity, of their innocent families. The report of the Gothic victory was soon diffused over the adjacent country; and while it filled the minds of the Romans with terror and dismay, their own hasty imprudence contributed to increase the forces of Fritigern, and the calamities of the province.

"Some time before the great emigration, a numerous body of Goths, under the command of Suerid and Colias, had been received into the protection and service of the empire. They were encamped under the walls of Hadrianople; but the ministers of Valens were anxious to remove them beyond the Hellespont, at a distance from the dangerous temptation which might so easily be communicated by the neighborhood, and the success, of their countrymen. The

respectful submission with which they yielded to the order of their march, might be considered as a proof of their fidelity; and their moderate request of a sufficient allowance of provisions, and of a delay of only two days was expressed in the most dutiful terms. But the first magistrate of Hadrianople, incensed by some disorders which had been committed at his country-house, refused this indulgence; and arming against them the inhabitants and manufacturers of a populous city, he urged, with hostile threats, their instant departure.

"The barbarians stood silent and amazed, till they were exasperated by the insulting clamors, and missile weapons, of the populace; but when patience or contempt was fatigued, they crushed the undisciplined multitude, inflicted many a shameful wound on the backs of their flying enemies, and despoiled them of the splendid armor, which they were unworthy to bear. The resemblance of their

sufferings and their actions soon united this victorious detachment to the nation of the Visigoths; the troops of Colias and Suerid expected the approach of the great Fritigern, ranged themselves under his standard, and signalized their ardor in the siege of Hadrianople. But the resistance of the garrison informed the barbarians, that in the attack of regular fortifications, the efforts of unskillful courage are seldom effectual. Their general acknowledged his error, raised the siege, declared that 'he was at peace with stone walls,' and revenged his disappointment on the adjacent country.

"He accepted, with pleasure, the useful reinforcement of hardy workmen, who labored in the gold mines of Thrace, for the emolument, and under the lash, of an unfeeling master; and these new associates conducted the barbarians, through the secret paths, to the most sequestered places, which had been chosen to secure the inhabitants, the cattle, and the magazines of corn. With

the assistance of such guides, nothing could remain impervious or inaccessible; resistance was fatal; flight was impracticable; and the patient submission of helpless innocence seldom found mercy from the barbarian conqueror.

"In the course of these depredations, a great number of the children of the Goths, who had been sold into captivity, were restored to the embraces of their afflicted parents; but these tender interviews,

which might have revived and cherished in their minds some sentiments of humanity, tended only to stimulate their native fierceness by the desire of revenge. They listened, with eager attention, to the complaints of their captive children, who had suffered the most cruel indignities from the lustful or angry passions of their masters, and the same cruelties, the same indignities, were severely retaliated on the sons and daughters of the Romans."

"The imprudence of Valens and his ministers had introduced into the heart of the empire a nation of enemies; but the Visigoths might even yet have been reconciled, by the manly confession of past errors, and the sincere performance of former engagements. These healing and temperate measures seemed to concur with the timorous disposition of the sovereign of the East: but, on this occasion alone, Valens was brave; and his unseasonable bravery was fatal to himself and to his subjects. He declared [A.D. 377] his intention of marching from Antioch to Constantinople, to subdue this dangerous rebellion; and, as he was not ignorant of the difficulties of the enterprise, he

solicited the assistance of his nephew, the Emperor Gratian, who commanded all the forces of the West. The veteran troops were hastily recalled from the defense of Armenia; that important frontier was abandoned to the discretion of Sapor; and the immediate conduct of the Gothic war was intrusted, during the absence of Valens, to his lieutenants Trajan and Profuturus, two generals who indulged themselves in a very false and favorable opinion of their own abilities.

"On their arrival in Thrace, they were joined by Richomer, count of the domestics; and the auxiliaries of the West, that marched under his banner, were composed of the Gallic legions, reduced indeed, by a spirit of desertion, to the vain appearances of strength and numbers. In a council of war, which was influenced by pride, rather than by reason, it was resolved to seek, and to encounter, the

barbarians, who lay encamped in the spacious and fertile meadows, near the most southern of the six mouths of the Danube. Their camp was surrounded by the usual fortification of wagons; and the barbarians, secure within the vast circle of the enclosure, enjoyed the fruits of their valor, and the spoils of the province. In the

midst of riotous intemperance, the watchful Fritigern observed the motions, and penetrated the designs, of the Romans. He perceived, that the numbers of the enemy were continually increasing; and, as he understood their intention of attacking his rear, as soon as the scarcity of forage should oblige him to remove his camp, he recalled to their standard his predatory detachments, which covered the adjacent country. As soon as they descried the flaming beacons, they obeyed, with incredible speed, the signal of their leader; the camp was filled with the martial crowd of barbarians; their impatient clamors

demanded the battle, and their tumultuous zeal was approved and animated by the spirit of their chiefs. The evening was already far advanced; and the two armies prepared themselves for the approaching combat, which was deferred only till the dawn of day. While the trumpets sounded to arms, the undaunted courage of the Goths was confirmed by the mutual obligation of a solemn oath; and as

53

they advanced to meet the enemy, the rude songs, which celebrated the glory of their forefathers, were mingled with their fierce and dissonant outcries, and opposed to the artificial harmony of the Roman shout. Some military skill was displayed by Fritigern to gain the advantage of a commanding eminence; but the bloody conflict, which began and ended with the light, was maintained on either side, by the personal and obstinate efforts of strength, valor, and agility.

"The legions of Armenia supported their fame in arms; but they were oppressed by the irresistible weight of the hostile multitude the left wing of the Romans was thrown into disorder and the field was strewed with their mangled carcasses. This partial defeat was balanced, however, by partial success; and when the two armies, at a late hour of the evening, retreated to their respective camps, neither

of them could claim the honors, or the effects, of a decisive victory. The real loss was more severely felt by the Romans, in proportion to the smallness of their numbers; but the Goths were so deeply confounded and dismayed by this vigorous, and perhaps unexpected, resistance, that they remained seven days within the circle of their fortifications. Such funeral rites, as the circumstances of time and place would admit, were piously discharged to some officers of distinguished rank; but the indiscriminate vulgar was left unburied on the plain. Their flesh was greedily devoured by the birds of prey, who in that age enjoyed very frequent and delicious feasts; and several years afterwards the white and naked bones, which covered the wide extent of the fields, presented to the eyes of Ammianus a dreadful monument of the

battle of Salices."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 16, 17.*  
A. T. J.

**"The Abiding Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5 , pp. 55, 56.**

THE late Hon. Richard Fletcher, of Boston, Mass., by his last will, established in charge of the trustees of Dartmouth College, "a fund from the income of which they were to offer, once in two years, a prize of \$500 for the essay best adapted" to counteract "the numerous and powerful influences constantly active in drawing professed Christians into fatal conformity with the world, both in spirit and practice." The fifth time of offering the prize fell in 1883. Accordingly the trustees of the fund and of Dartmouth College selected as the "specific theme" of the desired essay, "The Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day," and offered the five-hundred-dollar prize for the best. The committee of award was composed of the following gentlemen: "Prof. William Thompson, D. D., Prof. Llewellyn Pratt, D. D., and Rev. George M. Stone, D. D., all of Hartford, Conn." This committee, after a careful and thorough examination," awarded the prize to an essay which proved to have been written by the Rev. George Elliott, of West Union, Iowa. The essay, entitled "The Abiding Sabbath," appeared in 1884, and was issued from the press of the American Tract Society in the winter of 1884-85, in the form of a book of two hundred and eighty pages. A copy of the work has been in our hands some time, for notice, but, until now, we have not had time to give it the attention that we desired.

For more than a quarter of a century, Seventh-day Adventists have known, have preached, and have written, that the Sabbath question would yet be the leading question in the United States, not alone in religion, but in politics as well; or, as we might rather say, in the religio-political form that is soon to be given to the American Union. This we have known all these years; but, until with a few years, our opponents have thought that we were counting the Sabbath question of undue importance. Now, however, even *they* are constrained to admit that that question is fast assuming the place of first importance in the affairs of the country, and so confess that we have been only in the right about it all the time. Knowing the importance of the question, not only in itself, but also because of the prominence it is soon to assume in national affairs, we shall always endeavor, as far as in us lies, to keep our readers informed on the subject in all its bearings. "The Abiding Sabbath," being one of the latest as well as one of the most authoritative discussions of the question as to why we should keep

56

Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the Lord, we ask the attention of our readers while we examine the main points of the argument.

The book is divided into three parts,—*"Sabbath of Nature," "Sabbath of the Law,"* and *"Sabbath of Redemption."* We shall quote quite largely from the first two parts, and that without argument, there being in fact no room for argument between us, because the author of "The Abiding Sabbath," in these two parts, proves to perfection the perpetual obligation of the seventh day as the Sabbath, and that is exactly what we believe. We ask our readers to study carefully his

argument on the "Sabbath of Nature" and the "Sabbath of the Law," which we quote, (1) because it is excellent reading, and (2) because we want them to see clearly, by what curious freaks of logic it is, that after absolutely demonstrating the perpetual obligation of the seventh day, another day entirely is to be observed. He says most truly:—

"The Sabbath is an institution as old as the completion of the world. . . . It shares with marriage the glory of being the sole relics saved to the fallen race from their lost paradise. One is the foundation of the family, and consequently of the State; the other is equally necessary to worship and the church. These two fair and fragrant roses man bore with him from the blighted bliss of Eden.

"It is not, however, the mere fact of age that lends sacredness to these institutions; for years alone cannot give consecration or compel regard to anything which does not possess in itself some inherent sanctity and dignity. It is in the circumstances of its first institution, and in its essential character, that we must hope to discover the necessity and holiness of the Sabbath day.

"'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. 2:3. Such is the sublimely simple statement which forms the last strain of that magnificent hymn of creation which is our only glimpse into the beginning of things. It is surely consistent with sound common sense and sound interpretation to see in these words much more than a mere anticipation of the theocratic Sabbath of Israel. It seems absurd to express in words what some have implied in their reasonings on this passage: 'God rested on the seventh day; therefore 2,500 years afterwards he blessed and sanctified it.' The same form of language is used to describe what took place on the seventh day as in relating what took place in the six preceding days.

"It is certain that a first reading of this passage conveys to the mind the idea that the sanctification of the Sabbath as a day of rest took place at the very close of the creative week. That such was the case would probably never have been denied, if the denial had not been necessary to support a peculiar view. Doubt in regard to this proleptic interpretation is sustained by the recent discovery of mention of a day of rest in the Assyrian account of creation, which is believed to antedate Moses by nearly six hundred years, and the further discovery of the actual observance of a Sabbath in Babylonia long before the time of the Mosaic institution. Is not God saving his facts, in Egyptian tombs, on Assyrian bricks, and in all historic remains everywhere, that, at every crisis of his truth, when even the mouths of believers are silenced by the tumult of doubt, the very 'stones' may 'cry out'?

"A special authority attaches itself to the primitive revelation. Whatever critical opinions may assert concerning the early history of the world, to the Christian the testimony of Jesus Christ remains in force to the high obligation of the Edenic law. In reproving the corruptions of the marriage relation which had arisen under the Mosaic code, he reverts to the primitive law: 'From the beginning it was not so.' That is to say, the law of the beginning is supreme. Whatever institutions were given to man then were given for all time. There is given thus to marriage, and to its related institution, the Sabbath, a permanent character and authority

which transcend the Hebrew legislation in their universal and binding force. Those elements of truth which were given to the infant race, are the possession of humanity, and not of the Jew alone; they are the alphabet of all the growing knowledge of man, not to be forgotten as the world grows old, but to be borne with him in all his wanderings, to last through all changes, and be his guide up those rugged steeps by which he must climb to the lofty summits of his nobler destiny.

"Not to a single race, but to man; not to man alone, but to the whole creation; not to the created things alone, but to the Creator himself, came the benediction of the first Sabbath. Its significance extends beyond the narrow limits of Judaism, to all races, and perhaps to all worlds. It is a law spoken not simply through the lawgiver of a chosen people, but declared in the presence of a finished heaven and earth. The declaration in Genesis furnishes the best commentary on the saying of Jesus: 'The Sabbath was made for man.' For man, universal humanity, it was given with its benediction.

"The reason of the institution of the Sabbath is one which possesses an unchanging interest and importance to all mankind. The theme of the creation is not peculiar to Israel, nor is worship of the Creator confined to the children of Abraham. The primary article of every religious creed, and the foundation of all true religion, is faith in one God as the Maker of all things. Against atheism, which denies the existence of a personal God; against materialism, which denies that this visible universe has its roots in the unseen; and against secularism, which denies the need of worship, the Sabbath is therefore an eternal witness. It symbolically commemorates that creative power which spoke all things into being, the wisdom which ordered their adaptations and harmony, and the love which made, as well as pronounced, all 'very good.' It is set as the perpetual guardian of man against that spiritual infirmity which has everywhere led him to a denial of the God who made him, or to the degradation of that God into a creature made with his own hands. . . .

"While the reason remains, the law remains. The reason of the Sabbath is to be found in the fact of creation; it is God's one monument set in human history to that great event; and so long as the truth of creation and the knowledge of a Creator have any value to human thought, any authority over the human conscience, or make any appeal to human affections, so long the law and the institution of the Sabbath will abide with lasting instruction and undiminished obligation.

"God 'rested the seventh day from all his work which he had made.' Such is the record, declared in the beginning, embodied in the decalogue, and confirmed by the epistle to the Hebrews. It is a statement not to be easily understood at the first glance 'Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?' Isa. 40:28. If he is never weary how can we say of him that he rests? . . . God is a Spirit, and the only rest which he can know is that supreme repose which only the Spirit can know—in the fulfillment of his purpose and the completeness as well as completion of his work. Just as, in the solemn pauses between the creative days, he pronounced his creatures 'very good,' so did he rejoice over the

finishing of his work, resting in the perfect satisfaction of an accomplished plan; not to restore his wasted energy, as man rests, but to signify that in the coming of man the creative idea has found its consummation and crown. Such is the rest possible to a purely spiritual nature—the rest of a completed work.

"There is a still deeper sense in which the example of Deity reveals this obligation. Suppose the question to be asked, How can we know that any precept is moral in its meaning and authority, and not simply a positive and arbitrary command? What better answer could be given to this inquiry than to say that a moral precept must have the ground of its existence in the nature of God? Our highest conception of the moral law is to regard it as the transcript of his nature. . . . No more perfect vindication of the moral character of a law can be given than to show that it is a rule of the divine conduct; that it has been imposed upon his own activity by that infinite Will which is the supreme authority both in the physical and moral government of the universe. That law to which the Creator submits his own being must be of absolute binding force upon every creature made in his image. Such is the law of the Sabbath. 'God rested the seventh day,' and by so doing has given to the law of the Sabbath the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity. In no conceivable way could the Almighty so perfectly and with such unchallengeable authority declare, not simply his will in a positive institution, but the essentially moral character of the precept, as by revealing his own self-subjection to the rule which he imposes on his creatures. . . .

"Its obligation is addressed, not to man's physical nature alone, but to man as a spiritual being, made in the image of God; it is laid, not only on his bodily powers and natural understanding, but upon his moral reason as right, and upon his conscience as duty. It is therefore bounded by no limits of time, place, or circumstance, but is of universal and perpetual authority. . . .

"The Sabbath is therefore shown to be given in the beginning to all men; to have the lofty sanction of the example of God; to be rooted in the eternal world; to be the witness of the most important truths possible for man to know; to be a blessing to man's nature; to inclose a duty of worship to God. By all these revealings which are given by the institution at its first ordainment, we are justified in believing that it has a moral meaning within it, and imposes upon all races and generations of men an unchanging and unrelaxed obligation of dutiful observance."

We have quoted more than half of the whole first chapter; but we have no apology to make. We honestly thank Mr. Elliott that he has given us so masterly a demonstration of the perpetual and universal obligation of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. We ask the reader to study it carefully; for it is a vindication of principles that are eternal, and that no ingenuity of man can undermine.

Next week, if the Lord will, we shall notice his "Sabbath of the Law"—the fourth commandment.

A. T. J.

**"The Fiery Furnace" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5 , p. 59.**

## The Commentary

### NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON

(February 7. Dan. 5:16-28.)

AT the end of the three years' schooling of the Hebrew children, referred to in last weeks' lesson, they were required to undergo an examination upon what they had learned. The king himself conducted the examination. "And among them all was found none like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah; therefore stood they before the king. And in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm." Dan. 1:19, 20.

SHORTLY afterward, king Nebuchadnezzar had his dream of the great image, in which was represented the course of empire from his day to the end of the world. The dream made a deep impression on his mind, but he could not possibly recall what he had seen. He was so exercised in mind over it, in trying to recall it, that he could not sleep, and he finally called for the magicians, astrologers, sorcerers, and Chaldeans, that they might tell him what he had dreamed. Daniel and his three brethren, however, were not brought in among these, probably on account of their youth. None of all these that came could tell the king anything at all about what he wanted to know, by which he discovered their imposture, and commanded that they should be killed. Although Daniel and his brethren were by some means overlooked in the call to gather the wise men before the king, they were not missed when the officers went to execute the decree of death upon all such.

THEY were found, and were about to be taken to execution when Daniel asked to be taken to the king. His request was granted, and he asked time and he would tell all the king's matter. Then God showed the thing to Daniel in a night vision, and so the whole matter with its meaning was shown to the king. "Then the king made daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts, and made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon. Then Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon; but Daniel sat in the gate of the king."

THESE events occurred in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, about 603 B. C. The event which is the subject of the lesson for to-day was about twenty-three years afterward. During this time, Nebuchadnezzar had made an expedition into Egypt and laid it waste. There he had opportunity to see a colossal image which had been set up by Rameses II., the "king who knew not Joseph." This image with its pedestal was 115 feet high, and weighed 1,200 tons. It is supposed that it was in imitation of this image, that Nebuchadnezzar erected his, in his ambition to excel in things great all surrounding kingdoms. See *Christian at Work*, July 9, 1885, page 651.

WHEN Nebuchadnezzar had set up his image, he "sent to gather together the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the

counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image." Dan. 3:2. When they had all come, and all was ready, "Then a herald cried aloud" the command that when the sound of all the music was heard, all the assembly should fall down and worship the great image. Of course Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, being principal officers, were there; and also of course they refused to obey the king's command. It was told the king immediately, and he called them up and asked them about it. Thinking that perhaps it was inadvertence, and that they had not intentionally disobeyed, he asked them, "Is it true [*is it of purpose*, margin; *is it a laid plan*, Hebrew] O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?" Then he repeated his command to them direct, and he received a direct answer in which he learned that it was "of purpose," that it was because of a "laid plan," that they refused to worship the image which he had set up.

"SHADRACH, Mechach, and Abednego answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." They were immediately bound, and were plunged into the midst of the furnace, with it already heated seven times hotter than it was usual to heat it. But they were no sooner fallen into the furnace than Nebuchadnezzar was almost petrified with astonishment. He cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast three men *bound* into the midst of the fire?" They replied, "True, O king." But he answered, "Lo, I see *four men loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have not hurt; *and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.*" Then they were called forth.

THUS God delivered those who trusted in him. And thus he vindicated the principle that, we are bound to resist the laws of men, when they are against the law or word of God. Daniel's deliverance from the lion's den, and the deliverance of the apostles from prison more than once, are only additional assertions of the principle that, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:20. This lesson is of vital importance to every Sunday-school scholar in this Union. For the National Reform Party has set itself to make an image to the papal power, and to compel all men, under pains and penalties, to worship both the papal power and its image, and this in direct violation of the plain commandment of God. And each one who lives the natural course of life, will be called upon, and that soon, to decide for himself whether he will "worship Him that made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters" (Rev. 14:5-12); or whether he will renounce allegiance to God and worship the papal power and the National Reform image to it in the United States. The commandment of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." In defiance of this commandment, and upon the sole authority of the Catholic Church, the National Reformers are going to enact a law by which they can compel everybody to keep Sunday. But, "If any man worship the beast and his image, . . . he shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out

without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

A. T. J.

**February 4, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5 , p. 68.**

*(Continued.)*

"THE progress of the Goths had been checked by the doubtful event of that bloody day; and the Imperial generals, whose army would have been consumed by the repetition of such a contest, embraced the more rational plan of destroying the barbarians by the wants and pressure of their own multitudes. They prepared to confine the Visigoths in the narrow angle of land between the Danube, the desert of Scythia, and the mountains of Hemus, till their strength and spirit should be insensibly wasted by the inevitable operation of famine. The design was prosecuted with some conduct and success; the barbarians had almost exhausted their own magazines, and the harvests of the country; and the diligence of Saturninus, the master-general of the cavalry, was employed to improve the strength, and to contract the extent, of the Roman fortifications. His labors were interrupted by the alarming intelligence, that new swarms of Barbarians had passed the unguarded Danube, either to support the cause, or to imitate the example, of Fritigern.

"The just apprehension, that he himself might be surrounded, and overwhelmed, by the arms of hostile and unknown nations, compelled Saturninus to relinquish the siege of the Gothic camp; and the indignant Visigoths, breaking from their confinement, satiated their hunger and revenge by the repeated devastation of the fruitful country, which extends above three hundred miles from the banks of the Danube to the straits of the Hellespont. The sagacious Fritigern had successfully appealed to the passions, as well as to the interest, of his Barbarian allies; and the love of rapine, and the hatred of Rome, seconded, or even prevented, the eloquence of his ambassadors. He cemented a strict and useful alliance with the great body of his countrymen, who obeyed Alatheus and Saphrax as the guardians of their infant king; the long animosity of rival tribes was suspended by the sense of their common interest; the independent part of the nation was associated under one standard; and the chiefs of the Ostrogoths appear to have

yielded to the superior genius of the general of the Visigoths. He obtained the formidable aid of the Taifale, whose military renown was disgraced and polluted by the public infamy of their domestic manners. . . .

"But the most powerful auxiliaries of the Goths were drawn from the camp of those enemies who had expelled them from their native seats. The loose subordination, and extensive possessions, of the Huns and the Alani, delayed the conquests, and distracted the councils, of that victorious people. Several of the hordes were allured by the liberal promises of Fritigern; and the rapid cavalry of Scythia added weight and energy to the steady and strenuous efforts of the Gothic infantry. The Sarmatians, who could never forgive the successor of Valentinian, enjoyed and increased the general confusion; and a seasonable irruption of the Alemanni, into the provinces of Gaul, engaged the attention, and diverted the forces, of the emperor of the West."

"While Gratian deserved and enjoyed the applause of his subjects, the Emperor Valens, who, at length, had removed his court and army from Antioch, was received by the people of Constantinople as the author of the public calamity. Before he had reposed himself ten days [A.D. 378, May 30-June 11] in the capital, he was urged by the licentious clamors of the Hippodrome to march against the barbarians, whom he had invited into his dominions; and the citizens, who are always brave at a distance from any real danger, declared, with confidence, that, if they were supplied with arms, they alone would undertake to deliver the province from the ravages of an insulting foe. The vain reproaches of an ignorant multitude hastened the downfall of the Roman empire; they provoked the desperate rashness of Valens; who did not find, either in his reputation or in his mind, any motives to support with firmness the public contempt. He was soon persuaded, by the successful achievements of his lieutenants, to despise the power of the Goths, who, by the diligence of Fritigern, were now collected in the neighborhood of Hadrianople.

"The march of the Taifale had been intercepted by the valiant Frigerid; the king of those licentious Barbarians was slain in battle; and the suppliant captives were sent into distant exile to cultivate the lands of Italy, which were assigned for their settlement in the vacant territories of Modena and Parma. The exploits of Sebastian, who was recently engaged in the service of Valens, and promoted to the rank of master-general of the infantry, were still more honorable to himself, and useful to the republic. He obtained the permission of selecting three hundred soldiers from each of the legions; and this separate detachment soon acquired the spirit of discipline, and the exercise of arms, which were almost forgotten under the reign of Valens. By the vigor and conduct of Sebastian, a

large body of the Goths were surprised in their camp; and the immense spoil, which was recovered from their hands, filled the city of Hadrianople, and the adjacent plain. The splendid narratives, which the general transmitted of his own exploits, alarmed the Imperial court by the appearance of superior merit; and though he cautiously insisted on the difficulties of the Gothic war, his valor was praised, his advice was rejected; and Valens, who listened with pride and pleasure to the flattering suggestions of the eunuchs of the palace, was impatient to seize the glory of an easy and assured conquest.

"His army was strengthened by a numerous reinforcement of veterans; and his march from Constantinople to Hadrianople was conducted with so much military skill, that he prevented the activity of the barbarians, who designed to occupy the intermediate defiles, and to intercept either the troops themselves, or their convoys of provisions. The camp of Valens, which he pitched under the walls of Hadrianople, was fortified, according to the practice of the Romans, with a ditch and rampart; and a most important council was summoned, to decide the fate of the emperor and of the empire. The party of reason and of delay was strenuously maintained by Victor, who had corrected, by the lessons of experience, the native fierceness of the Sarmatian character; while Sebastian, with the flexible and obsequious eloquence of a courtier, represented every precaution, and every measure, that implied a doubt of immediate victory, as unworthy of the courage and majesty of their invincible monarch.

"The ruin of Valens was precipitated by the deceitful arts of Fritigern, and the prudent admonitions of the emperor of the West. The advantages of negotiating in the midst of war were perfectly understood by the general of the barbarians; and a Christian ecclesiastic was dispatched, as the holy minister of peace, to penetrate, and to perplex, the councils of the enemy. The misfortunes, as well as the provocations, of the Gothic nation, were forcibly and truly described by their ambassador; who protested, in the name of Fritigern, that he was still disposed to lay down his arms, or to employ them only in the defense of the empire; if he could secure for his wandering countrymen a tranquil settlement on the waste lands of Thrace, and a sufficient allowance of corn and cattle. But he added, in a whisper of confidential friendship, that the exasperated barbarians were averse to these reasonable conditions; and that Fritigern was doubtful whether he could accomplish the conclusion of the treaty, unless he found himself supported by the presence and terrors of an Imperial army.

"About the same time, Count Richomer returned from the West to announce the defeat and submission of the Alemanni, to inform Valens that his nephew advanced by rapid marches at the head of

the veteran and victorious legions of Gaul, and to request, in the name of Gratian and of the republic, that every dangerous and decisive measure might be suspended, till the junction of the two emperors should insure the success of the Gothic war. But the feeble sovereign of the East was actuated only by the fatal illusions of pride and jealousy. He disdained the importunate advice; he rejected the humiliating aid; he secretly compared the ignominious, at least the inglorious, period of his own reign, with the fame of a beardless youth; and Valens rushed into the field, to erect his imaginary trophy, before the diligence of his colleague could usurp any share of the triumphs of the day.—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 18, 20.*  
A. T. J.

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' Sabbath of the Law" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 5 , pp. 72, 73.**

### **SABBATH OF THE LAW**

IN further notice of "The Abiding Sabbath," we shall here give some extracts from the author's discussion of the fourth commandment, showing the universal and everlasting obligation of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. He says:—

"The giving of the law at Sinai is the loftiest landmark in the history of Israel. It is the beginning of their civil and religious polity. From that moment Israel became the nation of Jehovah, the nation of the law, the leader among the nations of the earth in the search after a positive righteousness. That the Sabbath is a part of that code, has therefore a meaning not for the Hebrew alone, but for the whole race of mankind.

"Everywhere in the sacred writings of the Hebrews they are reminded that they are the people peculiarly guided by Providence. Historian, psalmist, and prophet never tire in recounting the marvelous interpositions of Jehovah in behalf of his chosen people. And this thought is the key-note to the decalogue, '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), is the introduction to the law. When therefore the Sabbath is introduced into the decalogue, while its old significance as a testimony of creation is not lost, but especially recalled, it becomes, beside, a monument of the divine Providence whose particular manifestations Israel, among the nations, has most largely experienced. The Sabbath of the law is the Sabbath of Providence.

"The declaration on Sinai is perhaps the strongest attestation which the Sabbath ordinance has received. It is henceforth based upon an express command of God himself, is given in

circumstances of the most impressive solemnity, and has received the awful sanction of embodiment in the moral law, against which 'the soul that sinneth, it shall die.' Eze. 18:4. God has spoken, and his creatures must obey or perish.

"We commonly speak of the decalogue as the 'ten commandments.' A more precise rendering of the Hebrew terms would be the 'ten words' (Ex. 34:28, margin; Deut. 4:13; 10:2, 4, margin), an exact equivalent of which we have taken from the Greek, in the word 'decalogue.' These statutes are therefore not simply commands or precepts of God, for God may give commandments which have only a transient and local effect; they are in a distinctive sense the word of God, an essential part of that word which 'abideth.' In the decalogue we get a glimpse of that inner movement of the divine will which is the permanent foundation for all temporary ordinances. It is not contended that this use of language is rigidly uniform, but only that by the phrase, 'the ten words,' as well as in the general scope of Hebrew legislation, the moral law is fully distinguished from the civil and ceremonial law. The first is an abiding statement of the divine will; the last consists of transient ordinances having but a temporary and local meaning and force. The decalogue is also called the 'testimony' (Ex. 25:16 and in many other places), that

73

is, the witness of the divine will; also the words of the 'covenant' (34:28), and 'his (i.e., Jehovah's) covenant' (Deut. 4:13), upon obedience to which his favor was in a special manner conditioned. The names given to this code declare its unchanging moral authority.

"The manner in which this law was given attests its special sanctity and high authority. Before its announcement, the people of Israel, by solemn rites, sanctified themselves, while the holy mountain was girded with the death-line which no mortal could pass and live. When the appointed day came, to the sublime accompaniment of pealing thunders and flashing lightnings, the loud shrilling of angel-blown trumpets, the smoking mountain, and the quaking earth, from the lips of Jehovah himself sounded forth 'with a great voice' the awful sentences of this divine law, to which in the same way 'he added no more.' Deut. 5:22. Not by the mouth of an angel or prophet came this sublimest code of morals, but the words were formed in air by the power of the Eternal himself. And when it was to be recorded, no human scribe took down the sacred utterances; they were engraved by no angel hand; but with his own finger he inscribed on tables of stone, whose preparation, in the first instance, was 'the work of God,' the words of his will. Ex. 31:18; 32:16; 34:1, 4, 28.

"The law declared by his own mouth and indited by his own hand was finally placed in the ark of the covenant, underneath the mercy-seat, where sprinkled blood might atone for its violation; . . . and beneath the flaming manifestation of the very presence of the Almighty, the glory of the shekinah; circumstances signifying forever the divine source of this law and the divine solicitude that it should be obeyed. This superior solemnity and majesty of announcement and conservation distinguish the decalogue above all other laws given to man, and separate it widely from the civil polity and ritual afterwards given by the hand of Moses. These latter are written by no almighty finger and spoken to the people by no divine voice; for these it is sufficient that Moses hear and record them.

"Of the law thus impressively given, the fourth commandment forms a part. Amid the same cloud of glory, the same thunders and lightnings, uttered by the same dread voice of the Infinite One, and graven by his finger, came forth these words as well: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' It is impossible, in view of these facts, to class the Sabbath with the ceremonial institutions of Israel. By the sacred seal of the divine lip and finger, it has been raised far above those perishing rites. In other words, it belongs to that moral law which Paul calls 'holy, and just, and good' (Rom. 7:12), and not that ritual law of which Peter declares, 'Neither our fathers nor we were able to bear' it. Acts. 15:10.

"Nothing can be found in the form of words in which the fourth commandment is expressed which indicates that it is less universal in its obligation or less absolute in its authority than the other nine with which it is associated. . . . But it is sometimes claimed that this is simply a Mosaic institute, and therefore of transient force; that this has not, like the others, an inward reason which appeals to the conscience; that it is, in short, not a moral but a positive precept. . . .

"The proof which would exclude this commandment from the throne of moral authority on which the others are seated should amount to demonstration. . . . The distinction cannot be maintained between this commandment and the remainder of the decalogue. The prohibition of image-worship is not deemed essential by either Roman or Greek Christianity; but the more spiritual mind of Protestantism can see that this law is absolutely necessary to guard a truly spiritual conception of Deity. So, many excellent Christians have failed to discern the moral necessity of the Sabbath. Clearer insight will reveal that all the laws of the first table are guarded by this institution, as all in the second table are enforced by the tenth, 'Thou shalt not covet.'

"The moral authority of the decalogue did not begin with its announcement on Sinai. Its precepts had been known and practiced through all the patriarchal ages. Murder was condemned

in Cain, and dishonor of parents in Ham. To Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had come the knowledge of one God, and the last had exhorted his children against image-worship. Gen. 35:2. Theft, falsehood, and adultery are all denounced by the record of pre-Mosaic times. As a declaration of the eternal and unchanging moral law its binding force did not begin with its announcement at Horeb, but dated from the beginning of things, and for the same reason will endure until the consummation of all things. Nor was it given to Israel alone. The Gentiles 'show the work of the law written in their hearts.' Rom. 2:14, 15.

"Jesus Christ has confirmed its obligation: 'If thou wilt center into life, keep the commandments.' Matt. 19:17. His great generalization of the whole into the double duty of love to God and man is a further confirmation of the persistence of its ethical force. James writes: 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that 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. It is impossible to suppose that the apostle has not in mind the whole decalogue, and that he does not equally affirm the profaner of the Sabbath to be a violator of the whole law. In a statement of such gravity he must have specified the exception if any existed. It is worthy of our notice that he bases the sanctity of each command on the fact that each was spoken by one God. But the law of the Sabbath was as surely uttered by the voice of Jehovah as any other precept of the ten. If the 'ten words' of Sinai live to-day, imposing an unrelaxed obligation upon all mankind, as is testified both by the nature of the legislation and by the authority of Jesus and his apostles, the Sabbath shares their perpetuity, both of existence and obligation.

"In the law spoken by the mouth of God himself and written by his own finger, the transcript of his will, the reasons assigned for the institution of the Sabbath are such as appeal, not to Israel alone, but to man as man. The Sabbath recalls a fact of universal interest, the creation of the world, and is based on a process in the nature of God, who in some ineffable way 'rested on the seventh day.' The ideas connected with the Sabbath in the fourth commandment are thus of the most permanent and universal meaning. The institution, in the light of the reasons assigned, is as wide as the creation and as eternal as the Creator.

"Instituted at the creation by the example of the Creator, its obligation extends to every creature. It is inconceivable, on any theory of inspiration, that any narrower interpretation is to be given to this command. If language is to have any meaning at all, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not simply an Israelitish, but a human institution. As it answers a universal need, so is it

enforced by a universal reason, being supported by the only state of facts that could create a perpetual institute,—the law of the beginning.

"These considerations cannot be treated with too much gravity. Long should pause the erring hand of man before it dares to chip away with the chisel of human reasonings one single word graven on the enduring tables by the hand of the infinite God. What is proposed? To make an erasure in a Heaven-born code; to expunge one article from the recorded will of the Eternal! Is the eternal tablet of his law to be defaced by a creature's hand? He who proposes such an act should fortify himself by reasons as holy as God and as mighty as his power. None but consecrated hands could touch the ark of God; thrice holy should be the hands which would dare alter the testimony which lay within the ark.

"By the lasting authority of the whole decalogue, with which the fourth commandment is inseparably connected, which is the embodiment of immutable moral law, and *by the very words used in framing the command*, the Sabbath is shown to be an institution of absolute, universal, and unchanging obligation.

"Here may properly be inserted that prayer which the Anglican Church prescribes as a response to the recitation of each of the ten commandments: 'Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.'"

Amen! say we. We know that our readers, after reading these quotations, will be most curious to know how in the world their author, in the face of them, is going to get the first day of the week into the fourth commandment, and the law of the beginning, as "The Abiding Sabbath." Next week, if the Lord will, we shall set forth some of the ways in which he *tries* to do it.

A. T. J.

**"The Commentary. Notes on the International Lesson. The Handwriting on the Wall. Dan. 5:1-12, 25-28" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5 , pp. 74, 75.**

The Commentary  
(February 14. Dan. 5:1-12, 25-28.

AGAIN the scene of our lesson is laid in Babylon, "the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." Still she sits, the "lady of kingdoms," comforting herself with the thought, "I shall be a lady forever;" "I shall not sit a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children." But just then it was that she should no more be called the lady of kingdoms, and just then it was that there should come upon her that which had been spoken of her: "These two things shall come to thee in a moment in one day, the loss of children, and widowhood: they shall come upon thee in their perfection for the multitude of thy sorceries,

and for the great abundance of thine enchantments. . . . Therefore shall evil come upon thee; thou shalt not know from whence it riseth: and mischief shall fall upon thee; thou shalt not be able to put it off: and desolation shall come upon thee suddenly, which thou shalt not know." Isa. 47:1-15.

THE events noted in this lesson occurred about forty-four years after those of the lesson for last week. The great king Nebuchadnezzar had been dead about twenty-three years, and with him had departed the greatness and the real glory of the kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar himself had finally been brought to a full acknowledgment of the true God, and had published a decree to that effect to all the nations of his dominion (see Daniel 4); but it seems to have had no discernible impression on any that followed him in the kingdom, and iniquity culminated in his grandson, Belshazzar, the subject of the present lesson. Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by his son, Evil-merodach; but "his lusts, and other wickedness made him so intolerable, that at length even his own relations conspired against him and put him to death," after his having reigned two years, and Neriglissar, his brother-in-law, reigned in his stead. Neriglissar reigned nearly four years, and was succeeded, by merely in name, by Laborosoarchod, "a mere boy," who was suffered to remain only a few months when Nabonadius, the father of Belshazzar, took the throne, B.C. 555, and held it till the end of the empire, B.C. 538.

NABONADIAS sometime, we know not just how long, before the ruin of the kingdom, had associated his son, Belshazzar, with himself in the rule of the kingdom. In the year 539 B.C. Cyrus, at the head of a heavy army of Medes and Persians, left Ecbatana in an expedition

75

against Babylon. In the spring of 538 B.C. he crossed the Tigris, and came within sight of Babylon itself before he met any opposition. Nabonadius had drawn out an army to meet the invader a short distance from the city. The Babylonian forces were defeated, and King Nabonadius took refuge in Borsippa about six miles from Babylon. Cyrus shut him up there, left enough soldiers to hold him, and he with the main army laid siege to the glorious capital. The defeat of Nabonadius, and his flight to Borshippa, left to the young Belshazzar the sole direction of affairs in Babylon.

CYRUS carried on the siege for some time with no prospect of success against its "mountain-high" walls, and its braze, iron-barred gates, protected by an impassable moat. But midsummer coming on, and with it the grand Babylonian festival in honor of the god Tammuz, Cyrus determined on a stratagem. Knowing of the boundless license in which it was the wont of the Babylonians to indulge in that delebration, Cyrus went up the Euphrates a considerable distance, and dug channels by which to turn its waters from their course. As the Euphrates flowed through the city under the great walls, Cyrus's plan was to draw the water down so shallow that men could wade without difficulty, and have them march into the city by the river-bed. But even that would have been of no avail, had not the Babylonians given themselves up to utter heedlessness in their wild orgies. For on each bank of the river, within the city, stood walls about a hundred and fifty feet high, with double gates of solid brass;

and if only these gates had been shut or even watched, the Persians in the bed of the river would have been certainly caught in a trap.

HOWEVER, no such precaution was thought of in the proud, wicked city. "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." Then he called for the sacred vessels of Jehovah, which his grandfather had brought from the house of God in Jerusalem; "and the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank in them." "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another. The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers. And the king spake, and said to the wise men of Babylon, Whosoever shall read this writing, and show me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom."

BUT none of all these could tell him a word. Then his mother came in, and told him of Daniel's ability to interpret secrets. Daniel was immediately sent for; and he came, and told the king the writing and the meaning of it. "God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it." "Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting." "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." The drunkenness and lascivious carousals in the palace were copied to perfection in all parts of the city. Drunkenness was everywhere, and men and women mingled together in the awful obscenity of that heathen revelry which was the most acceptable worship of Venus and Adonis.

"MEANWHILE, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. Anxiously they noted the gradual sinking of the water in the river-bed; still more anxiously they watched to see if those within the walls would observe the suspicious circumstance, and sound an alarm through the city. Should such an alarm be given, all their labors would be lost. . . . But as they watched, no sounds of alarm reached them—only a confused noise of revel and riot, which showed that the unhappy townsmen were quite unconscious of the approach of danger. At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the deep river-bed, and on the landing-places opposite the river-gates clusters of men grew into solid columns. The undefended gateways were siezed [*sic.*]; a war-shout was raised; the alarm was spread; and swift runners started off to show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end. In the darkness and confusion of the night a terrible massacre ensued. The drunken revelers could make no resistance. The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful handwriting upon the wall, which too late had warned him of his peril, could do nothing even to check the progress of the assailants, who carried all before them everywhere. Bursting into the palace, a band of Persians

made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry."

"In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old."

With this lesson read Rawlinson's "Fourth Monarchy," chap. 8, par. 52-55. Jer. 50 and 51; Isa. 21:1-9; 47:1-15; 45:1-4.

A. T. J.

### **"Going to Canossa" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 5 , p. 80.**

IN 1075, A. D. Pope Gregory VII. took it upon himself to interfere in the affairs of State of Germany. It was determined that any ecclesiastic who should accept office from the hands of a layman should be deposed, while the secular lord who should presume to bestow investiture, should be excommunicated. Henry IV. resisted the pope's pretensions, and so was brought on the war of investitures, and the memorable contest between Hildebrand and Henry. Henry first deposed the pope, and then was in turn deposed by the pope; then he went to Canossa, and, in the garb of a supplicant, stood three days and nights in the wintry blast, awaiting the pleasure of Hildebrand to receive his submission.

In 1872, a similar contest arose between the German Chancellor, Bismarck, and Pope Pius IX. The contention went on quite bitterly; but in 1870 Prince Bismarck declared, "We will not go to Canossa."

In 1885, a dispute sprang up, which, for a while, threatened war between Germany and Spain. He got out of the difficulty, Bismarck sought the mediation of the pope, and selected him as arbiter in his controversy. This so tickled the pope that he conferred upon the Chancellor the "Decoration of the Order of Christ." And that so pleased Prince Bismarck that his gratitude found vent in a remarkable letter to the pope, of which we copy the following report in a London dispatch of January 18, 1886:—

"A sensation has been created by the publication of a letter from Prince Bismarck to the pope, acknowledging the receipt of the Decoration of the Order of Christ, recently conferred on the German Chancellor by his Holiness. The letter commences by addressing the pope as 'Sire,' and says: 'Your kind letter and Decoration have greatly gratified myself and Emperor William.' It then goes on to state that the pope's words, that 'papacy means to practice works of peace,' first suggested to Prince Bismarck the idea of seeking the mediation of his Holiness in the Carolines question, and in deference to his faith and unweakened confidence in the pope's elevated views and impartiality, he selected the pope as arbiter of the dispute. Germany and Spain have no cause to complain of the terms of the protocol, and the effect of the mediation will be lasting. Prince Bismarck says he will not neglect chances to testify his lively gratitude, highest devotion, and deepest respect for his Holiness in the future. The letter is signed, 'Your very humble servant, Bismarck.'"

Taking the matter altogether, we think Prince Bismarck is a long way on the road, if he has not actually gone, to Canossa. And so princes and kings are all going to Canossa.

A. T. J.

**February 11, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 6 , pp. 84, 85.**

*(Continued.)*

"ON the 9th of August [A.D. 378], a day which has deserved to be marked among the most inauspicious of the Roman Calendar, the Emperor Valens, leaving, under a strong guard, his baggage and military treasure, marched from Hadrianople to attack the Goths, who were encamped about twelve miles from the city. By some mistake of the orders, or some ignorance of the ground, the right wing, or column of cavalry arrived in sight of the enemy, whilst the left was still at a considerable distance; the soldiers were compelled, in the sultry heat of summer, to precipitate their pace; and the line of battle was formed with tedious confusion and irregular delay. The Gothic cavalry had been detached to forage in the adjacent country; and Fritigern still continued to practice his customary arts. He dispatched messengers of peace, made proposals, required hostages, and wasted the hours, till the Romans, exposed without shelter to the burning rays of the sun, were exhausted by thirst, hunger, and intolerable fatigue.

"The emperor was persuaded to send an ambassador to the Gothic camp; the zeal of Richomer, who alone had courage to accept the dangerous commission, was applauded; and the count of the

domestics, adorned with the splendid ensigns of his dignity, had proceeded some way in the space between the two armies, when he was suddenly recalled by the alarm of battle. The hasty and imprudent attack was made by Baeurius the Iberian, who commanded a body of archers and targeteers; and as they advanced with rashness, they retreated with loss and disgrace. In the same

moment, the flying squadrons of Alatheus and Saphrax, whose return was anxiously expected by the general of the Goths, descended like a whirlwind from the hills, swept across the plain, and added new terrors to the tumultuous, but irresistible charge of the barbarian host.

"The event of the battle of Hadrianople, so fatal to Valens and to the empire, may be described in a few words: the Roman cavalry fled; the infantry was abandoned, surrounded, and cut in pieces. The most skilful evolutions, the firmest courage, are scarcely sufficient to

extricate a body of foot, encompassed, on an open plain, by superior numbers of horse; but the troops of Valens, oppressed by the weight of the enemy and their own fears, were crowded into a narrow space, where it was impossible for them to extend their ranks, or even to use, with effect, their swords and javelins. In the midst of tumult, of slaughter, and of dismay, the emperor, deserted by his guards and wounded, as it was supposed, with an arrow, sought protection among the Lancearii and the Mattiarii, who still maintained their ground with some appearance of order and firmness. His faithful generals, Trajan and Victor, who perceived his danger, loudly exclaimed that all was lost, unless the person of the emperor could be saved. Some troops, animated by their exhortation, advanced to his relief; they found only a bloody spot, covered with a heap of broken arms and mangled bodies, without being able to discover their unfortunate prince, either among the living or the dead.

"Their search could not indeed be successful, if there is any truth in the circumstances with which some historians have related the death of the emperor. By the care of his attendants, Valens was removed from the field of battle to a neighboring cottage, where they attempted to dress his wound, and to provide for his future safety. But this humble retreat was instantly surrounded by the enemy; they tried to force the door, they were provoked by a discharge of arrows from

the roof, till at length, impatient of delay, they set fire to a pile of dry magots, and consumed the cottage with the Roman emperor and his train. Valens perished in the flames; and a youth, who dropped from the window, alone escaped, to attest the melancholy tale, and to inform the Goths of the inestimable prize which they had lost by their own rashness. A great number of brave and distinguished officers perished in the battle of Hadrianople, which equaled in the actual loss, and far surpassed in the fatal consequences, the misfortune which Rome had formerly sustained in the fields of Canne.

"Two master-generals of the cavalry and infantry, two great officers of the palace, and thirty-five tribunes, were found among the slain; and the death of Sebastian might satisfy the world, that he was the victim, as well as the author, of the public calamity. Above two thirds of the Roman army were destroyed: and the darkness of the night was esteemed a very favorable circumstance, as it served to conceal the flight of the multitude, and to protect the

more orderly

retreat of Victor and Richomer, who alone, amidst the general consternation, maintained the advantage of calm courage and regular discipline."

"The pride of the Goths was elated by this memorable victory; but their avarice was disappointed by the mortifying discovery, that the richest part of the Imperial spoil had been within the walls of Hadrianople. They hastened to possess the reward of their valor; but they were encountered by the remains of a vanquished army, with an intrepid resolution, which was the effect of their despair, and the only hope of their safety. The walls of the city, and the ramparts of the adjacent camp, were lined with military engines, that threw stones of an enormous weight; and astonished the ignorant Barbarians by the noise, and velocity, still more than by the real effects, of the discharge. The soldiers, the citizens, the provincials, the domestics of the palace, were united in the danger, and in the defense; the

furious assault of the Goths was repulsed; their secret arts of treachery and treason were discovered; and, after an obstinate conflict of many hours, they retired to their tents; convinced, by experience, that it would be far more advisable to observe the treaty, which their sagacious leader had tacitly stipulated with the fortifications of great and populous cities.

"After the hasty and impolitic massacre of three hundred deserters, an act of justice extremely useful to the discipline of the Roman armies, the Goths indignantly raised the siege of Hadrianople. The scene of war and tumult was instantly converted into a silent solitude; the multitude suddenly disappeared; the secret paths of the woods and mountains were marked with the footsteps of the trembling fugitives, who sought a refuge in the distant cities of Illyricum and Macedonia; and the faithful officers of the household, and the treasury, cautiously proceeded in search of the emperor, of

whose death they were still ignorant. The tide of the Gothic inundation rolled from the walls of Hadrianople to the suburbs of Constantinople. The barbarians were surprised with the splendid appearance of the capital of the East, the height and extent of the walls, the myriads of wealthy and affrighted citizens who crowded the ramparts, and the various prospect of the sea and land.

"While they gazed with hopeless desire on the inaccessible beauties of Constantinople, a sally was made from one of the gates by a party of Saracens, who had been fortunately engaged in the service of Valens. The cavalry of Scythia was forced to yield to the admirable swiftness and spirit of the Arabian horses; their riders were skilled in the evolutions of irregular war; and the Northern

barbarians were astonished and dismayed, by the inhuman ferocity of the barbarians of the South. . . . The army of the Goths, laden with the spoils of the wealthy suburbs and the adjacent territory, slowly moved, from the Bosphorus, to the mountains which form the western boundary of Thrace. The important pass of Succus was betrayed by the fear, or the misconduct, of Maurus; and the Barbarians, who no longer had any resistance to apprehend from the scattered and vanquished troops of the East, spread themselves over the face of a fertile and cultivated country, as far as the confines of Italy and the Adriatic Sea.

"The effects which were produced by the battle of Hadrianople on the minds of the Barbarians and of the Romans, extended the victory of the former, and the defeat of the latter, far beyond the limits of a single day. A Gothic chief was heard to declare, with insolent moderation, that, for his own part, he was fatigued with slaughter: but that he was astonished how a people, who fled before him like a flock of sheep, could still presume to dispute the possession of their treasures and provinces. The same terrors which the name of the Huns had spread among the Gothic tribes, were inspired, by the formidable name of the Goths, among the subjects and soldiers of the Roman Empire.

"Five months after the death of Valens, the emperor Gratian produced [Jan. 19, A.D. 379] before the assembled troops [Theodosius] his colleague and their master; who, after a modest, perhaps a sincere, resistance, was compelled to accept, amidst the general acclamations, the diadem, the purple, and the equal title of Augustus. The provinces of Thrace, Asia, and Egypt, over which Valens had reigned, were resigned to the administration of the new emperor; but, as he was specially intrusted with the conduct of the Gothic war, the Illyrian prefecture was dismembered; and the two great dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia were added to the dominions of the Eastern Empire.

"The deliverance and peace of the Roman provinces was the work of prudence, rather than of valor: the prudence of Theodosius was seconded by fortune: and the emperor never failed to seize, and to improve, every favorable circumstance. As long as the superior genius of Frigidian preserved the union, and directed the motions of the Barbarians, their power was not inadequate to the conquest of a great empire. The death of that hero, the predecessor and master of the renowned Alaric, relieved an impatient multitude from the intolerable yoke of discipline and discretion. The barbarians, who had been restrained by his authority, abandoned themselves to the dictates of their passions; and their passions were seldom uniform or consistent.

An army of conquerors was broken into many disorderly bands of savage robbers; and their blind and irregular fury was not less

pernicious to themselves, than to their enemies. Their mischievous disposition was shown in the destruction of every object which they wanted strength to remove, or taste to enjoy; and they often consumed, with improvident rage, the harvests, or the granaries, which soon afterwards became necessary for their own subsistence.

"A spirit of discord arose among the independent tribes and nations, which had been united only by the bands of a loose and voluntary alliance. The troops of the Huns and the Alani would naturally upbraid the flight of the Goths; who were not disposed to use with moderation the advantages of their fortune; the ancient jealousy of the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths could not long be suspended; and the haughty chiefs still remembered the insults and injuries, which they had reciprocally offered, or sustained, while the nation was seated in the countries beyond the Danube. The progress of domestic faction abated the more diffusive sentiment of national animosity; and the officers of Theodosius were instructed to purchase, with liberal gifts and promises, the retreat or service of the discontented party. The acquisition of Modar, a prince of the royal blood of the Amali, gave a bold and faithful champion to the cause of Rome. The illustrious

85

deserter soon obtained the rank of master-general, with an important command; surprised an army of his countrymen, who were immersed in wine and sleep; and, after a cruel slaughter of the astonished Goths, returned with an immense spoil, and four thousand wagons, to the Imperial camp."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 26, par. 21, 23, 28, 26, 29.*

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"'The Abiding Sabbath.' Some Five-Hundred-Dollar Logic" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 6 , pp. 89, 90.**

IT will be borne in mind that the book entitled "The Abiding Sabbath" was written to prove "the perpetual obligation of the Lord's day;" and that by the term "Lord's day," the author of the book means, in every instance, the first day of the week. Therefore, "being interpreted," the book, "The Abiding Sabbath," is an argument to prove the perpetual obligation of the first day of the week. It is likewise to be remembered that the trustees of Dartmouth College paid the Fletcher prize of \$500 for the essay which composes the book "The Abiding Sabbath." This certainly is tangible proof that those trustees, and the Committee of Award appointed by them, considered that the object of the essay had been accomplished, and that thereby the perpetual obligation of the first day of the

week had been proved. But we are certain that any one who has read the two preceding chapters on this subject, will wonder how, in view of the arguments there used, the author can make it appear that the first day of the week is "the abiding Sabbath." Well, to tell in a few words what we shall abundantly demonstrate, he does it by directly contradicting every sound argument that he has made, and every principle that he has established.

In the first chapter of the book, from the scripture "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. 2:3), he proves the institution of the Sabbath at creation, and says: "Whatever institutions were given to man then, were given for all time."

And again: "'God rested the seventh day,' and by so doing has given to the law of the Sabbath the highest and strongest sanction possible, even to Deity. . . . It is therefore-bounded by no limits of time, place, or circumstance, but is of universal and perpetual authority."

It was the seventh day upon which God rested from the work of creation; it was the seventh day which he then blessed; it was the seventh day which he then sanctified; and he says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Now if, as Mr. Elliott says, this institution was given to man "for all time," and that, too, "with the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity;" and if it is bounded "by no limits of time, place, or circumstance," how can it be possible that the first day of the week is the abiding Sabbath? It is clearly and absolutely impossible. The two things cannot stand together. God did not rest the first day of the week. He did not bless, nor did he sanctify, the first day of the week. He has never called the first day of the week the Sabbath; nor as such an institution has he ever given it any sanction of Deity, much less has he ever given it the "highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity." Then upon no principle of truth can it ever be made to appear that the first day of the week is the abiding Sabbath.

Then in Part II., on the fourth commandment,—the "Sabbath of the law,"—he says of the Sabbath therein given to Israel when God brought them out of Egypt:—

"The first institution of religion given to the emancipated nation *was the very same with the first given to man.*"—P. 110.

He says that it has "a meaning not for the Hebrews alone, but for the whole race of mankind;" that "the reason of the commandment recalls the ordinance of creation;" that "the ideas connected with the Sabbath in the fourth commandment are thus of the *most permanent* and universal meaning;" and that "the institution, in the light of the reasons assigned, is *as wide as creation* and as eternal as *the Creator.*"—Pp. 114, 126.

And yet into this commandment, which says as plainly as language can speak, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," Mr. Elliott proposes to read the first day as "the abiding Sabbath." Before noticing his reasons for such a step, we would insert one of his own paragraphs:—

"Long should pause the erring hand of man before it dares to chip away with the chisel of human reasonings *one single word* graven on the enduring tables by

the hand of the infinite God. What is proposed? To make an erasure in a Heaven-born code; to expunge one article from the recorded will of the Eternal! Is the eternal tablet of his law to be defaced by a creature's hand? He who proposes such an act *should fortify himself by reasons as holy as God and as mighty as his power*. None but consecrated hands could touched the ark of God; thrice holy should be the hands which would dare to alter the testimony which lay within the ark."—*Pp. 128, 129*. And so say we.

After proving that the ten commandments are of universal and perpetual obligation, he discovers that the decalogue "contains transient elements." He says:—

"It may be freely admitted that the decalogue in the form in which it is stated, contains transient elements. These, however, are easily separable. For example, the promise attached to the requirement of filial reverence, 'that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee,' has a very evident reference to Israel alone, and is a promise of national perpetuity in possession of the promised land."

But lo, just here he discovers that this is not a "transient element," and that it has not "reference to Israel alone;" for he continues in the very same paragraph:—

"Even this element is not entirely of limited application, however, for Paul quotes the commandment in his letter to the Christians of Ephesus (Eph. 6:2), as 'the first . . . with promise,' evidently understanding the covenant of long life to have a wider scope than simply the Hebrew nationality. And it is clear that nothing can be imagined which could give more enduring stability to civil institutions than that law-abiding character which is based on respect for superiors and obedience to their commands."—*Pp. 120, 121*.

His proposition is that "the decalogue contains transient elements." And to demonstrate his proposition, he produces as an "example," a "transient element" which he immediately proves is not a transient element at all. Then what becomes of his proposition? Well, by every principle of common logic, it is a miserable failure. But by this new, high-priced kind, this five-hundred-dollar-prize logic, it is a brilliant success; for by it he accomplishes all that he intended when he started out; that is, that by it he might put aside as a "transient element" the *seventh day*, and swing into its place the seventh part of time. For after proving that his example of a transient element is not a transient element at all, he continues:—

"This serves to illustrate how we may regard the temporal element in the law of the Sabbath. It does not bind us to the precise day, but to the seventh of our time."

To the trustees of Dartmouth College, and to the Committee of Award which they appointed, and to the American Tract Society, it may serve to illustrate such a thing; but to anybody who loves truth, sound reasoning, and fair dealing, it only

serves to illustrate the deplorable weakness of the cause in behalf of which resort has to be made to such subterfuges.

Besides this, his admission that the decalogue contains transient elements is directly contrary to the argument that he has already made on this very subject. On page 116, he had already written of the ten commandments:—

"These statutes are therefore not simply commands or precepts of God; for God may give commandments which have only a transient and local effect; they are in a *distinctive sense* the word of God, an essential part of that word *which abideth*. . . . By the phrase 'the ten words,' as well as in the general scope of Hebrew legislation, the moral law *is fully distinguished* from the civil and ceremonial law. *The first is an abiding statement of the divine will; the last consists of transient ordinances* having but a temporary and local meaning."

Yet directly in the face of this, he will have it freely admitted that the decalogue "contains transient elements." Are there transient elements in the divine will? Can that which abideth be transient? And if the decalogue contains transient elements, then wherein is it "fully distinguished" from the "civil and ceremonial law," which "consists of transient ordinances"? The genuine logic of his position is (1) the ceremonial law consists of transient ordinances; (2) the decalogue is fully distinguished from the ceremonial law; (3) therefore the decalogue consists of nothing transient. But with the aid of this five-hundred-dollar-prize logic it is thus: The ceremonial law consists of transient ordinances. The decalogue is fully distinguished from the ceremonial law. Therefore it may be freely admitted that the decalogue contains transient elements!! And so "with the ceremonial system vanished the Jewish Sabbath," which he defines to be the seventh day, p. 177, 190. By one argument on these transient elements, he manages to put away the precise seventh day, and to put in its place "the seventh of our time;" by another he is enabled to abolish the seventh of our time, as well as the precise seventh day, by which he opens the way to insert in the commandment the precise first day as the "abiding Sabbath" and of "perpetual obligation."

Again we read:—

"While the Sabbath of Israel had features which enforce and illustrate the abiding Sabbath, it must not be forgotten that it had a wholly distinct existence of its own. . . . Moses really instituted something new, something different from the old patriarchal seventh day."—P. 134.

With this read the following:—

"The first institution of religion given to the emancipated nation was the very same with the first given to man."—P. 110.

How the Sabbath of Israel could be the *very same* with the first given to man, and yet have a *wholly distinct existence* of its own; how it could be the "very same" with the first given to man, and yet be "something new" 2500 years afterward; how it could be something different from the old patriarchal seventh day, and yet in it there be "still embodied the true Sabbath," we cannot possibly

conceive; but perhaps the genius that can discern in the decalogue transient elements which it proves are not transient at all, could also tell how all these things can be.

Just one more illustration of the wonderful efficacy of this five-hundred-dollar-prize logic, and we shall close this article. On page 135 he says:—

"In the Mosaic Sabbath, for the time of its endurance and no longer, was embodied, for a particular people and no others, this permanent institution which was ordained at creation, and which lives now with more excellent glory in the Lord's day."

That is to say: 1. In the Mosaic institution, "for

90

the time of its endurance [1522 years] and no longer," was embodied an institution which is "rooted in the eternal world" (p. 28), and which is as eternal as the Creator (p. 126); 2. In the Mosaic institution, which was "for a particular people and no others," was embodied an institution whose "unrelaxed obligation" extends to "every creature," "to all races of earth and all ages of the world's history" (pp. 122, 124).

In other words, in an institution that was for a particular people and *no others*, for 1522 years and *no longer*, was embodied an institution that is eternal, and for all races in all ages of the world's history.

Now we wish that Mr. Elliott, or some of those who were concerned in paying the five-hundred-dollar prize for this essay, would tell us how it were possible that an institution that is as eternal as the Creator could be embodied in one that was to endure for 1522 years and *no longer*; and how an institution that is of relaxed obligation upon all races in all ages, could be embodied in one that was for a particular people and *no others*. And when he has told us that, then we wish he would condescend to inform us how in the Mosaic Sabbath there could be embodied three such diverse elements as (1) The "permanent institution which was ordained at creation," which was the seventh day; (2) "Something new," which he says was "not improbably a different day;" and (3) "the institution which lives now with more excellent glory in the Lord's day," which he says is the first day of the week.

We have not the most distant idea, however, that Mr. Elliott, or any one else, will ever explain any of these things. They cannot be explained. They are absolute contradictions throughout. But by them he has paved the way by which he intends to bring in the first day of the week as the abiding Sabbath, and they are a masterly illustration of the methods by which that institution is made to stand.

Next week we shall notice his Sabbath of Redemption. A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The Second Temple. Ezra 1:1-4; 3:8-13" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 6 , pp. 90, 91.**

The Commentary

(February 21.—Ezra 1:1-4; 3:8-13.)

THE glorious kingdom of Babylon had fallen, and the kingdom of the Medes and Persians had taken its place. The captivity of Babylon that was laid upon Judah was now to be broken. The great Nebuchadnezzar had carried away all the people of the land, except a few of the very poorest, to Babylon, "where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia, to fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath, to fulfill threescore and ten years." One hundred and six years before they were carried to Babylon, Isaiah had not only said that they should be carried away, but had also said that they should return, and that the temple and Jerusalem should be rebuilt. One hundred and seventy-four years before the feast of Belshazzar and the fall of Babylon, Isaiah had written of both, and of Cyrus in his capture of the city. Thus he called Cyrus by name more than a hundred years before he was born. Then it was that the prophet wrote: "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." "He shall build my city, and he shall

91

let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord." Isa. 44:28; 45:1, 13.

ALTHOUGH Isaiah had prophesied the captivity, he had not said how long it should be. Jeremiah told that it should be seventy years. In the year 606 B.C., the first captivity was made, when among those taken was Daniel. Then, exactly when the seventy years ended—B.C. 536—Cyrus issues his proclamation for the return of the captives to their own land, to build the temple of the Lord. And this is a copy of the proclamation: "Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord God of heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel, (he is the God), which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, beside the freewill offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem."

"THE Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus." How did the Lord do this? By his angels. In Daniel 10, we read of a time in the *third* year of Cyrus, when Daniel was greatly concerned about something in connection with the cause of God, and he fasted and mourned and prayed "three full weeks." At the end of the three weeks, as he was by the River Tigris, a glorious angel stood before him and said, "Fear not, Daniel; for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words." If, then, Daniel's words were heard the first day, what could have delayed the angel "three full weeks"? He tells: "But the prince of the

kingdom of Persia withstood me *one and twenty days;*" exactly the length of time Daniel had been seeking the knowledge which the angel was to give him. That is, the king of Persia was to have some part in the answer to Daniel's prayers; and the angel had to go to the court of Cyrus, and, by exerting his holy influence there, to bring about the events through which Daniel's prayer could be answered. And when the angel was to leave Daniel, he said, "Now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia." Read the tenth chapter of Daniel entire.

CYRUS, however, was not the first king of the Medo-Persian power after the fall of Babylon. In Dan. 5:30, it is said: "In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And *Darius the Median* took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old." And in Dan. 11:1, the same angel of the tenth chapter says: "Also I *in the first year* of Darius the Mede, even I stood to confirm and to strengthen him." Darius reigned two years, when he died, and Cyrus succeeded to the kingdom; and as the angel stood with Darius the Mede; and with Cyrus in his third year, to influence him so that Daniel's prayer could be answered, it is certain that it was by the influence of his holy angel that the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus to let go the captive people of God.

"HE hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem." How did Cyrus learn that God had charged him to do this? Daniel was in the court of the kingdom of Babylon during the whole of the captivity; and when Babylon had fallen, and Darius the Mede had taken the kingdom, he says: "In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; in the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." Dan. 9:1, 2. Then when Cyrus came to the throne in 536, at the expiration of the seventy years, it is certain that Daniel showed him the word of God by Isaiah saying: "Thus saith the Lord to Cyrus whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him," "He shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives." Thus Cyrus knew that God had charged him to build him a house.

IN answer to the proclamation made by Cyrus, there were 42,360 people, besides their servants and their maids that numbered 7,337, and 200 singing men and singing women—49,897 in the whole company—who returned to Jerusalem. Joshua the son of Jozadak was high priest and Zerubbabel was appointed governor. When they reached Jerusalem, they immediately set up "the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon." "From the first day of the seventh month began they to offer burnt offerings unto the Lord. But the foundation of the temple of the Lord was not yet laid."

THEN the chief of the fathers "offered freely for the house of God, to set it upon his place. They gave after their ability unto the treasure of the work." The amount of these gifts was about \$500,000, an average of ten dollars for each person—man, woman, child, servant, and maid—in the whole company. But the merit of the service was that they gave it "freely" and of "their ability," and the blessing of the Lord, in abundance, came upon both their gifts and them. "For God loveth a cheerful giver," and "if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted

according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. 8:12; 9:7.

WE do not wonder that "when the builders laid the foundation of the temple," "the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid." They had given freely of their ability, and they had a right to rejoice. When the first temple was to be built, the people offered willingly. "Then the people rejoiced, for that they offered willingly, because with perfect heart they offered willingly to the Lord; and David the king also rejoiced with great joy." 1 Chron. 29:9. If there were more, and more cheerful, more willing, giving to the cause of God, there would be more genuine rejoicing in God and in his truth. Try it. "It is more blessed to give than to receive." God *does* "love a cheerful giver."

A. T. J.

**February 18, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 7 , p. 100.**

(Continued.)

"IN the hands of a skilful politician, the most different means may be successfully applied to the same ends; and the peace of the empire, which had been forwarded by the divisions, was accomplished by the reunion, of the Gothic nation. Athanaric, who had been a patient spectator of these extraordinary events, was at length driven, by the chance of arms, from the dark recesses of the woods of Cauca land. He no longer hesitated to pass [A.D. 381, Jan. 25] the Danube; and a very considerable part of the subjects of Fritigern, who already felt the inconveniences of anarchy, were easily persuaded to acknowledge for their king a Gothic Judge, whose birth they respected, and whose abilities they had frequently experienced. But age had chilled the daring spirit of Athanaric; and, instead of leading his people to the field of battle and victory, he wisely listened to the fair proposal of an honorable and advantageous treaty.

"Theodosius, who was acquainted with the merit and power of his new ally, condescended to meet him at the distance of several miles from Constantinople; and entertained him in the Imperial city, with the confidence of a friend, and the magnificence of a monarch. The barbarian prince observed, with curious attention, the variety of objects which attracted his notice, and at last broke out into a sincere and passionate exclamation of wonder. I now behold (said he) what I never could believe, the glories of this stupendous capital! And as he cast his eyes around, he viewed, and he admired, the commanding situation of the city, the strength and beauty of the walls and public edifices, the capacious harbor, crowded with innumerable vessels, the perpetual concourse of distant nations, and the arms and discipline of the troops. Indeed, (continued Athanaric,)

the emperor of the Romans is a god upon earth; and the presumptuous man, who dares to lift his hand against him, is guilty of his own blood.'

The Gothic king did not long enjoy this splendid and honorable reception; and, as temperance was not the virtue of his nation, it may justly be suspected, that his mortal disease was contracted amidst the pleasures of the Imperial banquets. But the policy of Theodosius derived more solid benefit from the death, than he could have expected from the most faithful services, of his ally. The funeral of Athanaric was performed with solemn rites in the capital of the East; a stately monument was erected to his memory; and his whole army, won by the liberal courtesy, and decent grief, of Theodosius, enlisted under the standard of the Roman Empire. The submission of so great a body of the Visigoths was productive of the most salutary consequences; and the mixed influence of force, of reason, and of corruption, became every day more powerful, and more extensive. Each independent chieftain hastened to obtain a separate treaty, from the apprehension that an obstinate delay might expose him, alone and unprotected, to the revenge, or justice, of the conqueror. The general, or rather the final, capitulation of the Goths, may be dated [A.D. 382, Oct. 8] four years, one month, and twenty-five days, after the defeat and death of the emperor Valens.

"The original treaty which fixed the settlement of the Goths, ascertained their privileges, and stipulated their obligations, would illustrate the history of Theodosius and his successors. The series of their history has imperfectly preserved the spirit and substance of this single agreement. The ravages of war and tyranny had provided many large tracts of fertile but uncultivated land for the use of those barbarians who might not disdain the practice of agriculture. A numerous colony of the Visigoths was seated in Thrace; the remains of the Ostrogoths were planted in Phrygia and Lydia; their immediate wants were supplied by a distribution of corn and cattle; and their future industry was encouraged by an exemption from tribute, during a certain term of years [A.D. 383-395]. The barbarians would have deserved to feel the cruel and perfidious policy of the Imperial court, if they had suffered themselves to be dispersed through the provinces. They required, and they obtained, the sole possession of the villages and districts assigned for their residence; they still cherished and propagated their native manners and language; asserted, in the bosom of despotism, the freedom of their domestic government; and acknowledged the sovereignty of the emperor, without submitting to the inferior jurisdiction of the laws and magistrates of Rome.

"The hereditary chiefs of the tribes and families were still permitted to command their followers in peace and war; but the royal dignity was abolished; and the generals of the Goths were appointed and removed at the pleasure of the emperor. An army of forty thousand Goths was maintained for the perpetual service of the empire of the East; and those haughty troops, who assumed the title of *Fúderati*, or allies, were distinguished by their gold collars, liberal pay, and licentious privileges. Their native courage was improved by the use of arms and the knowledge of discipline; and, while the republic was guarded, or threatened, by the doubtful sword of the barbarians, the last sparks of the military flame were

finally extinguished in the minds of the Romans. Theodosius had the address to persuade his allies, that the conditions of peace, which had been extorted from him by prudence and necessity, were the voluntary expressions of his sincere friendship for the Gothic nation.

"It was generally believed, that the Goths had signed the treaty of peace with a hostile and insidious spirit; and that their chiefs had previously bound themselves, by a solemn and secret oath, never to keep faith with the Romans; to maintain the fairest show of loyalty and friendship, and to watch the favorable moment of rapine, of conquest, and of revenge. But as the minds of the Barbarians were not insensible to the power of gratitude, several of the Gothic leaders sincerely devoted themselves to the service of the empire, or, at least, of the emperor; . . . And, as the impatient Goths could only be restrained by the firm and temperate character of Theodosius, the public safety seemed to depend on the life and abilities of a single man.

"If the subjects of Rome could be ignorant of their obligations to the great Theodosius, they were too soon convinced how painfully the spirit and abilities of their deceased emperor had supported the frail and mouldering edifice of the republic. He died in the month of January; and before the end of the winter of the same year [A.D. 395] the Gothic nation was in arms. The barbarian auxiliaries erected their independent standard, and boldly avowed the hostile designs which they had long cherished in their precious minds. Their countrymen, who had been constrained by the conditions of the last treaty to a sea of tranquility and labor, deserted their arms at the first sound of the trumpet, and eagerly resumed the weapons which they had reluctantly laid down. The barriers of the Danube were thrown open; the savage warriors of Scythia issued from their forests; and the uncommon severity of the winter allowed the poet to remark, 'that they rolled their ponderous wagons over the broad and icy back of the indignant river.' The unhappy natives of the provinces to the south of the Danube submitted to the calamities, which, in the course of twenty years, were almost grown familiar to their imagination; and the various troops of barbarians, who gloried in the Gothic name, were irregularly spread from the woody shores of Dalmatia to the walls of Constantinople.

"The interruption, or at least the diminution, of the subsidy which the Goths had received from the prudent liberality of Theodosius, was the specious pretense of their revolt; the affront was imbibited by their contempt for the unwarlike sons of Theodosius, and their resentment was inflamed by the weakness or treachery of the minister of Arcadius. . . . The Goths, instead of being impelled by the blind and headstrong passions of their chiefs, were now directed by the bold and artful genius of Alaric. That renowned leader was descended from the noble race of the Balti, which yielded only to the royal dignity of the Amali; he had solicited the command of the Roman armies; and the Imperial court provoked him to demonstrate the folly of their refusal and the importance of their loss. Whatever hopes might be entertained of the conquest of Constantinople, the judicious general soon abandoned an impracticable enterprise. In the midst of a divided court and a discontented people, the

Emperor Arcadius was terrified by the aspect of the Gothic arms; but the want of wisdom and valor was supplied by the strength of the city, and the fortifications, both of the sea and the land, might securely brave the impotent and random darts of the barbarians. Alaric disdained to trample any longer on the prostrate and rained countries of Thrace and Dacia, and he resolved to seek a plentiful harvest of fame and riches in a province which had hitherto escaped the ravages of war."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 29, vol. 32; chap. 30, par. 1.*

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' The Sabbath of Redemption" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 7 , pp. 104, 105.**

### **THE SABBATH OF REDEMPTION**

"THE Sabbath of Redemption" composes Part III. of "The Abiding Sabbath," and in it throughout the author still diligently pursues his course of systematic self-contradiction. The first division of this part is "The Testimony of Jesus Christ" upon the subject of the Sabbath, a few sentences of which we quote. He says:—

"As already shown, the Sabbath contained moral elements; it belonged not solely to Israel, but was sanctioned by the primitive revelation to the race, being the first article in the law of the beginning; it was a part of that sublime code which by the mouth of the Eternal himself was spoken to his chosen people from the mountain of God; its violation had been surrounded, in the Mosaic legislation and in the prophetic instructions, with penalties, and its observance with blessings, such as could hardly be attached to a simple institution of ritual. The abiding Sabbath, belonging to the moral law *is therefore not repealed or canceled by Jesus*, but rather confirmed with new uses, loftier meanings, and holier objects. The ceremonial Sabbath abides by the authority of the Sabbath's Lord."—*P. 159.*

Then in speaking of the "false strictness" with which the Jews has surrounded and obscured the real intent of the Sabbath, and how Jesus swept this all away, he says:—

"There is not in all this any hint of the abolition of the Sabbath, or release from its obligations. The words of Jesus become meaningless when they are applied to anything but the abuses and perversions of its purposes by the Rabbinical schools. Had he desired to abolish it altogether, nothing would have been easier than to do so in terms. His words are everywhere framed with the utmost care, and strictly guarded against any construction which would involve a denial of the real sacredness of the day blessed by the Creator and sanctioned by the moral law."—*P. 163.*

Now the day blessed by the Creator is the seventh day; for "God bless the seventh day" is the word of God, and "The seventh day is the Sabbath" is the declaration of God in the moral law. Therefore we submit that as Christ's words are "strictly guarded against any construction which would involve a denial of the real sacredness of the day blessed by the Creator and sanctioned by the moral law," then the word of Christ binds every man to the observance of the seventh day, and forever debars any application of his teaching to any other than the seventh day; for God never blessed any but the seventh day, and none other than the seventh day is sanctified, as the Sabbath, by the moral law.

Again he says:—

"Jesus confirms the Sabbath on its spiritual basis. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' . . . Thus he at once rid it of all the false restrictions of Judaism, and, establishing it upon its primitive foundations, he brought forth its higher reason in the assertion of its relation to the well-being of man. 'The Sabbath was made for man;' not for the Jew only, but for the whole race of mankind; not for one age alone, but for man universally, under every circumstance of time and place."—*P. 165.*

102

Then in another place Mr. Elliott says further:—

"The declaration in Genesis furnishes the best commentary on the saying of Jesus: 'The Sabbath was made for man.'"—*P. 17.*

The "declaration in Genesis" is: "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." We agree perfectly with Mr. Elliott that that "furnishes the best commentary on the saying of Jesus," in Mark 2:27. It is the Lord's own commentary on his own word; it is his own explanation of his own statement. Therefore when, by any statement in any way, Mr. Elliott or any one else attempts to bring the first day of the week into place as the Sabbath, it is simply doing violence to the word of God, and is in direct contradiction to the divine commentary.

Now in accordance with his scheme throughout, after having, by every principle of logic, established the obligation of the seventh day as the Sabbath, he proceeds at once to contradict it all. He says:—

"'The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' This is an assertion by our Lord of his right to make such modifications in the law of the Sabbath, and give it such new adjustments as should to him seem best for the religious culture of the race. As Lord of the Sabbath, he doubtless had the power to set it entirely aside,—a power which certainly he has nowhere exercised, either by himself or through his apostles. *He had the right to change its day* and alter or add to its meanings,—a right which *he has exercised* in giving us the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath, and in making it a monument of redemption as well as of creation and providence. Because he is

'Lord of the Sabbath,' we can rightly call the Sabbath the Lord's day, and the Lord's day our Sabbath. That which he has asserted that he had the power to do, *we have the right to assume he has done*, and we have, moreover, the right to infer that the change which came over the Sabbatic institutions in the early Christian centuries was not without his will, but by his authority and in fulfillment of his purpose."—*Pp. 168, 169.*

Again:—

"More subtly than Moses, yet as really as the lawgiver in the wilderness, he was instituting a new Sabbath."—*P. 172.*

Here are several points, upon each of which we wish to dwell for a moment. We take the last one first: "More subtly than Moses, yet as really . . . he was instituting a new Sabbath." How subtly did Moses institute a new Sabbath? Why not at all, subtly or otherwise. Moses instituted no weekly Sabbath, either new or old. God spoke the word from Heaven: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;" as Mr. Elliott himself says, "Not by the mouth of angel or prophet came this sublimest code of morals: but the words were formed in air *by the power of the Eternal himself.*"—*P. 117.* But go back even beyond Sinai, to the Wilderness of Sin, at the falling of the manna, nor yet there was it left to Moses to mark the day that was the Sabbath, much less was it given to him to institute the Sabbath. Here, again, Mr. Elliott states the case precisely: "*God himself* provided the feast in the wilderness which marked for them the weekly recurrence of the holy day. . . . The connection of the miraculous supply of food with the seventh day was certainly calculated to strongly impress the Sabbath upon the thoughts and imaginations of the people, and thus was laid the sure foundation for the Sinaitic legislation."—*P. 110.*

That seventh day which was singled out for Israel by the miracle of the manna in the wilderness of Sin, and which was so kept before them for forty years, *that* was the identical seventh day which the word "formed in air by the power of the Eternal himself" declared to be the Sabbath of the Lord. And *that* was the very seventh day which that same word declared was the one on which God rested from creation, the day which he, at creation, blessed and sanctified. That was the only weekly Sabbath that was ever known to Moses or to Israel; and with its institution Moses had nothing whatever to do, either subtly or otherwise. And when Mr. Elliott brings in Christ as, "more subtly than Moses, yet as really . . . instituting a new Sabbath," it is simply saying, as a matter of fact, that Christ really instituted no new Sabbath at all. And that is the truth.

"That which he has asserted he had the power to do, we have the right to assume he has done," says Mr. Elliott. Is, then, the authority of the "Christian Sabbath" to rest upon assumption? Is the first day of the week to be brought in by an inference? The day that has received "the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity;" the day which has been specified in the word "formed in air by the power of the Eternal himself;" the day that was pointed out by weekly

miracles for forty continuous years,—that is to be supplanted by one that is brought in merely upon the assumption that what the Lord has asserted that he had the power to do, he has done! But any such assumption is wholly illegitimate. And we shall prove by Mr. Elliott's own words that this, his assumption, is simply willful.

"The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Now in that declaration there is just as much of an assertion of his power to entirely set aside the Sabbath, as there is of his power to change it. Therefore, upon Mr. Elliott's proposition, there is just as much "right to assume" that Christ abolished the Sabbath, as there is to assume that he changed it. Mr. Elliott says: "As Lord of the Sabbath, *he doubtless had the power* to set it entirely aside." Therefore, if his assertion of his power to do a thing gives right to the assumption that he has done it, why is it not right to assume that he has set it entirely aside? But no; Mr. Elliott will not at all allow that. But in the very next sentence he says: "He had the right to change its day," and, "That which he has asserted he had the power to do, we have the right to assume he has done," therefore the inference is that whatever change has come over it, was "by his authority and in fulfillment of his purpose." We repeat, and this Mr. Elliott's argument allows, that in Christ's quoted words there is just as much assertion of the power to set the Sabbath "entirely aside," or do with it any imaginable thing, as there is to "change its day;" and Mr. Elliott's argument is just as sound a basis for the assumption that the Sabbath has been abolished, or that any other wild scheme has been accomplished with it, as it is for his assumption that it has been changed. And when Mr. Elliott lays down this proposition, which equally allows any assumption that the imagination might frame, it depends simply upon the wishes of the individual as to what shall be assumed, and therefore the assumption is wholly willful. Christ has asserted his power to call from their graves, all the dead; by Mr. Elliott's proposition we have the right to assume that he has done it. Christ has asserted his power to destroy death; under this novel proposition we have the right to assume that he has done it. Every body knows, however, that such assumptions would be absolutely false; but they would be no more so than is Mr. Elliott's assumption that Christ changed the Sabbath. Mr. Elliott's proposition is simply absurd. The fact is that we have no right to assume anything in the premises.

"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. No man can do more than his duty. But when we have done all that is commanded, we have but done our duty. Therefore nothing can be duty that is not commanded. No man ever yet cited a commandment of God for keeping the first day of the week; there is no such commandment. Therefore until a commandment of God can be produced which enjoins the observance of the first day of the week, there can be no duty in that direction, Mr. Elliott's five-hundred-dollar-prize assumptions to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Want of space forbids any further notice this week. Next week we shall notice his theory of a change of the day.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Nehemiah's Prayer. Nehemiah 1:1-11" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 7 , pp. 106, 107.**

(February 28. Nehemiah 1:1-11.)

NEHEMIAH was cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, king of Persia who reigned B.C. 461-425). It was in the twentieth year (B.C. 444) of Artaxerxes Longimanus, that Hanani and "certain men of Judah" came to Susa, the winter palace of the kings of Persia, and Nehemiah inquired of them "concerning the Jews that had escaped which were left of the captivity, and concerning Jerusalem." And they said, "The remnant that are left of the captivity there in the province are in great affliction and reproach; the wall of Jerusalem also is broken down, and the gates thereof are burned with fire." It was now fully ninety years since the laying of the foundation of the temple, as recorded in last week's lesson; and although the temple had been finished some time, yet the walls still remained in ruins as they had been left by Nebuchadnezzar.

AS was learned in the lesson of last week, about 50,000 people returned to Jerusalem under the decree of Cyrus in 536 B.C. they had no sooner got the temple under way than serious opposition arose. The people who had been sent into Samaria by Sargon (2 Kings 17 :24-33) and Esar-haddon (Ezra 4:2, 9, 10), kings of Assyria, and who had thus inhabited the land of Israel since the captivity of the ten tribes, came and proposed to help the Jews in building the temple. But as these were really heathen, though pretending in a manner to fear Jehovah. "Zerubbabel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them. Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel." It would be an immense benefit to both the church and the world, if this spirit were found in the work of the church at the present day, instead of so many fairs, festivals, grab-bags, fish-ponds, ring-cakes, raffles, and gambling enterprises generally, by which the world is inveighed into the support of the church. True, the opposition of the world would be greater, but so would the devotion of the church.

WHEN these people found they could have no part in the building, they employed "every possible means to hinder it. They hired accusers against them at the court of Cyrus, but to no purpose; and as soon as Cyrus was dead, and Cambyses reigned, they wrote to him "an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem" (Cambyses, B.C. 529-522, is the Ahasuerus of Ezra 4:6); but their accusation was of no avail with Cambyses, and so the work went on in spite of their opposition. But Cambyses was no sooner dead, than they renewed their efforts and wrote a letter to his successor, Smerdis (the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:7-23); and he, being an enemy to the religion of Cyrus and Cambyses, was glad of an opportunity to oppose a work which they had favored, and so he issued a decree that the work should stop; and the Samaritans hurried up to Jerusalem, and made the Jews "cease by force and power." The reign of Smeris only continued from the spring of B.C. 522 to the end of the year. January 1, B.C.

521. Darius Hystaspes (Ezra 4:24) came to the throne of Persia, and in the beginning of his second year Haggai and Zechariah the prophets stirred up the people to carry forward the work, and the building began again.

THE work had no sooner begun again than the Samaritans renewed their opposition, and wrote a letter to Darius; but as they were different men from those who had written the other letters, they gave a very fair account of the matter, as they had received it from the Jews. They told him that the Jews claimed to be working under authority of a decree of Cyrus, and asked him to look among the records and see whether there was any such decree. Darius did so, and found the original decree; whereupon he made a decree commanding the Samaritans to not only let the Jews alone, but to give them expenses from the king's tribute to help in building, and animals for burnt offerings and wheat, salt, wine, and oil. And so the house "was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king." Ezra 5; 6:22.

AFTER this for sixty years we have nothing further in regard to affairs in Jerusalem. In the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 457, he issued a decree under which Ezra led up from Babylon about 7,000 people. But though Ezra and his company went up there to help build the city and the wall (Ezra 9:9), yet the people had so intermarried with the nations around them, in taking strange wives from among them, that all Ezra's time was occupied in reforming these things, and re-establishing and regulating the worship of God and the service of the house of God, and in bringing back the people to obedience to the word of God. And on this account the building of the wall was neglected for thirteen years longer, till the time of Nehemiah, as given in the lesson of to-day.

NEHEMIAH received letters from Artaxerxes Longimanus to the governors beyond the Euphrates, and so departed and came to Jerusalem. But "when Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel." When Nehemiah had been there three days, he arose in the night and viewed the ruins of the wall round about the city; then he called upon all the people, and said, "Come, and let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach." "And they said, Let us rise up and build. So they strengthened their hands for this good work." The work was apportioned among the people and the priests, and every one built over against his own house. "So the wall was finished in the twenty and fifth day of the month Elul, in the fifty and two days." Neh. 6:15. If each one would, over against his own house, build up the wall of Christian character, the troubles in the church would all cease, and the work of God would prosper.

NEHEMIAH remained there twelve years as governor, at his own charges; and at his table were supported "one hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, beside those that came to" him "from among the heathen; . . . yet for all this required not I the bread of the governor, because the bondage was heavy upon this people." "But the former governors that had been before me were chargeable unto the people, and had taken of them bread and wine,

beside forty shekels of silver; even their servants bare rule over the people, but so did not I, because of the fear of God." Neh. 5:14-15. Nehemiah is one of the most entirely unselfish men mentioned in the Bible. He sought the good of the people always, "in every thing acting always in the fear of God."

A. T. J.

**February 25, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 8 , p. 116.**

"THE character of the civil and military officers, on whom Rufinus had devolved the government of Greece, confirmed the public suspicion, that he had betrayed the ancient seat of freedom and learning to the Gothic invader. The proconsul Antiochus was the unworthy son of a respectable father; and Gerontius, who commanded the provincial troops, was much better qualified to execute the oppressive orders of a tyrant, than to defend, with courage and ability, a country most remarkably fortified by the hand of nature. Alaric had traversed [A.D. 396], without resistance, the plains of Macedonia and Thessaly, as far as the foot of Mount Oeta, a steep and woody range of hills, almost impervious to his cavalry. They stretched from east to west, to the edge of the sea-shore; and left, between the precipice and the Malian Gulf, an interval of three hundred feet, which, in some places, was contracted to a road capable of admitting only a single carriage. In this narrow pass of Thermopyle, where Leonidas and the three hundred Spartans had gloriously devoted their lives, the Goths might have been stopped, or destroyed, by a skilful general; and perhaps the view of that sacred spot might have kindled some sparks of military ardor in the breasts of the degenerate Greeks.

"The troops which had been posted to defend the Straits of Thermopyle, retired, as they were directed, without attempting to disturb the secure and rapid passage of Alaric; and the fertile fields of Phocis and Búotia were instantly covered by a deluge of Barbarians who massacred the males of an age to bear arms, and drove away the beautiful females, with the spoil and cattle of the flaming villages. The travelers, who visited Greece several years afterwards, could easily discover the deep and bloody traces of the march of the Goths; and Thebes was less indebted for her preservation to the strength of her seven gates, than to the eager haste of Alaric, who advanced to occupy the city of Athens, and the important harbor of the Pireus. The same impatience urged him to prevent the delay and danger of a siege, by the offer of a capitulation; and as soon as the Athenians heard the voice of the Gothic herald, they were easily persuaded to deliver the greatest part of their wealth, as the ransom of the city of Minerva and its inhabitants.

"The treaty was ratified by solemn oaths, and observed with mutual fidelity. The Gothic prince, with a small and select train, was admitted within the walls; he indulged himself in the refreshment of the bath, accepted a splendid banquet, which was provided by the magistrate, and affected to show that he was not ignorant of the manners of civilized nations. But the whole territory of Attica, from the promontory of Sunium to the town of Megara, was blasted by his baleful presence; and, if we may use the comparison of a contemporary philosopher, Athens itself resembled the bleeding and empty skin of a slaughtered victim. The confidence of the cities of Peloponnesus in their natural rampart, had tempted them to neglect the care of their antique walls; and the avarice of the Roman governors had exhausted and betrayed the unhappy province. Corinth, Argos, Sparta, yielded without resistance to the arms of the Goths; and the most fortunate of the inhabitants were saved, by death, from beholding the slavery of their families and the conflagration of their cities. The vases and statues were distributed among the barbarians, with more regard to the value of the materials, than to the elegance of the workmanship; the female captives submitted to the laws of war; the enjoyment of beauty was the reward of valor; and the Greeks could not reasonably complain of an abuse which was justified by the example of the heroic times.

"From Thermopylae to Sparta, the leader of the Goths pursued his victorious march without encountering any mortal antagonists; but one of the advocates of expiring Paganism has confidently asserted, that the walls of Athens were guarded by the goddess Minerva, with her formidable Aegis, and by the angry phantom of Achilles; and that the conqueror was dismayed by the presence of the hostile deities of Greece. In an age of miracles, it would perhaps be unjust to dispute the claim of the historian Zosimus to the common benefit: yet it cannot be dissembled, that the mind of Alaric was ill prepared to receive, either in sleeping or waking visions, the impressions of Greek superstition. The songs of Homer, and the fame of Achilles, had probably never reached the ear of the illiterate *barbarian*; and the *Christian* faith, which he had devoutly embraced, taught him to despise the imaginary deities of Rome and Athens. The invasion of the Goths, instead of vindicating the honor, contributed, at least accidentally, to extirpate the last remains of paganism; and the mysteries of Ceres, which had subsisted eighteen hundred years, did not survive the destruction of Eleusis, and the calamities of Greece.

"The last hope of a people who could no longer depend on their arms, their gods, or their sovereign, was placed in the powerful assistance of the general of the West; and Stilicho, who had not been permitted to repulse, advanced to chastise, the invaders of Greece. A numerous fleet was equipped in the ports of Italy; and

the troops, after a short and prosperous navigation over the Ionian Sea, were safely disembarked on the isthmus, near the ruins of Corinth. The woody and mountainous country of Arcadia, the fabulous residence of Pan and the Dryads, became the scene of a long and doubtful conflict between the two generals not unworthy of each other. The skill and perseverance of the Roman at length prevailed; and the Goths, after sustaining a considerable loss from disease and desertion, gradually retreated to the lofty mountain of Pholoe, near the sources of the Peneus, and on the frontiers of Elis; a sacred country, which had formerly been exempted from the calamities of war. The camp of the barbarians was immediately besieged; the waters of the river were diverted into another channel; and while they labored under the intolerable pressure of thirst and hunger, a strong line of circumvallation was formed to prevent their escape.

"After these precautions, Stilicho, too confident of victory, retired to enjoy his triumph, in the theatrical games, and lascivious dances, of the Greeks; his soldiers, deserting their standards, spread themselves over the country of their allies, which they stripped of all that had been saved from the rapacious hands of the enemy. Alaric appears to have seized the favorable moment to execute one of those hardy enterprises, in which the abilities of a general are displayed with more genuine luster, than in the tumult of a day of battle. To extricate himself from the prison of Peloponnesus, it was necessary that he should pierce the intrenchments which surrounded his camp; that he should perform a difficult and dangerous march of thirty miles, as far as the Gulf of Corinth; and that he should transport his troops, his captives, and his spoil, over an arm of the sea, which, in the narrow interval between Rhium and the opposite shore, is at least half a mile in breadth. The operations of Alaric must have been secret, prudent, and rapid; since the Roman general was confounded by the intelligence, that the Goths, who had eluded his efforts, were in full possession of the important province of Epirus. This unfortunate delay allowed Alaric sufficient time to conclude the treaty, which he secretly negotiated, with the ministers of Constantinople. The apprehension of a civil war compelled Stilicho to retire, at the haughty mandate of his rivals, from the dominions of Arcadius; and he respected, in the enemy of Rome, the honorable character dominions of Arcadius; and he respected, in the enemy of Rome, the honorable character of the ally and servant of the emperor of the East."

About this time Synesius, a Greek philosopher who was at Constantinople, delivered an oration before the Emperor Arcadius, in which the emperor was exhorted to banish luxury from the court and camp, and, in the place of his barbarian mercenaries, to enlist an army of citizens of the empire, put himself at

their head, and drive the whole gang of barbarians out of all his provinces, and back into the wastes of Scythia, or reduce them to slavery. But:—

"The court of Arcadius indulged the zeal, applauded the eloquence, and neglected the advice, of Synesius. While the oration of Synesius, and the downfall of the barbarians, were the topics of popular conversation, an edict was published at Constantinople, which declared the promotion of Alaric to the rank of master-general of the Eastern Illyricum. The Roman provincials, and the allies, who had respected the faith of treaties, were justly indignant, that the ruin of Greece and Epirus should be so liberally rewarded. The Gothic conqueror was received as a lawful magistrate, in the cities which he had so lately besieged. The fathers, whose sons he had massacred, the husbands, whose wives he had violated, were subject to his authority; and the success of his rebellion encouraged the ambition of every leader of the foreign mercenaries.

"The use to which Alaric applied his new command, distinguishes the firm and judicious character of his policy. He issued his orders to the four magazines and manufactures of offensive and defensive arms, Margus, Ratiaria, Naissus, and Thessalonica, to provide his troops with an extraordinary supply of shields, helmets, swords, and spears; the unhappy provincials were compelled to forge the instruments of their own destruction; and the Barbarians removed the only defect which had sometimes disappointed the efforts of their courage. The birth of Alaric, the glory of his past exploits, and the confidence in his future designs, insensibly united the body of the nation under his victorious standard; and, with the unanimous consent of the Barbarian chieftains, the master-general of Illyricum was elevated, according to ancient custom, on a shield, and solemnly proclaimed king of the Visigoths. Armed with this double power, seated on the verge of the two empires, he alternately sold his deceitful promises to the courts of Arcadius and Honorius; till he declared and executed his resolution of invading the dominions of the West. The provinces of Europe which belonged to the Eastern emperor, were already exhausted; those of Asia were inaccessible; and the strength of Constantinople had resisted his attack. But he was tempted by the fame, the beauty, the wealth of Italy, which he had twice visited; and he secretly aspired to plant the Gothic standard on the walls of Rome, and to enrich his army with the accumulated spoils of three hundred triumphs."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 30, par. 2, 3, 4.*

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' 'Apostolic Testimony'" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 8 , pp. 120, 121.**

**"APOSTOLIC TESTIMONY**

IN following the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" through the different principal headings under which his argument is framed, and his logic displayed, next after the "Testimony of Christ" we come to his so-called "Apostolic Testimony." Before we record his first definite proposition under this head, we wish to repeat one sentence from his exposition of the "Testimony of Christ:"—

"As Lord of the Sabbath, he doubtless had the power to set it entirely aside—a power which certainly he has *nowhere exercised, either by himself or through his apostles.*"—*P. 168.*

Here is the definite, positive statement that Christ has certainly nowhere, exercised the power to set the Sabbath aside, either by himself or through his apostles. Now please read the following:—

"The Jewish Sabbath is definitely abolished by apostolic authority."—*P. 175.*

True, in this latter statement, he prefixes to the Sabbath the epithet "Jewish;" but on page 190 he defines the "Jewish" Sabbath to be the "seventh day." And as the Lord from Heaven said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" as that is the day upon which the Lord rested, which he blessed and which he sanctified; as from the creation of the world that was the only day that had ever been known as the Sabbath; and as that day is the only day that was ever recognized as the Sabbath, by either Christ or his apostles, his insertion of the epithet "Jewish" does not in the least relieve his latter statement from being a direct contradiction of the former. Therefore, as Christ nowhere set the Sabbath aside, "either by himself or through his apostles," and as the only weekly Sabbath of which either himself or his apostles knew anything "was definitely abolished by apostolic authority," it follows inevitably, by his own words, that if the apostles did abolish it, it was *without the authority of Christ.* But no, no; he will not allow that for an instant. Well, how does he avoid the conclusion? Oh, that is easy enough; he simply contradicts again both himself and the conclusion, thus:—

"It is demonstrated that the Sabbath of the law was abolished by apostolic authority, *in accordance with the developed teachings of Jesus Christ.*"—*P.186.*

We beg our readers not to think that we draw out these sentences for the purpose of *making* contradictions, nor to think we are trying to make the matter worse than it really is. The contradictions are all there; we simply take them as we find them. And really we should not know how to go about it to make the thing worse than it is, nor as bad even as it is. We could wish indeed, that it were not so; but in such a cause it cannot be otherwise; and we want the people to see exactly how the Sunday institution is made to stand by an argument that ought to be the most conclusive, seeing it was considered worthy of a five-hundred-dollar prize.

We proceed. In proof of his word that the "Jewish" Sabbath is definitely abolished by apostolic authority, he says:—

"No wonder that the apostles could so little tolerate the proposed continuance of the bondage from which Christ had set them free. Gal. 5:1. Had he not taken away 'the handwriting of ordinances' against them, and 'nailed it to his cross?'"—*P. 176.*

But of all things the Sabbath is one that can by no possibility be classed with the ordinances that were *against* us. Christ said, "The Sabbath was made *for* man." The proof is absolute therefore that the Sabbath was no part of those ordinances which Paul says were "taken away;" for those that were taken away were such as were against us (Col. 2:14); unless, indeed, by Mr. Elliott's costly reasoning it could be made to appear that the same thing can be *for* us and *against* us at the same time. But, allowing all the wondrous efficacy of this high-priced logic, we doubt its power to the performance of this feat. Yet on the strength of the above statement he makes the following assertion:—

"With the ceremonial system vanished the Jewish Sabbath."—*P.*

177.

It would be an easy task indeed to disprove this, on our own part; but he does it himself so effectually that we need merely to copy his words. Of the law given at Sinai, he says:—

"Of the law thus impressively given, the fourth commandment forms a part. Amid the same cloud of glory, the same thunders and lightnings, uttered by the same dread voice of the Infinite One, and graven by his finger, came forth these words as well: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' It is impossible, in view of these facts, *to class the Sabbath with the ceremonial institutions* of Israel. By the sacred seal of the divine lip and finger, it has been raised *far above those perishing rites.*"—*P. 118.*

That is a fact. It *is* impossible, even by prefixing to it the epithet "Jewish," to class the Sabbath with the ceremonial institutions of Israel. For amid the same cloud of glory, the same thunderings and lightnings, the same dread voice of the Infinite One, who said, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," said also, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath"—not of the Jews, but—"of *the Lord thy God.*" It is indeed raised far above the perishing rites and ordinances that were against us. Therefore, although the ceremonial system vanished, the Sabbath remains; for it is no part of the ceremonial, but is an essential part of the moral system. But Mr. Elliott is not done yet. He continues:—

"Such is the relation of apostolic teaching to the Jewish Sabbath. The yoke of the fathers with its crushing weight of sacerdotal requirements, was cast off. The galling fetters of tradition were broken, and forever was the infant church delivered from 'statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live.' Eze. 20:25."—*P. 180.*

Over against that please read this concerning the Sabbath of the fourth commandment:—

"It belongs to that moral law which Paul calls 'holy, and just, and good' (Rom. 7:12), and *not* that ritual law of which Peter declares, 'neither our fathers nor we were able to bear' it. Acts 15:10."—*Pp. 118, 119.*

So, then, the "yoke" which was "cast off" had nothing to do with the Sabbath; and the "statutes that were not good," etc., from which the infant church was delivered, were not at all those of which the Sabbath is a part, for they are "holy, and just, and good." And more, we should like to know upon what principle it is that the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" applies the phrase, "the galling fetters of tradition," to an institution given by the direct word of God, with a voice that shook the earth, and whose obligation was graven upon the tables of stone by the divine finger? For by the term "Jewish" Sabbath he invariably means the seventh day, and that is the very day named by the voice of God. But lo, this is to be pushed aside as "the galling fetters of tradition;" and in its place is to be put a day—Sunday—to which in all the word of God there is no shadow of sacredness at-

121

tached; a day which rests for its authority solely upon, "we have the right to assume," "the right to infer," "doubtless," "probably," "in all likelihood," and "a religious *consensus* of the Christian church" (*p. 203*); and in all this we are to suppose there is nothing traditional!

Again we read:—

"It has already been shown that the Sabbath is a part of the moral law; it has the mark of universality as co-existent with man; it embodies a spiritual significance; it has a reasonable basis in the physical mental and moral needs of man; it was incorporated in the decalogue, the outline of moral law given to Israel; it was enforced by such threatened penalties for violation and promised blessings for observance as *could not have been attached to a merely ceremonial ordinance*; and Jesus confirmed these historical and rational proofs by his own example and teachings."—*P. 183.*

That is the truth, and it is well stated. But now see what an extraordinary conclusion he draws from it:—

"Being, therefore, a part of the moral law, it is established as an apostolic institution by every word and phrase in which the apostles assert that law to be still binding on men."—*P. 184.*

"Being, therefore, a part of the moral law, it is established as an *apostolic institution*!! Is, then, the moral law an apostolic institution? Does the moral law find its origin in the apostles? Do the precepts of the moral law find their spring in the will, and derive their authority from the actions, of the apostles? We confess it impossible for us to find language that would fittingly characterize such a preposterous proposition. It is astonishing how any man who is capable of forming the least conception of moral law, could set it forth as sober argument. Nor are we allowed to entertain the charitable view that perhaps it was done ignorantly; for Mr. Elliott himself has given us a perfect exposition of the ground

of existence of moral law, not only of moral law in the abstract, but also of the Sabbath as being itself a moral institution. He says:—

"Suppose the question to be asked, How can we know that any precept is moral in its meaning and authority, and not simply a positive and arbitrary command? What better answer could be given to this inquiry than to say that *a moral precept must have the ground of its existence in the nature of God?* Our highest conception of the moral law is to regard it as *the transcript of his nature*. . . . All must agree that no more perfect vindication of the moral character of a law can be given than to show that it is a rule of the divine conduct; that it has been imposed upon his own activity by that infinite will which is the supreme authority both in the physical and moral government of the universe. That law to which the Creator submits his own being must be of absolute binding force upon every creature made in his image. *Such is the law of the Sabbath*. 'God rested the seventh day,' and by so doing has given to the law of the Sabbath the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity."—*P. 24.*

Such, in truth, is the origin and ground of authority of all moral obligation; such is the origin and ground of authority of the moral obligation of the seventh day. The seventh day is the only day that has, or ever has had, any such sanctions; therefore the seventh day is the only day that has, or that can have under the existing order of things, any claim whatever to the moral consideration of mankind. And the above statement of the ground of moral obligation effectually shows the utter absurdity of the idea that the Sabbath, "being a part of the moral law, is established as an *apostolic institution*." How could he possibly think himself called upon to make such a statement anyhow? Why, just thus: He has set out to have the first day of the week the Sabbath; he knows that it cannot be made to appear with any shadow of authority before the days of the apostles; he knows that even though it be made to originate with them, it can have no authority outside of the church unless it be moral; therefore, in contradiction of his own proofs, and in defiance of every principle of the basis of moral obligation, he is compelled to make the apostles the source of moral obligation. But he might better have spared himself the pains; for the idea is repugnant to the very consciousness of every man who will pause to think at all upon the subject. The apostles were the subjects, not the authors, of moral obligation.

Notice again that the statement which we are here discussing is the conclusion which he has drawn from a series of things which he says had "already been shown;" and we must give him the credit, which is very seldom his due, that from his main premises his conclusion is logical. The proposition under which he draws his conclusion is that, "The apostles, by confirming the moral law, have enforced the obligation of the Sabbath." Under this, his principal term is:—

"The apostles of Jesus Christ, as he had done in the sermon on the mount, re-enacted for the church the whole decalogue in its universal meanings."—*Pp. 181-2.*

To enact, is "to decree; to establish by legal and authoritative acts; to make into a law."—*Webster*.

To re-enact, therefore, is to re-decree, to re-establish by legal and authoritative acts, to make again into a law. Now, if after the enactment by God and the re-enactment by Christ, the decalogue still needed to be confirmed by the apostles, and still needed legislative acts of the apostles to establish it legally and authoritatively as a moral standard, then we submit that Mr. Elliott's conclusion that the Sabbath, "being a part of the moral law, is established as an apostolic institution," is strictly logical. But we sincerely question the wisdom as well as the justice of paying five-hundred-dollar prizes for a style of reasoning which can be logical only in the reversal of every principle of the philosophy of moral obligation.

It most excellently serves his purpose though. His grand argument from "apostolic testimony" he closes thus:—

"As certainly as historical proof can be adduced for any fact, so certainly is it demonstrated that the Sabbath of the law was abolished by apostolic authority, in accordance with the developed teachings of Jesus Christ. But although the Sabbath of the law ceased, the law of the Sabbath is abiding."

If, then, the Sabbath of the law be abolished while the law of the Sabbath remains, it must follow that the law of the Sabbath remains with no Sabbath. Oh, no, not at all. This is the emergency which he has all the while been laboring to create, and of course he meets it promptly. He continues thus:—

"And *it is in the highest degree probable* that the Lord's day which embodied its spirit was instituted by the immediate authority of the apostles, and therefore by the supreme authority of their Master, Jesus Christ."—*P. 186*.

And so the grand feat of getting Sunday into the fourth commandment is accomplished at last; and "it is in the highest degree probable" that the reader sees just how it is done. But there is yet one more thing to be done that the work may be complete in every part; that is, to transfer to the first day the Sabbath associations with which God has surrounded the seventh day. And we beg that Mr. Elliott be allowed to tell how that is done, because it rounds out his work in such symmetrical proportions. He says:—

"It is easy to comprehend how the Jewish Sabbath must almost at once have lost its hold on the affections of the disciples. . . . In the most powerful manner possible, those feelings of festal gladness and holy joy inseparable from the true idea of the Sabbath, were forever disconnected from the seventh day. . . . And *by the most natural revulsion of feeling*, all that was lost from the seventh day was transferred to the first day of the week."—*P. 188*.

There, the work is done; the climax is reached; the "Hill Difficulty" is passed; and the first day of the week has become the "abiding Sabbath." It rests for its *authority* upon an, "it is in the highest degree probable;" and for its *sacredness*, upon "the most natural revulsion of feeling." But against all his probabilities of however high degree, and against all his revulsions of feeling however natural,

we set the plain word of God "which liveth and *abideth* forever;" "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Reading the Law. Nehemiah  
8:1-12" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 8 , pp. 122, 123.**

(March 7.—Nehemiah 8:1-12.)

WHEN Nehemiah had finished the walls of Jerusalem, and had set up the gates, the enemies of the Jews were still active, as they had been from the beginning—even as Daniel had prophesied nearly a hundred years before that the walls should be built "even in troublous times"—and watchmen were set upon the wall, all around, "every one in his watch, and every one to be over against his house." Although the wall was finished and the gates set up, "the city was large and great; but the people were few therein, and the houses were not builded." But before going any further in the matter of building particularly, he began a further reformation in the lives and worship of the people. So he says: "And my God put it into mine heart to gather together the nobles, and the rulers, and the people, that they might be reckoned by genealogy." Neh. 7:1-6.

"AND all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street that was before the water gate from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law." The words of the book, though written by Moses, were really the words of God; and it was right that the ears of all the people should be attentive to the words that were read to them. Inattention to the reading of the word of God is disrespectful to its Author. If some one of the rulers of this world were to send a communication to us personally, there would be close attention given to the reading of it. The Bible is the communication which the Majesty of the universe sends to us; it is the word of our best Friend; in it he teaches us to profit, telling us the way which we should go to reach happiness and peace at all times. Would that *all* people to-day to whom the word is read, were as attentive as were these people at Jerusalem when Ezra read. "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isa. 48:17, 18.

"AND Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose. . . . And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people (for he was above all the people); and when he opened it, all the people stood up; and Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped

the Lord with their faces to the ground." It is right for all the people to have part in the worship. It is for the people to listen attentively to the reading of the word; it is right for them to join in thought in the prayer of the one who leads; and it is right for them to respond to the words of the prayer by saying Amen. This is the rule of the New Testament as well as of the Old. Paul prohibits speaking in the church in an unknown tongue without an interpreter, because the unlearned could not say Amen to what was said, seeing he could not understand what was said. Therefore if he who speaks or prays is to do it in language that can be understood, so that those who hear can say Amen to it, why do not those who hear say Amen to it? If it be the speaker's part to speak in language to be understood so that the hearers may say Amen, it is equally the part of the hearers to say Amen when they do understand. But there is so much coldness, formality, listlessness, and inattention, in the services of the church that this duty is almost entirely neglected. This ought not so to be.

SUCH was the preaching on the occasion of which we write; for says the scripture: "So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." This is the only kind of preaching that is strictly genuine. The Bible is God's word to the people. The minister is to take that word, and, by the aid of the Spirit of God, to put it into the mind and hearts of the people, and it can be done only by *reading* in the book in the law of God *distinction*, and *giving the sense*, and causing them to *understand* the reading. It cannot be done by taking a single verse, or sentence, or perhaps a single word, from the Bible, and then talking about something else for thirty or forty minutes. In other words, it cannot be done as D. L. Moody says that some men do: Take the text from the Bible, and go all over Christendom for the sermon. Under the solemn charge "before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom," the command of God is, "preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2. Again: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, *let him speak my word faithfully*. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. 23:28, 29. The word of man is chaff; the word of God is wheat. Give the people the word of God—the wheat—and they will have bread; they will have that upon which they can feed. Give them the words of men, and they have chaff indeed.

CHRIST said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63); and, "By every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," shall man live. And when he sends forth men to preach, the commission is "Go ye. . . . and teach all nations. . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the

world." It is true, that if the word of God be preached faithfully there will be many points wherein the people will be found to be doing wrong; many things will be found held contrary to the word of God; and things even which our fathers did not do, shall we have to do, as it happened at the time of which this lesson tells. It will be found that the coming of the Lord is near, and that we must prepare to

meet him while living. It will be found that future life depends on the resurrection of the dead, and not on the immortality of the soul. It will be found that future life is obtained through the Son of God *alone*; that he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. It will be found that the seventh day, and *not* the first day of the week, is the Sabbath of the Lord, and that we must keep it so, or our action will not be Sabbath-keeping at all. And when we find out these things, and many others in which we have thought and done wrong, we must be like this people of old, honest enough with God and ourselves to turn from our ways and thoughts and conform to those of the word of God. See Neh. 8:13-17. Then it will be with us as was said to them, "The joy of the Lord is your strength."

A. T. J.

**March 4, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9 , p. 132.**

"THE scarcity of facts, and the uncertainty of dates, oppose our attempts to describe the circumstances of the first invasion of Italy by the arms of Alaric. His march, perhaps from Thessalonica, through the warlike and hostile country of Pannonia, as far as the foot of the Julian Alps [A.D. 400-403]; his passage of those mountains, which were strongly guarded by troops and intrenchments; the siege of Aquileia, and the conquest of the provinces of Istria and Venetia, appear to have employed a considerable time. Unless his operations were extremely cautious and slow, the length of the interval would suggest a probable suspicion, that the Gothic king retreated towards the banks of the Danube; and re-enforced his army with fresh swarms of barbarians, before he again attempted to penetrate into the heart of Italy. Since the public and important events escape the diligence of the historian, he may amuse himself with contemplating, for a moment, the influence of the arms of Alaric on the fortunes of two obscure individuals, a presbyter of Aquileia and a husbandman of Verona. The learned Rufinus, who was summoned by his enemies to appear before a Roman synod, wisely preferred the dangers of a besieged city; and the barbarians, who furiously shook the walls of Aquileia, might save him from the cruel sentence of another heretic, who, at the request of the same bishops, was severely whipped, and condemned to perpetual exile on a desert island.

"The *old man*, who had passed his simple and innocent life in the neighborhood of Verona, was a stranger to the quarrels both of kings and of bishops; *his* pleasures, his desires, his knowledge, were confined within the little circle of his paternal farm; and a staff supported his aged steps, on the same ground where he had sported in his infancy. Yet even this humble and rustic felicity (which Claudian describes with so much truth and feeling) was still exposed to the undistinguishing rage of war. His trees, his old

*contemporary* trees, must blaze in the conflagration of the whole country; a detachment of Gothic cavalry might sweep away his cottage and his family; and the power of Alaric could destroy this happiness, which he was not able either to taste or to bestow. 'Fame,' says the poet, 'encircling with terror her gloomy wings, proclaimed the march of the barbarian army, and filled Italy with consternation;' the apprehensions of each individual were increased in just proportion to the measure of his fortune; and the most timid, who had already embarked their valuable effects, meditated their escape to the Island of Sicily, or the African coast. The public distress was aggravated by the fears and reproaches of superstition. Every hour produced some horrid tale of strange and portentous accidents; the Pagans deplored the neglect of omens, and the interruption of sacrifices; but the Christians still derived some comfort from the powerful intercession of the saints and martyrs.

"The emperor Honorius was distinguished, above his subjects, by the preeminence of fear, as well as of rank. The pride and luxury in which he was educated, had not allowed him to suspect, that there existed on the earth any power presumptuous enough to invade the repose of the successor of Augustus. The arts of flattery concealed the impending danger, till Alaric approached the palace of Milan. But when the sound of war had awakened the young emperor, instead of flying to arms with the spirit, or even the rashness, of his age, he eagerly listened to those timid counselors, who proposed to convey his sacred person, and his faithful attendants, to some secure and distant station in the provinces of Gaul [A.D. 403]. Stilicho alone had courage and authority to resist his disgraceful measure, which would have abandoned Rome and Italy to the barbarians; but as the troops of the palace had been lately detached to the Rhetian frontier, and as the resource of new levies was slow and precarious, the general of the West could only promise, that if the court of Milan would maintain their ground during his absence, he would soon return with an army equal to the encounter of the Gothic king.

"Without losing a moment, (while each moment was so important to the public safety), Stilicho hastily embarked on the Larian Lake, ascended the mountains of ice and snow, amidst the severity of an Alpine winter, and suddenly repressed, by his unexpected presence, the enemy, who had disturbed the tranquillity of Rhetia. The barbarians, perhaps some tribes of the Alemanni, respected the firmness of a chief, who still assumed the language of command; and the choice which he condescended to make, of a select number of their bravest youth, was considered as a mark of his esteem and favor. The cohorts, who were delivered from the neighboring foe, diligently repaired to the Imperial standard; and

Stilicho issued his orders to the most remote troops of the West, to advance, by rapid marches, to the defense of Honorius and of Italy. The fortresses of the Rhine were abandoned; and the safety of Gaul was protected only by the faith of the Germans, and the ancient terror of the Roman name. Even the legion, which had been stationed to guard the wall of Britain against the Caledonians of the North, was hastily recalled; and a numerous body of the cavalry of the Alani was persuaded to engage in the service of the emperor, who anxiously expected the return of his general. The prudence and vigor of Stilicho were conspicuous on this occasion, which revealed, at the same time, the weakness of the falling empire. The legions of Rome, which had long since languished in the gradual decay of discipline and courage, were exterminated by the Gothic and civil wars; and it was found impossible, without exhausting and exposing the provinces, to assemble an army for the defense of Italy.

"When Stilicho seemed to abandon his sovereign in the unguarded palace of Milan, he had probably calculated the term of his absence, the distance of the enemy, and the obstacles that might retard their march. He principally depended on the rivers of Italy, the Adige, the Mincius, the Oglio, and the Addua, which, in the winter or spring, by the fall of rains, or by the melting of the snows, are commonly swelled into broad and impetuous torrents. But the season happened to be remarkably dry; and the Goths could traverse, without impediment, the wide and stony beds, whose centre was faintly marked by the course of a shallow stream. The bridge and passage of the Addua were secured by a strong detachment of the Gothic army; and as Alaric approached the walls, or rather the suburbs, of Milan, he enjoyed the proud satisfaction of seeing the emperor of the Romans fly before him. Honorius, accompanied by a feeble train of statesmen and eunuchs, hastily retreated towards the Alps, with a design of securing his person in the city of Arles, which had often been the royal residence of his predecessors.

"But Honorius had scarcely passed the Po, before he was overtaken by the speed of the Gothic cavalry; since the urgency of the danger compelled him to seek a temporary shelter within the fortifications of Asta, a town of Liguria or Piemont, situate on the banks of the Tanarus. The siege of an obscure place, which contained so rich a prize, and seemed incapable of a long resistance, was instantly formed, and indefatigably pressed, by the king of the Goths; and the bold declaration, which the emperor might afterwards make, that his breast had never been susceptible of fear, did not probably obtain much credit, even in his own court. In the last, and almost hopeless extremity, after the barbarians had already proposed the indignity of a capitulation, the Imperial captive

was suddenly relieved by the fame, the approach, and at length the presence, of the hero, whom he had so long expected. At the head of a chosen and intrepid vanguard, Stilicho swam the stream of the Addua, to gain the time which he must have lost in the attack of the bridge; the passage of the Po was an enterprise of much less hazard and difficulty; and the successful action, in which he cut his way through the Gothic camp under the walls of Asta, revived the hopes, and vindicated the honor, of Rome.

"Instead of grasping the fruit of his victory, the barbarian was gradually invested, on every side, by the troops of the West, who successively issued through all the passes of the Alps; his quarters were straitened; his convoys were intercepted; and the vigilance of the Romans prepared to form a chain of fortifications, and to besiege the lines of the besiegers. A military council was assembled of the long-haired chiefs of the Gothic nation; of aged warriors, whose bodies were wrapped in furs, and whose stern countenances were marked with honorable wounds. They weighed the glory of persisting in their attempt against the advantage of securing their plunder; and they recommended the prudent measure of a seasonable retreat. In this important debate, Alaric displayed the spirit of the conqueror of Rome; and after he had reminded his countrymen of their achievements and of their designs, he concluded his animating speech by the solemn and positive assurance that he was resolved to find in Italy either a kingdom or a grave."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 30, par. 5, 6, 7.*

A. T. J.

*(To be concluded next week.)*

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' 'Origin of the Lord's Day'" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9 , pp. 136, 137.**

### **"ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S DAY.**

AFTER leading us through one hundred and eighty-six pages of fact and fiction, of truth and error, of contradiction and recontradiction of Scripture, reason, and himself, the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" has arrived at the all-important conclusion that "it is in the *highest degree probable* that the Lord's day [Sunday] was instituted by the immediate authority of the apostles;" and that "by the most natural revulsion of feeling all that was lost from the seventh day was transferred to the first day of the week." And so after all this he comes to the discussion of the "origin of the Lord's day." Speaking of the resurrection of Christ, thus he proceeds:—

"The idea of completion, symbolized by the number seven and embodied in the Sabbath as the memorial of a finished creation, is transferred [by a "natural revulsion of feeling," we suppose, of

course] to the Lord's day, the monument of a finished redemption."—  
P. 189.

If redemption had been finished when the Saviour arose from the dead, or were it even yet finished, we should question the right of Mr. Elliott, or any other man, to erect in memory of it a monument whose only foundation is a high degree of probability, and whose only rites of dedication are performed by a "natural revulsion of feeling." How much more may we question this right, when redemption, so far from being finished at the resurrection of Christ, will not be finished till the end of the world. The disciples asked the Saviour what should be the sign of his coming and of the end of the world, and he answered, "There shall be *signs* in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, *then look up*, and lift up your heads; *for your redemption draweth nigh*." Luke 21:25-28. These things did not "begin to come to pass," till 1780 A.D.; for then it was that the sun was turned to darkness and the moon also. Therefore it is plain from these words of Christ, that instead of redemption being completed at the resurrection of Christ, it was not even "nigh" for 1749 years after that event.

This is confirmed by Paul. He says: "Ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Rom. 8:23. Our bodies will be redeemed at the resurrection of the dead: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death" (Hos. 13:14); and the resurrection of the dead is accomplished at the second coming of the Lord. "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. Therefore Paul, in telling of our redemption, places its accomplishment exactly where Christ places it, that is, at the second coming of the Lord, and not at his resurrection.

Again Paul writes: "In whom [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." Eph. 1:13, 14. "That Holy Spirit of promise" was not given until the day of Pentecost, forty-nine days *after* the resurrection of Christ; and this, says Paul, is the earnest of our inheritance *until* (not because of) the *redemption* of the purchased possession. By this Holy Spirit, says Paul, "ye are sealed *until* the day of redemption." Eph. 4:30. Now as the Holy Spirit was given to be with those who trust in Christ "until the redemption," and as that Spirit was not so given till forty-nine days after the resurrection of Christ, this is proof most positive that the day of the resurrection of Christ could not possibly be made "the monument of a finished redemption." And when Mr. Elliott, or anybody else, whether individually or by "a general

*consensus* of the Christian church," sets up the first day of the week as a monument of a finished redemption, it simply perverts the Scripture doctrine of redemption, and puts darkness for light, and error for truth.

Again he says of the first day of the week:—

*"It is the abiding Sabbath.* It was on the first day of the week that the Saviour rose. It is remarkable that this phrase, 'first day of the week,' marks the only case in which any day of the week is distinguished from the rest in Scripture by its number, excepting the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath. Eight times the term is used in the New Testament, five of the instances occurring in connection with the account of the Lord's resurrection. Other days have no distinctive title, save only the sixth day, which is the 'Sabbath eve,' or 'day of preparation.' The first day is therefore placed in such significant relation with the seventh day as to impress upon it a meaning which cannot be disregarded."—*Pp. 189, 190.*

If the mention of the first day of the week eight times in the New Testament marks it so distinctively and impresses upon it so strong a meaning as Mr. Elliott imagines, how is it that the mention of the Sabbath *fifty-nine* times in the New Testament (with sole reference to the seventh day) can impress upon it no meaning whatever? It would seem that if the mention of a day would give any distinction at all to it, the day that is mentioned most would properly be entitled to the most distinction. But behold, here it is just the reverse; the day that is mentioned eight times is entitled to the distinction, while a day that is mentioned *more than seven times as often* is entitled to no distinction whatever!

He remarks the "significant relations" in which the first day of the week is placed with the seventh, but in not one instance does he notice these relations. We shall do it for him; for there is a relation there which is very "significant" indeed, in view of his theory that the first day of the week is "the abiding Sabbath."

The first mention of the first day of the week in the New Testament is in Matt. 28:1: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." There *is* a "significant" relation between the Sabbath—the seventh day—and the first day of the week; and that which is signified by it is that the Sabbath is ended before the first day of the week begins.

The next mention is in Mark 16:1, 2: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." Here also is a very significant relation between the Sabbath and the first day of the week; and the significance of it is that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. Notice, too, that these women came to the sepulcher *very early* in the morning the first day of the week; yet as early as it was, "*the Sabbath was past.*" And the significance of that is, that Mr. Elliott, or anyone else, may arise *very early in the morning* the first day of the week, just as early as he pleases in

fact, but he will be too late for the Sabbath—he will find that the Sabbath is past; it will not "abide" on the first day of the week.

137

The third mention is Luke 23:54-56; 24:1: "And that day [the day of crucifixion] 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 upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." In this passage, the "relations" between the Sabbath and the first day of the week are doubly significant. For here it is not only shown that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes; it is not only shown that although people may arise very early in the morning the first day of the week, they will be too late for the Sabbath; but it is stated explicitly that the Sabbath that was past was "the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*." Therefore it is by these texts proved as absolutely as the word of God can prove anything, that Sunday, the first day of the week, the so-called Lord's day, is not the Sabbath according to the commandment of God; and that when people rest on Sunday, the first day of the week, they do not rest "according to the commandment." It is likewise proved that the Sabbath according to the commandment is—not a seventh part of time, nor simply one day in seven, but—the definite seventh day of the week, the day *before* the one on which Christ rose from the dead.

We repeat, the relations in which are placed the seventh day and the first, in the Scripture, are indeed most "significant,"—so significant that it is utterly impossible to honestly or truthfully pass off the first day of the week as the Sabbath; and that it proves positively that the day before that upon which Christ arose from the dead, the day before the first day of the week, is the Sabbath according to the commandment of God; and that therefore the seventh day, and *not* the first, is "the abiding Sabbath."

Other supposed probabilities as to the origin of the so-called Lord's day will be noticed next week.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Esther's Petition. Esther 4:10-17; 5:1-8" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 9 , pp. 138, 139.**

(March 14.—Esther 4:10-17; 5:1-8.)

IN the connected story of the Bible, the place of the book of Esther is between the sixth and seventh chapters of Ezra, between Darius and Artaxerxes, kings of Persia; for the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther was Xerxes, king of Persia. "The Hebrew *Ahashverosh* is the natural equivalent of the old persian *Khshayarsha*, the true name of the monarch called by the Greeks Xerxes, as now read in his inscriptions."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Ahasuerus*. His reign was from 486-465 B.C. His

father, Darius Hystaspes, had left him the empire extended to its widest limit; and his reign marks the period of the greatest glory of the Persian Empire, and the beginning of its decline. In Dan. 11:2 is a prophecy spoken in the third year of Cyrus, B.C. 534, saying: "Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all; and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia."

IT was in fulfillment of this prophecy that Xerxes invaded Greece, B.C. 480, with the largest army ever known, when, in resisting it, the three hundred Spartans under Leonidas immortalized themselves at Thermopyle. It was in preparation for this invasion of Greece, that he gathered all the princes and governors of his empire to Susa, as recorded in Esther 1:3-9. "In the third year of his reign, he made a feast unto all his princes and his servants; the power of Persia and Media, the nobles and princes of the provinces, being before him." He called the governors and princes of the provinces to his capital to deliberate upon the invasion of Greece, and to levy the tribute and the forces that should be furnished by each province for the purpose. The royal entertainment continued six months. But it was no later than the seventh day of the feast when the king in his drunkenness commanded his chamberlains "to bring Vashti the queen before the king with the crown royal, to show the people and the princes her beauty." "But the queen Vashti refused to come." Then the king in council decided to put her away, and to publish a decree in the language of every people, "that every man should bear rule in his own house."

THEN in his sixth year he led his army into Greece, suffered a terrible defeat at Salamis, and at Platea, and, like Sennacherib of old, returned with shame of face into his own land. And there he for the rest of his days sought to occupy himself in the exercise of arms of a very different nature from those with which he had been occupied in the invasion of Greece. Then "he remembered Vashti, and what she had done, and what was decreed against her." It would seem that he remembered Vashti with the wish to call her to his side again; but the "decree" of the Persians and Medes had been published against her, and it was impossible to alter or reverse that; so he was compelled to do without Vashti, and seek another in her place, and the choice fell upon Esther, the adopted daughter of her cousin Mordecai. "And the king loved Esther above all the women, and she obtained grace and favor in his sight more than all the virgins; so that he set the royal crown upon her head, and made her queen instead of Vashti."

SHORTLY after this, two of the king's chamberlains had laid a plot to assassinate him, and Mordecai learned of it. He told Esther who brought it to the king; the matter was discovered; the two men were hanged, and there was a record made of the whole matter in the chronicles of the kingdom. Next Xerxes promoted Haman the Agagite to the chief place, "above all the princes that were with him." When the king promoted him, Haman exalted himself; and when all bowed and revered him as he passed except Mordecai, it soon created a stir; for Mordecai "had told them that he was a Jew." Being a Jew who feared and worshiped God, he would neither bow nor reverence any one but God. Then Haman was "full of wrath. And he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone; for they had showed him the people of Mordecai; wherefore Haman sought to

destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom." Haman therefore succeeded in obtaining a decree for the destruction of "a certain people" whose laws were "diverse from all people" whose laws were "diverse from all people; neither keep they the king's laws." So the decree was published throughout the realm. "And the king and Haman sat down to drink; but the city Shushan was perplexed."

"WHEN Mordecai perceived all that was done, Mordecai rent his clothes, and put on sackcloth with ashes, and went out into the midst of the city, and cried with a loud and a bitter cry; and came even before the king's gate." "So Esther's maids and her chamberlains came and told it her. . . . And she sent raiment to clothe Mordecai, and to take away his sackcloth from him; and he received it not." Then she sent her chamberlain "to know what it was and why it was;" and Mordecai told him all about it, and sent word to her to go to the king and "make a request before him for her people." But it was death for any one to go to the king without being called, unless the king should hold out the royal scepter; and as Esther had not been called for thirty days, it was a great risk indeed for her to go into the presence of the capricious king without being called. But Mordecai told her that if the Jews were indeed destroyed, she would not escape any more than any of the rest of the Jews. He also told her a truth in which is embodied the principle that underlies all of God's calling and work." If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed; and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?"

GOD'S purposes in the affairs of men will surely be accomplished. They will be accomplished by the instrumentality of men. And when he calls anybody to his work, whether directly or by putting him in a position of responsibility or influence by which men have a right to expect of him help in crises; if that person fails, then enlargement and deliverance will arise from another place, and he will be left in the place which he was weakly chosen, and the cause of God will advance without him. We owe to God and to his cause all our influence of position, all our responsibility of place, wherever it may be; and when a crisis comes, we are, like the fair queen Esther, to show our faithfulness, trusting in God for the result. It was for just such a time as this that she was brought to that place, and now if she should fail in her responsibility, she would show herself entirely unworthy of the place. And so it is ever. God's gifts are not for nothing. He expects them to be used for his glory, and "Them that honor me I will honor; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed," is his word to all. Esther nobly fulfilled her calling; she found favor in the eyes of God and the king; and by her deliverance arose for her nation and people.

HAMAN, expecting to be honored above all by the king, pronounces the sentence of what he

himself shall do in honor of Mordecai, whom he abhors; having erected a gallows upon which Mordecai shall be hanged, he himself is hanged upon it; having devoted to destruction Mordecai and his people, the evil which he intended came

upon himself and upon his house.  
A. T. J.

**March 11, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths and the Visigoths. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 10 , p. 148.**

*(Concluded).*

"THE loose discipline of the barbarians always exposed them to the danger of a surprise; but, instead of choosing the dissolute hours of riot and intemperance, Stilicho resolved to attack the *Christian* Goths, whilst they were devoutly employed in celebrating the festival of Easter. The execution of the stratagem, or, as it was termed by the clergy of the sacrilege, was intrusted to Saul, a barbarian and a Pagan, who had served, however, with distinguished reputation among the veteran generals of Theodosius. The camp of the Goths [A.D. 403, March 29], which Alaric had pitched in the neighborhood of Pollentia, was thrown into confusion by the sudden and impetuous charge of the Imperial cavalry; but, in a few moments, the undaunted genius of their leader gave them an order, and a field of battle; and, as soon as they had recovered from their astonishment, the pious confidence, that the God of the Christians would assert their cause, added new strength to their native valor. In this engagement, which was long maintained with equal courage and success, the chief of the Alani, whose diminutive and savage form concealed a magnanimous soul approved his suspected loyalty, by the zeal with which he fought, and fell, in the service of the republic; and the fame of this gallant barbarian has been imperfectly preserved in the verses of Claudian, since the poet, who celebrates his virtue, has omitted the mention of his name. His death was followed by the flight and dismay of the squadrons which he commanded; and the defeat of the wing of cavalry might have decided the victory of Alaric, if Stilicho had not immediately led the Roman and barbarian infantry to the attack.

"The skill of the general, and the bravery of the soldiers, surmounted every obstacle. In the evening of the bloody day, the Goths retreated from the field of battle; the intrenchments of their camp were forced, and the scene of rapine and slaughter made some atonement for the calamities which they had inflicted on the subjects of the empire. The magnificent spoils of Corinth and Argos enriched the veterans of the West; the captive wife of Alaric, who had impatiently claimed his promise of Roman jewels and Patrician

handmaids, was reduced to implore the mercy of the insulting foe; and many thousand prisoners, released from the Gothic chains, dispersed through the provinces of Italy the praises of their heroic deliverer. The triumph of Stilicho was compared by the poet, and perhaps by the public, to that of Marius; who, in the same part of Italy, had encountered and destroyed another army of Northern barbarians. The huge bones, and the empty helmets, of the Cimbri and of the Goths, would easily be confounded by succeeding generations; and posterity might erect a common trophy to the memory of the two most illustrious generals, who had vanquished, on the same memorable ground, the two most formidable enemies of Rome.

"The eloquence of Claudian has celebrated, with lavish applause, the victory of Pollentia, one of the most glorious days in the life of his patron; but his reluctant and partial muse bestows more genuine praise on the character of the Gothic king. His name is, indeed, branded with the reproachful epithets of pirate and robber, to which the conquerors of every age are so justly entitled; but the poet of Stilicho is compelled to acknowledge that Alaric possessed the invincible temper of mind, which rises superior to every misfortune, and derives new resources from adversity. After the total defeat of his infantry, he escaped, or rather withdrew, from the field of battle, with the greatest part of his cavalry entire and unbroken. Without wasting a moment to lament the irreparable loss of so many brave companions, he left his victorious enemy to bind in chains the captive images of a Gothic king; and boldly resolved to break through the unguarded passes of the Apennine, to spread desolation over the fruitful face of Tuscany, and to conquer or die before the gates of Rome.

"The capital was saved by the active and incessant diligence of Stilicho; but he respected the despair of his enemy; and, instead of committing the fate of the republic to the chance of another battle, he proposed to purchase the absence of the Barbarians. The spirit of Alaric would have rejected such terms, the permission of a retreat, and the offer of a pension, with contempt and indignation; but he exercised a limited and precarious authority over the independent chieftains who had raised him, for *their* service, above the rank of his equals; they were still less disposed to follow an unsuccessful general, and many of them were tempted to consult their interest by a private negotiation with the minister of Honorius. The king submitted to the voice of his people, ratified the treaty with the empire of the West, and repassed the Po with the remains of the flourishing army which he had led into Italy. A considerable part of the Roman forces still continued to attend his motions; and Stilicho, who maintained a secret correspondence with some of the barbarian chiefs, was punctually apprised of the designs that were

formed in the camp and council of Alaric. The king of the Goths, ambitious to signalize his retreat by some splendid achievement, had resolved to occupy the important city of Verona, which commands the principal passage of the Rhetian Alps; and, directing his march through the territories of those German tribes, whose alliance would restore his exhausted strength, to invade, on the side of the Rhine, the wealthy and unsuspecting provinces of Gaul.

"Ignorant of the treason which had already betrayed his bold and judicious enterprise, he advanced towards the passes of the mountains, already possessed by the Imperial troops; where he was exposed, almost at the same instant, to a general attack in the front, on his flanks, and in the rear. In this bloody action, at a small distance from the walls of Verona, the loss of the Goths was not less heavy than that which they had sustained in the defeat of Pollentia; and their valiant king, who escaped by the swiftness of his horse, must either have been slain or made prisoner, if the hasty rashness of the Alani had not disappointed the measures of the Roman general. Alaric secured the remains of his army on the adjacent rocks; and prepared himself, with undaunted resolution, to maintain a siege against the superior numbers of the enemy, who invested him on all sides. But he could not oppose the destructive progress of hunger and disease; nor was it possible for him to check the continual desertion of his impatient and capricious barbarians. In this extremity he still found resources in his own courage, or in the moderation of his adversary; and the retreat of the Gothic king was considered as the deliverance of Italy."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 30, par. 8, 9.*

Although Alaric was thus defeated and compelled to retreat to his camp outside the confines of Italy, and although his retreat "was considered as the deliverance of Italy," yet it was only a seeming deliverance; and his retreat was only for a season, during which, events were being so shaped that when he returned it was to trace a line of devastation over the whole length of Italy, from the Alps to the straits of Sicily; and Rome herself, which had stood for so many ages the mistress of the world, was visited with such a calamity as to fill with "grief and terror," "the astonished empire."

And now while Alaric and his terrible Visigoths, chafing bitterly under their defeat, hang like an angry cloud ready to burst from the Illyrian frontier upon the Western Empire, a furious tempest is excited on the coast of the Baltic Sea, and a torrent of barbarous German tribes pours from the north upon the devoted empire, and carries destruction almost to the gates of Rome. Here we must leave the Visigoths for a short time while we contemplate, with curious interest, the nations of the North, and the causes which impel them upon the tottering empire.

A. T. J.

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' 'Origin of the Lord's Day'" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 10 , pp. 152, 153.**

**"ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S DAY.**

IN continuing his efforts to find the origin of the Lord's day, the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" says:—

"After the several appearances of the Saviour on the day of his resurrection, there is no recorded appearance until a week later, when the first day is again honored by the Master. John 20:26. The exact mention of the time, which is not usual even with John's exactness, very evidently implies that there was already attached a special significance to the 'first day of the week' at the time when this gospel was written."—*P. 190.*

From Mr. Elliott's assertion of "the *exact* mention of the time, which is not usual even with John's exactness," it would naturally be supposed that John 20:26 makes exact mention of the first day of the week; we might expect to open the book and read there some such word as, "the next first day of the week," etc. Now let us read the passage referred to, and see how much exactness of expression there is about the first day of the week. The record says:—

"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.

There is the "exact mention" which attaches significance to the first day of the week! That is, an expression in which the first day of the week is not mentioned; an expression, indeed, in which there is no exactness at all, but which is wholly indefinite. "*After eight days*" is exactly the phrase which John wrote. Will Mr. Elliott tell us exactly how long after? Granting that it was the very next day after eight days, then we would ask the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" if the first day of the week comes every *ninth* day? If this is to be considered an exact mention of time, unusual even with John's exactness, then we should like to see a form of words which Mr. Elliott would consider *inexact*.

Perhaps some one may ask what day we think it was. We make no pretensions to wisdom above that which is written. And as the word of God says it was "after eight days," without telling us anything about how long after, we know nothing more definitely about what day it was than what the word tells us, that it was "*after eight days*." We know of a similar expression in Matt. 17:1: "And *after six days* Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart;" and we know that Luke's record of the same scene says: "And it came to pass *about an eight days* after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James, and went up into a mountain to pray." Luke 9:28. Therefore we know that Inspiration shows that "after six days" is "about eight days," and by the same rule "after eight days" is about ten days. But even then it is as indefinite as it was before, and Inspiration alone knows what day it was.

But, though we know nothing at all about what day it was, we do know what day it was not. We know that the meeting previous to the one under consideration was on the first day of the week, John 20:19. We know that the next first day of the week would come exactly a week from that time. We know that a week consists of exactly seven days. And as the word of God says plainly that this meeting was "after *eight* days," we therefore know by the word of God that this meeting was *not* on the next first day of the week.

Then says Mr. Elliott:—

"These repeated appearances of Jesus upon the first day *doubtless* furnished the first suggestion of the practice which very quickly sprang up in the church of employing that day for religious assembly and worship. . . . This impression *must have been* strongly intensified by the miraculous occurrences of Pentecost, if that festival fell, as we think *probable*, on the first day of the week—a view maintained by the early tradition of the church and by many eminent scholars."—*Pp. 190, 191.*

Yes, "doubtless" it "must have been," "if" it was as he thinks "probable." But against the "early tradition of the church," and the "many eminent scholars," we will place just as many and as eminent scholars, and the word of God. It is true that the day of the week on which that Pentecost came is not of the least importance in itself either for or against any sacredness that was put upon it by that occurrence. It is "the day of Pentecost" that is named by the word of God. It was the feast of Pentecost with its types, that was to meet the grand object—the reality—to which its services had ever pointed. And everybody knows that the Pentecost came on each day of the week in succession as the years passed by; the same as does Christmas, or the Fourth of July, or any other yearly celebration. Therefore whatever were its occurrences, they could have no purpose in giving to the day of the week on which it fell any particular significance.

Yet though this be true, there is so much made of it by those who will have the first day of the week to be the Sabbath, by claiming always that Pentecost was on the first day of the week, that we feel disposed to refer to the Scriptures, which show that this claim is not founded on fact.

The word Pentecost signifies "*the fiftieth day*," and was always counted, beginning with the sixteenth day of the first month. It is also called "the feast of weeks," because it was seven complete weeks from the day of the offering of the first-fruits, which was the second day of the feast of unleavened bread, the sixteenth day of the first month. On the fourteenth day of the first month, all leaven was to be put away from all the houses. They were to kill the passover lamb in the evening of the fourteenth, and with it, at the beginning of the fifteenth day of the month, they were to begin to eat the unleavened bread, and the feast of unleavened bread was to continue until the twenty-second day of the month. The first day of the feast, that is, the fifteenth of the month, was to be a sabbath, no servile work was to be done in that day. Ex. 12:6-8, 15-19; Lev. 23:5-7. Because of the putting away of the leaven on the fourteenth day, and the beginning to eat the unleavened bread on the evening of that day, it is sometimes

referred to as the first day of unleavened bread; but the fifteenth day was really the first, and was the one on which no servile work was to be done.

On "the *morrow*" after this fifteenth day of the month—this sabbath—the wave-sheaf of the first-fruits was to be offered before the Lord, and with that day—the sixteenth day of the month—they were to begin to count fifty days, and when they reached the fiftieth day that was *Pentecost*. Lev. 23:10, 11, 15, 16; Deut. 16:8, 9. Now if we can learn on what day of the week the passover fell at the time of the crucifixion, we can tell on what day of the week the Pentecost came that year. We know that the Saviour was crucified "the day before the Sabbath." Mark 15:42. We know that the Sabbath was "the Sabbath day according to the commandment" (Luke 23:54-56), and *that* was the seventh day—Saturday—and therefore "the day before," was the sixth day—Friday. It is plain, then, that Jesus was crucified on Friday; this in itself, requires no proof, but it is important to distinctly mention it here, because the day before he was crucified, "the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we *prepare for thee to eat the passover*? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time

153

is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; *and they made ready the passover*." Matt. 26:17-19; Mark 14:12-16; Luke 22:7-15. And *that* was the evening of Thursday, the fourteenth day of the month; because "the fourteenth day of the month at even is the Lord's passover." Lev. 23:5; Ex. 12:6.

From the passover supper Jesus went direct to Gethsemane, whence he was taken by the mob which Judas had brought, and after his shameful treatment by the priests and Pharisees and soldiers, was crucified in the afternoon of the same day. That was the *fifteenth day of the month*, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; and the morrow after that day was the *first* of the fifty days which reached to Pentecost. Therefore, as the day of the crucifixion was the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, and was Friday, the fifteenth day of the month; and as the next day, the sixteenth of the month, was the Sabbath according to the commandment, and was the first of the fifty days; anyone who will count the fifty days will find for himself that "the fiftieth day," Pentecost, fell that year on "the Sabbath day according to the commandment," and *that* is the seventh day.

So then the day which the advocates of Sunday sacredness claim has received such sacred sanctions by the occurrences of the day of Pentecost, was not the first day of the week at all; but it was the seventh day, the very day which they so unsparingly condemn. (See Geikie's "Life of Christ," Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," and the opinions of such men as Neander, Olshausen, Dean Alford, Lightfoot, Jennings, Professor Hackett, Albert Barnes, etc.) Let us say again that we make no use of this fact in the way of claiming any sacredness for the seventh day because of it; that day, in the beginning, was given "the highest and strongest sanction possible even to Deity," and nothing was ever needed afterward to add to its sacredness. We simply state it as the truth according to

the Scriptures; and being, as it is, the truth, it shows that the claims for Sunday sacredness based upon the occurrences of Pentecost are entirely unfounded.

There are two other texts cited by Mr. Elliott in this connection which we shall notice next week.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Messiah's Messenger. Malachi 3:1-6; 4:1-6" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 10 , p. 155.**

(March 21.—Malachi 3:1-6; 4:1-6.)

FROM the day that man sinned to the days of Malachi, there had been promises of the coming of the Deliverer. And now as the last prophetic voice of the Old Testament is heard, it announces the coming of the messenger to prepare the way of the promised One, and to make ready a people prepared to meet him. This messenger came accordingly, calling the people to repentance, and to belief on him that was to come. Those who received the message of the messenger, were by that prepared to receive Him whom the messenger announced. Those who rejected the words and testimony of the messenger, likewise rejected the Messiah when he came. He knew that he was that messenger. He knew the message that he had to bear to the people, and he delivered his message faithfully and fearlessly. He, like the prophet Haggai before him, was "the Lord's messenger in the Lord's message unto the people." Hag. 1:13.

JOHN the Baptist came "preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand. . . . And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. 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; 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." Matt. 3:1-12. And when they sent priests and Levites to ask him who he was, "he said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias." John 1:23. He knew the work that he had to do. He knew that the time was come for the fulfillment of these prophecies. And he knew that his work was the fulfillment of them. He was the one of whom Malachi had spoken in the lesson for to-day; he was the one of whom Isaiah had spoken; and he and his message were the living evidence that God gave to the people that the Messiah was at hand. And while he was preaching, Messiah came and was baptized of him.

BUT it was not alone the first coming of Christ that was announced by John the Baptist, nor by Malachi, nor by any of the prophets. John the Baptist announced the gathering of the wheat into the garner—the harvest—and the burning up of the chaff. This is what Malachi had prophesied in the verses

chosen for the present lesson. He not only spoke of the coming of the Lord to his temple as at his first advent, but he also spoke of the coming of the same Lord "to judgment" (verse 5), which will be at his second advent; as says Paul, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, *who shall judge* the quick and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*; preach the word." This is the coming which is referred to in the questions, "Who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth?" Verse 2. See also Joel 2:11. It is then especially that he sits as a refiner and purifier of silver, and whosoever reflects his image will be accepted with him. And this is especially so of those who shall be alive on the earth to behold him when he appeareth. They are to endure a "fiery trial" (1 Pet. 4:12, 13); they are to be "baptized with the baptism;" they are to have every vestige of this world's dross purged out of them. The test will be severe so that none is like it; but those who endure it shall come forth as gold, and "be found unto praise and honor and glory at his the appearing of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1:7.

THEN after that comes the burning up of the chaff, "For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Here is the declaration of the word of God, as plain as language can make it, that *all* that do wickedly shall be burned up, root and branch. And the force of these words cannot be evaded except by making the language figurative, and then it may be made to mean just what any one pleases. But as long as plain language conveys any real meaning, so long will it be the truth that these words mean that the wicked shall be burned up as chaff is burned in the fire. This is made even stronger, if such a thing were possible, by the third verse, which says to the righteous, "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for *they shall be ashes* under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." The wicked are to be punished upon this earth (Prov. 11:31; Isa. 24:21; Rev. 20:8, 9); they are to be punished by fire, and that fire is to be the fire that is to melt the earth. 2 Pet. 3:7, 10. The earth will in that day burn as an oven, and all the wicked being upon it, will be, according to the words of the prophet, burned up upon the earth. Then the earth is to be made over new, and the righteous shall dwell therein forever. (Rev. 21:5, 7), according to the word of Christ, "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth" (Matt. 5:5); and according to the words of Malachi in the lesson. After saying that the wicked shall be burned up, then he says: "But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall." And the wicked, having been consumed on the earth, and returned to dust and ashes, shall be ashes under the soles of the feet of those who inherit and inhabit the earth. The doctrine of eternal torment is contrary to the word of God. More than a hundred times the Lord speaks of the fate of the wicked in terms that denote nothing but utter destruction and cessation of existence.

AS THERE was a message of his coming carried to the people to whom Christ was to appear in his first advent; likewise there will be a message announcing his coming to the people who will see him in his second advent. It

will be a message such as was that of Elijah to the people of his day. "Ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord . . . How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal [the sun] then follow him." (1 Kings 18:21). The world in these last days have forsake the commandments of the Lord and have followed Rome, and now God sends a message of warning and of duty to this, the generation of those who shall see the appearing of the Lord in glory. He says; "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. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12. Then the next thing that is seen is a white cloud, and upon the cloud, one like the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle, and coming to reap the harvest of the earth; to gather the wheat into his garner, and to gather the chaff to burn it." Rev. 14:14-19. As those who accepted the message of God by John the Baptist were thereby prepared to accept the Messiah which he announced, so those now who accept this message of God will be thereby prepared to meet the Messiah in his second advent to this world. God's message and his messengers are now in the world announcing the second coming of Christ, as really as was his message in the world proclaiming his first coming. Will you accept the message and meet him in peace, bear his image, and be gathered as the precious wheat into his garner? or will you reject his warning and be found among the chaff? A. T. J.

**March 18, 1886**

**"The Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 11 , p. 164.**

AS we now turn our attention to the North, it will be necessary for us to take a brief survey of the positions of the nations which dwelt there at this period—about A.D. 400-406.

The right bank of the middle and upper Rhine was inhabited by the Franks and the Alemanni. The Angles dwelt in what is now Southern Denmark, and the Saxons upon the lower Elbe. Eastward of the Elbe, and on the Oder, dwelt the Lombards; on the coast of the Baltic, between the Oder and the Vistula, were the Vandals; south of the Vandals, on the Vistula, were the Burgundians; east of the Vistula, toward the Baltic, were the Suevi; and over the whole country east of the Suevi, and stretching away to the River Volga, were spread the Sarmatians. In the southern country below the Sarmatians, from the Danube through the valley of the Dnieper to the coasts of the Caspian Sea, was the dominion of the Huns ruled by Rugilas. It was, as we have seen, this inundation of the Huns that drove the Ostrogoths and the Visigoths across the Danube into the territories of the Roman Empire. And we shall now find that it was a like movement of another people, further north, that crowded other tribes of the Huns upon the Sarmatians;

these, in turn, were forced upon the nations of Northern Germany, which were thus displaced and driven across the Rhine upon Western Rome. Of this we read:—

"While Italy rejoiced in her deliverance from the Goths, a furious tempest was excited among the nations of Germany, who yielded to the irresistible impulse that appears to have been gradually communicated [A.D. 400] from the eastern extremity of the continent of Asia. The Chinese annals, as they have been interpreted by the learned industry of the present age, may be usefully applied to reveal the secret and remote causes of the fall of the Roman Empire. The extensive territory to the north of the great wall was possessed, after the flight of the Huns, by the victorious Sienpi, who were sometimes broken into independent tribes, and sometimes reunited under a supreme chief; till at length, styling themselves *Topa*, or masters of the earth, they acquired a more solid consistence, and a more formidable power. The Topa soon compelled the pastoral nations of the eastern desert to acknowledge the superiority of their arms; they invaded China in a period of weakness and intestine discord; and these fortunate Tartars, adopting the laws and manners of the vanquished people, founded an Imperial dynasty, which reigned near one hundred and sixty years over the northern provinces of the monarchy.

"Some generations before they ascended the throne of China, one of the Topa princes had enlisted in his cavalry a slave of the name of Moko, renowned for his valor, but who was tempted, by the fear of punishment, to desert his standard, and to range the desert at the head of a hundred followers. This gang of robbers and outlaws swelled into a camp, a tribe, a numerous people, distinguished by the appellation of *Geougen*; and their hereditary chieftains, the posterity of Moko the slave, assumed their rank among the Scythian monarchs. The youth of Toulun, the greatest of his descendants, was exercised by those misfortunes which are the school of heroes. He bravely struggled with adversity, broke the imperious yoke of the Topa, and became the legislator of his nation, and the conqueror of Tartary. His troops were distributed into regular bands of a hundred and of a thousand men; cowards were stoned to death; the most splendid honors were proposed as the reward of valor; and Toulun, who had knowledge enough to despise the learning of China, adopted only such arts and institutions as were favorable to the military spirit of his government. His tents, which he removed in the winter season to a more southern latitude, were pitched, during the summer, on the fruitful banks of the Selinga. His conquests stretched from Corea far beyond the River Irtish. He vanquished, in the country to the north of the Caspian Sea, the nation of the *Huns*; and the new title of *Khan*, or *Cagan*,

expressed the fame and power which he derived from this memorable victory.

"The chain of events is interrupted, or rather is concealed, as it passes from the Volga to the Vistula, through the dark interval which separates the extreme limits of the Chinese, and of the Roman, geography. Yet the temper of the Barbarians, and the experience of successive emigrations, sufficiently declare, that the Huns, who were oppressed by the arms of the Geougen, soon withdrew from the presence of an insulting victor. The countries towards the Euxine were already occupied by their kindred tribes; and their hasty flight, which they soon converted into a bold attack, would more naturally be directed towards the rich and level plains, through which the Vistula gently flows into the Baltic Sea. The North must again have been alarmed, and agitated, by the invasion of the Huns; *and the nations who retreated before them* [the Sarmatians] must have pressed with incumbent weight on the confines of Germany. The inhabitants of those regions, which the ancients have assigned to the *Suevi*, the *Vandals*, and the *Burgundians*, might embrace the resolution of abandoning to the fugitives of Sarmatia their woods and morasses; or at least of discharging their superfluous numbers on the provinces of the Roman empire."—*Chap. 30, par. 13, 14.*

## THE SUEVI

"In that part of Upper Saxony, beyond the Elbe, which is at present called the Marquisate of Lusace, there existed, in ancient times, a sacred wood, the awful seat of the superstition of the Suevi. None were permitted to enter the holy precincts, without confessing, by their servile bonds and suppliant posture, the immediate presence of the sovereign Deity. Patriotism contributed, as well as devotion, to consecrate the Sonnenwald, or wood of the Semnonen. It was universally believed, that the nation had received its first existence on that sacred spot. At stated periods, the numerous tribes who gloried in the Suevic blood, resorted thither by their ambassadors; and the memory of their common extraction was perpetrated by barbaric rites and human sacrifices. The wide-extended name of Suevi filled the interior countries of Germany, from the banks of the Oder to those of the Danube. They were distinguished from the other Germans by their peculiar mode of dressing their long hair, which they gathered into a rude knot on the crown of the head; and they delighted in an ornament that showed their ranks more lofty and terrible in the eyes of the enemy. Jealous as the Germans were of military renown, they all confessed the superior valor of the Suevi; and the tribes of the Usipetes and Tencteri, who, with a vast army, encountered the dictator Cesar,

declared that they esteemed it not a disgrace to have fled before a people to whose arms the immortal gods themselves were unequal."

### **THE VANDALS**

"A striking resemblance of manners, complexion, religion, and language, seemed to indicate that the Vandals and the Goths were originally one great people." "The numerous tribes of the Vandals were spread along the banks of the Oder, and the sea-coast of Pomerania and Mecklenburgh."

### **THE BURGUNDIANS**

"About the middle of the fourth century, the countries, perhaps of Lusace and Thuringia, on either side of the Elbe, were occupied by the vague dominion of the Burgundians; a warlike and numerous people, of the Vandal race, whose obscure name insensibly swelled into a powerful kingdom, and has finally settled on a flourishing province. The most remarkable circumstance in the ancient manners of the Burgundians appears to have been the difference of their civil and ecclesiastical constitution. The appellation of Hendinos was given to the king or general, and the title of Sinistus to the high priest, of the nation. The person of the priest was sacred, and his dignity perpetual; but the temporal government was held by a very precarious tenure. If the events of war accuses the courage or conduct of the king, he was immediately deposed; and the injustice of his subjects made him responsible for the fertility of the earth, and the regularity of the seasons, which seemed to fall more properly within the sacerdotal department."—*Chap. 25, par. 20.*

A. T. J.

*(To be continued.)*

**"The Abiding Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 11 , pp. 168, 169.**

ACTS 20:7; 1 COR. 16:2

IN continuing his search for the origin of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" comes to Acts 20:7. As this text mentions a meeting of disciples on the first day of the week, at which an apostle preached, it is really made the foundation upon which to lay the claim of the custom of the primitive church, and the example of the apostles in sanctioning the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath. But although there was a meeting held on the first day of the week, and although an apostle was at the meeting, as

a matter of fact, there is in it neither custom nor example in favor of keeping Sunday as the Sabbath. Here is what Mr. Elliott makes of the passage:—

"The most distinct reference to the Christian use of the first day of the week is that found in Acts 20:7: 'And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' . . . The language clearly implies that the apostle availed himself of the occasion brought about by the custom of assemblage on the first day of the week to preach to the people. . . . Here, then, is a plain record of the custom of assemblage on the first day of the week, less than thirty years after the resurrection. The language is just what would be used in such a case."—*Pp. 194, 195.*

It is hard to see how he can find "a plain record of the custom of assemblage on the first day of the week," when the record says nothing at all about any such custom. In all the narrative of which this verse forms a part there is no mention whatever of anything that was there done being done according to custom, nor to introduce what should become a custom, nor that it was to be an example to be followed by Christians throughout all coming time. So the fact is that Mr. Elliott's "plain record" of a custom lacks the essential thing which would show a custom.

Nor is his statement that "the language is just what would be used in such a case," any more in accordance with the fact; for when Luke, who wrote this record, had occasion to speak of that which was a custom he did so plainly. For example: "And he [Jesus] came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, *as his custom was*, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Luke 4:16. Again: "And Paul, *as his manner [custom] was*, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts 17:2. In these two passages, the words, "as his custom was," and "as his manner was," as Luke wrote them, are identical—*Kata to eiothos*—and in both instances mean precisely *as his custom was*; and *that* "language is just what" Inspiration *has* used in such cases as a plain record of a custom. Therefore we submit that the total absence of any such language from the passage under consideration, is valid argument that it is not a record of any such thing as the custom of the assemblage of Christians on the first day of the week.

If the record really said that it was then a custom to assemble on the first day of the week; if it said: Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together, *as their custom was*, as the same writer says that it was the custom of Christ and of Paul to go to the Sabbath assemblies; if it said: Upon the first day of the week Paul preached to the disciples *as his custom was*; then no man could deny that such was indeed the custom: but as in the word of God there is neither statement nor hint to that effect, no man can rightly affirm that such was a custom, without going beyond the word of God; and *that* is prohibited by the word itself—"Thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deut. 12:32. More than this, reading into that passage the "custom" of assemblage on the first day of the week, is not only to go beyond that which is written; it is to do violence to the very language in which it is written. The meaning of the word "custom" is, "A frequent repetition of the same act." A single act is not custom. An act repeated once or

twice is not custom. The *frequent* repetition of an act, *that* is custom. It is so, likewise, in the case of example. Webster says: "The word 'example' should never be used to describe what stands singly and alone." Now as Acts 20:7 is the *only* case on record that a religious meeting was ever held, either by the disciples or the apostles, on the first day of the week, as there is no record of a *single* repetition of that act, much less of a "frequent repetition" of it, it follows inevitably that there is no shadow of justice nor of right in the claim that the custom of the apostles and of the primitive church sanctions the observance of that day as the day of rest and worship—the Sabbath.

Instead, therefore, of the Sunday deriving any sacredness from the word of God, or resting for its observance upon the authority of that word, or upon that which is just and right, or upon the example of the apostles, or the custom of the primitive church, it is contrary to all these. It is essentially an interloper, and rests for its so-called sacredness and for its authority upon nothing but sheer willfulness.

The next reference noticed by Mr. Elliott is 1 Cor. 16:1, 2, of which he writes:—

"Another incidental allusion to the religious use of the day—an allusion none the less valuable because incidental—is the direction of Paul in 1 Cor. 16:1, 2: 'Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. 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.' . . . The Corinthians were on that day to deposit their alms in a common treasury."—*Pp. 195, 196.*

Paul's direction is, "Let every one of you lay by him in store;" Mr. Elliott says they were "to de-

169

posit their alms in a common treasury." Now can a man lay by him in store, and deposit in a common treasury, the same money at the same time? If there are any, especially of those who keep Sunday, who think that it can be done, let them try it. Next Sunday, before you go to meeting find out how God has prospered you, and set apart accordingly that sum of money which you will lay by you in store by depositing it in the common treasury of the church. Then as you go to church, take the money along, and when the collection box is passed, put in it that which you are going to lay by you in store; and the work is done! According to Mr. Elliott's idea, you have obeyed this scripture. That is you have obeyed it by putting away from you the money which the Scripture directs you to lay by you. You have put into the hands of others that which is to be laid by you. You have carried away and placed entirely beyond your control, and where you will never see it again, that which is to be laid by you in store. In other words you have obeyed the Scripture by directly disobeying it!

True, that is a novel kind of obedience; but no one need be surprised at it in this connection; for that is the only kind of obedience to the Scripture that can ever be shown by keeping Sunday as the Sabbath. The commandment of God says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath." And people propose to obey that commandment by remembering the

first day instead of the seventh. The word of God says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, *in it thou shalt not do any work;*" and people who keep Sunday propose to obey that word by working all day on the day in which God says they shall do no work. And so it is in perfect accord with the principles of the Sunday-sabbath that Mr. Elliott should convey the idea that 1 Cor. 16:2 was obeyed by doing directly the opposite of what the text says.

But he seeks to justify his theory by the following remark:—

"That this laying in store did not mean a simple hoarding of gifts by each one in his own house, is emphatically shown by the reason alleged for the injunction, 'that there be no gatherings' (*i.e.* "collections," the same word used in the first verse) 'when I come.' . . . If the gifts had had to be collected from house to house, the very object of the apostle's direction would have failed to be secured."

This reasoning might be well enough if it were true. But it is not true. This we know because Paul himself has told us just what he meant, and has shown us just what the Corinthians understood him to mean; and Mr. Elliott's theory is the reverse of Paul's record of facts. A year after writing the first letter to the Corinthians, Paul wrote the second letter; and in the second letter he makes explicit mention of this very "collection for the saints," about which he had given these directions in the first letter. In the second letter (chap. 9:1-5), Paul writes:—

"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."

Now if Mr. Elliott's theory be correct, that the Corinthians were to deposit their alms in a common treasury each first day of the week, and if that was what Paul meant that they should do, then why should Paul think it "necessary" to send brethren before himself "to make up" this bounty, so "that it might be ready" when he came? If Mr. Elliott's theory be correct, what possible danger could there have been of these brethren finding the Corinthians "unprepared"? and why should Paul be afraid that they were unprepared? No; Mr. Elliott's theory and argument are contrary to the facts. In the first letter to the Corinthians (16:2), Paul meant just what he said, that on the first day of the week every one should "lay by him in store;" and the Corinthian Christians so understood it, and so likewise would everyone else understand it, were it not that its *perversion* is so sorely essential in bolstering up the baseless fabric of the Sunday Lord's day. But the Corinthians, having no such thing to cripple or pervert their ability to understand plain language, understood it as it was written, and as Paul meant that it should be understood. Each one laid by him as directed; then when the time came for Paul

to go by them and take their alms to Jerusalem, he sent brethren before to make up the bounty which had been laid by in store, so that it might be ready when he came. Therefore, 1 Cor. 16:2 gives no sanction whatever to the idea of meetings on the first day of the week.

And now after all his peregrinations in search of the origin of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, Mr. Elliott arrives at the following intensely logical deduction:—

"The selection of the Lord's day by the apostles as the one festival day of the new society seems so obviously natural, and even necessary, that when we join to these considerations the fact that it was so employed, we can no longer deny to the religious use of Sunday the high sanction of apostolic authority."—*P. 198.*

All that we shall say to that is, that it is the best illustration that we have ever seen of the following rule, by "Rev. Levi Philetus Dobbs, D.D.,"—Dr. Wayland, editor of the National Baptist—for proving something when there is nothing with which to prove it. In fact we hardly expected ever to find in "real life" an illustration of the rule; but Mr. Elliott's five-hundred-dollar-prize logic has furnished a perfect illustration of it. The rule is:—

"Prove the premise by the conclusion, and then prove the conclusion by the premise; proving A by B and then proving B by A. And if the people believe the conclusion already (or think they do, which amounts to the same thing), and if you bring in now and then the favorite words and phrases that the people all want to hear, and that they have associated with orthodoxy, 'tis wonderful what a reputation you will get as a logician."

If "Dr. Dobbs" had offered a five-hundred-dollar prize for the best real example that should be worked out under that rule, we should give a unanimous, rising, rousing vote in favor of Rev. George Elliott and his "Abiding Sabbath" as the most deserving of the prize.

Yet with all this he finds "complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command for the [Sunday] Sabbath or definite rules for its observance are concerned." What! A New Testament institution, and yet in the New Testament there is neither command nor rules for its observance!! Next week we shall notice how he accounts for such an anomaly.

A. T. J.

**March 25, 1886**

**"The Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 12, p. 180.**

*(Continued.)*

IT will be often necessary, in the course of this history, to use the phrase "the bounds of the Western Empire," or "the limits of the Western Empire;" and we

shall here indicate those limits in such a way that every one who reads may understand.

Take any good map of Europe; begin at the Frith of the Clyde, in Scotland; and draw a line from a point twelve miles northwest of Glasgow to a point on the Frith of the Forth, twenty-two miles northeast of Edinburg; this is the line of the Wall of Antoninus. Follow down the east coast of Britain to the English Channel; cross the Channel to the mouth of the Rhine; follow up the Rhine to the mouth of the Neckar; and then follow up the Neckar to the place where two rivers flow in from the east, near together. From there go southeastward to Ratisbon, or, in other words, to a point on the Danube about the twelfth degree of east longitude; follow the course of the Danube to the mouth of the Drave; and from there carry the line of the southward flow of the Danube due south to the sea-coast of Tripoli. Then follow the northern border of the Great Desert, westward to the ocean, and, with the exception of Ireland, all the countries between the line thus draw and the Atlantic Ocean, formed the Western Empire.

"About four years after the victorious Toulun had assumed the title of Khan of the Geougen, another barbarian, the haughty Rhodogast, or Radagaisus, marched [A.D. 405] from the northern extremities of Germany almost to the gates of Rome, *and left the remains of his army to achieve the destruction of the West*. The Vandals, the Suevi, and the Burgundians, formed the strength of this mighty host; but the Alani, who had found a hospitable reception in their new seats, added their active cavalry to the heavy infantry of the Germans; and the Gothic adventurers crowded so eagerly to the standard of Radagaisus, that by some historians, he has been styled the King of the Goths. Twelve thousand warriors, distinguished above the vulgar by their noble birth, or their valiant deeds, glittered in the van; and the whole multitude, which was not less than *two hundred thousand fighting men*, might be increased, by the accession of women, of children, and of slaves, to the amount of *four hundred thousand persons*. This formidable emigration issued from the same coast of the Baltic, which had poured forth the myriads of the Cimbri and Teutones, to assault Rome and Italy in the vigor of the republic. After the departure of those barbarians, their native country, which was marked by the vestiges of their greatness, long ramparts, and gigantic moles, remained, during some ages, a vast and dreary solitude; till the human species was renewed by the powers of generation, and the vacancy was filled by the influx of new inhabitants."—*Chap. 30, par. 14.*

The Alani, mentioned here, were a part of that nation which dwelt between the Volga and the Don, which, when the Huns swept over their country, A.D. 375, advanced, with "intrepid courage, towards the shores of the Baltic; associated themselves with the northern tribes of Germany; and shared the spoil of the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain."—*Chap. 26, par. 11.*

"The correspondence of nations was, in that age, so imperfect and precarious, that the revolutions of the North might escape the knowledge of the court of Ravenna; till the dark cloud, which was collected along the coast of the Baltic, burst in thunder upon the banks of the upper Danube [A.D. 406]. The emperor of the West [Honorius], if his ministers disturbed his amusements by the news of the impending danger, was satisfied with being the occasion, and the spectator, of the war. The safety of Rome was intrusted to the counsels, and the sword, of Stilicho; but such was the feeble and exhausted state of the empire, that it was impossible to restore the fortifications of the Danube, or to prevent, by a vigorous effort, the invasion of the Germans. The hopes of the vigilant minister of Honorius were confined to the defense of Italy. He once more abandoned the provinces, recalled the troops, pressed the new levies, which were rigorously exacted, and pusillanimously eluded; employed the most efficacious means to arrest, or allure, the deserters; and offered the gift of freedom, and of two pieces of gold, to all the slaves who would enlist. By these efforts he painfully collected, from the subjects of a great empire, an army of thirty or forty thousand men, which, in the days of Scipio or Camillus, would have been instantly furnished by the free citizens of the territory of Rome. The thirty legions of Stilicho were re-enforced by a large body of Barbarian auxiliaries; the faithful Alani were personally attached to his service; and the troops of Huns and of Goths, who marched under the banners of their native princes, Huldin and Sarus, were animated by interest and resentment to oppose the ambition of Radagaisus.

"The king of the confederate Germans passed, without resistance, the Alps, the Po, and the Apennine; leaving on one hand the inaccessible palace of Honorius, securely buried among the marshes of Ravenna; and, on the other, the camp of Stilicho, who had fixed his head-quarters at Ticinum, or Pavia, but who seems to have avoided a decisive battle, till he had assembled his distant forces. Many cities of Italy were pillaged, or destroyed; and the siege of Florence, by Radagaisus, is one of the earliest events in the history of that celebrated republic; whose firmness checked and delayed the unskillful fury of the barbarians. . . . Florence was reduced to the last extremity; and the fainting courage of the citizens was supported only by the authority of St. Ambrose; who had communicated, in a dream, the promise of a speedy deliverance. On a sudden, they beheld, from their walls, the banners of Stilicho, who advanced, with his united force, to the relief of the faithful city; and who soon marked that fatal spot for the grave of the barbarian host [A.D. 406]. . . . The method of surrounding the enemy with strong lines of circumvallation, which he had twice employed against the Gothic king, was repeated on a

larger scale, and with more considerable effect. . . . The imprisoned multitude of horses and men was gradually destroyed, by famine rather than by the sword; but the Romans were exposed, during the progress of such an extensive work, to the frequent attacks of an impatient enemy. . . . A seasonable supply of men and provisions had been introduced into the walls of Florence, and the famished host of Radagaisus was in its turn besieged. The proud monarch of so many warlike nations, after the loss of his bravest warriors, was reduced to confide either in the faith of a capitulation, or in the clemency of Stilicho. But the death of the royal captive, who was ignominiously beheaded, disgraced the triumph of Rome and of Christianity; and the short delay of his execution was sufficient to brand the conqueror with the guilt of cool and deliberate cruelty.

"The fame of the victory, and more especially of the miracle, has encouraged a vain persuasion, that the whole army, or rather nation, of Germans, who migrated from the shores of the Baltic, miserably perished under the walls of Florence. Such indeed was the fate of Radagaisus himself, of his brave and faithful companions, and of more than one third of the various multitude of Sueves and Vandals, of Alani and Burgundians, who adhered to the standard of their general. . . . After the defeat of Radagaisus, two parts of the German host, which must have exceeded the number of one hundred thousand men, still remained in arms, between the Apennine and the Alps, or between the Alps and the Danube. It is uncertain whether they attempted to revenge the death of their general; but their irregular fury was soon diverted by the prudence and firmness of Stilicho, who opposed their march, and facilitated their retreat; who considered the safety of Rome and Italy as the great object of his care, and who sacrificed, with too much indifference, the wealth and tranquillity of the distant provinces. The barbarians acquired, from the junction of some Pannonian deserters, the knowledge of the country, and of the roads; and the invasion of Gaul, which Alaric had designed, was executed [A.D. 406, Dec. 31] by the remains of the great army of Radagaisus.

"Yet if they expected to derive any assistance from the tribes of Germany, who inhabited the banks of the Rhine, their hopes were disappointed. The Alemanni preserved a state of inactive neutrality; and the Franks distinguished their zeal and courage in the defense of the of the empire. . . . When the limits of Gaul and Germany were shaken by the northern emigration, the Franks bravely encountered the single force of the Vandals; who, regardless of the lessons of adversity, had again separated their troops from the standard of their barbarian allies. They paid the penalty of their rashness; and twenty thousand Vandals, with their king Godigisclus, were slain in the field of battle. The whole people must have been extirpated, if the squadrons of the Alani, advancing to their relief, had not

trampled down the infantry of the Franks; who, after an honorable resistance, were compelled to relinquish the unequal contest. The victorious confederates pursued their march, and on the last day of the year [406], in a season when the waters of the Rhine were most probably frozen, they entered, without opposition, the defenceless provinces of Gaul. This memorable passage of the Suevi, the Vandals, the Alani, and the Burgundians, who never afterwards retreated, may be considered as the fall of the Roman empire in the countries beyond the Alps; and the barriers, which had so long separated the savage and the civilized nations of the earth, were from that fatal moment leveled with the ground.—*Chap. 30, par. 15, 16, 17, 18.*  
A. T. J.

(To be concluded next week.)

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' The Commandment for Sunday-keeping" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 12 , pp. 184, 185.**

### **THE COMMANDMENT FOR SUNDAY-KEEPING**

THE author of "The Abiding Sabbath" insists that the Sunday-sabbath "is established as an apostolic institution;" and that "the religious use of Sunday" has "the high sanction of apostolic authority;" not only by the *example* of the apostles, but by their plain commands—in fact by commands so plain that they cannot be misunderstood. Thus he says:—

"Preachers of the gospel of the resurrection and founders of the church of the resurrection, they [the apostles] gave a new, sacred character to the day of the resurrection by their own example and by their explicit injunctions."—*P. 198.*

Now an "injunction" is, "That which is enjoined; an order; *a command; a precept.*" Enjoin, is "to lay upon, as an order or command; *to give a command to; to direct with authority;*" "this word has the force of *pressing admonition.* It has also the sense of command." "Explicit denotes something which is set forth in the *plainest language*, so that it cannot be misunderstood."—Webster. "Explicit injunctions," then, are commands that are set forth in language so plain that they cannot be misunderstood. Therefore Mr. Elliott's unqualified declaration is that, by commands so plain that they cannot be misunderstood, the apostles have given a sacred character to Sunday. But everybody who ever read the New Testament knows that that is not true. *And so does Mr. Elliott;* for as already quoted, on page 184 he plainly confesses "the *complete silence* of the New Testament so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath or definite rules for its observance are concerned." And that by the word "Sabbath" in this place he means the Sunday is undoubted, because he immediately begins an argument to account for this "complete silence," and to justify it. But knowing and confessing as he does, "the *complete silence* of the New Testament so far as any *explicit command*" for the observance of the first day of the week is concerned, it is

impossible to conceive by what mental process consistent with honesty, he could bring himself, in less than fifteen pages from these very words, to say that the apostles gave a "sacred character to the day of the resurrection by their own example and by their *explicit injunctions*." Compare pages 184 and 198.

And it is by such proofs as this that Sunday is shown to be the Lord's day and the Christian Sabbath! It is such stuff as this that Professor William Thompson, D. D., Professor Llewellyn Pratt, D. D., and Rev. George M. Stone, D. D., all of Hartford, Conn., "after a *careful (?) and thorough (?) (!)* examination" accounted worthy of a prize of five hundred dollars; and to which, by a copyright, the American Tract Society has set its seal of orthodoxy.

But although he finds this "complete silence," he finds no difficulty in accounting for it; and here is how he does it:—

"It is not difficult to account for the complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath or definite rules for its observance are concerned. . . . *The conditions under which the early Christian church existed were not favorable for their announcement.* . . . The early church, a struggling minority composed of the poorest people, *could not* have instituted the Christian Sabbath in its full force of meaning. The ruling influences of government and society were against them."—*P. 184.*

Therefore, according to this five-hundred-dollar-prize Christianity, commandments for the observance of Christian duties can be announced only when the conditions under which the church exists are favorable to their announcement; that is, when the ruling influences of government and society are in favor of it. And the one great distinguishing institution of Christianity is dependent upon "the ruling influences of government and society," for "its full force and meaning"! Christians can wear the badge of their profession only when the majority favor it! We confess that that is in fact the true doctrine of the Sunday-sabbath. We have heard it preached often. And we know that is the doctrine upon which it was based in the origin of its claim to Christian recognition. But is that the kind of religion that Christ instituted in the world? Is that the manner of "Christian walk and conversation" to which he referred when he said: "Enter ye in [strive to enter 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"? Was it to incite his disciples to faithfulness under the favor of "the ruling influences of government and society" that Christ said, "The brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child; the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake; but he that endureth to the end shall be saved"? Was it to induce the "early Christian church" to wait for the sanction of the majority, and the favor of "the ruling influences of government and society," that Christ gave the command, "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"? The fact is that Mr. Elliott's reason

for the "complete silence" of the New Testament in regard to a command for the observance of the Sunday, as well as the doctrine of the Sunday-sabbath itself, is contrary to every principle of the doctrine of Christ.

But according to Mr. Elliott's scheme of Christian duty and faithfulness, when was the "Christian Sabbath" really instituted "in its full force of meaning"? He tells us plainly. Hear him:—

"For the perfect establishment of the Christian Sabbath, as has already been observed, there was needed a social revolution in the Roman empire. *The infant church*, in its struggles through persecution and martyrdom, *had not the power even to keep the Lord's day perfectly* itself, much less could the sanctity of the day be guarded from desecration by unbelievers. We should expect therefore to find the institution making a deepening groove on society and in history, and becoming a well-defined ordi-

185

nance the very moment that Christianity became a dominant power. That such was the case the facts fully confirm. From the records of the early church and the works of the Christian Fathers we can clearly see the growth of the institution culminating in *the famous edict of Constantine*, when Christianity became the established religion of the empire."—*P. 213.*

Now as there was no command for the observance of the Sunday institution, and as it was not, and could not be, kept by the "struggling minority" that formed the early Christian church, the "deepening groove on society and in history" that was made by "the institution," could have been made only by influences from beyond the struggling minority, *i.e.*, from the majority. And that is the fact. The majority were heathen. The worship of the sun was the chief worship of all the heathen. And as ambitious bishops, in their lust of power, of numbers, and "of the ruling influences of government and society," opened the way for the heathen to come into the church, bringing with them their heathen practices and customs, the day of the sun, being the chief of these, thus gained a place under the name of Christianity, and so went on making its "deepening groove on society and in history," until it culminated in "the famous edict of Constantine," in honor of "the venerable day of the sun," and commanding its partial observance. Of this famous edict, we shall let the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" himself tell:—

"The Emperor Constantine was converted, and Christianity became, practically, the religion of the empire. *It was now possible to enforce the Christian Sabbath and make its observance universal.* In the year 321, consequently, was issued the famous edict of Constantine commanding abstinence from servile labor on Sunday. The following is the full text:—

"The Emperor Constantine to Helpidius.

"On the venerable day of the sun, let the magistrates and people living in towns rest, and let all workshops be closed. Nevertheless, in the country, those engaged in the cultivation of land may freely and lawfully work, because it often happens that

another day is not so well fitted for sowing grain and planting vines; lest by neglect of the best time, the bounty provided by Heaven should be lost. Given the seventh day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls, both for the second time."—P. 228.

The man who can see in the life of Constantine any evidences of conversion, possesses a degree of penetration truly wonderful; equal, indeed to that which can discern "transient elements" where it demonstrates that there are none. The one act of Constantine which is most nearly consistent with the idea of conversion, was performed in March, A.D. 313, eight years before the earliest date we have ever heard claimed for his conversion. That act was the edict of Milan, "the great act of toleration," which "confirmed to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion," and stopped the persecution of Christians. But even this one act that was consistent with conversion, was undone by his "conversion," for soon after his "conversion" the edict of Milan was revoked. We shall name here some of his principal acts after his "conversion;" March 7, A.D. 321, he issued an edict in honor of the venerable day of the sun. The very next day, March 8, 321, he issued an edict commanding the consultation of the soothsayers. In 323 Licinius was murdered by his orders, in violation of a solemn oath given to his own sister, Constantia. In 326 he was guilty of the murder of his own son, Crispus, his nephew, Licinius, and his wife, Fausta, to say nothing of others. To the end of his life he continued to imprint the *image* of Apollo on one side of his imperial coins, and the name of Christ on the other. In view of these things it may be safely and sincerely doubted whether he was ever converted at all. And we most decidedly call in question the Christian principle that could dwell consistently with a life so largely made up of heathen practices, and stained with so much blood.

But to say nothing further on the subject of the "conversion" of Constantine, it is evident from Mr. Elliott's argument that the "influences of government and society" which were essential to the complete sanctity of the "Christian Sabbath," and for which it was compelled to wait nearly three hundred years, were embodied in an imperial edict of *such* a man, in honor—not of the Lord's day, nor of the Christian Sabbath, nor of Christ, but—of the venerable day of the sun; that the legislation which was to enforce the "Christian Sabbath," and make its observance universal, was a piece of legislation that enforced the "venerable day of the sun," and made its observance partial, that is, obligatory upon *only* the *people who lived in towns*, and such as *worked at trades*; while country people might "freely and *lawfully* work." However, on the nature of this legislation, we need ourselves to make no further comment. The author of "The Abiding Sabbath" exposes it so completely that we can better let him do it here. He says:—

"To fully understand the provisions of this legislation, the peculiar position of Constantine must be taken into consideration. He was not himself free from all remains of heathen superstition. It seems certain that before his conversion he had been particularly devoted to the worship of Apollo, the sun-god. . . . The problem before him was to legislate for the new faith in such a manner as

*not to seem entirely inconsistent with his old practices, and not to come in conflict with the prejudices of his pagan subjects. These facts serve to explain the peculiarities of this decree. He names the holy day, not the Lord's day, but the 'day of the sun,' the heathen designation, and thus at once seems to identify it with his former Apollo-worship; he excepts the country from the operation of the law, and thus avoids collision with his heathen subjects."*—P. 229.

Now as he had been particularly devoted to the worship of Apollo, the sun-god; as he shaped this edict so as not to be inconsistent with his old practices, and not to conflict with the prejudices of this pagan subjects; as he gives the day its heathen designation, and thus identifies it with his former Apollo-worship; and as in it he avoids collision with his heathen subjects; then we should like to know where in the edict there comes in any legislation for his *Christian* subjects. In other words, if he had intended to legislate solely and entirely for his heathen subjects, and to enjoin a heathen practice, could he have framed an edict that would more clearly show it than does the one before us? Impossible. Therefore, by Mr. Elliott's own comments, it is demonstrated that the famous edict of Constantine was given wholly in favor of the heathen, enjoining the observance of a heathen institution, Sunday, in honor of the great heathen god, the sun. And if that was to favor Christianity, then so much the worse for the Christianity (?) which it favored. At the very best it could only be heathenism under the name of Christianity.

Such is the command, and such its source, that it is seriously proposed shall be observed instead of the holy commandment of the living God, spoken with a voice that shook the earth, and twice written with his own blazing finger upon the enduring stone. Such is the day, and such its sanctions, that it is proposed shall wholly supplant the day to which have been given "the highest and strongest sanctions possible even to Deity,"—the day upon which God rested, which he blessed, which he sanctified, and which he has distinctly commanded us to keep, saying, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." "*The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." The observance of the seventh day is that which we, by the word of God, urge upon the conscience of every man. But if we had no better reasons for it than are given in this five-hundred-dollar-prize essay, or than we have ever seen given, for the observance of Sunday, we should actually be ashamed ever to put our pen to paper to advocate it.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The Word Made Flesh. John 1:1-18" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 12 , pp. 186, 187.**

(April 4.—John 1:1-18.)

IN the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." "In the beginning," that is,

before creation, before time was; for in his prayer at the last supper he said: "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory *which I had with thee before the world was.*" "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold the glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me *before the foundation of the world.*" John 17:5, 24. How long before, no finite mind can measure; for in the announcement by the prophet of the place of his birth, when he came into the world, it is said: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah 5:2. The margin reads, Hebrew, from "*the days of eternity.*" The mind must be able to grasp eternity before it can measure the length of days of the Saviour of the world; before it can know how long the Word was before the world was.

THAT the Word was Jesus Christ is evident from verse 14. He is called the Word of God because through him is revealed to us the thoughts of God, as our words express our thoughts and feelings to others. He is the expression of God's will to the children of men. "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. In him is shown the love of God to the children of men. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us because that God send his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." 1 John 4:9. The words which he spake are the words of God: "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. . . . Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 12:49, 50. In short, in him God revealed *himself*; for said Jesus, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." John 14:9. Christ is the Word of God.

"AND the Word was God." "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 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? And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, *Thy throne, O God*, is for ever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Heb. 1:4-9. The Father calls the Son, God.

"ALL things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." "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. "God . . . created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:9. "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 (exist)." Col. 1:16, 17. Now as Jesus Christ made all things, "and without him was not anything made that was made;" and as "the Sabbath was made" (Mark 2:27), it follows that Christ made the Sabbath. And as the Sabbath was made as the memorial of creation, that man might thus remember and honor the Creator; and as the seventh day is declared to be "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," *who "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," it follows that the seventh day is the Sabbath of *Christ* the Lord. It is Christ who rested the seventh day. It is Christ who blessed and sanctified the seventh day. It is Christ who made the seventh day the Sabbath. And as long as he remains what he is, "The same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," the seventh day must remain the Sabbath. It can change no more than he can change; for he has declared by his living word that it *is* the Sabbath; and he cannot deny himself.

IT is the duty of all men to "honor the Son, even as the honor the Father." John 5:23. It is not enough to honor the Son as Redeemer and King. He must be honored as Creator also, or else he is not honored even as is the Father. Now the Creator has appointed a memorial of creation, by the keeping of which he is remembered and honored as Creator. That memorial is the Sabbath, which he himself has made and declared to be the seventh day. That is the day which Christ the Creator made the Sabbath; it is the day by the observance of which he is honored as Creator. Therefore it is the duty of all men to keep the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. The seventh day is the Sabbath of Christ the Creator. Will you keep it, and so honor him as Creator?

"IN him was life." "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. "All have sinned." Rom. 3:23. Death has passed upon the whole human race. But *in Christ* there is life. "The gift of God is eternal life *through* Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life.*" John 3:36. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6:53. "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.*" 1 John 5:11, 12. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3:4.

"AND the Word was made flesh." That Word which was in the beginning; which was with God before the world was, even from the days of eternity,—that Word was made flesh. Mark, it does not say that the Word came and dwelt in a body of flesh, though distinct from it, as it is said the immortal soul dwells in the body, so that when the body died the Word left it, as it is said the immortal soul at death leaves the body of man. It says nothing of the kind. It does say, "The Word *was made flesh.*" John says: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and *our hands have handled,* of the Word of life." 1 John 1:1. This could not be said if that Word dwelt in a human body, as the immortal soul is said to do; for no man ever saw what is called the immortal soul, much less did any man ever handle one with his hands. If it be said that it was so, and that only the body died, while the

real Word left the body and did not die, then what but a human sacrifice was ever made for the sins of the world? No; "The Word was made flesh," "for the suffering of death." Heb. 2:9. He "poured out his soul unto death;" "Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin." Isa. 53:10, 12. "I am he that liveth, *and was dead*; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Rev. 1:18. "The Word was made flesh." The Word of God died. And we have a *divine* sacrifice for sin. "Whosoever believeth on him shall not perish;" for "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever *liveth* to make intercession for them." Heb. 7:25.

"AS many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God. . . . 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 3:1, 2. Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.

A. T. J.

**April 1, 1886**

**"The Suevi, the Vandals, and the Burgundians. (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 13 , p. 196.**

*(Concluded).*

"WHILE the peace of Germany was secured by the attachment of the Franks, and the neutrality of the Alemanni, the subjects of Rome, unconscious of their approaching calamities, enjoyed the state of quiet and prosperity, which had seldom blessed the frontiers of Gaul. Their flocks and herds were permitted to graze in the pastures of the Barbarians; their huntsmen penetrated, without fear or danger, into the darkest recesses of the Hercynian wood. The banks of the Rhine were crowned, like those of the Tyber, with elegant houses, and well-cultivated farms; and if a poet descended the river, he might express his doubt, on which side was situated the territory of the Romans. This scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert; and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolation of man. The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed; and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished after a long and obstinate siege; Strasburgh, Spire, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread [A.D. 407] from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps,

and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the barbarians, who drove before them, in a promiscuous crowd, the bishop, the senator, and the virgin, laden with the spoils of their houses and altars. . . . And in less than two years, the divided troops of the savages of the Baltic, whose numbers, were they fairly stated, would appear contemptible, advanced, without a combat, to the foot of the Pyrenean Mountains."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 30, par. 19.*

"The situation of Spain, separated, on all sides, from the enemies of Rome, by the sea, by the mountains, and by intermediate provinces, had secured the long tranquillity of that remote and sequestered country; and we may observe, as a sure symptom of domestic happiness, that, in a period of four hundred years, Spain furnished very few materials to the history of the Roman Empire. The footsteps of the barbarians [a band of Franks] who, in the reign of Gallienus [A.D. 260-268] had penetrated beyond the Pyrenees, were soon obliterated by the return of peace; and in the fourth century of the Christian aera, the cities of Emerita, or Merida, of Corduba, Seville, Bracara, and Tarragona, were numbered with the most illustrious of the Roman world. The various plenty of the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms, was improved and manufactured by the skill of an industrious people; and the peculiar advantages of naval stores contributed to support an extensive and profitable trade. The arts and sciences flourished under the protection of the emperors; and if the character of the Spaniards was enfeebled by peace and servitude, the hostile approach of the Germans, who had spread terror and desolation from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, seemed to rekindle some sparks of military ardor. As long as the defense of the mountains was intrusted to the hardy and faithful militia of the country, they successfully repelled the frequent attempts of the barbarians. But no sooner had the national troops been compelled to resign their post to the Honorian bands, in the service of Constantine [a common soldier who was raised to the Imperial dignity by the legions of Britain because he happened to have that name] than the gates of Spain [A.D. 409, Oct. 13] were treacherously betrayed to the public enemy, about ten months before the sack of Rome by the Goths.

"The consciousness of guilt, and the thirst of rapine, prompted the mercenary guards of the Pyrenees to desert their station; to invite the arms of the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Alani; and to swell the torrent which was poured with irresistible violence from the frontiers of Gaul to the sea of Africa. The misfortunes of Spain may be described in the language of its most eloquent historian, who has concisely expressed the passionate, and perhaps exaggerated, declamations of contemporary writers.

"The irruption of these nations was followed by the most dreadful calamities; as the barbarians exercised their indiscriminate cruelty on the fortunes of the Romans and the Spaniards, and ravaged with equal fury the cities and the open country. The progress of famine reduced the miserable inhabitants to feed on the flesh of their fellow-creatures; and even the wild beasts, who multiplied, without control, in the desert, were exasperated, by the taste of blood, and the impatience of hunger, boldly to attack and devour their human prey. Pestilence soon appeared, the inseparable companion of famine; a large proportion of the people was swept away; and the groans of the dying excited only the envy of their surviving friends. *At length the barbarians, satiated with carnage and rapine, and afflicted by the contagious evils which they themselves had introduced, fixed their permanent seats in the depopulated country.* The ancient Galicia, whose limits included the kingdom of Old Castille, was divided between the Suevi and the Vandals; the Alani were scattered over the provinces of Carthagera and Lusitania, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean; and the fruitful territory of Bútica was allotted to the Silingi, another branch of the Vandalic nation. After regulating this partition, the conquerors contracted with their new subjects some reciprocal engagements of protection and obedience; the lands were again cultivated; and the towns and villages were again occupied by a captive people. The greatest part of the Spaniards was even disposed to prefer this new condition of poverty and barbarism, to the severe oppressions of the Roman government; yet there were many who still asserted their native freedom; and who refused, more especially in the mountains of Galicia, to submit to the barbarian yoke."—*Id., chap. 31, par. 36.*

While these settled in Spain, the Burgundians remained in Gaul, and were finally established on the River Rhine. The Encyclopedia Britannica says of these three peoples:—

"The Burgundians, the Vandals, and many of the Suevi, wandered westwards early in the fifth century, in search of new homes; and the Burgundians soon conquered from the Romans the whole valley of the Rhone, in which they henceforth settled. The Vandals and the Suevi went on the Spain."—*Encyc. Brit., art., Germany, part II., Confederation of Tribes, par. 2.*

We shall have occasion to again mention each of these nations and to fix the date and place of their final settlement; but as their future history is so inseparably connected with the movements of other barbarous nations who followed their ruinous example in invading the remains of the Western Empire, we must now return and follow the course of these other lines of devastation.

A. T. J.

**"The Abiding Sabbath.' The Fathers, Etc." *The Signs of the Times* 12, 13 , pp. 200, 201.**

### **THE FATHERS, ETC**

AS we have shown, the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" fills up, with the heathen edict of Constantine for the partial observance of Sunday, the blank left by "the complete silence of the New Testament" so far as any command or rules on that subject are concerned; yet his system is not complete without the sanction of the Fathers. So, as is the custom of the advocates of Sunday observance, he gives to the Fathers, the Councils, the popes, and the Catholic saints, a large place in his five-hundred-dollar-prize argument for Sunday keeping. We have before cited one of the rules laid down by the Rev. Levi Philetus Dobbs, D. D., for proving a thing when there is nothing with which to prove it, and have given an example from the "Abiding Sabbath" in illustration of the rule. We here present another of the Doctor's rules, and in Mr. Elliott's treatment of the Fathers, our readers can see its application. Says Dr. Dobbs:—

"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 don't 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 stagers. And to the common mind, one of these is just as good as another. If it happens that the point 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, don't 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 don't 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 can't be sustained in any other way.*"

The first of the Fathers to whom Mr. Elliott refers is Clement of Rome, who he says died about A.D. 100. From Clement he quotes a passage which says nothing about any particular day, much less does it say that Sunday is the Lord's day, or the "abiding Sabbath," and of it the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" says:—

"This passage does not indeed refer by name to the Lord's day, but it proves conclusively the existence at that time of prescribed seasons of worship, and asserts their appointment by the Saviour himself."—*P. 214.*

But for all it mentions no day, it is, says he, an "important link in the argument" that proves that Sunday is the Lord's day and of "perpetual obligation." An argument in which such a thing as that is counted "an important link," must be sorely pushed to find a connection that will hold it up.

His next link is no better. This time he proposes a quotation from Ignatius, and of it says:—

"The passage is obscure, and the text doubtless corrupt, but the trend of meaning is not indistinct."—*P. 215, note.*

It seems to us that an institution that has to be supported by an argument that is dependent upon a "trend of meaning," drawn from an "obscure passage," in a "corrupt text," is certainly of most questionable authority. True, he says "the argument can do without it if necessary;" but it is particularly to be noticed that his argument does not do without it, and he deems it of sufficient importance to devote more than a page of his book to its consideration. We would remark, also, that we have never yet seen nor heard an extended argument for the Sunday institution that did do without it.

His next quotation is from a writing of about equal value with this of Ignatius. He says:—

"Here may be introduced a quotation from the so-called Epistle of Barnabas. . . . The external evidence of the authorship of this writing would be

201

convincing but for the discredit which its internal characters casts upon it."—*Pp. 216, 217, note.*

That is to say, we might consider this epistle genuine if the writing itself did not show the contrary. And as if to make as strong as possible the doubt of its genuineness, he adds: "There is a very close relationship between this writing and the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.'" And to the "Teaching" he refers by the doubting phrase, "if genuine."

Then after mention of Pliny's letter to Trajan, Justin Martyr, Melito, the "Teaching," and Ireneus, he comes to Clement of Alexandria, of whom he speaks as follows:—

"Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194, in a mystical exposition of the fourth commandment, in the midst of fanciful speculations on the religious signification of numbers, comes down long enough from the loftier flights of his spiritual arithmetic to tell us that the seventh day of the law has given place to the eighth day of the gospel. . . . *Nobody, of course, can tell what far-fetched and unheard-of meanings may lie underneath the words of the good semi-Gnostic Father; but as far as his testimony goes, it helps to establish the fact that the first day of the week filled the same place in the minds of the church of that time, that the seventh day had occupied in the Jewish system.*"—*P. 223.*

Certainly. It matters not what "mystical expositions," nor what "fanciful interpretations," nor what "far-fetched and unheard-of meanings" there may be, they all "help to establish" the heathen institution of Sunday, in the place of the day made holy and commanded to be kept so, by the Creator of the heavens and the earth.

With just one more witness he closes the second century. And it is most fittingly done, as follows:—

"This century will be concluded with the mention of *that most brilliant and erratic of all* the ante-Nicene Christian writers, Tertullian, of Carthage. . . This *vehement writer* fitly closes this list of evidences of the honored place filled by the Lord's day in the first two centuries of the Christian church."—*Pp. 223, 224.*

Fitly, indeed, does this "vehement writer," and most erratic of all the ante-Nicene Fathers, close the list of the first two centuries. But what a list! He gives us a list of ten witnesses to prove that Sunday is the Lord's day, and that it was observed as such in the first two centuries, and by his own words it is shown that the first one does not mention the day at all; the second is an obscure passage in a corrupt text; the third is doubtful; the fourth speaks only of a "stated day," without giving it any title at all; the fifth "calls it by its heathen name;" the seventh is doubtful but teaches that men may steal if they are in need; the ninth is so mystical, so fanciful, that "nobody can tell what far-fetched and unheard-of meanings may lie underneath his words;" the tenth is the "most brilliant and erratic [having no certain course; roaming about without a fixed destination] of all," and this "vehement ["furious; violent; impetuous; passionate; ardent; hot"] writer,"—we do not wonder that Dean Milman calls him "this fiery African"—*this* witness "fitly closes the list of evidences of the honored place filled by the Lord's day in the first two centuries!" Well we should say so. But what is a point worth that is "proved" by such evidences? It is worth all that the Sunday-sabbath is, which is supported by it, and that is—nothing. Yet these are the only witnesses that can be called, and false, doubtful, and untrustworthy though they be, they must be used or the Sunday institution will fail. But whether the failure would be any greater without such proofs than with them, we leave the reader to decide. And that is part of the argument for the obligation of Sunday, that was accounted worth a prize of five hundred dollars! We should like very much to see an argument on that question which that committee of award would consider to be worth nothing.

After this array of five-hundred-dollar-prize witnesses for Sunday, we hope our readers will justify us in declining to follow Mr. Elliott through a further list, composed of Origen, and Athanasius, Theodosius the Great, and Emperor Leo the Thracian, and a number of Catholic saints, such as Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, "Chrysostom the golden-mouthed," and Jerome, whom Mosheim calls "the foul-mouthed" (*Cent. 4, part 2, chap. 2, last par. but one*; through the Councils of Nice, Sardica, Gangra, Antioch, First of Toledo, Fourth of Carthage, and that of Laodicaea, and so on down to the Synod of Dort, and the Westminster Assembly.

Yet his work on this division of his subject would be incomplete, and out of harmony with his method of argument throughout, if he should not turn about and upset it all. Accordingly, therefore, he at once destroys the edifice which he has thus so laboriously erected. Among the dangers which threaten the Sunday institution of to-day he declares that:—

"Dangerous is the substitution of the dictum of the church for the warrant of Holy Scripture. . . To make the Lord's day only an ecclesiastical contrivance, is to give no assurance to the moral

reason, and to lay no obligation upon a free conscience. *The church cannot maintain this institution by its own edict.* Council, assembly, convocation, and synod can impose a law on the conscience *only* when they are able to back their decree *with 'thus saith the Lord.'*"—P. 263.

The only dictum that the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" has shown for the Sunday-sabbath is the dictum of the church. The only means by which he has fixed the day to be observed is "by a religious consensus of the Christian church" (P. 203). The only edicts which he had presented are the heathen edicts of Constantine, additional laws by Constantine and Theodosius the Great, and the decree of Emperor Leo the Thracian. It is only in these, and the action of council, assembly, convocation, and synod that he obtains authority to impose the observance of Sunday as a law upon the conscience. He has given no "Thus saith the Lord" for the institution nor for its observance; but on the contrary has confessed the "complete silence of the New Testament," in regard to any command or rules for either the institution or its observance. Therefore, by his own argument, the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath is of "no obligation upon a free conscience." And that is the truth.

Mr. Elliott devotes a chapter to argument against the seventh day as the Sabbath, which we shall notice next.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The First Disciples. John 1:35-51"  
*The Signs of the Times* 12, 13 , pp. 202, 203.**

(April 11.—John 1:35-51.)

JOHN the Baptist had now been preaching for about six months, calling the people to repentance, and to the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," saying to the people that they should believe on Him who should come after him. And there "went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan." And "the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who are thou? And he confessed and denied not; but confessed and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. . . . And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them, saying, I baptize with water; but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; he it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose."

"When the messengers from the highest authority in Jerusalem were communing with John in reference to his mission and work, he could have taken honor to himself, had he been so disposed. But he would not assume honors that did not belong to him. While conversing with the messengers, suddenly his eye kindled, his countenance lighted up, and his whole being seemed stirred with

deep emotion, as he discovered the person of Jesus in the concourse of people. He raised his hand, pointing to Christ, saying, There standeth One among you whom ye know not. I have come to prepare the way before him whom ye now see. He is the Messiah. He it is who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. 'The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me. And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not. But he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record, that this is the Son of God. Again, the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, behold the Lamb of God!'"

"Again the next day after, Jesus, and two of his disciples; and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God.' And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. Then Jesus turned and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? The disciples confessed that they were seeking Christ, and that they desired to become acquainted with him, and to be instructed by him at his home. These two disciples were charmed with the deeply impressive, yet simple and practical, lessons of Christ. Their hearts had never been so moved before. Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of these disciples. He was interested for his friends and relatives, and was anxious that they also should see Christ, and hear for themselves his precious lessons. Andrew went in search of his brother Simon, and with assurance claimed to have found Christ, the Messiah, the Saviour of the world. He brought his brother to Jesus, and as soon as Jesus looked upon him, he said, Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone."

203

The next day Christ selected another disciple, Philip, and bade him follow him. Philip fully believed that Christ was the Messiah, and began to search for others to bring them to listen to the teachings of Christ, which had so charmed him. Then Philip found Nathanael. He was one of the number who heard John proclaim, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' He felt deeply convicted, and retired to a grove, concealed from every human eye, and there meditated upon the announcement of John, calling to his mind the prophecies relating to the coming of

the Messiah and his mission. . . . He bowed before God and prayed that if the person whom John had declared to be the Redeemer of the world was indeed the promised deliverer, that it might be made known to him. The Spirit of the Lord rested upon Nathanael in such a special manner that he was convinced that Christ was the Messiah. While Nathanael was praying, he heard the voice of Philip calling him, saying, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."

"In these first few disciples the foundation of the Christian church was being laid by individual effort. John first directed two of his disciples to Christ. Then one of these finds a brother, and brings him to Christ. He then calls Philip to follow him, and he went in search of Nathanael. Here is an instructive lesson for all the followers of Christ. It teaches them the importance of personal effort, making direct appeals to relatives, friends, and acquaintances. There are those who profess to be acquainted with Christ for a life time who never make personal effort to induce one soul to come to the Saviour. They have left all the work with the minister. He may be well qualified for his work; but he cannot do the work which God has left upon the members of the church. Very many excuse themselves from being interested in the salvation of those who are out of Christ, and are content to selfishly enjoy the benefits of the grace of God themselves, while they make no direct effort to bring others to Christ. In the vineyard of the Lord there is a work for all to do, and unselfish, interested, faithful workers will share largely of his grace here, and of the reward he will bestow hereafter. Faith is called into exercise by good works, and courage and hope are in accordance with working faith. The reason many professed followers of Christ have not a bright and living experience, is because they do nothing to gain it. If they would engage in the work which God would have them do, their faith would increase, and they would advance in the divine life."

"Jesus was pleased with the earnest faith of Nathanael that asked for no greater evidence than the few words he had spoken. And he looked forward with pleasure to the work he was to do in relieving the oppressed, healing the sick, and in breaking the bands of Satan. In view of these blessings which Christ came to bestow, he says to Nathanael, in the presence of the other disciples, 'Hereafter ye shall see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.'

"Christ virtually says, On the bank of Jordan the heavens were opened before me, and the Spirit descended like a dove upon me. That scene at Jordan was but a token to evidence that I was the Son of God. If you believe in me as such, your faith shall be quickened, and you shall see that the heavens will be opened, and shall never be closed. I have opened them for you, and the angels

of God, that are united with me in the reconciliation between earth and Heaven, uniting the believers on the earth with the Father above, will be ascending, bearing the prayers of the needy and distressed from the earth to the Father above, and descending, bringing blessings of hope, courage, health, and life, for the children of men.

"The angels of God are ever moving up and down from earth to Heaven, and from Heaven to earth. All the miracles of Christ performed for the afflicted and suffering were, by the power of God, through the ministration of angels. Christ condescended to take humanity, and thus he unites his interests with the fallen sons and daughters of Adam here below, while his divinity grasps the throne of God. And thus Christ opens the communication of man with God, and God with man. All the blessings from God to man are through the ministration of holy angels."—*Great Controversy, by Mrs. E. G. White, pp. 63-68.*

A. T. J.

**April 8, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 14 ,  
p. 212.**

IT was five years (A.D. 403-408) from the time that the Visigoths retreated from Italy at the first invasion of Alaric, till their return in their second invasion of the Western Empire, from which they never retreated. During these five years, Alaric was strengthening his forces, and the Emperor Honorius was most effectually weakening the empire. And to the efforts of Honorius were added the effects of the invasion of Radigaisus. When the Visigoths, after the battle of Verona, in A.D. 403, had retired into Illyricum,—

"Adversity had exercised and displayed the genius of Alaric; and the fame of his valor invited to the Gothic standard the bravest of the Barbarian warriors; who, from the Euxine to the Rhine, were agitated by the desire of rapine and conquest. He had deserved the esteem, and he soon accepted the friendship, of Stilicho himself. Renouncing the service of the emperor of the East, Alaric concluded, with the court of Ravenna, a treaty of peace and alliance, by which he was declared master-general of the Roman armies throughout the prefecture of Illyricum; as it was claimed, according to the true and ancient limits, by the minister of Honorius. The execution of the ambitious design, which was either stipulated, or implied, in the articles of the treaty, appears to have been suspended by the formidable irruption of Radagaisus; and the neutrality of the Gothic king may perhaps be compared to the indifference of Cesar, who, in the conspiracy of Catiline, refused

either to assist, or to oppose, the enemy of the republic.—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 30, par. 22.*

The "ambitious design" here referred to was an expedition against Constantinople, which Stilicho had proposed, as Gibbon suspects, more with the purpose of getting Alaric and his barbarians engaged as far as possible from Italy, rather than from any real wish to make the conquest of the capital, or of the provinces of the East. "This design could not long escape the penetration of the Gothic king, who continued to hold a doubtful, and perhaps a treacherous, correspondence with the rival courts; who protracted, like a dissatisfied mercenary, his languid operations in Thessaly and Epirus, and who soon returned to claim the extravagant reward of his ineffectual services. From his camp near Emona, on the confines of Italy, he transmitted to the emperor of the West a long account of promises, of expenses, and of demands; called for immediate satisfaction, and clearly intimated the consequences of a refusal."—*Id.*

The Senate and Honorius, by the advice of Stilicho, who alone knew the weakness of the empire, granted to the demands of Alaric, a subsidy of 4,000 pounds of gold, which, for the time being, satisfied the avarice of the Visigoths. But now the faithful minister of the emperor, and of the empire, who had twice delivered from the barbarians both the emperor and Italy, and who was still the only stay of falling Rome, Stilicho, was sacrifice to the treacherous ambition of a crafty rival. "The crafty Olympius," *who exercised a splendid office, and "who concealed his vices under the mask of Christian piety, had secretly undermined the benefactor by whose favor he was promoted to the honorable offices of the Imperial palace."* By representing to Honorius that Stilicho "already meditated the death of his sovereign, with the ambitious hope of placing the diadem on the head of his son Eucherius," Olympius succeeded in spupplanting Stilicho in the mind of the emperor, and "the respectful attachment of Honorius was converted [May, A.D. 408] into fear, suspicion, and hatred.

At the instigation of Olympius there were massacred of the friends of Stilicho, "the most illustrious officers of the empire; two Pretorian prefects, of Gaul and of Italy; two masters-general of the cavalry and infantry; the masters of the offices; the questor; the treasurer; and the domestics. The intelligence of the massacre of Pavia filled the mind of Stilicho with just and gloomy apprehensions; and he instantly summoned, in the camp of Bologna, a council of the confederate leaders, who were attached to his service, and would be involved in his ruin. The impetuous voice of the assembly called aloud for arms, and for revenge; to march, without a moment's delay, under the banners of a hero, whom they had so often followed to victory; to surprise, to oppress, to extirpate the guilty Olympius, and his degenerate Romans; and perhaps to fix the diadem on the head of their injured general. Instead of executing a resolution, which might have been justified by success, Stilicho hesitated till he was irrecoverably lost. He was still ignorant of the fate of the emperor; he distrusted the fidelity of his own party; and he viewed with horror the fatal consequences of arming a crowd of licentious

barbarians against the soldiers and people of Italy. The confederates, impatient of his timorous and doubtful delay, hastily retired, with fear and indignation.

"At the hour of midnight, Sarus, a Gothic warrior, renowned among the barbarians themselves for his strength and valor, suddenly invaded the camp of his benefactor, plundered the baggage, cut in pieces the faithful Huns, who guarded his person, and penetrated to the tent, where the minister, pensive and sleepless, meditated on the dangers of his situation. Stilicho escaped with difficulty from the sword of the Goths and, after issuing a last and generous admonition to the cities of Italy, to shut their gates against the barbarians, his confidence, or his despair, urged him to throw himself into Ravenna, which was already in the absolute possession of his enemies. Olympius, who had assumed the dominion of Honorius, was speedily informed, that his rival had embraced, as a suppliant the altar of the Christian church. The base and cruel disposition of the hypocrite was incapable of pity or remorse; but he piously affected to elude, rather than to violate, the privilege of the sanctuary. Count Heraclian, with a troop of soldiers, appeared, at the dawn of day, before the gates of the church of Ravenna. The bishop was satisfied by a solemn oath, that the Imperial mandate only directed them to secure the person of Stilicho; but as soon as the unfortunate minister had been tempted beyond the holy threshold, he produced the warrant for his instant execution. Stilicho supported, with calm resignation, the injurious names of traitor and parricide; repressed the unseasonable zeal of his followers, who were ready to attempt an ineffectual rescue; and, with a firmness not unworthy of the last of the Roman generals, submitted his neck to the sword of Heraclian."—*Id.*, chap. 30, par. 23-25.

"The incapacity of a weak and distracted government may often assume the appearance, and produce the effects, of a treasonable correspondence with the public enemy. If Alaric himself had been introduced [Sept., A.D. 408] into the council of Ravenna, he would probably have advised the same measures which were actually pursued by the ministers of Honorius. The king of the Goths would have conspired, perhaps with some reluctance, to destroy the formidable adversary, by whose arms, in Italy, as well as in Greece, he had been twice overthrown. Their active and interested hatred laboriously accomplished the disgrace and ruin of the great Stilicho. The valor of Sarus, his fame in arms, and his personal, or hereditary, influence over the confederate barbarians, could recommend him only to the friends of their country, who despised, or detested, the worthless characters of Turpilio, Varanes, and Vigilantius. By the pressing instances of the new favorites, these generals, unworthy as they had shown themselves of the names of soldiers, were promoted to the command of the cavalry, of the

infantry, and of the domestic troops. The Gothic prince would have subscribed with pleasure the edict which the fanaticism of Olympius dictated to the simple and devout emperor. Honorius excluded all persons, who were adverse to the Catholic church, from holding any office in the state; obstinately rejected the service of all those who dissented from his religion; and rashly disqualified many of his bravest and most skilful officers, who adhered to the pagan worship, or who had imbibed the opinions of Arianism.

"These measures, so advantageous to an enemy, Alaric would have approved, and might perhaps have suggested; but it may seem doubtful, whether the Barbarian would have promoted his interest at the expense of the inhuman and absurd cruelty which was perpetrated by the direction, or at least with the connivance of the Imperial ministers. The foreign auxiliaries, who had been attached to the person of Stilicho, lamented his death; but the desire of revenge was checked by a natural apprehension for the safety of their wives and children; who were detained as hostages in the strong cities of Italy, where they had likewise deposited their most valuable effects. At the same hour, and as if by a common signal, the cities of Italy were polluted by the same horrid scenes of universal massacre and pillage, which involved, in promiscuous destruction, the families and fortunes of the barbarians. Exasperated by such an injury, which might have awakened the tamest and most servile spirit, they cast a look of indignation and hope towards the camp of Alaric, and unanimously swore to pursue, with just and implacable war, the perfidious nation who had so basely violated the laws of hospitality. By the imprudent conduct of the ministers of Honorius, the republic lost the assistance, and deserved the enmity, of thirty thousand of her bravest soldiers; and the weight of that formidable army, which alone might have determined the event of the war, was transferred from the scale of the Romans into that of the Goths."—*Id.*, chap. 31, par. 1.

A. T. J.

*(To be continued.)*

**"The Abiding Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 14 , p. 216.**

### **"THE CHANGE OF DAY.**

UNDER the title of "The Change of Day," the author of "The Abiding Sabbath" devotes a chapter to the denial of the right of the seventh day to be considered the Sabbath; and he starts with the attempt to make a distinction between the Sabbath as an institution, and the Sabbath as the name of a day. He says:—

"Let it be urged that the Sabbath as an institution, and the Sabbath as the name of a day, are entirely distinct."—*P.* 201.

This is a turn that is quite commonly taken by those who deny that the seventh day is the Sabbath, but we wish that some of those who think they see this distinction, would describe what they call the "institution." We wish they would tell us what it is. We wish they would tell us how the "institution" was made, and how it can be observed distinct from the day. For says Mr. Elliott:—

"The particular day is no essential part of the institution."—*P. 203.*

If, therefore, the day be no essential part of the institution, it follows that the institution can be observed without reference to the day; and so we say we should like for Mr. Elliott, or someone else who thinks the proposition correct, to tell us how that can be done. But Mr. Elliott does not believe the proposition, nor does anyone else whom we have ever known to state it. In his argument under this very proposition that, "The particular day is no essential part of the institution," Mr. Elliott says:—

"Without doubt, the spiritual intent of the Sabbath will fail of full realization *except all men unite upon one day.*"—*Id.*

Then what his argument amounts to is just this: The particular day is no essential part of the institution, yet the institution will fail of proper realization unless all unite upon a particular day. In other words, the particular day is an essential part of the institution. And that is exactly where everyone lands who starts with this proposition. But it is not enough to say that the day is an essential part of the institution. The day *is* the institution, and the institution is the day. And if the particular day be taken away, the institution is destroyed. The commandment of God is not, Remember the Sabbath *institution*, to keep it holy. Nor is it merely, Remember the Sabbath, as though it were something indefinite. But it is plainly, "Remember the Sabbath *day*, to keep it holy." Ex. 20:8. The word of God is not that he blessed the Sabbath institution, and hallowed it. But the word is, "The Lord blessed the Sabbath *day*, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:11.

Nor is it left to men to select, and unite upon, some "one day" to be the Sabbath. The Lord not only commands men to remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, but he also tells them, as plainly as language can tell, that "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath." It is the seventh day that God blessed at creation. It is the seventh day that he then sanctified. It is the seventh day upon which he rested. Gen. 2:2, 3. It was the rest, the blessing, and the sanctification of the seventh day that made the institution of the Sabbath. And it is simply the record of a fact, when the Lord wrote on the table of stone, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Sup-

217

pose the question should be asked, What is the Sabbath? As the word of God is true, the only true answer that can be given is, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Therefore it is as plain as words can make it, that apart from the seventh day there is no Sabbath; and that apart from the seventh day there is no Sabbath institution.

Again, the word Sabbath means rest, and with this Mr. Elliott agrees; he says:—

"The word 'Sabbath' is the one used in the fourth commandment; it means 'rest,' and it is the substantive form of the

verb employed in Gen. 2:2, 3, also Ex. 31 : 17, to describe the divine resting after creation."—P. 202.

But God did not bless the *rest*, he blessed the rest *day*; he did not hallow the *rest*, he hallowed the *rest day*. That rest day was the seventh day, the last day of the week. "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." Did God rest any day of the week but the seventh day? Assuredly not. Then is not the seventh day the rest day of God? Most certainly. Then whenever anybody calls any day the Sabbath but the seventh day—the last day of the week—he not only contradicts the plain word of God but he also contradicts the very language in which he himself speaks, because he gives the title of "rest" to that which by no possibility can truthfully bear it. The word of God is the truth, and it says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God; in it *thou* shalt not do any work."

Yet in the face of his own reference to Gen. 2:2, 3, and Ex. 31 : 17, the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" has the assurance to write the following:—

"As a human monument the particular day has value, but it has no bearing on that divine ordinance of rest and worship which comes to us out of eternity and blends again with it at the end of time."—P. 203.

"As a *human* monument?" How did the particular day—the seventh day—in Gen. 2:2, 3 become a human monument? What human being had anything to do with the erection of that monument? It was God who set up that monument, and when an institution established by the Lord himself, can be called a human monument, we should like to know how much further a five-hundred-dollar prize would not justify a man in going.

And again, "The particular day has no bearing upon that divine ordinance which comes to us out of eternity." This, too, when the particular day *is* that divine ordinance. If the particular day has no bearing upon that divine ordinance of *rest* and worship which comes to us out of eternity, then what is the ordinance, and how can it be observed? This brings him again to the important concession that, "all men must unite upon one day," or else the Sabbath will fail of its proper realization. But we would ask, Did not the Lord know that when he made the Sabbath? Did he not know that it is necessary that all men should unite upon one day? We are certain that he did, and that he made ample provision for it. He himself selected the day which should be the Sabbath. He rested a certain definite day, he blessed that day, and he set it apart from the other days of the week, and he commanded man—the human race—to remember that day, and to do no work therein. That day is the last day of the week, the seventh day, and not the first day of the week. But the day which the Lord has chosen to be the Sabbath; the day which he has put honor upon; the day which he has by his own divine words and acts set apart from all other days; the day which he by his own voice from Heaven has commanded to be kept holy; that day which he has called his own—is to be set aside by men as not essential, and a heathen institution, by the authority of a heathen commandment, exalted to the place of the Lord's day, and as all-essential. But it is wickedness.

As for us, we choose to obey the word of God rather than the word of men. We choose to rest the day in which he has commanded us to rest. We choose to hallow the day which he has hallowed. We choose to *keep* holy the day which he has made holy, and which he has commanded all men to keep holy.

Reader, "God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Heb. 4:4. What are *you* going to do? God says, Remember the rest day, to keep it holy. Ex. 20:8. What are you going to do? God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath [the rest] of the Lord thy God; *in it thou shalt not do any work.*" Ex. 20:10. What are you going to do?

"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." "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy day*; and call 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.

A. T. J.

**April 15, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 15 , p. 228.**

"IN the arts of negotiation, as well as in those of war, the Gothic king maintained [Oct., A.D. 408] his superior ascendant over an enemy, whose seeming changes proceeded from the total want of counsel and design. From his camp, on the confines of Italy, Alaric attentively observed the revolutions of the palace, watched the progress of faction and discontent, disguised the hostile aspect of a barbarian invader, and assumed the more popular appearance of the friend and ally of the great Stilicho: to whose virtues, when they were no longer formidable, he could pay a just tribute of sincere praise and regret. The pressing invitation of the malecontents, who urged the king of the Goths to invade Italy, was enforced by a lively sense of his personal injuries; and he might especially complain, that the Imperial ministers still delayed and eluded the payment of the four thousand pounds of gold which had been granted by the Roman senate, either to reward his services, or to appease his fury. His decent firmness was supported by an artful moderation, which

contributed to the success of his designs. He required a fair and reasonable satisfaction; but he gave the strongest assurances, that, as soon as he had obtained it, he would immediately retire. He refused to trust the faith of the Romans, unless Etius and Jason, the sons of two great officers of state, were sent as hostages to his camp; but he offered to deliver, in exchange, several of the noblest youths of the Gothic nation.

"The modesty of Alaric was interpreted, by the ministers of Ravenna, as a sure evidence of his weakness and fear. They disdained either to negotiate a treaty, or to assemble an army; and with a rash confidence, derived only from their ignorance of the extreme danger, irretrievably wasted the decisive moments of peace and war. While they expected, in sullen silence, that the Barbarians would evacuate the confines of Italy, Alaric, with bold and rapid marches, passed the Alps and the Po; hastily pillaged the cities of Aquileia, Altinum, Concordia, and Cremona, which yielded to his arms; increased his forces by the accession of thirty thousand auxiliaries; and, without meeting a single enemy in the field, advanced as far as the edge of the morass which protected the impregnable residence of the emperor of the West. Instead of attempting the hopeless siege of Ravenna, the prudent leader of the Goths proceeded to Rimini, stretched his ravages along the sea-coast of the Hadriatic, and meditated the conquest of the ancient mistress of the world.

"An Italian hermit, whose zeal and sanctity were respected by the barbarians themselves, encountered the victorious monarch, and boldly denounced the indignation of Heaven against the oppressors of the earth; but the saint himself was confounded by the solemn asseveration of Alaric, that he felt a secret and preternatural impulse, which directed, and even compelled, his march to the gates of Rome. He felt, that his genius and his fortune were equal to the most arduous enterprises; and the enthusiasm which he communicated to the Goths, insensibly removed the popular, and almost superstitious, reverence of the nations for the majesty of the Roman name. His troops, animated by the hopes of spoil, followed the course of the Flaminian way, occupied the unguarded passes of the Apennine, descended into the rich plains of Umbria; and, as they lay encamped on the banks of the Clitumnus, might wantonly slaughter and devour the milk-white oxen, which had been so long reserved for the use of Roman triumphs. A lofty situation, and a seasonable tempest of thunder and lightning, preserved the little city of Narni; but the king of the Goths, despising the ignoble prey, still advanced with unabated vigor; and after he had passed through the stately arches, adorned with the spoils of barbaric victories, he pitched his camp under the walls of Rome [A.D. 408]."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 2.*

"By a skillful disposition of his numerous forces, who impatiently watched the moment of an assault, Alaric encompassed the walls, commanded the twelve principal gates, intercepted all communication with the adjacent country, and vigilantly guarded the navigation of the Tyber, from which the Romans derived the surest and most plentiful supply of provisions. The first emotions of the nobles, and of the people, were those of surprise and indignation, that a vile barbarian should dare to insult the capital of the world; but their arrogance was soon humbled by misfortune; and their unmanly rage, instead of being directed against an enemy in arms, was meanly exercised on a defenseless and innocent victim. Perhaps in the person of Serena, the Romans might have respected the niece of Theodosius, the aunt, nay, even the adoptive mother, of the reigning emperor; but they abhorred the widow of Stilicho; and they listened with credulous passion to the tale of calumny, which accused her of maintaining a secret and criminal correspondence with the Gothic invader. Actuated, or overawed, by the same popular frenzy, the senate, without requiring any evidence of his guilt, pronounced the sentence of her death. Serena was ignominiously strangled; and the infatuated multitude were astonished to find, that this cruel act of injustice did not immediately produce the retreat of the barbarians, and the deliverance of the city.

"That unfortunate city gradually experienced the distress of scarcity, and at length the horrid calamities of famine. The daily allowance of three pounds of bread was reduced to one half, to one third, to nothing; and the price of corn still continued to rise in a rapid and extravagant proportion. The poorer citizens, who were unable to purchase the necessaries of life, solicited the precarious charity of the rich; and for a while the public misery was alleviated by the humanity of Leta, the widow of the emperor Gratian, who had fixed her residence at Rome, and consecrated to the use of the indigent the princely revenue which she annually received from the grateful successors of her husband. But these private and temporary donatives were insufficient to appease the hunger of a numerous people; and the progress of famine invaded the marble palaces of the senators themselves. The persons of both sexes, who had been educated in the enjoyment of ease and luxury, discovered how little is requisite to supply the demands of nature; and lavished their unavailing treasures of gold and silver, to obtain the coarse and scanty sustenance which they would formerly have rejected with disdain. The food the most repugnant to sense or imagination, the aliments the most unwholesome and pernicious to the constitution, were eagerly devoured, and fiercely disputed, by the rage of hunger. A dark suspicion was entertained, that some desperate wretches fed on the bodies of their fellow-creatures,

whom they had secretly murdered; and even mothers, (such was the horrid conflict of the two most powerful instincts implanted by nature in the human breast), even mothers are said to have tasted the flesh of their slaughtered infants!

"Many thousands of the inhabitants of Rome expired in their houses, or in the streets, for want of sustenance; and as the public sepulchers without the walls were in the power of the enemy the stench, which arose from so many putrid and unburied carcasses, infected the air; and the miseries of famine were succeeded and aggravated by the contagion of a pestilential disease. The assurances of speedy and effectual relief, which were repeatedly transmitted from the court of Ravenna, supported for some time, the fainting resolution of the Romans, till at length the despair of any human aid tempted them to accept the offers of a preternatural deliverance. Pompeianus, praefect of the city, had been persuaded, by the art or fanaticism of some Tuscan diviners, that, by the mysterious force of spells and sacrifices, they could extract the lightning from the clouds, and point those celestial fires against the camp of the barbarians. The important secret was communicated to Innocent, the bishop of Rome; and the successor of St. Peter is accused, perhaps without foundation, of preferring the safety of the republic to the rigid severity of the Christian worship. But when the question was agitated in the senate; when it was proposed, as an essential condition, that those sacrifices should be performed in the capitol, by the authority, and in the presence, of the magistrates, the majority of that respectable assembly, apprehensive either of the divine or of the Imperial displeasure, refused to join in an act, which appeared almost equivalent to the public restoration of Paganism."—*Id.*, chap. 31, par. 14.

*(To be continued.)*

**"The Abiding Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 15 , pp. 232, 234.**

LIKE the majority of people who keep Sunday, the author of the "Abiding Sabbath" finds great difficulty in fixing the day, when the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day—is under discussion, but not the least difficulty when the first day of the week is to be pointed out. He inquires:—

"When does the day commence and end? Shall we define, as in the first chapter of Genesis, that the 'evening and morning' make a day, and therefore reckon from sunset to sunset, as did the Puritans? or shall we keep the civil day, from midnight to midnight?"—*P.* 204.

To those who regard the word of God as of any authority, we should think the day as defined in the first chapter of Genesis would be sufficient, and that therefore they would reckon the day as the Bible does, and as Mr. Elliott knows

how to do, that is, "from sunset to sunset." But those who choose a heathen institution—Sunday—instead of the institution of God—the Sabbath day—we should expect to find reckoning as the heathen did, that is, "from midnight to midnight." And nothing more plainly marks the heathen origin of the Sunday institution, and the heathen authority for its observance, than does the fact that it is reckoned from midnight to midnight. If the religious observance of Sunday had been introduced by the apostles, or enjoined by any authority of God, it would have been observed and reckoned as the Bible gives the reckoning, from sunset to sunset. But instead of that, the Sunday institution bears Rome on its very face. Rome from her beginning reckoned the day from midnight to midnight. Sunday was the great heathen Roman day; and when by the working of the "mystery of iniquity," and Constantine's heathen edict, and his political, hypocritical conversion, this "wild solar holiday of all pagan times" was made the great papal Roman day, it was still essentially the same thing; and so it is yet. However much Protestants may dress it up, and call it the "Christian Sabbath," and the "Lord's day," the fact still remains that the Lord never called it his day; that there is nothing about it either Sabbath or Christian, for the Lord never rested on it, and Christ never gave any direction whatever in regard to it; and *that* it rests essentially upon human authority, and that of heathen origin.

Now he says:—

"As a concession to that human weakness which is troubled after eighteen centuries' drill in spiritual religion, about the particular day of the week to be honored, the question will be fairly met."—*P.*  
205.

Remember, he has promised that the question shall "be fairly met." And the proposition with which he starts in fulfillment of that promise, is this:—

"There is no possible means of fixing the day of the original Sabbath."—*lb.*

Let us see. The Scripture says at the close of

233

the six days employed in creation, that God "rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made;" that he "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested." Gen. 2:2, 3. In the fourth commandment, God spoke and wrote with direct reference to the day upon which he rested from creation, and pointed out that day as the one upon which the people should rest, saying: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work. . . . For [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore [for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Therefore nothing can be plainer than that God, in the fourth commandment, pointed out distinctly "the day of the original Sabbath." The word of God says also that the day the Saviour lay in the grave certain persons "rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.*" Luke 23:56. The Sabbath day according to the commandment, is the day of the original Sabbath. When those persons rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment, they rested the day of the original Sabbath. Therefore the day of the original Sabbath is fixed by the word of God to the day

which followed the crucifixion of the Saviour. And that same word declares that the day which followed this day of the original Sabbath, was the first day of the week. Mr. Elliott finds no difficulty at all in fixing the first day of the week—the day of the resurrection of the Saviour. But the day of the original Sabbath is the day which immediately precedes the first day of the week. Therefore, as Mr. Elliott finds it not only possible but *easy* to fix the first day of the week, how can it be that he finds it impossible to fix the day of the original Sabbath, which immediately precedes the first day of the week?

But Mr. Elliott proceeds to *argue* the proposition, and this is how he begins:—

"Who can tell on what day of the week the first man was created?"—*lb.*

Shall we grant Mr. Elliott's implied meaning, and conclude that he does not know on what day of the week the first man was created? Not at all; for within eight lines of this question, he begins to tell us of the day on which man first existed. He says:

"For the sake, however, of any literalists who still believe that the work of creation began on Sunday eve, and ended Friday at sunset, it may be suggested that *the seventh day of creation was the first day of man's existence.*"

There, reader, you have it. He himself knows what day of the week the first man was created. For as "the seventh day of creation was man's first day of existence," it follows inevitably that man must have been created on the seventh day, unless indeed he supposes that man was created one day and did not exist till another! But who ever before heard of "the seventh day of creation"? ! We cannot imagine where he ever learned of such a thing. Never from the Bible, certainly; for the Bible tells of only *six* days of creation. The first chapter of Genesis gives the record of the six days of creation; and in the fourth commandment God declares, "In *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and *all that in them is.*" The Bible tells plainly that man was created on the sixth day. But lo, Mr. Elliott finds seven days of creation, and that the seventh day of creation was the first day of man's existence!! What a wonderful thing a five-hundred-dollar-prize essay is!

Well, what is Mr. Elliott's conclusion from this line of argument? Here it is:—

"If he [man] began the calculation of the week from that time, and kept the same Sabbath with his Maker, then the first day of the week, and not the seventh, was the primitive and patriarchal Sabbath. If a crude, bald literalism is to be the rule of interpretation, let us follow it boldly, no matter where it takes us."—*P. 206.*

We should say that if crude, bald nonsense is to characterize the argument by which the Sunday-sabbath is supported, then the essay entitled "The Abiding Sabbath" is fully entitled to the five-hundred-dollar prize which it received. This is the only reply that we shall make to this argument, for he himself knows that it is worthless; and he feels the necessity of making an apology for it, which he does, saying:—

"This suggestion is made, *not for any value which it possesses*, in itself, but as a fair illustration of the difficulties attending any attempt to fix the day."—*ib.*

If an honest inquiry were made for the day which *God has fixed* as the day of the original and only Sabbath of the Lord, it would, in every case, be found with less than a hundredth part of the difficulty that has attended this self-contradictory prize, or any other effort, to show that Sunday is the Sabbath.

We now take our leave of Mr. Elliott and his prize essay; to pursue the subject further would only be to multiply notices of nonsense. In closing, we would simply repeat the remarks already made, that, in consideration of the fact that the committee of award decided that this essay was worthy of a prize of five hundred dollars, we should very much like to see an essay on this subject which that committee would decide to be worth nothing. If this essay stands as one of the best arguments for the Sunday-sabbath, and this it certainly does by taking the aforesaid prize, and by its receiving the endorsement of the American Tract Society by a copyright, then the Sunday institution must be in a most sorry plight. And if we had no better reasons for calling the people to the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day—than those that are given in this prize essay for Sunday-keeping, we should actually be ashamed ever to urge anybody to keep it.

The word of God is truth. All his commandments are truth. Ps. 119:151. When God has spoken, that word must be accepted as the truth, and all there is then to do is to obey the word as he has spoken it. "It shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God as he hath commanded us." Nothing is obedience but to do what the Lord says, *as he says it*. He says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." To disregard the day which God has commanded to be kept, is disobedience. And the disobedience is not in the slightest relieved by the substitution of another day for the one which the Lord has fixed, even though that other day be styled "Christian." The fact is that the seventh day is the Sabbath; and in the fast-hastening Judgment the question will be, Have you kept it? God is now calling out a people who will keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. Nothing but that will answer. Neither commandment of God nor faith of Jesus ever enjoined the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week. Both commandment of God and faith of Jesus show the everlasting obligation to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Will you obey God? Will you keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus?

A. T. J.

**April 22, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 16, p. 244.**

"THE last resource of the Romans was in the clemency, or at least in the moderation, of the king of the Goths. The senate, who in this emergency assumed the supreme powers of government, appointed two ambassadors to negotiate with the enemy. This important trust was delegated [A.D. 509] to Basilius, a senator, of Spanish extraction, and already conspicuous in the administration of provinces; and to John, the first tribune of the notaries, who was peculiarly qualified, by his dexterity in business, as well as by his former intimacy with the Gothic prince. When they were introduced into his presence, they declared, perhaps in a more lofty style than became their abject condition, that the Romans were resolved to maintain their dignity, either in peace or war; and that, if Alaric refused them a fair and honorable capitulation, he might sound his trumpets, and prepare to give battle to an innumerable people, exercised in arms, and animated by despair. 'The thicker the hay, the easier it is mowed,' was the concise reply of the Barbarian; and this rustic metaphor was accompanied by a loud and insulting laugh, expressive of his contempt for the menaces of an unwarlike populace, enervated by luxury before they were emaciated by famine. He then condescended to fix the ransom, which he would accept as the price of his retreat from the walls of Rome; *all* the gold and silver in the city, whether it were the property of the state, or of individuals; all the rich and precious movables; and *all* the slaves that could prove their title to the name of *barbarians*.

"The ministers of the senate presumed to ask, in a modest and suppliant tone, 'If such, O king, are your demands, what do you intend to leave us?' 'YOUR LIVES!' replied the haughty conqueror; they trembled, and retired. Yet, before they retired, a short suspension of arms was granted, which allowed some time for a more temperate negotiation. The stern features of Alaric were insensibly relaxed; he abated much of the rigor of his terms; and at length consented to raise the siege, on the immediate payment of five thousand pounds of gold, of thirty thousand pounds of silver, of four thousand robes of silk, of three thousand pieces of fine scarlet cloth, and of three thousand pounds weight of pepper. But the public treasury was exhausted; the annual rents of the great estates in Italy and the provinces, had been exchanged, during the famine, for the vilest sustenance; the hoards of secret wealth were still concealed by the obstinacy of avarice; and some remains of consecrated spoils afforded the only resource that could avert the impending ruin of the city. As soon as the Romans had satisfied the rapacious demands of Alaric, they were restored, in some measure, to the enjoyment of peace and plenty. Several of the gates were cautiously opened; the importation of provisions from the river and the adjacent country was no longer obstructed by the Goths; the citizens resorted in crowds to the free market, which was held

during three days in the suburbs; and while the merchants who undertook this gainful trade made a considerable profit, the future subsistence of the city was secured by the ample magazines which were deposited in the public and private granaries.

"A more regular discipline than could have been expected, was maintained in the camp of Alaric; and the wise Barbarian justified his regard for the faith of treaties, by the just severity with which he chastised a party of licentious Goths, who had insulted some Roman citizens on the road to Ostia. His army, enriched by the contributions of the capital, slowly advanced into the fair and fruitful province of Tuscany, where he proposed to establish his winter quarters; and the Gothic standard became the refuge of forty thousand barbarian slaves, who had broke their chains, and aspired, under the command of their great deliverer, to revenge the injuries and the disgrace of their cruel servitude. About the same time, he received a more honorable re-enforcement of Goths and Huns, whom Adolphus, the brother of his wife, had conducted, at his pressing invitation, from the banks of the Danube to those of the Tyber, and who had cut their way, with some difficulty and loss, through the superior number of the Imperial troops. A victorious leader, who united the daring spirit of a barbarian with the art and discipline of a Roman general, was at the head of a hundred thousand fighting men; and Italy pronounced, with terror and respect, the formidable name of Alaric.

"At the distance of fourteen centuries, we may be satisfied with relating the military exploits of the conquerors of Rome, without presuming to investigate the motives of their political conduct. In the midst of his apparent prosperity [A.D. 409], Alaric was conscious, perhaps, of some secret weakness, some internal defect; or perhaps the moderation which he displayed, was intended only to deceive and disarm the easy credulity of the ministers of Honorius. The king of the Goths repeatedly declared, that it was his desire to be considered as the friend of peace, and of the Romans. Three senators, at his earnest request, were sent ambassadors to the court of Ravenna, to solicit the exchange of hostages, and the conclusion of the treaty; and the proposals, which he more clearly expressed during the course of the negotiations, could only inspire a doubt of his sincerity, as they might seem inadequate to the state of his fortune. The barbarian still aspired to the rank of master-general of the armies of the West; he stipulated an annual subsidy of corn and money; and he chose the provinces of Dalmatia, Noricum, and Venetia, for the seat of his new kingdom, which would have commanded the important communication between Italy and the Danube. If these modest terms should be rejected, Alaric showed a disposition to relinquish his pecuniary demands, and even to content himself with the

possession of Noricum; an exhausted and impoverished country, perpetually exposed to the inroads of the Barbarians of Germany.

"But the hopes of peace were disappointed by the weak obstinacy, or interested views, of the minister Olympius. . . . Olympius might have continued to insult the just resentment of a people who loudly accused him as the author of the public calamities; but his power was undermined by the secret intrigues of the palace. The favorite eunuchs transferred the government of Honorius, and the empire, to Jovius the Praetorian prefect; an unworthy servant, who did not atone, by the merit of personal attachment, for the errors and misfortunes of his administration. The exile, or escape of the guilty Olympius, reserved him for more vicissitudes of fortune; he experienced the adventures of an obscure and wandering life; he again rose to power; he fell a second time into disgrace; his ears were cut off; he expired under the lash; and his ignominious death afforded a grateful spectacle to the friends of Stilicho. After the removal of Olympius, whose character was deeply tainted with religious fanaticism, the pagans and heretics were delivered from the impolitic proscription, which excluded them from the dignitaries of the State. . . . But the court and councils of Honorius still remained a scene of weakness and distraction, of corruption and anarchy."

"Jovius, from a selfish, and perhaps a criminal, motive, had negotiated with Alaric, in a personal interview under the walls of Rimini. During the absence of Jovius, the emperor was persuaded to assume a lofty tone of inflexible dignity, such as neither his situation, nor his character, could enable him to support; and a letter, signed with the name of Honorius, was immediately dispatched to the Praetorian prefect, granting him a free permission to dispose of the public money, but sternly refusing to prostitute the military honors of Rome to the proud demands of a barbarian. This letter was imprudently communicated to Alaric himself; and the Goth, who in the whole transaction had behaved with temper and decency, expressed, in the most outrageous language, his lively sense of the insult so wantonly offered to his person and to his nation. The conference of Rimini was hastily interrupted; and the prefect Jovius, on his return to Ravenna, was compelled to adopt, and even to encourage, the fashionable opinions of the court. By his advice and example, the principal officers of the state and army were obliged to swear, that, without listening, in *any* circumstances, to *any* conditions of peace, they would still persevere in perpetual and implacable war against the enemy of the republic. This rash engagement opposed an insuperable bar to all future negotiation."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 15-17.*

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**May 6, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 17 , p. 260.**

(Continued.)

"WHILE the emperor and his court enjoyed, with sullen pride, the security of the marshes and fortifications of Ravenna, they [A. D. 409] abandoned Rome, almost without defense, to the resentment of Alaric. Yet such was the moderation which he still preserved, or affected, that, as he moved with his army along the Flaminian way, he successively dispatched the bishops of the towns of Italy to reiterate his offers of peace, and to conjure the emperor, that he would save the city and its inhabitants from hostile fire, and the sword of the barbarians. These impending calamities were, however, averted, not indeed by the wisdom of Honorius, but by the prudence or humanity of the Gothic king, who employed a milder, though not less effectual, method of conquest. Instead of assaulting the capital, he successfully directed his efforts against the *Port* of Ostia, one of the boldest and most stupendous works of Roman magnificence. The accidents to which the precarious subsistence of the city was continually exposed in a winter navigation, and an open road, had suggested to the genius of the first Cesar the useful design, which was executed under the reign of Claudius. The artificial modes, which formed the narrow entrance, advanced far into the sea, and firmly repelled the fury of the waves, while the largest vessels securely rode at anchor within three deep and capacious basins, which received the northern branch of the Tyber, about two miles from the ancient colony of Ostia. The Roman *Port* insensibly swelled to the size of an Episcopal city, where the corn of Africa was deposited in spacious granaries for the use of the capital.

"As soon as Alaric was in possession of that important place, he summoned the city to surrender at discretion; and his demands were enforced by the positive declaration, that a refusal, or even a delay, should be instantly followed by the destruction of the magazines, on which the life of the Roman people depended. The clamors of that people, and the terror of famine, subdued the pride of the senate; they listened, without reluctance, to the proposal of placing a new emperor on the throne of the unworthy Honorius; and the suffrage of the Gothic conqueror bestowed the purple on Attalus, prefect of the city. The grateful monarch immediately acknowledged his protector as master general of the armies of the

West; Adolphus, with the rank of count of the domestics, obtained the custody of the person of Attalus; and the two hostile nations seemed to be united in the closest bands of friendship and alliance.

"The gates of the city were thrown open, and the new emperor of the Romans, encompassed on every side by the Gothic arms, was conducted, in tumultuous procession, to the palace of Augustus and Trajan. After he had distributed the civil and military dignities among his favorites and followers, Attalus convened an assembly of the senate, before whom, in a formal and florid speech, he asserted his resolution of restoring the majesty of the republic, and of uniting to the empire the provinces of Egypt and the East, which had once acknowledged the sovereignty of Rome. Such extravagant promises inspired every reasonable citizen while a just contempt for the character of an unwarlike usurper, whose elevation was the deepest and most ignominious wound which the republic had yet sustained from the insolence of the barbarians. But the populace, with their usual levity, applauded the change of masters. The public discontent was favorable to the rival of Honorius; and the sectaries, oppressed by his persecuting edicts, expected some degree of countenance, or at least of toleration, from a prince who, in his native country of Ionia, had been educated in the pagan superstition, and who had since received the sacrament of baptism from the hands of an Arian bishop.

"The first days of the reign of Attalus were fair and prosperous. An officer of confidence was sent with an inconsiderable body of troops to secure the obedience of Africa; the greatest part of Italy submitted to the terror of the Gothic powers, and though the city of Bologna made a vigorous and effectual resistance, the people of Milan, dissatisfied perhaps with the absence of Honorius, accepted, with loud acclamations, the choice of the Roman senate. At the head of a formidable army, Alaric conducted his royal captive almost to the gates of Ravenna; and a solemn embassy of the principal ministers and Jovius, the Pretorian prefect, of Valens, master of the cavalry and infantry, of the questor Potamius, and of Julian, the first of the notaries, was introduced, with martial pomp, into the Gothic camp. In the name of their sovereign, they consented to acknowledge the lawful election of his competitor, and to divide the provinces of Italy and the West between the two emperors.

"Their proposals were rejected with disdain; and the refusal was aggravated by the insulting clemency of Attalus, who condescended to promise that, if Honorius would instantly resign the purple, he should be permitted to pass the remainder of his life in the peaceful exile of some remote island. So desperate indeed did the situation of the son of Theodosius appear, to those who were the best acquainted with his strength and resources, that

Jovius and Valens, his minister and his general, betrayed their trust, infamously deserted the sinking cause of their benefactor, and devoted their treacherous allegiance to the service of his more fortunate rival. Astonished by such examples of domestic treason, Honorius trembled at the approach of every servant, at the arrival of every messenger. He dreaded the secret enemies, who might lurk in his capital, his palace, his bed-chamber; and some ships lay ready in the harbor of Ravenna, to transport the abdicated monarch to the dominions of his infant nephew, the emperor of the East.

"But there is a Providence (such at least was the opinion of the historian Procopius) that watches over innocence and folly; and the pretensions of Honorius to its peculiar care cannot reasonably be disputed. At the moment [A. D. 410] when his despair, incapable of any wise or manly resolution, meditated a shameful flight, a seasonable re-enforcement of four thousand veterans unexpectedly landed in the port of Ravenna. To these valiant strangers, whose fidelity had not been corrupted by the factions of the court, he committed the walls and gates of the city; and the slumbers of the emperor were no longer disturbed by the apprehension of imminent and internal danger. The favorable intelligence which was received from Africa suddenly changed the opinions of men, and the state of public affairs. The troops and officers, whom Attalus had sent into that province, were defeated and slain; and the active zeal of Heraclian maintained his own allegiance, and that of his people."

"The failure of the African expedition, was the source of mutual complaint and recrimination in the party of Attalus; and the mind of his protector was insensibly alienated from the interest of a prince, who wanted spirit of command, or docility to obey. . . . The resentment of the Gothic king was exasperated by the malicious arts of Jovius, who had been raised to the rank of patrician, and who afterwards excused his double perfidy, by declaring, without a blush, that he had only *seemed* to abandon the service of Honorius, more effectually to ruin the cause of the usurper. In a large plain near Rimini, and in the presence of an innumerable multitude of Romans and barbarians, the wretched Attalus was publicly despoiled of the diadem and purple; and those ensigns of royalty were sent by Alaric, as the pledge of peace and friendship, to the son of Theodosius.

"The degradation of Attalus removed the only real obstacle to the conclusion of the purple, and Alaric advanced within three miles of Ravenna, to press the irresolution of the Imperial ministers, whose insolence soon returned with the return of fortune. His indignation was kindled by the report, that a rival chieftain, that Sarus, the personal enemy of Adolphus, and the hereditary foe of the house of Balti, had been received into the palace. At the head of three hundred followers, that fearless barbarian immediately

sallied from the gates of Ravenna; surprised, and cut in pieces, a considerable body of Goths; re-entered the city in triumph; and was permitted to insult his adversary, by the voice of a herald, who publicly declared that the guilt of Alaric had forever excluded him from the friendship and alliance of the emperor.

"The crime and folly of the court of Ravenna were expiated a third time by the calamities of Rome. The king of the Goths, who no longer dissembled his appetite for plunder and revenge, appeared in arms under the walls of the capital, and the trembling senate, without any hopes of relief, prepared, by a desperate resistance, to delay the ruin of their country. But they were unable to guard against the secret conspiracy of their slaves and domestics; who, either from birth or interest, were attached to the cause of the enemy. At the hour of midnight [Aug. 24 A. D. 410] the Salarian gate was silently opened, and the inhabitants were awakened by the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet. *Eleven hundred and sixty three years after the foundation of Rome, the Imperial city, which had subdued and civilized so considerable a part of mankind, was delivered to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia.*"—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 18-21.*

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Some One-Thousand-Dollar Reasons for Keeping Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 17 , pp. 264, 265.**

OUR readers will remember that for several weeks lately we have bestowed some attention upon a book entitled "The Abiding Sabbath," the book being an essay that received a prize of five hundred dollars, as the best of a number of efforts, by different individuals, to prove the perpetual obligation of all men to keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath. We are perfectly willing that the decision as to the merit of that book, shall rest with our readers. We have nothing more to say in regard to it. But since we began the review of the foregoing prize essay, we have received another on the same subject, and with exactly the same design. This too is a prize essay. Not a five-hundred-dollar, but a one-thousand-dollar prize essay. It was written in 1884 by "A. E. Waffle, M. A., then Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Lewisburg University, Lewisburg, Pa." The prize of one thousand dollars was awarded "after a painstaking and protracted examination," by the Committee of Publication of the American Sunday-school Union; the award was approved by the Board of the Union; and the essay was printed and copyrighted by the Union in 1885. It makes a book of 418 pages, and is printed under the title of "The Lord's Day; Its Universal and Perpetual Obligation."

The author of this book treats the subject in three parts. Part I he devotes to proving the necessity of the Sabbath, by showing that it is necessary to man's

physical, his intellectual, his moral and religious, and his social welfare. In Part II he discusses the proposition that "the Sabbath of the Bible was made for all men." In Part III he considers "the nature and importance of the Sabbath." We shall not notice the work in detail because the ground has been mostly covered in our review of "The Abiding Sabbath." About all that we shall do with this book will be to notice the reasons that are given for keeping Sunday, as we want the people to become thoroughly acquainted with the kind of reasoning that draws five-hundred-dollar prizes, and one-thousand-dollar prizes, in proof that Sunday is the Sabbath. We need to make no apology for following up this subject. For certainly a subject to which is devoted so much high-priced discussion, is worthy of notice to any extent to which that discussion may run; more especially when in it there are involved moral and religious principles upon which turn eternal destinies.

Of the early institution of the Sabbath Mr. Waffle says:—

"Our first argument is founded upon the fact that the Sabbath was instituted at the beginning of human history. . . . In the first three verses of the second chapter of Genesis, we read: '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.' . . . The nature of this early Sabbath is hinted at in the words which record its institution. God *rested* from the work of creation. This is evidently meant to teach men that on the seventh day they are to cease from secular toil, and rest. . . . This idea is more fully developed in the statement that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day. . . . Sanctifying the day means that God set it apart as a day to be devoted to holy uses. It could have no higher use than to keep man near to his God and to cultivate his moral and religious nature. . . . It is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that a Sabbath, on which men rested from secular toil and engaged in the worship of God, was instituted at the beginning of human history. Just as the law of marriage and the law of property are older than the decalogue, so the law of the Sabbath, having its origin in the needs of man and in the benevolence and wisdom of God, was given to the first man, and but repeated and emphasized on Sinai. . . . The bearing of this conclusion upon the general discussion will be readily perceived. If the Sabbath did have this early origin, it was given to the whole race, and should be observed by every human being. . . . The moral law itself is not done away in Christ; no more are the things before it which God made obligatory upon man. Unless it can be shown that the law of the Sabbath, given at the creation, has been repealed by a new legislative act of God, it is still binding upon all men who learn of it. For, coming at

this time, it was not given to one man or to one nation, but to the whole human family."

That is the exact truth, well stated. The Sabbath was instituted at the beginning of human history. The first three verses of the second chapter of Genesis *are* evidently meant to teach men that *on the seventh day* they are to cease from secular toil, and rest. And it is indeed true that, unless it can be shown that the law of the Sabbath *given at creation*, has been repealed by a new legislative act of God, it is still binding upon all men who learn of it. And that it has not been repealed, that there has been no new legislative act of God, neither by himself, nor by Christ, nor by the apostles, Mr. Waffle shows conclusively. After proving the Sabbath to be a part of the moral law, he advances argument to show that "the law of the Sabbath has never been repealed," from which we shall present a few passages. He says:—

"If the conclusions of the preceding chapter are just, the law of the Sabbath *can never be abrogated*. So far as it is a moral law it must remain binding upon all men while the world stands. . . . We assert that the law of the Sabbath, so far as it is a moral law, has never been annulled. A law can be repealed only by the same authority that enacted it. It certainly cannot be done away by those who are subject to it. If the law of the Sabbath, *as it appeared in the ten commandments*, has been abolished, it must have been done by some decree of Jehovah. Where have we the record of such a decree? Through what prophet or apostle was it spoken? . . . We can find no words of Christ derogatory to this institution [the Sabbath] as it was originally established, or as it was intended to be observed. All his utterances on the subject were for the purpose of removing misapprehensions or of correcting abuses. It is strange that he should take so much pains to establish the Sabbath upon a proper foundation and promote right views of it, if he had any intention of doing away with the institution altogether. . . . The same is true of his actions. There is no record that he ever did anything upon the Sabbath not consistent with its purposes from the beginning. He healed the sick; but works of mercy on that day were never forbidden except in the rabbinical perversions of the Sabbath.

"It is fair to conclude that Christ never intended to abolish the Sabbath. The only conceivable ground for such a statement is the fact that he opposed the notions of it prevalent in his time. But his efforts to correct these furnish the best evidence that he was desirous of preserving the true Sabbath. He said that it became him to 'fulfill all righteousness.' He voluntarily placed himself under the law, including the law of the Sabbath. Thus he not only maintained the sacredness of the Sabbath by his words, but he also kept it as *an example for us*.

"But do the *apostles* teach that the fourth commandment is no longer in force; that it is not binding upon Christians? It is asserted by many that they do, and appeals are made to their epistles to

maintain the assertion. . . . Paul says: 'Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.' How could he have given it higher praise? And this he says just after the declaration, 'We are delivered from the law.' Does he mean that we are delivered from that which is 'holy, and just, and good,' and that we are henceforth to disregard the things required in the law? Not at all. He simply means that we are freed from the penalty and the bondage of the law. Again he says: 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.' Here his meaning obviously is that the law is not only honored by the redemption through Christ, but is established in the minds of those who through faith enjoy this redemption, faith giving ability to appreciate its excellence, and power joyfully to obey it. But he is even more specific. When he wants a summary of our duties to our fellowmen, he can do no better than to take the second table of the law. Rom. 13:8-10. . . . Paul was hardly so inconsistent as to quote thus from a law which had been abrogated as a rule of life.

"He is not alone in this practice. St. James says: 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. For he that 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.' What of it, if the law is annulled? It does not matter if we violate obsolete laws. But James would have said that these laws were still binding, and that no one of them could be violated with impunity. His main point is the integrity of the law—the impossibility of wrenching out one of its members without destroying all. The way in which Paul and James and Peter and John urge upon the Christians to whom they write abstinence from certain specific sins, and the performance of specific duties, shows that those who believe in Christ have need of law. This general view of the relation of Christians to the law will help us to understand what is said by Paul concerning the law of the Sabbath. It is plain that no part of the moral law is abolished. This is still recognized as of binding force upon all. The law of the Sabbath is a part of it, and any apostolic precepts which appear hostile to the Sabbath must be interpreted in the light of this fact.

"Our conclusion is that there is nothing in the writings of the apostles which, when fairly interpreted, implies the abrogation of the Sabbath. . . . They honored the moral law as the highest expression of God's will, and say no word to indicate that the law of the Sabbath was not a part of it. Thus both Christ and his inspired apostles have given their sanction to this institution. They have not taken away this choice gift of God to men."

This is sound doctrine. It is true that in speaking of the law of the Sabbath he uses the qualifying phrase, "so far as it is a moral law;" but as the law of the Sabbath is moral to the fullest extent; as there is nothing about it that is not

moral, his statement is literally sound. That is, the law of the Sabbath in its widest extent "must remain binding upon all men while the world stands;" and the law

265

of the Sabbath being entirely moral, "has never been annulled." There is more of it that might be quoted, but we have not the space for it. Besides, this is all-sufficient to show the universal and unchangeable obligation of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord.

And now, in view of the fact that the seventh day is the day which God established as the Sabbath at creation; in view of the fact that the seventh day is the day named by God in the fourth commandment; in view of the fact that the law of the Sabbath "as it appeared in the ten commandments," has never been repealed; in view of the fact that Christ kept, "as an example for us," this identical day—the seventh day—named at creation and in the decalogue; in view of the fact that the apostles maintain that "*no part* of the moral law is abolished," and that it is "of binding force upon all;" in view of the fact that God, and Christ, and his inspired apostles, have given their sanction to this institution, and that in all their words of sanction to the institution there is no reference to anything but the seventh day as the Sabbath; in view of all this, we ourselves would give a thousand dollars, if we had it, to any man who could show, by any process of legitimate reasoning, how Sunday, or any other day but the seventh day, can be the Sabbath.

Next week, if the Lord will, we shall give our readers the advantage of some of the steps which Mr. Waffle takes to accomplish this, for which he received a prize of one thousand dollars. A. T. J.

**May 13, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18 , pp. 276, 277.**

"The proclamation of Alaric, when he forced his entrance into a vanquished city, discovered, however, some regard for the laws of humanity and religion. He encouraged his troops boldly to seize the rewards of valor, and to enrich themselves with the spoils of a wealthy and effeminate people: but he exhorted them, at the same time, to spare the lives of the unresisting citizens, and to respect the churches of the apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, as holy and inviolable sanctuaries. Amidst the horrors of a nocturnal tumult, several of the Christian Goths displayed the fervor of a recent conversion; and some instances of their uncommon piety and moderation are related, and perhaps adorned, by the zeal of ecclesiastical writers. While the barbarians roamed through the city in quest of prey, the humble dwelling of an aged virgin, who had devoted her life to the service of the altar, was forced open by one of the powerful Goths. He immediately demanded, though in civil language, all the gold and silver in her possession; and was

astonished at the readiness with which she conducted him to a splendid hoard of massy plate, of the richest materials, and the most curious workmanship. The barbarian viewed with wonder and delight this valuable acquisition, till he was interrupted by a serious admonition, addressed to him in the following words: 'These,' said she, 'are the consecrated vessels belonging to St. Peter: if you presume to touch them, the sacrilegious deed will remain on your conscience. For my part, I dare not keep what I am unable to defend.'

"The Gothic captain, struck with reverential awe, dispatched a messenger to inform the king of the treasure which he had discovered; and received a peremptory order from Alaric, that all the consecrated plate and ornaments should be transported, without damage or delay, to the church of the apostle. From the extremity, perhaps, of the Quirinal hill, to the distant quarter of the Vatican, a numerous detachment of Goths, marching in order of battle through the principal streets, protected, with glittering arms, the long train of their devout companions, who bore aloft, on their heads, the sacred vessels of gold and silver; and the martial shouts of the Barbarians were mingled with the sound of religious psalmody. From all the adjacent houses, a crowd of Christians hastened to join this edifying procession; and a multitude of fugitives, without distinction of age, or rank, or even of sect, had the good fortune to escape to the secure and hospitable sanctuary of the Vatican. The learned work, concerning the *city of God*, was professedly composed by St. Augustin, to justify the ways of Providence in the destruction of the Roman greatness. He celebrates, with peculiar satisfaction, this memorable triumph of Christ; and insults his adversaries, by challenging them to produce some similar example of a town taken by storm, in which the fabulous gods of antiquity had been able to protect either themselves or their deluded votaries.

"In the sack of Rome, some rare and extraordinary examples of barbarian virtue have been deservedly applauded. But the holy precincts of the Vatican, and the apostolic churches, could receive a very small proportion of the Roman people; many thousand warriors, more especially of the Huns, who served under the standard of Alaric, were strangers to the name, or at least to the faith, of Christ; and we may suspect, without any breach of charity or candor, that in the hour of savage license, when every passion was inflamed, and every restraint was removed, the precepts of the gospel seldom influenced the behavior of the Gothic Christians. The writers, the best disposed to exaggerate their clemency, have freely confessed, that a cruel slaughter was made of the Romans; and that the streets of the city were filled with dead bodies, which remained without burial during the general consternation. The

despair of the citizens was sometimes converted into fury; and whenever the barbarians were provoked by opposition, they extended the promiscuous massacre to the feeble, the innocent, and the helpless. The private revenge of forty thousand slaves was exercised without pity or remorse; and the ignominious lashes, which they had formerly received, were washed away in the blood of the guilty, or obnoxious, families.

"The matrons and virgins of Rome were exposed to injuries more dreadful, in the apprehension of chastity, than death itself; and the ecclesiastical historian has selected an example of female virtue, for the admiration of future ages. A Roman lady, of singular beauty and orthodox faith, had excited the impatient desires of a young Goth, who, according to the sagacious remark of Sozomen, was attached to the Arian heresy. Exasperated by her obstinate resistance, he drew his sword, and, with the anger of a lover, slightly wounded her neck. The bleeding heroine still continued to brave his resentment, and to repel his love, till the ravisher desisted from his unavailing efforts, respectfully conducted her to the sanctuary of the Vatican, and gave six pieces of gold to the guards of the church, on condition that they should restore her inviolate to the arms of her husband. Such instances of courage and generosity were not extremely common. The brutal soldiers satisfied their sensual appetites, without consulting either the inclination or the duties of their female captives.

"But avarice is an insatiate and universal passion; since the enjoyment of almost every object that can afford pleasure to the different tastes and tempers of mankind may be procured by the possession of wealth. In the pillage of Rome, a just preference was given to gold and jewels, which contain the greatest value in the smallest compass and weight; but, after these portable riches had been removed by the more diligent robbers, the palaces of Rome were rudely stripped of their splendid and costly furniture. The sideboards of massy plate, and the variegated wardrobes of silk and purple, were irregularly piled in the wagons, that always followed the march of a Gothic army. The most exquisite works of art were roughly handled, or wantonly destroyed; many a statue was melted for the sake of the precious materials; and many a vase, in the division of the spoil, was shivered into fragments by the stroke of a battle-axe. The acquisition of riches served only to stimulate the avarice of the rapacious barbarians, who proceeded, by threats, by blows, and by tortures, to force from their prisoners the confession of hidden treasure. Visible splendor and expense were alleged as the proof of a plentiful fortune; the appearance of poverty was imputed to a parsimonious disposition; and the obstinacy of some misers, who endured the most cruel torments before they would discover the secret object of their affection, was

fatal to many unhappy wretches, who expired under the lash, for refusing to reveal their imaginary treasures.

"The edifices of Rome, though the damage has been much exaggerated, received some injury from the violence of the Goths. At their entrance through the Salarian gate, they fired the adjacent houses to guide their march, and to distract the attention of the citizens; the flames, which encountered no obstacle in the disorder of the night, consumed many private and public buildings; and the ruins of the palace of Sallust remained, in the age of Justinian, a stately monument of the Gothic conflagration. Yet a contemporary historian has observed, that fire could scarcely consume the enormous beams of solid brass, and that the strength of man was insufficient to subvert the foundations of ancient structures. Some truth may possibly be concealed in his devout assertion, that the wrath of Heaven supplied the imperfections of hostile rage; and that the proud Forum of Rome, decorated with the statues of so many gods and heroes, was levelled in the dust by the stroke of lightning.

"Whatever might be the numbers of equestrian or plebeian rank, who perished in the massacre of Rome, it is confidently affirmed that only one senator lost his life by the sword of the enemy. But it was not easy to compute the multitudes, who, from an honorable station and a prosperous fortune, were suddenly reduced to the miserable condition of captives and exiles. As the barbarians had more occasion for money than for slaves, they fixed at a moderate price the redemption of their indigent prisoners; and the ransom was often paid by the benevolence of their friends, or the charity of strangers. The captives, who were regularly sold, either in open market, or by private contract, would have legally regained their native freedom, which it was impossible for a citizen to lose, or to alienate. But as it was soon discovered that the vindication of their liberty would endanger their lives; and that the Goths, unless they were tempted to sell, might be provoked to murder, their useless prisoners; the civil jurisprudence had been already qualified by a wise regulation, that they should be obliged to serve the moderate term of five years, till they had discharged by their labor the price of their redemption.

"The nations who invaded the Roman empire, had driven before them, into Italy, whole troops of hungry and affrighted provincials, less apprehensive of servitude than of famine. The calamities of Rome and Italy dispersed the inhabitants to the most lonely, the most secure, the most distant places of refuge. While the Gothic cavalry spread terror and desolation along the sea-coast of Campania and Tuscany, the little island of Igilium, separated by a narrow channel from the Argentarian promontory, repulsed, or eluded, their hostile attempts; and at so small a distance from Rome, great numbers of citizens were securely concealed in the

thick woods of that sequestered spot. The ample patrimonies, which many senatorian families possessed in Africa, invited them, if they had time, and prudence, to escape from the ruin of their country, to embrace the shelter of that hospitable province. The most illustrious of these fugitives was the noble and pious Proba, the widow of the praefect Petronius. After the death of her husband, the most powerful subject of Rome, she had remained at the head of the Anician family, and successively supplied, from her private fortune, the expense of the consulships of her three sons.

"When the city was besieged and taken by the Goths, Proba supported, with Christian resignation, the loss of immense riches; embarked in a small vessel, from whence she beheld, at sea, the flames of her burning palace, and fled with her daughter Leta, and her granddaughter, the celebrated virgin, Demetrias, to the coast of Africa. The benevolent profusion with which the matron distributed the fruits, or the price, of her estates, contributed to alleviate the misfortunes of exile and captivity. But even the family of Proba herself was not exempt from the rapacious oppression of Count Heraclian, who basely sold, in matrimonial prostitution, the noblest maidens of Rome to the lust or avarice of the Syrian merchants. The Italian fugitives were dispersed through the provinces, along the coast of Egypt and Asia, as far as Constantinople and Jerusalem; and the village of Bethlem, the solitary residence of St. Jerom and his female converts, was crowded with illustrious beggars of either sex, and every age, who excited the public compassion by the remembrance of their past fortune.

"This awful catastrophe of Rome filled the astonished empire with grief and terror. So interesting a contrast of greatness and ruin,

277

disposed the fond credulity of the people to deplore, and even to exaggerate, the afflictions of the queen of cities. The clergy, who applied to recent events the lofty metaphors of oriental prophecy, were sometimes tempted to confound the destruction of the capital and the dissolution of the globe."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 22-24, 26.*

A. T. J.

(To be continued.)

**"Some One-Thousand-Dollar Reasons for Keeping Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18 , pp. 279, 280.**

HAVING shown that the Sabbath was given "at the beginning of human history," "for the whole human race, and should be observed by every human being;" having shown that the law of the Sabbath not only has never been abrogated, but that it "*can never be abrogated,*" Mr. Waffle proceeds thus:—

"Accepting the conclusion that the fourth commandment is still in force, it may very properly be asked, 'Why then do not Christians obey it by keeping holy the seventh day of the week, as it directs? By what right is this plain precept disregarded and the first day of the week observed?' This question is a natural one, and unless a satisfactory answer can be given, the Christian world must stand convicted of error."—*P. 184.*

Here are some important acknowledgments. It is acknowledged (1) that the fourth commandment "directs" that "the seventh day of the week" shall be kept holy. This is important in this connection in view of the claim so often made nowadays by Sunday-keepers that the fourth commandment does not refer to any particular day. And (2) it is acknowledged that this "plain precept" is 'disregarded' by Christians. We think he does well to state that "unless a satisfactory answer can be given" to the question as to why this is, "the Christian world must stand convicted of error." We are perfectly satisfied that the Christian world must stand convicted of error on this question. And to prove that this is so, we need nothing better than Mr. Waffle's one-thousand-dollar-prize essay; and that is the use that we propose to make of it in this occasion.

The Fourth Commandment, which Mr. Waffle here admits "directs" that "the seventh day of the week" shall be kept holy, is the law of the Sabbath. Says Mr. Waffle, "The law of the Sabbath can never be abrogated."—*P. 157.* Now as the law of the Sabbath directs that the seventh day of the week shall be kept holy, and as that law can never be abrogated, it is plainly proven that the "Christian world," in disregarding "this plain precept," must stand convicted of error.

Again, Mr. Waffle says:—

"Unless it can be shown that the law of the Sabbath, given at the creation, has been repealed by a new legislative act of God, it is still binding upon all men who learn of it."—*P. 136.*

And:—

"Up to the time of Christ's death no change had been made in the day." "The authority must be sought in the words or in the example of the inspired apostles."—*P. 186.*

Then he quotes Matt 16:19, and John 20:23, and says:—

"It is generally understood that these words gave to the apostles supreme authority in legislating for the church. . . . So far as the record shows, they did not, however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week."—*P. 187.*

Now as "the law of the Sabbath" "is still binding upon all men who learn of it" "unless it has been repealed by a new legislative act of God;" as that law "directs" the observance of "the seventh day of the week;" as "up to the time of Christ's death, no change had been made in the day;" as "the authority [for the change] must be sought in the

words or in the example of the inspired apostles," to whom (according to Mr. Waffle's claim) was given "supreme authority in legislating for the church;" and as

in the exercise of that legislative authority, "they *did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath*, and its observance on the first day of the week;" as, therefore, there has been no new legislative act of God—by Mr. Waffle's own words it stands proven to a demonstration that the law of the Sabbath which enjoins the observance of "the seventh day of week" is still binding upon all men, and that in disregarding "this plain precept" "the Christian world must stand convicted of error."

Again we read:—

"If the law of the Sabbath, *as it appeared in the ten commandments*, has been abolished, it must have been done by some decree of Jehovah. Where have we the record of such a decree? Through what prophet or apostle was it spoken?" "We can find no words of Christ derogatory to this institution as it was originally established, or as it was intended to be observed." "There is nothing in the writings of the apostles which, when fairly interpreted, implies the abrogation of the Sabbath."—*Pp. 160, 165, 183.*

The law of the Sabbath, "*as it appeared in the ten commandments*," is the fourth commandment. And that commandment, by Mr. Waffle's own interpretation, "directs" that "the seventh day of the week" shall be kept holy. Now as the abolition of that commandment would require some decree of Jehovah; and as no such decree has ever been recorded, nor spoken, neither by prophet nor by apostle, the obligation of the fourth commandment still remains upon all men to keep holy "the seventh day of the week." Therefore, in disregarding this "plain precept," "the Christian world must stand convicted of error."

We must recur to a sentence before quoted. It is this:—

"The *authority* [for the change from the seventh to the first day of the week] must be sought in the words or in the example of the inspired apostles."

Now with that please read this:—

"A law can be repealed only by the same authority that enacted it. It certainly cannot be done away by those who are subject to it."—*P. 160.*

Was the law of the Sabbath enacted by the authority of the words or the example of the inspired apostles? Was it enacted by the authority of inspired men of any class, or at any time? No. The very idea is preposterous. Then it can never be repealed by the authority of inspired men, be they apostles or what not. That law was enacted by the living God in person. And it can never be repealed except by the personal act of the Lord himself. Any attempt of an inspired man to nullify any portion of the moral law *would vitiate his inspiration*. "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. This is also conveyed in Mr. Waffle's argument: "It certainly cannot be done away by those who are subject to it." The inspired apostles were subject to the law of the Sabbath, as well as to all the rest of the law of God. And to charge to their words or to their example, the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, is to deny their inspiration,

to declare that there is no light in them, and to place them beyond the pale of being men of God. This, too, is even admitted in Mr. Waffle's argument. He says:—

"There is nothing in the example of the apostles to oblige the most tender conscience to abstain from secular employment on the first day of the week, if there is no other authority for observing a weekly Sabbath."—*P. 160.*

Please bear in mind (1) that the aim of this one-thousand-dollar prize essay is to prove that the first day of the week is the true, genuine, and only weekly Sabbath; (2) that the author of the essay admits that the fourth commandment "directs" that "the seventh day of the week" is to be kept holy; (3) and that he likewise declares that the apostles, as supreme legislators for the church, "did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week." Then it is plain that all that remains to which he can appeal, and in fact the only thing to which he does appeal as authority for keeping the first day of the week, is the *example* of the apostles. Then when even this he sweeps away with the declaration that "there is nothing in the example of the apostles to oblige the most tender conscience to abstain from secular employment on the first day of the week," his argument leaves not a vestige of authority upon which to rest the observance of the first day of the week. Thus, again, he demonstrates that in disregarding the "plain precept" of the fourth commandment, which "directs" the "keeping holy the seventh day of the week," and which is "still in force," "the Christian world must stand convicted of error."

That is exactly what we have believed for years. It is just what we are constantly endeavoring to set before the "Christian world," as well as before the world in general. And we are thankful that the American Sunday-school Union, by its one-thousand-dollar prize, has enabled us to lay before our readers such a conclusive demonstration of it. We are not prepared to say but what the Union has done a good work in awarding the one-thousand-dollar prize to the essay of Mr. A. E. Waffle, M. A., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature, etc., etc.; for we cannot see how it would be possible to put together an argument for the first day of the week which could more positively convict the Christian world of error in disregarding the plain precept to keep the seventh day.

J.

**"One of the Devil's Devices" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 18 , p. 280.**

PAUL, in referring to Satan, on a certain occasion, said, "We are not ignorant of his devices." A good many people are ignorant of his devices. In many cases, however, this is no fault of his, for he makes no effort at all to conceal them; but rather makes exertions to openly advertise them to all. One of his latest and most mischievous devices is now freely advertised by his agents in flaring posters in the most public places. This poster reads as follows:—

"Lorillard's Cognac Cocktails: A Chew That Beats a Drink."

Which, being interpreted, means that Mr. Lorillard, the tobacco king, now furnishes a brand of tobacco so saturated with French brandy, and so doctored up with the stuff of which "cocktails" are made, that to take a chew of it is better than to take a drink of liquor. And thus the appetite for strong drink is directly created and fastened upon those who use the tobacco. It has been hitherto denied that the use of tobacco does tend to create the desire for strong drink. But that can be denied no longer, when the fact is publicly and widely advertised that now a chew of "Lorillard's Cognac Cocktail" drink. Nor is it to be supposed for a moment that this particular brand of tobacco is the only one that is so prepared. In the case of this brand the fact is boldly avowed, and that is all the difference; unless perhaps this is somewhat more heavily dosed than other brands.

Nor yet is this confined to chewing tobacco. Smoking tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes, are all laden with nerviness, such as vanilla, valerian, cascarilla bark, New England rum, and even opium; and cigarette tobacco is the most highly "flavored" of all, with chewing tobacco next. This is as stated by a manufacturer of the stuff itself. In April, 1882, it was stated by a large tobacco manufacturer in New York City, that he personally knew *fifteen* chemists who were "employed exclusively in factories in that city" whose duties consisted in "flavoring of fillings and in developing and heightening the narcotic powers of the weed, and thus making it marketable at higher prices." He declared that by the use of vanilla and valerian "the dullest and weakest stems may be flavored up into a fair article of tobacco." Vanilla, valerian, and cascarilla bark, all three, enter into the composition of cigarette tobacco. The vanilla "flavor" is used "in the form of an *alcoholic* tincture;" while another formula is composed of a combination of vanilla, valerian, and New England rum. It can be very readily seen that the direct and inevitable tendency of the use of manufactured tobacco in any form is to create an appetite for the strongest kind of intoxicating drinks.

A great point is made against the Chinese in that they spread the opium curse in this country. Whereas the Chinese would be comparatively powerless in this, were it not for the opium and its kindred drugs in the cigars and other forms of tobacco, by which are sown the seeds of the curse. It is opium in the "best" Havana cigars, that makes them the "best." It is the opium in the fine Havana, that has such a soothing effect upon the smoker, and enslaves him more than does the tobacco.

The use of tobacco alone, or of strong drink alone, is destructive enough to satisfy anything or anybody, unless it should be the devil; but the two combined, as the manufacturers of tobacco now combine them, certainly can leave nothing more destructive to body and soul, to be desired even by the devil himself. And this introduces a grave question as to how much longer Prohibitionists, and temperance reformers generally, can leave out of their work the unqualified condemnation of the use of tobacco in any form? To leave it out is to do but half their work, if they do even as much as half. With tobacco in its various forms constantly creating and fastening upon its victims by the thousands the appetite for strong drink, prohibition seems a long way off, while it confines its efforts to the effect, instead of striking at the cause as well. We are happy to say that Seventh-day Adventists are, and have ever been, uncompromisingly opposed to

the use of either tobacco or strong drink; for in a measure at least, we are not ignorant of Satan's devices.

J.

**May 20, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 19 , pp. 292, 293.**

*(Continued.)*

"THE retreat of the victorious Goths, who evacuated Rome on the sixth day [A.D. 410, Aug. 29] might be the result of prudence; but it was not surely the effect of fear. At the head of an army encumbered with rich and weighty spoils, their intrepid leader advanced along the Appian way into the southern provinces of Italy, destroying whatever dared to oppose his passage, and contenting himself with the plunder of the unresisting country. The fate of Capua, the proud and luxurious metropolis of Campania, and which was respected, even in its decay, as the eighth city of the empire, is buried in oblivion; whilst the adjacent town of Nola has been illustrated, on this occasion, by the sanctity of Paulinus, who was successively a consul, a monk, and a bishop. . . . Nola was not saved from the general devastation; and the captive bishop was protected only by the general opinion of his innocence and poverty.

"Above four years [A.D. 408-412] elapsed from the successful invasion of Italy by the arms of Alaric, to the voluntary retreat of the Goths under the conduct of his successor Adolphus; and, during the whole time, they reigned without control over a country, which, in the opinion of the ancients, had united all the various excellences of nature and art. The prosperity, indeed, which Italy had attained in the auspicious age of the Antonines, had gradually declined with the decline of the empire. The fruits of a long peace perished under the rude grasp of the barbarians; and they themselves were incapable of tasting the more elegant refinements of luxury, which had been prepared for the use of the soft and polished Italians. Each soldier, however, claimed an ample portion of the substantial plenty, the corn and cattle, oil and wine, that was daily collected and consumed in the Gothic camp; and the principal warriors insulted the villas and gardens, once inhabited by Lucullus and Cicero, along the beautiful coast of Campania. Their trembling captives, the sons and daughters of Roman senators, presented, in goblets of gold and gems, large draughts of Falernian wine to the haughty victors; who stretched their huge limbs under the shade of plane-trees, artificially disposed to exclude the scorching rays, and to

admit the genial warmth, of the sun. These delights were enhanced by the memory of past hardships: the comparison of their native soil, the bleak and barren hills of Scythia, and the frozen banks of the Elbe and Danube, added new charms to the felicity of the Italian climate.

"Whether fame, or conquest, or riches, were the object of Alaric, he pursued that object with an indefatigable ardor, which could neither be quelled by adversity nor satiated by success. No sooner had he reached the extreme land of Italy, than he was attracted by the neighboring prospect of a fertile and peaceful island. Yet even the possession of Sicily he considered only as an intermediate step to the important expedition, which he already meditated against the continent of Africa. The Straits of Rhegium and Messina are twelve miles in length, and, in the narrowest passage, about one mile and a half broad; and the fabulous monsters of the deep, the rocks of Scylla, and the whirlpool of Charybdis, could terrify none but the most timid and unskillful mariners.

"Yet as soon as the first division of the Goths had embarked, a sudden tempest arose, which sunk, or scattered, many of the transports; their courage was daunted by the terrors of a new element; and the whole design was defeated by the premature death of Alaric [A.D. 410], which fixed, after a short illness, the fatal term of his conquests. The ferocious character of the barbarians was displayed in the funeral of a hero whose valor and fortune they celebrated with mournful applause. By the labor of a captive multitude, they forcibly diverted the course of the Busentinus, a small river that washes the walls of Consentia. The royal sepulcher, adorned with the splendid spoils and trophies of Rome, was constructed in the vacant bed; the waters were then restored to their natural channel; and the secret spot, where the remains of Alaric had been deposited, was forever concealed by the inhuman massacre of the prisoners, who had been employed to execute the work.

"The personal animosities and hereditary feuds of the barbarians were suspended by the strong necessity of their affairs; and the brave Adolphus, the brother-in-law of the deceased monarch, was unanimously elected to succeed to his throne. The character and political system of the new king of the Goths may be best understood from his own conversation with an illustrious citizen of Narbonne; who afterwards, in a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, related it to St. Jerom, in the presence of the historian Orosius. 'In the full confidence of valor and victory, I once aspired,' said Adolphus, 'to change the face of the universe; to obliterate the name of Rome; to erect on its ruins the dominion of the Goths; and to acquire, like Augustus, the immortal fame of the founder of a new empire. By repeated experiments, I was gradually convinced, that laws are essentially necessary to maintain and regulate a well-constituted state; and that the fierce, untractable humor of the Goths was incapable of bearing the salutary yoke of laws and civil government. From that moment I proposed to myself a different object of glory and ambition; and it is now my sincere wish that the gratitude of future ages should acknowledge the merit of a stranger, who employed the sword of the Goths, not to subvert, but to restore and maintain, the prosperity of the Roman empire.'

"With these pacific views, the successor of Alaric suspended the operations of war; and seriously negotiated with the Imperial court a treaty of friendship and alliance. It was the interest of the ministers of Honorius, who were now released from the obligation of their extravagant oath, to deliver Italy from the intolerable weight of the Gothic powers; and they readily accepted their service against the tyrants and Barbarians who infested the provinces beyond the Alps. Adolphus, assuming the character of a Roman general, directed his march [A.D. 412] from the extremity of Campania to the southern provinces of Gaul. His troops, either by force of agreement, immediately occupied the cities of Narbonne, Thoulouse, and Bordeaux; and though they were repulsed by Count Boniface from the walls of Marseilles, they soon extended their quarters from the Mediterranean to the ocean.

"The oppressed provincials might exclaim, that the miserable remnant, which the enemy had spared, was cruelly ravished by their pretended allies; yet some specious colors were not wanting to palliate, or justify the violence of the Goths. The cities of Gaul, which they attacked, might perhaps be considered as in a state of rebellion against the government of Honorius; the articles of the treaty, or the secret instructions of the court, might sometimes be alleged in favor of the seeming usurpations of Adolphus; and the guilt of any irregular, unsuccessful act of hostility might always be imputed, with an appearance of truth, to the ungovernable spirit of a

Barbarian host, impatient of peace or discipline. The luxury of Italy had been less effectual to soften the temper, than to relax the courage, of the Goths; and they had imbibed the vices, without imitating the arts and institutions, of civilized society.

"The professions of Adolphus were probably sincere, and his attachment to the cause of the republic was secured by the ascendant which a Roman princess had acquired over the heart and understanding of the Barbarian king. Placidia, the daughter of the great Theodosius, and of Galla, his second wife, had received a royal education in the palace of Constantinople; but the eventful story of her life is connected with the revolutions which agitated the Western empire under the reign of her brother Honorius. When Rome was first invested by the arms of Alaric, Placidia, who was then about twenty years of age, resided in the city; and her ready consent to the death of her cousin Serena has a cruel and ungrateful appearance, which, according to the circumstances of the action, may be aggravated, or excused, by the consideration of her tender age. The victorious barbarians detained, either as a hostage or a captive, the sister of Honorius; but, while she was exposed to the disgrace of following round Italy the motions of a Gothic camp, she experienced, however, a decent and respectful treatment. The authority of Jornandes, who praises the beauty of Placidia, may perhaps be counterbalanced by the silence, the expressive silence, of her flatterers; yet the splendor of her birth, the bloom of youth, the elegance of manners, and the dexterous insinuation which she condescended to employ, made a deep impression on the mind of Adolphus; and the Gothic king aspired to call himself the brother of the emperor.

"The ministers of Honorius rejected with disdain the proposal of an alliance so injurious to every sentiment of Roman pride; and repeatedly urged the restitution of Placidia, as an indispensable condition of the treaty of peace. But the daughter of Theodosius submitted, without reluctance, to the desires of the conqueror, a young and valiant prince, who yielded to Alaric in loftiness of stature, but who excelled in the more attractive qualities of grace and beauty. The marriage of Adolphus and Placidia was consummated before the Goths retired from Italy; and the solemn, perhaps the anniversary day of their nuptials was afterwards celebrated in the house of Ingenuus, one of the most illustrious citizens of Narbonne in Gaul. The bride, attired and adorned like a Roman empress, was placed on a throne of state; and the king of the Goths, who assumed, on this occasion, the Roman habit, contented himself with a less honorable seat by her side. The nuptial gift, which, according to the custom of his nation, was offered to Placidia, consisted of the rare and magnificent spoils of her country. Fifty beautiful youths, in silken robes, carried a basin in

each hand; and one of these basins was filled with pieces of gold, the other with precious stones of an inestimable value. . . . The barbarians enjoyed the insolence of their triumph; and the provincials rejoiced in this alliance, which tempered, by the mild influence of love and reason, the fierce spirit of their Gothic lord.

"The hundred basins of gold and gems, presented to Placidia at her nuptial feast, formed an inconsiderable portion of the Gothic treasures; of which some extraordinary specimens may be selected from the history of the successors of Adolphus. Many curious and costly ornaments of pure gold, enriched with jewels, were found in their palace of Narbonne, when it was pillaged, in the sixth century, by the Franks: sixty cups, caps, or chalices; fifteen *patens*, or plates, for the use of the communion; twenty boxes, or cases, to hold the books of the Gospels; this consecrated wealth was distributed by the son of Clovis among the churches of his dominions, and his pious liberality seems to upbraid some former sacrilege of the Goths.

"They possessed, with more security of conscience, the famous *missorium*, or great dish for the service of the table, of massy gold, of the weight of five hundred pounds, and of far superior value, from the precious stones, the exquisite workmanship, and the tradition, that it had been presented by Etius, the patrician, to Torismond, king of the Goths. One of the successors of Torismond purchased the aid of the French monarch by the promise of this magnificent gift. When he was seated on the throne of Spain, he delivered it with reluctance to the ambassadors of Dagobert; despoiled them on the road; stipulated, after a long ne-

280

gotiation, the inadequate ransom of two hundred thousand pieces of gold; and preserved the *missorium*, as the pride of the Gothic treasury. When that treasury, after the conquest of Spain, was plundered by the Arabs, they admired, and they have celebrated, another object still more remarkable; a table of considerable size, of one single piece of solid emerald, encircled with three rows of fine pearls, supported by three hundred and sixty-five feet of gems and massy gold, and estimated at the price of five hundred thousand pieces of gold. Some portion of the Gothic treasures might be the gift of friendship, or the tribute of obedience; but the far greater part had been the fruits of war and rapine, the spoils of the empire, and perhaps of Rome."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 26-30.*

J.

(To be continued.)

**"Some One-Thousand-Dollar Reasons for Keeping Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 19 , pp. 295, 296.**

WE come now in this one-thousand-dollar-prize essay to the discussion of the change from the seventh to the first day of the week in the observance of the Sabbath. It is true that, as already shown, the author of this essay leaves no room for any change; nevertheless he insists that there has been a change, and insists on giving "reasons" for it. And as reasons to be worth \$1,000 ought to be pretty good, we shall, as far as in us lies, give our readers the full benefit of them. To get a full and fair statement of the question before us we shall quote again a passage previously referred to, as follows:—

"Accepting the conclusion that the Fourth Commandment is still in force, it may very properly be asked, Why then do not Christians obey it by keeping holy the seventh day of the week, as it directs? By what right is this plain precept disregarded and the first day of the week observed? This question is a natural one, and unless a satisfactory answer can be given, the Christian world must stand convicted of error."

Now we are prepared to hear what he proposes shall be the "satisfactory answer," and which we have good reason to suppose the American Sunday-school Union considers "a satisfactory answer," seeing they paid \$1,000 for it. Mr. Waffle's first effort at "a satisfactory answer" is the following:—

"The fact that the observance of the first day of the week is so nearly universal and has been of such long continuance is very significant."

That certainly is not a satisfactory answer. In fact, it is no answer at all. It is simply a begging of the question. But he says it is "very significant." Significant of what? Why, this:—

"It suggests that there must have been some good and sufficient reason for the change."—*P. 184.*

That is to say: The "plain precept" of God has been disregarded by nearly everybody for a long while; therefore there must be some good and sufficient reason for it. In other words: It must be right because nearly everybody does it. But he knows that such doctrine as that will never do, even in a one-thousand-dollar-prize essay, so he immediately adds this caution:—

"Too much should not be made of this, for the church has sanctioned many false doctrines and been tainted by many corrupt practices."

That is the truth. And one of the falsest of her many false doctrines, and one of the most corrupt of her many corrupt practices, is the disregard for the "plain precept" of God as laid down in the fourth commandment, and the substitution for it of the observance of the heathen institution of Sunday, in defense of which Mr. A. E. Waffle writes, and the American Sunday-school Union prints, this essay, which was counted worth a thousand dollars.

His next attempt at a satisfactory answer is this:

"We have taken the custom of keeping the Sabbath on the first day of the week as we found it; and while this does not exempt us from the duty of inquiry, it throws upon those who question our course 'the burden of proof.'"—*P. 185.*

Can anything be too absurd to find a place in a prize essay on the Sunday-sabbath? Here is a proposition that is contrary to the commonest king of common sense, as well as to the rules of logic and of evidence. Says Dr. Carson: "It is self-evident that in every question *the burden of proof* lies on the side of the affirmative. An affirmation is of no authority without proof. It is as if it had not been affirmed. If I assert a doctrine, I must prove it; for until it is proved it can have no claim to reception. Strictly speaking, it exists only on its proof; and a mere affirmation of it is only an existence on affirmation. If I obstinately refuse proof, I leave my doctrine without foundation, and a simple denial of it is sufficient. No man can be called upon to disprove that which alleges no proof. It is a truth as clear as the light of the sun, that, in every instance, proof lies with the affirmative, or with the holders of the doctrine or rite. If *presumption* has the privilege of casting the burden of proof on the other side, then every man has a right to decline defending his own opinions, and to cast the burden of proof upon those who dispute them. Can anything be more monstrous?" Yet in this grand prize essay this monstrosity is just what is presented as "a satisfactory answer" to the question, "By what right is the plain precept of the fourth commandment disregarded and the first day of the week observed?"

One other statement he makes in this connection, which we wish to transcribe. He says:—

"It is not claimed that the apostles began to keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week immediately after the death of Christ."—*P. 189.*

Then on what day *did* they keep the Sabbath immediately after the death of Christ? Did they keep it on the seventh day, or did they keep no Sabbath at all between the death of Christ and the time when it is claimed they began to keep the first day of the week? In either case, would there not be just as much apostolic example for *not* keeping the first day of the week as there would be for keeping it? There certainly is.

After having begged the question of "a satisfactory answer" through more than five pages, he comes to the discussion of the question of reasons for the change. This he introduces with the question:—

"Was there any reason for such a change?"—*P. 190.*

And in answer to his own question he again begins at once to beg the question thus:—

"If the apostles were guided by the Holy Spirit when they made it, we need not ask for their reason."

This might be readily enough allowed if the apostles had anywhere told us that they did make the change. But when, as Mr. Waffle himself says, "so far as the record shows, they did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day;" and when men insist upon palming off upon us by the authority of the apostles

something that the apostles knew nothing about, we insist that we *do* need to ask for the reason.

But Mr. Waffle continues to beg his question. He says:—

"But since the reality of the change is disputed, we may say that if good reasons for it can be discovered, they furnish presumptive proof that it really took place under divine direction."

But if reasons were discovered which should seem to us good, does it follow that these would be good reasons in the sight of God? Does it follow that these reasons will bear the test of the Judgment? And if, without any command of God, reasons should be discovered which seem to us good for the performance of what we deem religious duties, and we insist upon men's performing these supposed duties, then what is that but to make human reason, instead of the word of God, the standard of human duty? And what is that but to usurp the

296

prerogative of God? And what is that but to imitate the papacy? This is just what is done by Protestants when they insist upon the observance of Sunday, when, even as they admit, so far as the record of God shows, there is no command for it. Though they number to the one hundredth figure their so-called reasons for it, we care not. If there be no command of God for it, there can be no reason for it.

At last, by the help of all this beating about, Mr. Waffle actually reaches the place where he introduces the "reasons" which he has begged so hard may be admitted. The first of these is this:—

"One such reason can undoubtedly be found in the abuses which had gathered around the Jewish Sabbath. Christ would not burden his church with such a Sabbath as the rabbis had made; and the easiest way to get rid of these abuses was to change the day."—*P. 190.*

The second reason is:—

"The Gentile churches would never have accepted the Sabbath of the Jews as they had come to observe it."—*Id.*

The third reason is:—

"Christians were not to observe the Sabbath precisely as the Jews had kept it before these abuses arose and while they were acting in accordance with the divine law."—*P. 191.*

To take the space to refute such puerile "reasons" as these, seems to us an imposition upon the good sense and intelligence of our readers. As for the first, if there be any truth at all in it, we should be obliged to believe that Christ changed almost every precept of God; for there was scarcely one which the rabbis, the scribes, and Pharisees had not made void by their traditions and abuses. As for the second, it really has no place; for the great Author of Christianity never asked the Gentile churches, nor any other churches, to accept "the Sabbath of *the Jews* as they had come to observe it." But he does ask all to accept the Sabbath of *the Lord* as he himself observed it, and as he taught that it should be observed. For this cause he swept away the traditions and abuses that the Jews had heaped upon it. As for the third, what is said there is, in fact, that "Christians were not to

observe the Sabbath by acting in accordance with the divine law" (!), which is simply abominable.

But such are the "reasons" for disregarding the plain precept of Jehovah. It was for such "reasons" as this that the American Sunday-school Union, "after a painstaking and protracted examination," paid a prize of \$1,000. There is, however, just one redeeming feature of this subject. That is, the author of these "reasons" relieves the apostles of all responsibility for them. He says:—

"We do not say that the apostles saw these reasons and were governed by them. We offer them in explanation of the fact that they were led by the Spirit to make the change, and as suggesting a probability that it would be made."—*P. 192.*

We think Mr. Waffle does well to relieve the apostles from the folly of any knowledge of these preposterous "reasons." And we are certain that all will do well to remain just as far from seeing and being governed by these "reasons" as were the apostles. In this we have an instance of "apostolic example" that we can all safely follow. J.

**May 27, 1886**

**"The Visigoths in the Western Empire. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 20 , p. 308.**

*(Concluded).*

"AT a time when it was universally confessed, that almost every man in the empire was superior in personal merit to the princes whom the accident of their birth had seated on the throne, a rapid succession of usurpers [A.D. 411-416], regardless of the fate of their predecessors, still continued to arise. This mischief was peculiarly felt in the provinces of Spain and Gaul, where the principles of order and obedience had been extinguished by war and rebellion. Before Constantine resigned the purple [A.D. 411], and in the fourth month of the siege of Arles, intelligence was received in the Imperial camp, that Jovinus has assumed the diadem at Mentz, in the Upper Germany, at the instigation of Goar, king of the Alani, and of Guntiarus, king of the Burgundians; and that the candidate, on whom they had bestowed the empire, advanced with a formidable host of barbarians, from the banks of the Rhine to those of the Rhone. Every circumstance is dark and extraordinary in the short history of the reign of Jovinus. It was natural to expect, that a brave and skilful general, at the head of a victorious army, would have asserted, in a field of battle, the justice of the cause of Honorius. The hasty retreat of Constantius [a general of the empire] might be justified by weighty reasons; but he resigned, without a struggle, the possession of Gaul; and

Dardanus, the Praetorian praefect, is recorded as the only magistrate who refused to yield obedience to the usurper.

"When the Goths, two years after the siege of Rome, established their quarters in Gaul [A.D. 412], it was natural to suppose that their inclinations could be divided only between the emperor Honorius, with whom they had formed a recent alliance, and the degraded Attalus, whom they reserved in their camp for the occasional purpose of acting the part of a musician or a monarch. Yet in a moment of disgust, (for which it is not easy to assign a cause, or a date), Adolphus connected himself with the usurper of Gaul; and imposed on Attalus the ignominious task of negotiating the treaty, which ratified his own disgrace. We are again surprised to read, that, instead of considering the Gothic alliance as the firmest support of his throne, Jovinus upbraided, in dark and ambiguous language, the officious importunity of Attalus; that, scorning the advice of his great ally, he invested with the purple his brother Sebastian; and that he most imprudently accepted the service of Sarus, when that gallant chief, the soldier of Honorius, was provoked to desert the court of a prince, who knew not how to reward or punish.

"Adolphus, educated among a race of warriors, who esteemed the duty of revenge as the most precious and sacred portion of their inheritance, advanced with a body of ten thousand Goths to encounter the hereditary enemy of the house of Balti. He attacked Sarus at an unguarded moment, when he was accompanied only by eighteen or twenty of his valiant followers. United by friendship, animated by despair, but at length oppressed by multitudes, this band of heroes deserved the esteem, without exciting the compassion, of their enemies; and the lion was no sooner taken in the toils, than he was instantly dispatched. The death of Sarus dissolved the loose alliance which Adolphus still maintained with the usurpers of Gaul. He again listened to the dictates of love and prudence; and soon satisfied the brother of Placidia, by the assurance that he would immediately transmit to the palace of Ravenna the heads of the two tyrants, Jovinus and Sebastian. The king of the Goths executed his promise without difficulty or delay; the helpless brothers, unsupported by any personal merit, were abandoned by their barbarian auxiliaries; and the short opposition of Valentia was expiated by the ruin of one of the noblest cities of Gaul."

"The important present of the heads of Jovinus and Sebastian had approved the friendship of Adolphus, and restored Gaul to the obedience of his brother Honorius. Peace was incompatible with the situation and temper of the king of the Goths. He readily accepted the proposal [A.D. 414] of turning his victorious arms against the barbarians of Spain; the troops of Constantius

intercepted his communication with the seaports of Gaul, and gently pressed his march towards the Pyrenees; he passed the mountains, and surprised, in the name of the emperor, the city of Barcelona. The fondness of Adolphus for his Roman bride, was not abated by time or possession: and the birth of a son, surnamed, from his illustrious grandsire, Theodosius, appeared to fix him forever in the interest of the republic. The loss of that infant, whose remains were deposited in a silver coffin in one of the churches near Barcelona, afflicted his parents; but the grief of the Gothic king was suspended by the labors of the field; and the course of his victories was soon interrupted by domestic treason.

"He had imprudently received into his service one of the followers of Sarus; a barbarian of a daring spirit, but of a diminutive stature; whose secret desire of revenging the death of his beloved patron was continually irritated by the sarcasms of his insolent master. Adolphus was assassinated [A.D. 415] in the palace of Barcelona; the laws of the succession were violated by a tumultuous faction; and a stranger to the royal race, Singeric, the brother of Sarus himself, was seated on the Gothic throne. The first act of his reign was the inhuman murder of the six children of Adolphus, the issue of a former marriage, whom he tore, without pity, from the feeble arms of a venerable bishop. The unfortunate Placidia, instead of the respectful compassion, which she might have excited in the most savage breasts, was treated with cruel and wanton insult. The daughter of the emperor Theodosius, confounded among a crowd of vulgar captives, was compelled to march on foot above twelve miles, before the horse of a barbarian, the assassin of a husband whom Placidia loved and lamented.

"But Placidia soon obtained the pleasure of revenge, and the view of her ignominious sufferings might rouse an indignant people against the tyrant, who was assassinated on the seventh day of his usurpation. After the death of Singeric, the free choice of the nation bestowed the Gothic scepter on Wallia [A.D. 415-418], whose warlike and ambitious temper appeared, in the beginning of his reign, extremely hostile to the republic. He marched in arms from Barcelona to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, which the ancients revered and dreaded as the boundary of the world. But when he reached the southern promontory of Spain, and, from the rock now covered by the fortress of Gibraltar, contemplated the neighboring and fertile coast of Africa, Wallia resumed the designs of conquest, which had been interrupted by the death of Alaric. The winds and waves again disappointed the enterprise of the Goths; and the minds of a superstitious people were deeply affected by the repeated disasters of storms and shipwrecks.

"In this disposition the successor of Adolphus no longer refused to listen to a Roman ambassador, whose proposals were enforced

by the real, or supposed, approach of a numerous army, under the conduct of the brave Constantius. A solemn treaty was stipulated and observed; Placidia was honorably restored to her brother; six hundred thousand measures of wheat were delivered to the hungry Goths; and Wallia engaged to draw his sword in the service of the empire. A bloody war was instantly excited among the barbarians of Spain; and the contending princes are said to have addressed their letters, their ambassadors, and their hostages, to the throne of the Western emperor, exhorting him to remain a tranquil spectator of their contest; the events of which must be favorable to the Romans, by the mutual slaughter of their common enemies. The Spanish war was obstinately supported, during three campaigns, with desperate valor, and various success; and the martial achievements of Wallia diffused through the empire the superior renown of the Gothic hero. He exterminated the Silingi, who had irretrievably ruined the elegant plenty of the province of Bútica. He slew, in battle, the king of the Alani; *and the remains of those Scythian wanderers, who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were ever afterwards confounded.*

"The Vandals themselves, and the Suevi, yielded to the efforts of the invincible Goths. The promiscuous multitude of barbarians, whose retreat had been intercepted, were driven into the mountains of Galicia; where they still continued, in a narrow compass and on a barren soil, to exercise their domestic and implacable hostilities. In the pride of victory, Wallia was faithful to his engagements: he restored his Spanish conquests to the obedience of Honorius; and the tyranny of the Imperial officers soon reduced an oppressed people to regret the time of their barbarian servitude. While the event of the war was still doubtful, the first advantages obtained by the arms of Wallia had encouraged the court of Ravenna to decree the honors of a triumph to their feeble sovereign. He entered Rome like the ancient conquerors of nations; and if the monuments of servile corruption had not long since met with the fate which they deserved, we should probably find that a crowd of poets and orators, of magistrates and bishops, applauded the fortune, the wisdom, and the invincible courage, of the emperor Honorius.

"Such a triumph might have been justly claimed by the ally of Rome, if Wallia, before he repassed the Pyrenees, had extirpated the seeds of the Spanish war. *His victorious Goths, forty-three years after they had passed the Danube, were established [A.D. 419], according to the faith of treaties, in the possession of the second Aquitain; a maritime province between the Garonne and the Loire, under the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bourdeaux.* That metropolis, advantageously situated for the trade of the ocean, was built in a regular and elegant form; and its numerous

inhabitants were distinguished among the Gauls by their wealth, their learning, and the politeness of their manners. The adjacent province, which has been fondly compared to the garden of Eden, is blessed with a fruitful soil, and a temperate climate; the face of the country displayed the arts and the rewards of industry; and the Goths, after their martial toils, luxuriously exhausted the rich vineyards of Aquitain. The Gothic limits were enlarged by the additional gift of some neighboring dioceses; and *the successors of Alaric fixed their royal residence at Toulous* which included five populous quarters, or cities, within the spacious circuit of its walls."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 31, par. 35, 37-39. J.*

**"We Would See Jesus" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 20 , p. 311.**

"AND there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast; the same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desire him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus."

The desire of these Greeks was certainly a very natural one. They had come up to Jerusalem to worship, and had found the name of Jesus upon everybody's lips. From the highest to the lowest, from the proud and courted Pharisee to the outcast leper, from the high priest and the chief priests, supposed to be the purest in the nation, to the abandoned sinner, all, all were talking about Jesus. Of course not all praising him, not all glorifying him; the chief priests and the Pharisees were most bitterly opposed to him, and were only waiting impatiently for an opportunity to kill him, while the common people were anxious to make him, while the common people were anxious to make him a king. But whether it was to praise or to condemn; whether it was to kill or to make a king, the sole subject of it all was Jesus, and it was the most natural thing in the world that these Greeks should want to see the Person about whom so much was made.

From that day to this, the name that has been used most in this world is the name of Jesus. The one Person about whom more has been said, and of whom more has been made than of any other person this world ever saw, is the Man Christ Jesus. True, as at the first, some have praised him, and some have cursed him; some have worshiped him, while others have sought to kill him, crying, "Crush the wretch," and often he has been wounded in the house of his friends; still the name more than all others that is used in the wide world to-day, is the name of Jesus. And with those Greeks of old, we now say, "We would see Jesus."

Not, however, as they, simply because much is said of him, either for or against him; not because there are even now those, as Ingersoll, who would kill at least his name out of the earth; nor yet because there are those, as the National Reformers, who would take him by force and make him king of the United States. Not because of any of these things would we see him. But we would see him as he is, for what he is. For even as saith the Scripture, Having not seen him we love him (1 Peter 1:8); and because we love him we would see him. Having not seen him we love him because he first loved us. We love him

because he loved us and gave himself for us. We love him for his gentle pity for sinners such as we. We love him for his cheerful mercy to men so fearfully undeserving as are we. We love him because in "the great love wherewith he loved us" he, "his own self, bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." We love him for his lofty humanity. We love him for his "profound reverence for infinite goodness and truth." We love him for the moral force and the benign influence of his mighty character. We love him for his perfect goodness. For this cause would we see him. We would see him because of

—"the character he bears.

And all the forms of love he wears."

Yet we would not now see him as he *was*. We would not now see his visage so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. We would not now see him a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. We would not now see him oppressed and afflicted. We would not now see him taken as a lamb to the slaughter. We would not now see him in his travail of soul. We would not now see him in his dreadful agony on the cruel tree. No; we would see him as he *is*. We would see him "that liveth," though once dead, yet now "alive for evermore, Amen;" and who has "the keys of hell and of death." We would see him as the disciples saw him—"his face did shine as the sun," "and his raiment became shining," "white as the light," "exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them." We would see him as Stephen saw him—in glory, "standing on the right hand of God." We would see him as Paul saw him—shining in light "above the brightness of the sun." We would see him as John saw him—his head and his hairs white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters;" "and his countenance as the sun shineth in his strength." We would see him as Isaiah saw him—"sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up," and the train of his glory filling the heavenly temple; about him standing the bright seraphim shading their glorious faces from his ineffable glory, and crying one unto another, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:1-4 with John 12:41). We would see him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and would hear his mighty voice saying to his angels, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." And then and there, in the midst of the church, would we see him and hear his glorious voice singing that song of promised praise to the Father (Heb. 2:12). Oh, 'tis thus that "we would see Jesus."

And we thank God, not only for the hope that we *shall* see him as he is, but also that the signs are abundant all about us that soon this "blessed hope" shall be fulfilled. And the blessed promise is that we shall not only "see him as he is," but "we shall *be like him*." "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*." We would see Jesus. In this hope we live. For its fruition we wait. But while so living and waiting, we would never for a moment forget that he "that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is

pure." 1 John 3:2, 3. And, even so, we would indeed see Jesus.  
J.

**"Some One-Thousand-Dollar Reasons for Keeping Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 20 , pp. 312, 313.**

OUR readers have seen Mr. Waffle's and the American Sunday-school Union's, one-thousand-dollar reasons for disregarding and abandoning the plain precept to observe the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. There yet remains to be noticed the reason why the first day of the week is kept. Mr. Waffle tells us that the apostles "were led to observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath, and gradually to abandon the seventh, by a variety of occurrences which seemed to them to warrant the change, and which, when carefully studied, leave no doubt in our minds that they acted in accordance with the divine intention." But how Mr. Waffle knows that these things seemed to the apostles to warrant the change, he nowhere tells us. And, as the apostles themselves have nowhere said a word on the subject, we have no confidence in Mr. Waffle's imagination of motives which he attributes to them.

Of these "occurrences" he says:—

"The first of them was the resurrection of our Lord. Each of the evangelists mentions very particularly the fact that this took place upon the first day of the week, showing that they felt it important to mark the day. . . . But they might not have given the day the prominence they did if Christ had not distinguished it, by choosing it for most of his appearances to them and other disciples. On the same day on which he arose, he appeared no less than five times. . . . But the fact that Christ rose on that day and manifested himself so often to the disciples, *would not necessarily imply a purpose on his part to honor it*, had it not been for *subsequent occurrences*."—Pp. 192-194.

Here it is admitted that our knowledge of the purpose of Christ to honor the first day of the week depends upon occurrences other than his resurrection, and upon occurrences after those of that same day. Therefore, if these "subsequent occurrences" should not be what Mr. Waffle claims, then the fact stands confessed that we have nothing that implies a purpose of Christ to put honor on the first day of the week. Now the first of these subsequent occurrences he relates as follows:—

"For six days he did not appear to them at all, so far as the record shows; but 'on the eighth day, or as we should say, on the seventh day afterwards,' he appeared to the eleven as they were gathered in a closed room."—P. 194.

But there is no such record as that he appeared to his disciples "on the eighth day." The reference here is, of course, to John 20:26, which reads: "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." And when Inspiration has written "*after eight days*," we should like to know

by what right, or rule, it is that Mr. Waffle reads "on the eighth day," and then, not satisfied with that, gives it another turn and reads, "as we should say on the seventh day afterward." "On what meat doth this our Cesar feed that he is grown so great" that he can thus boldly manipulate the words of Inspiration? And what can a cause be worth that can be sustained only by resort to such unworthy shifts? It is true that Mr. Waffle quotes the clause from Canon Farrar, but we deny the right of Canon Farrar, or any other man, just as much as we deny the right of Mr. Waffle, to so manipulate the word of God. And it is one of the strongest evidences of the utter weakness of the Sunday cause that, to sustain it, such a consummate scholar as Canon Farrar is obliged to change the plain word of God. But someone may ask: Will not the Greek bear the construction that is thus given to the text? We say, emphatically, No. The words exactly as John wrote them, using English letters in place of Greek letters, are these, "*Kai meth hemeras okto*," and is, word for word, in English, "*And after days eight*." These are the very words that were penned by the beloved disciple, exactly as he penned them, by the Spirit of God; and when any man, we care not who he may be, changes them so as to make them read "on the eighth day," or "on the seventh day afterward," he is guilty of deliberately changing the word of God, as it was written by his own inspired apostle. And no cause can be the cause of God that is dependent for its support upon a change of the truth of God.

The next occurrence is the claim that Pentecost was on the first day of the week. But even though it were admissible that Pentecost was on Sunday, the word of God is still silent about the first day of the week being thereby set apart and made the Sabbath. And so long as we have only the opinions of men, and these opinions only the fruit of their own wishes, and these wishes supported only by their own imaginations, that Sunday is the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, so long we have the right to deny the truth of it, and to stand upon the "plain precept" of God, which, as Mr. Waffle says, "directs" that "the seventh day of the week" shall be kept holy.

Again Mr. Waffle says:—

"The Christians, at a very early date, were accustomed to hold their religious meetings on that day. The custom seems to have been begun a week from the day of the resurrection (John 20:26), though a single instance of the kind would not make this certain. But there can be no doubt concerning their habit at a later date. We read in Acts, 'Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.' The plain implication of these words is that it was the *custom* of Christians to meet on that day for the Lord's Supper."—*Pp. 197, 198.*

Notice that he says of this "custom" that "*a single instance* of the kind would not make this certain." Now it is a fact as clear as need be that the instance in John 20:26 was not on the first day of the week. It is likewise a fact that, so far as the word of God tells, the meeting recorded in Acts 20:7 is the only religious meeting ever held on the first day of the week. This, then, being the one single instance of the kind, and as "*a single instance of the kind*" would not make it certain that it was the custom, therefore it is plainly proved that there is nothing

that would make it certain that it was the custom for the apostles to hold meetings on the first day of the week. Well, then, it seems to us that service having for its authority only a custom about which there is nothing certain, is most certainly an unsafe foundation upon which to rest the reason for disregarding the plain precept of Jehovah. Reader, we want something more substantial than that to stand upon when every work shall be brought into the Judgment.

Next Mr. Waffle quotes 1 Cor. 16:2: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store," etc., and says:—

"It is evident that Paul desires them to bring in their offerings week by week and leave them in the hands of the proper church officers."

It is certainly evident that if that is what Paul desires he took the poorest kind of a way to tell it. Just think of it, Paul desires that Christians shall "bring in their offerings week by week and *leave them* in the hands of the proper church officers." And so that his desires may be fulfilled, he tells them, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you *lay by him* in store." That is, each one is to *lay by him* his offerings, by *leaving them* in the hands of somebody else! And *such* are these one-thousand-dollar reasons for keeping Sunday.

There is one more; he says:—

"John speaks of this as 'the Lord's day.' He says, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' If he had meant the Sabbath, he would have called it by that name. His expression is analogous to 'the Sabbath of the Lord,' which we find in the Old Testament; but it cannot mean the same day."—*P. 199.*

And why not, pray? "Analogous" means "correspondent; similar; like." Now if the expression "the Lord's day" is *correspondent* to; if it is *similar* to; if it is *like* the expression "the Sabbath of the Lord," then why is it that it cannot mean the same day? Oh, Mr. Waffle's one-thousand-dollar *fleet* that it cannot. Christ said, "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." The day of which Christ is Lord, and that day alone, is the Lord's day. But the day of which he was speaking when he said those words is the seventh day. He had not the slightest reference to any other day. He was speaking of the day which the Pharisees regarded as the Sabbath, which everybody knows was the seventh day of the week. Therefore, when "he said unto them," "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day," it was with sole reference to the seventh day. God had said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and now when, with sole reference to the seventh day, Christ says, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath," it shows that the seventh day, and that alone, is the Lord's day.

Here we shall present a series of syllogisms, and anybody in this wide world is at full liberty to find any flaw in them.

### FIRST SYLLOGISM

MAJOR PREMISE: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28.

MINOR PREMISE: "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Ex. 20:10.

CONCLUSION: Therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

Just as surely as the Scripture is true so surely is this conclusion true. Then using this conclusion as a major, we form a

### **SECOND SYLLOGISM**

MAJOR PREMISE: The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

MINOR PREMISE: The day of which he is Lord is the Lord's day.

CONCLUSION: Therefore, the seventh day is the Lord's day.

Now with this conclusion as a major, we form our

### **THIRD SYLLOGISM**

MAJOR PREMISE: The seventh day is the Lord's day.

MINOR PREMISE: John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Rev. 1:10.

CONCLUSION: John was in the spirit on the seventh day.

313

There, if there is any flaw anywhere in that, we shall be glad to have some one point it out. We shall not, however, offer a prize of one thousand dollars to have it pointed out, because we haven't a thousand dollars; but we will, and by these presents we now do, offer a one-thousand-dollar-prize—essay, to the Committee of Publication, or to the Board of the American Sunday-school Union, or to Mr. A. E. Waffle, if they, or either of them, will point out a flaw in the above series of syllogisms. We promise to give their manuscripts "a painstaking and protracted examination," and to send the grand prize—essay by return mail. We can assure them that the essay which we offer is worth \$1,000, especially to the Union, for the Union *paid* \$1,000 for it.

J.

### **"Dodson" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 14 , p. 319.**

DODSON.—Died of consumption in San Francisco, Cal., May 15, 1886, Clarence T. Dodson, aged 25 years, 6 months, and 2 days. Brother Dodson was sick six months, and as far as human estimate can measure, he died, I believe, in perfect peace with God through out Lord Jesus Christ; and so, we believe, he rests in the Christian's hope. The day before his death, he asked two of our brethren to come to him at 6 o'clock, P.M., for he expected to die at 7; and at that hour the pall of death seemed to fasten upon him, and signs of life became fainter and fainter until it vanished. He left a wife, and a child two and one-half years old. Services by the writer.

A. T. J.

**June 3, 1886**

### **"The Franks" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 21 , p. 324.**

OF the nations that established themselves upon the ruins of the Western Empire, the next one in order is the kingdom of the FRANKS, whose course we will now trace.

"As the posterity of the Franks compose one of the greatest and most enlightened nations of Europe, the powers of learning and ingenuity have been exhausted in the discovery of their unlettered ancestors. To the tales of credulity have succeeded the systems of fancy. Every passage has been sifted, every spot has been surveyed, that might possibly reveal some faint traces of their origin. It has been supposed that Pannonia, that Gaul, that the northern parts of Germany, gave birth to that celebrated colony of warriors. At length the most rational critics, rejecting the fictitious emigrations of ideal conquerors, have acquiesced in a sentiment whose simplicity persuades us of its truth. They suppose, that about the year [A.D.] 240, a new confederacy was formed under the name of Franks, by the old inhabitants of the Lower Rhine and the Weser. The present circle of Westphalia, the Landgraviate of Hesse, and the duchies of Brunswick and Luneburg, were the ancient of the Chauci who, in their inaccessible morasses, defied the Roman arms; of the Cherusci, proud of the fame of Arminius; of the Catti, formidable by their firm and intrepid infantry; and of several other tribes of inferior power and renown.

"The love of liberty was the ruling passion of these Germans; the enjoyment of it their best treasure; the word that expressed that enjoyment, the most pleasing to their ear. They deserved, they assumed, they maintained the honorable appellation of Franks, or Freemen; which concealed, though it did not extinguish, the peculiar names of the several states of the confederacy. Tacit consent, and mutual advantage, dictated the first laws of the union; it was gradually cemented by habit and experience. The league of the Franks may admit of some comparison with the Helvetic [Swiss] body; in which every canton, retaining its independent sovereignty, consults with its brethren in the common cause, without acknowledging the authority of any supreme head, or representative assembly. But the principle of the two confederacies was extremely different. A peace of two hundred years has rewarded the wise and honest policy of the Swiss. An inconstant spirit, the thirst of rapine, and a disregard to the most solemn treaties, disgraced the character of the Franks.

"The Rhine, though dignified with the title of Safeguard of the provinces, was an imperfect barrier against the daring spirit of enterprise with which the Franks were actuated. Their rapid devastations stretched from the river to the foot of the Pyrenees; nor were they stopped by those mountains. Spain, which had never dreaded, was unable to resist, the inroads of the Germans. During twelve years [A.D. 256-268], the greatest part of the reign of

Gallienus, that opulent country was the theatre of unequal and destructive hostilities. Tarragona, the flourishing capital of a peaceful province, was sacked and almost destroyed; and so late as the days of Orosius, who wrote in the fifth century [*cir.* A.D. 415], wretched cottages, scattered amidst the ruins of magnificent cities, still recorded the rage of the barbarians. When the exhausted country no longer supplied a variety of plunder, the Franks seized on some vessels in the ports of Spain, and transported themselves into Mauritania. The distant province was astonished with the fury of these barbarians, who seemed to fall from a new world, as their name, manners, and complexion, were equally unknown on the coast of Africa."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 10, par. 22, 24.*

In July, A.D. 276, Probus became Emperor of Rome, and reigned to August, 282. He drove back and severely chastised the Franks, and other German tribes who had wandered into Gaul "in quest of booty."

"But the most important service which Probus rendered to the republic, was [A.D. 277] the deliverance of Gaul, and the recovery of seventy flourishing cities oppressed by the barbarians of Germany, who, since the death of Aurelian [January, A.D. 275], had ravaged that great province with impunity. Among the various multitude of those fierce invaders we may distinguish, with some degree of clearness, three great armies, or rather nations, successively vanquished by the valor of Probus. He drove back the Franks into their morasses; a descriptive circumstance from whence we may infer, that the confederacy known by the manly appellation of *Free*, already occupied the flat maritime country, intersected and almost overflowed by the stagnating waters of the Rhine, and that several tribes of the Frisians and Batavians had acceded to their alliance.

"Among the useful conditions of peace imposed by Probus on the vanquished nations of Germany, was the obligation of supplying the Roman army with sixteen thousand recruits, the bravest and most robust of their youth. The emperor dispersed them through all the provinces, and distributed this dangerous reenforcement, in small bands of fifty or sixty each, among the national troops; judiciously observing, that the aid which the republic derived from the barbarians should be felt but not seen. . . . The wisdom of Probus embraced a great and beneficial plan of replenishing the exhausted frontiers, by new colonies of captive or fugitive barbarians, on whom he bestowed lands, cattle, instruments of husbandry, and every encouragement that might engage them to educate a race of soldiers for the service of the republic. . . . But the expectations of Probus were too often disappointed. The impatience and idleness of the barbarians could ill brook the slow labors of agriculture. Their unconquerable love of freedom, rising against despotism, provoked them into hasty rebellions, alike fatal

to themselves and to the provinces; nor could these artificial supplies, however repeated by succeeding emperors, restore the important limit of Gaul and Illyricum to its ancient and native vigor.

"Of all the barbarians who abandoned their new settlements, and disturbed the public tranquillity, a very small number returned to their own country. For a short season they might wander in arms through the empire; but in the end they were surely destroyed by the power of a warlike emperor. The successful rashness of a party of Franks was attended, however, with such memorable consequences, that it ought not to be passed unnoticed. They had been established by Probus, on the sea-coast of Pontus, with a view of strengthening the frontier against the inroads of the Alani. A fleet stationed in one of the harbors of the Euxine [Black Sea] fell into the hands of the Franks; and they resolved, through unknown seas, to explore their way from the mouth of the Phasis to that of the Rhine. They easily escaped through the Bosphorus and the Hellespont, and cruising along the Mediterranean, indulged their appetite for revenge and plunder by frequent descents on the unsuspecting shores of Asia, Greece, and Africa. The opulent city of Syracuse, in whose port the natives of Athens and Carthage had formerly been sunk, was sacked by a handful of barbarians, who massacred the greatest part of the trembling inhabitants. From the Island of Sicily, the Franks proceeded to the columns of Hercules, trusted themselves to the ocean, coasted round Spain and Gaul, and steering their triumphant course through the British Channel, at length finished their surprising voyage, by landing in safety on the Batavian or Frisian shores. The example of their success, instructing their countrymen to conceive the advantages and to despise the dangers of the sea, pointed out to their enterprising spirit a new road to wealth and glory."—*Id.*, chap. 12, par. 18, 21, 22.

After this we find no important movement of the Franks, till the time of Constantine, the son of Constantine. At the death of Constantine, March 22, A.D. 327, the empire fell to his three sons—Constantine, Constans, and Constantius—and was partitioned accordingly. But "three years had scarcely elapsed before the sons of Constantine seemed impatient to convince mankind that they were incapable of contenting themselves with the dominions which they were unqualified to govern." Constantine invaded the dominions of Constans, was drawn into an ambuscade, where, with a few attendants, he was surprised, surrounded, and slain, March, A.D. 340. Constans survived him nearly ten years, when he was murdered, February, A.D. 350, by the command of Magnentius, an ambitious soldier, who had usurped the purple. This left Magnentius and Constantius to dispute the sole reign of the empire. The dispute was soon brought to a close, however, at the battle of Mursa (Essek) on the River Drave. Magnentius was defeated, and "throwing away the imperial ornaments, escaped with some difficulty from the pursuit of the light-horse, who incessantly followed his rapid flight from the banks of the Drave to the foot of the Julian Alps. He,

however, managed to escape into Gaul, where he gathered together some forces, but was defeated the second time, and, to escape being given up to Constantius he killed himself by falling on his sword, Aug. 10, A.D. 353, leaving Constantius in undisputed possession of the empire. See Gibbon, chap. 18.

J.

*(Concluded next week.)*

**"Some One-Thousand-Dollar Reasons for Keeping Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 21 , pp. 327, 328.**

WE verily believe that there never was an extended argument made in favor of the Sunday-sabbath in which appeal for help was not made to the Fathers, and we never expect to see an argument on that subject that does not so do. This one-thousand-dollar-prize argument is by no means an exception. We wish that the American Sunday-school Union, or the trustees of Dartmouth College, or whoever else may have the management of a prize fund, would offer a prize of five hundred or one thousand dollars for an essay on the perpetual obligation of the Sunday-sabbath, which should make no mention of the Fathers, and no reference to any human authority, but should be confined strictly to the word of God. Such a production would be worth such a prize as a curiosity in Sunday-sabbath literature, if for nothing else.

To what purpose is a reference to the Fathers anyhow? What is the good of it? Suppose all the Fathers with one voice should say that Sunday is the Lord's day, that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath; still to the man who fears God and trembles at his word (and to such alone the Lord looks, Isa. 66:2) the question would be, What saith the Scripture? To that question there is but one answer that ever comes to anybody on this subject. That answer is, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." The Scripture said to the Fathers, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." If the Fathers disregarded it, they sinned, that is all. The Scripture says to the American Sunday-school Union, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." If the American Sunday-school Union disregards it, the Union sins, that is all. The Scripture says to Mr. A. E. Waffle, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." When Mr. Waffle disregards it, he sins, and when he or any other teaches others to disregard it, he teaches rebellion against the Lord, that is all.

Suppose the Fathers and everybody else from the apostles' day to our own should have disregarded the commandment of God, it would still be just as much our duty to obey that commandment as it would if all had kept it strictly. It is not a question of what the Fathers did, but what they should have done. We are not to interpret the commandment of God by what men have done; but what men have done must be tested by the commandment. The law of God is the immutable standard, and men's actions must conform to that or they are wrong. Mr. Waffle himself admits as much. Thus he says:—

We are under no obligation to follow the example of Christians who lived in any age subsequent to that of the apostles. *Perversions of Christian doctrine and corrupt practices* sprang up so early *and prevailed so widely* as to make such an imitation altogether unsafe."—*P. 203.*

Why then does Mr. Waffle, as well as do Sunday advocates generally, go to an age of "perversions of Christian doctrine," an age of "corrupt practices" so widely prevalent as to make it "altogether unsafe"? This is why:—

"We study their history because it throws *additional light* upon the teaching and the example of the apostles."—*Id.*

Go to an age of darkness to throw additional light upon the age of light itself! Go to an age of "perversion of Christian doctrine" to gain "additional light" upon the perfection of Christian doctrine! Go to an age of "corrupt practices" to gain "additional light" upon the only age of pure practices that the world has ever seen! Study the perversion of Christian doctrine, and the corrupt practices of men, because it throws "additional light" upon the word of God! Use a tallow-dip or a rush-light because it throws "additional light" upon the sun!! To what depths of absurdity will men not run in their attempts to justify their disregard of the commandment of God? What will they not sanction in their endeavors to make void the commandment of God by the traditions of men?

The teaching of the apostles is the word of God, and the word of God is light. Apart from the example of Christ there is no such thing as "the example of the apostles;" and the example of Christ is but the shining of that Light which came into the world, to which men will not come because they love darkness rather than light. And these men, instead of coming to the true Light, run away off to an age of darkness, to an age of confessed "corrupt practices" and "perversions of Christian doctrine," and there, by rummaging around among the Fathers, they manage to find some obscure passages in corrupt texts, and these are seized upon because they "throw additional light" upon the true Light. They run away into the darkness, where all things look alike, and in groping around there they find some men to whom they say, You look like us; you talk as we do; you walk as we do; your views of morals are just like ours;—*you are our Fathers*, and behold what great light is thrown, by your ways, upon the teaching and example of the apostles, *that is*, upon *what we are doing*. True, the apostles said nothing at all about it, but we are doing it, and you did it before us, and that is proof that the apostles intended to do it.

We know that between the Fathers and these their sons there is a most striking family resemblance. They do look alike; they do talk alike; they walk alike; and their ideas of what constitutes obedience to the word of God, are just alike, and we would be fully justified in saying that they all belong to the same family, even though the sons should not own it, but when they take every possible occasion to advertise it and to parade the Fathers as indeed their Fathers, they cannot blame us if we admit it, and do our best to give them the benefit of the relationship. But even though this family resemblance be so perfect that we can hardly tell the Fathers and their children apart, there is one fatal defect about it all, that is, *none of them look like Christ*. Not one of them walks as he walked; for

he kept the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. It matters not how much they may resemble one another, the question with us is, Do they resemble Christ? It matters not how closely their words may agree among themselves, the question still is, Do their words agree with the word of God?

We have not the disposition, even though we had the time, to go with Mr. Waffle and the American Sunday-school Union in their one-thousand-dollar excursion into that age where "perversions of Christian doctrine and corrupt practices sprang up so early and prevailed so widely," because Mr. Waffle himself has told us that it is "altogether unsafe," and, besides that we remember a statement in our Guide-Book, written about just such excursions as this, that says: "Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners." Moreover, we have before us the statement of what Mr. Waffle learned by it, and that is enough for us. Here it is:—

"Every statement bearing upon the subject, that can be discovered in the writings of the Fathers, is to the effect that the Christians of the first two centuries

328

were accustomed to keep holy the first day of the week, and that most of them regarded themselves at liberty not to keep the seventh-day Sabbath."—*P. 214.*

The commandment of God, written with his own finger on the tables of stone, says: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." But here we are informed that "every statement bearing on the subject, that can be discovered in the writings of the Fathers, is to the effect that the most of them [Christians] regarded themselves at liberty *not to keep* the seventh-day Sabbath." But this is simply to say that they regarded themselves at liberty not to keep the commandment of God. Well, we know a great many people in our own day who regard themselves at liberty to do the same thing; and, like their Fathers, too, they will call themselves "Christians." Yea, they will even hold that to be the distinguishing feature of a Christian. The Mormons too regard "themselves at liberty not to keep the seventh-day Sabbath," and also not to keep the commandment that forbids adultery, and they call themselves "saints." Well, if disobedience to that one commandment is what makes a Christian, why should not disobedience to two commandments make a saint? Will Mr. Waffle or the American Sunday-school Union tell us why? The commandment of God directs the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath. The Fathers and Mr. Waffle and other Christians of that kind "regard themselves at liberty not to keep it." The word of God likewise directs the keeping of the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" the Mormons "regard themselves at liberty not to keep it." The word of God directs the keeping of the second commandment; the Catholics "regard themselves at liberty not to keep it." The word of God directs the keeping of the third commandment; Colonel Ingersoll and his kind regard themselves at liberty not to keep it. Now upon what principle can these "Christians" convince those "saints," and Catholics, and atheists, of sin? We should like to see Mr. Waffle frame an argument that would

show that they are wrong, that would not equally condemn himself, and all those who with him "regard themselves at liberty not to keep the seventh-day Sabbath."

Well, when Mr. Waffle finds that the Fathers, and others of their day, regarded themselves at liberty not to keep the commandment of God, what does he do? Does he say that they were disobedient? Does he repudiate such an example and hold to the commandment of God instead? Not he. He just settles down upon the sinful example as though it were righteousness itself. It is the very thing which he has been all this time striving to reach—something to strengthen and confirm him, and others whom he can reach, in *their* disregard of the commandment. For he says of these writings of the Fathers:—

"Thus they strengthen the conclusion *we have already reached* from our examination of the example and teachings of the apostles, that the latter intended to transfer the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day."—*P. 214.*

It never requires a great deal of evidence, nor of a very strong kind, to strengthen a conclusion we have already reached, especially when we have reached the conclusion without evidence. And that such is the way Mr. Waffle has reached his conclusion is plain by his own words. He had already written this:—

"So far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath and its observance on the first day of the week."

If, then, the apostles gave no command for it, the conclusion which he has reached is, so far as the *teaching* of the apostles goes, totally without evidence. And as he has said that "the authority must be sought in the words or in the *example* of the inspired apostles," when he admits that there is no command for it, he has nothing at all left but what he calls the example of the apostles, upon which to base his conclusion. And upon this we would remind him of his own words, that "the average mind is more readily moved by a direct command than by an *inference* drawn from the *example* of even inspired men."—*P. 242.* He has reached his conclusion, then, by an inference drawn from the example of the apostles. But how does he know and how can he show that his inference is just? Oh, by studying the history of an age of "corrupt practices and perversions of Christian doctrine," he learns "that the most of them regarded themselves at liberty not to keep the seventh-day Sabbath," and that they "*could hardly have made a mistake* concerning the import of their [the apostles'] words and actions." And so having landed himself and his whole Sunday-sabbath scheme squarely upon Catholic ground in the midst of an age of "corrupt practices" and perversions of Christian doctrine, his great one-thousand-dollar task is completed; his grand one-thousand-dollar prize is won, and there we leave him to enjoy it.

We have now examined the reasons for keeping Sunday which have been given in a five-hundred-dollar-prize essay, and in a one-thousand-dollar-prize essay. We have been asked which is the better one of the essays. We can only reply that there is no "better" about it—each is worse than the other. Yet we are not prepared to say that the trustees of Dartmouth College, and the American Sunday-school Union, have done a wholly bad work in paying the prizes by

which these essays were put before the world. We are certainly justified in supposing that these essays furnish the very best argument for Sunday-keeping that can be made in the United States; and we think it well that the utter groundlessness of the Sunday institution either in Scripture or reason, should be made to appear, as is done in these essays, even though it be at an expense of \$1,500. Yet it does seem a pity to pay so much good money for so many bad arguments, in support of a worthless institution.

The commandment of God reads the same to us that it does to these prize essayists and to everybody else. It says to all: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." And for our part we hope we shall never reach the point where we shall regard ourselves at liberty not to keep the commandment of God, for to keep the seventh-day Sabbath is the commandment of God. He who regards himself at liberty not to keep it, regards himself at liberty to commit sin.

J.

**"Watch and Pray" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 21 , p. 329.**

JESUS had told his disciples that the temple in Jerusalem should be thrown down, that not one stone should be left upon another. And when they asked him, "When shall these things be?" he gave them a sign which, when they should see, they were to know that the desolation was at hand. That sign was, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." Luke 21:20. For this sign they were to look. They knew not *when* it would be, but if they believed the word of the Lord, they believed it would be, and they were to look for it. And even when they should see it, it was only a sign that the desolation was *nigh*. When they should see the sign, they could not tell when the event would be, only that it was nigh. But the *sign* was what concerned them most; they were not to wait for the event. For he said as soon as the armies were seen about Jerusalem, "Let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains;" and their flight was to be so hasty that if they were in the field they were not even to go to the house to get any clothes; and even if one was on the top of the house, he could not go down into the house to take anything with him. It is evident, therefore, that the sign which Christ gave must have had an important place in the minds of all who really believed his words, for otherwise they would not be ready to leave on such short notice. Indeed, the Saviour made provision that this sign should have an important place with them. Because in view of it he said, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Thus the Lord, in making it a part of their prayers, fixed the sign and their flight ever before them.

In the same conversation the disciples asked the Lord concerning a much greater event than the destruction of the temple, even the coming of the Lord himself in glory, and the sign of it. Of this he told them, "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." "And when

these things *begin to come to pass*, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption *draweth nigh*." And "when ye shall see *all these things*, know that it is near, even at the doors." Luke 21:25, 26; Matt. 24:33. These things began to come to pass in May, 1780, and any one who will look at all can see "*all these things*;" and as the disciples when they saw Jerusalem compassed with armies were *to know* that the desolation of it was nigh, just so *we know* that the coming of the Lord Jesus, "wrapped in a blaze of boundless glory," is at the doors. And just as they were to watch for the event and pray that they might escape it, so Jesus has said to us: "*Watch ye therefore, and pray always*, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Luke 21:36. He who believes the word of the Lord will watch for these things. He who watches for them will pray that he may escape them and stand blameless before the Son of man. And he shall be delivered as surely as were the disciples from the terrors that came upon devoted Judea. "And now, little children, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." 1 John 2:28.

J.

**June 10, 1886**

**"The Franks. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 22 , p. 340.**

(Concluded).

"IN the blind fury of civil discord, Constantius had abandoned to the barbarians of Germany the countries of Gaul, which still acknowledged the authority of his rival. A numerous swarm of Franks and Alemanni were invited [A.D. 351] to cross the Rhine by presents and promises, by the hopes of spoil, and by a perpetual grant of all the territories which they should be able to subdue. But the emperor, who for a temporary service had thus imprudently provoked the rapacious spirit of the barbarians, soon discovered and lamented the difficulty of dismissing these formidable allies, after they had tasted the richness of the Roman soil. Regardless of the nice distinction of loyalty and rebellion, these undisciplined robbers treated as their natural enemies all the subjects of the empire, who possessed any property which they were desirous of acquiring. Forty-five flourishing cities—Tongres, Cologne, Treves, Worms, Spire, Strasburgh, etc.—besides a far greater number of towns and villages, were pillaged, and for the most part reduced to ashes. The barbarians of Germany, still faithful to the maxims of their ancestors, abhorred the confinement of walls, to which they applied the odious names of prisons and sepulchers; and, fixing their independent habitations on the banks of rivers, the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Meuse, they secured themselves against the

danger of a surprise, by a rude and hasty fortification of large trees, which were felled and thrown across the roads. The Alemanni were established in the modern countries of Alsace and Lorraine; the Franks occupied the island of the Batavians, together with an extensive district of Brabant, which was then known by the appellation of Toxandria, *and may deserve to be considered as the original seat of their Gallic monarchy.*"

In a note Gibbon fixes the date of this permanent entrance of the Franks into Gaul, as follows:—

"The paradox of P. Daniel, that the Franks never obtained any permanent settlement on this side of the Rhine before the time of Clovis, is refuted with much learning and good sense by M. Biet, who has proved by a chain of evidence, their uninterrupted possession of Toxandria, *one hundred and thirty years before the accession of Clovis.*"

The accession of Clovis was in A.D. 481; and one hundred and thirty years carry us back to A.D. 351, as dated above.

"From the sources, to the mouth of the Rhine, the conquests of the Germans extended above forty miles to the west of that river, over a country peopled by colonies of their own name and nation; and the scene of their devastations was three times more extensive than that of their conquests. At a still greater distance the open towns of Gaul were deserted, and the inhabitants of the fortified cities, who trusted to their strength and vigilance, were obliged to content themselves with such supplies of corn as they could raise on the vacant land within the enclosure of their walls. The diminished legions, destitute of pay and provisions, of arms and discipline, trembled at the approach, and even at the name, of the barbarians. Under these melancholy circumstances, an unexperienced youth was appointed to save and to govern the provinces of Gaul, or rather, as he expressed it himself, to exhibit the vain image of Imperial greatness."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 19, par. 20, 21.*

In A.D. 355, Nov. 6, Constantius associated Julian with himself in the rule of the empire, and appointed to his administration the provinces of the West, with the immediate task of driving out these barbarians whom Constantius had invited in with the promise of a grant in perpetuity of all the lands which they should subdue.

"After Julian had repulsed the Alemanni from the provinces of the Upper Rhine, he turned his arms against the Franks [A.D. 358], who were seated nearer to the ocean, on the confines of Gaul and Germany; and who, from their numbers, and still more from their intrepid valor, had ever been esteemed the most formidable of the barbarians. Although they were strongly actuated by the allurements of rapine, they professed a disinterested love of war; which they considered as the supreme honor and felicity of human

nature; and their minds and bodies were so completely hardened by perpetual action, that, according to the lively expression of an orator, the snows of winter were as pleasant to them as the flowers of spring. In the month of December, which followed the battle of Strasburgh, Julian attacked a body of six hundred Franks, who had thrown themselves into two castles on the Meuse. In the midst of that severe season they sustained, with inflexible constancy, a siege of fifty-four days; till at length, exhausted by hunger, and satisfied that the vigilance of the enemy, in breaking the ice of the river, left them no hopes of escape, the Franks consented, for the first time, to dispense with the ancient law which commanded them to conquer or to die.

"The Cesar immediately sent his captives to the court of Constantius, who, accepting them as a valuable present, rejoiced in the opportunity of adding so many heroes to the choicest troops of his domestic guards. The obstinate resistance of this handful of Franks apprised Julian of the difficulties of the expedition which he meditated for the ensuing spring, against the whole body of the nation. His rapid diligence surprised and astonished the active barbarians. Ordering his soldiers to provide themselves with biscuit for twenty days, he suddenly pitched his camp near Tongres, while the enemy still supposed him in his winter quarters of Paris, expecting the slow arrival of his convoys from Aquitain. Without allowing the Franks to unite or deliberate, he skillfully spread his legions from Cologne to the ocean; and by the terror, as well as by the success, of his arms, soon reduced the suppliant tribes to implore the clemency, and to obey the commands, of their conqueror. The Chamavians submissively retired to their former habitations beyond the Rhine; *but the Salians were permitted to possess their new establishment of Toxandria, as the subjects and auxiliaries of the Roman Empire.* The treaty was ratified by solemn oaths; and perpetual inspectors were appointed to reside among the Franks, with the authority of enforcing the strict observance of the conditions."—*Id.*, chap. 19, par. 27.

From this time onward the power of the Franks in Gaul steadily grew until the time of the establishment of the Visigoths in Aquatain, A.D. 419 (as already related), when they were powerful enough to share with the Visigoths, and the Burgundians, in almost equal proportion the province of Gaul.

"The Franks, a loose confederation of German tribes, were in existence in the third century on the right bank of the Rhine, and for a long time showed no wish to migrate into Gaul. By degrees one of these tribes, the Salians, headed by a family called the Merewings or Merwings (the Merovingians), began to take the lead; they soon made themselves formidable by their incursions into Northern Gaul, and established themselves masters of the left bank of the lower Rhine. As the Roman power declined along that district, their

authority increased; early in the fifth century they had spread from the Rhine to the Somme."—*Encyc. Brit., Art, France, History, par. 13.*

Thus the Franks had northeastern Gaul below the Moselle; the Visigoths held all of southwestern Gaul from the Loire to the Bay of Biscay and the Gulf of Lyons; and the Burgundians possessed southeastern Gaul, now Switzerland, with the country of the Saone and the Rhone clear to the sea.

Gibbon states it thus:—

"About the same time, in the last years of the reign of Honorius, the Goths, the Burgundians, and the Franks, obtained a permanent seat and dominion in the provinces of Gaul. The liberal grant of the usurper Jovinus to his Burgundian allies, was confirmed by the lawful emperor; the lands of the First, or Upper, Germany, were ceded to those formidable barbarians; and they gradually occupied, either by conquest or treaty, the two provinces which still retain, with the titles of *Duchy* and *County*, the national appellation of Burgundy. The Franks, the valiant and faithful allies of the Roman republic, were soon tempted to imitate the invaders, whom they had so bravely resisted. Treves, the capital of Gaul, was pillaged by their lawless bands; and the humble colony, which they so long maintained in the district of Toxandia, in Brabant, insensibly multiplied along the banks of the Meuse and Scheld, till their independent power filled the whole extent of the Second, or Lower Germany."—*Id., chap. 31, par. 39. J.*

### **"Fear Ye Not Their Fear" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 22 , p. 343.**

AMONG the things which would particularly mark the nearness of the end of the world, the Saviour named, "distress of nations, with perplexity," and "men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth." This distress of nations is not merely distress which is common to all nations in all ages, but it is distress with perplexity. To be perplexed is to know not what to do; is to know not which way to turn. A nation may be distressed, but may know perfectly what to do to relieve itself. A nation may be troubled, yet see clearly its way out of the trouble. But when distress with perplexity comes upon a nation, it is troubled indeed. It knows not what to do, and in attempting a remedy it may increase the trouble, or at the best, may be able to relieve the distress only for a time.

That there is now among the great nations of the world a state of uneasiness which is not too strongly expressed by the words of Christ, is undeniable. The trouble is not between nation and nation as such, although there are deepening jealousies, which only add to the general tendency; but the distress of each nation is from within itself. In each nation there seems to be a condition of society which might be termed a chronic discontent. This spirit of discontent is growing and deepening everywhere. The following from the San Francisco *Chronicle* is, we believe, a fair estimate of the question as it stands to-day:—

"The feelings of the world at the beginning of the century have been compared to those of one awaking after a night of horrible orgies. There are not wanting signs that another wave of hopelessness is soon to sweep over the world, not, perhaps, attended with such a social upheaval, or followed by such desolating wars, but still terrible in its action and its consequence. The passions of men remain the same. National hatreds were never more bitter. We live here in this corner of the world in comparative quiet, while all Europe sleeps upon its arms. Want and misery increase with augmenting populations. All the avenues of life are full. All streams of discontent are swelled to the brim and ready to overflow."

Thinking men see these things; statesmen have to deal with them; the lower classes feel them and are the principal part of them; and all men fear them. Men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth. True, there are some who are determined to have the millennium ushered in at once, who profess to see nothing but that all things are growing better, and that "to-morrow shall be as this day and much more abundant." But it is simply fatuous to cry peace in the very presence of the most gigantic preparations for war that the world has ever seen,—to cry safety when destruction, hundred-handed, stands before the cabin as well as before the palace. Wickedness is surely as great now as any would wish to see, but it is just as certain that every one who lives will see greater wickedness, as it is that he lives at all. The world is in its last days, and the record of Him who made the world, and who knoweth what is in men, is, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." As bad as evil men are now, there is yet to be worse, yea, even worse and worse. As great as is deception now, men will yet see greater. It is easy enough for all to see it, and all do see it—except the professed watchmen.

In this general uneasiness and discontent, in this fear which causes men's hearts to fail, whether they realize the cause or not, it is only to be expected that there will be efforts made on all hands for protection. But the efforts made for protection will not protect. All the trade unions and labor leagues that can be formed, and all the boycotts that can be laid, will not better the condition of the laboring man one white. With all the unions and leagues and organizations of whatever kind there may be that have ever been formed for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the laboring man, his condition is no better than it was before there was ever any such union formed. As a matter of fact the troubles and difficulties of the laboring man are increased with the increase of the leagues. It is impossible that it should be otherwise, when in becoming a member of a union, he has to literally sell himself to an irresponsible despotism. But it is because of the uncertainty, the uneasiness, the fear that pervades all, that all these confederacies are formed. But relief will never be found in any of these things, nor by any of these methods, but rather in the opposite of all these.

"For the Lord spake thus to me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, A confederacy, to

all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid." A league is a confederacy. All these leagues, unions, etc., that are now so abundant, are confederacies. They are formed, even as the prophet says, because of a fear which pervades the people, leading them to say, "A confederacy, a league must be formed, and that will relieve us." But it will do nothing of the kind. The evil is inherent; it lies in the very nature of things. It is growing, and will grow "worse and worse," and the only safety is to separate from it all, and from all the confederacies that are formed because of it. The Lord instructs us that we should not walk in the way of this people. The Lord says to us, "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy." The Lord says, "Neither fear ye their fear, now be afraid." But "sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary." Isa. 8:13, 14.

There is the way and the only way of relief. God is over all and above all. If he be made the dwelling place, in his truth he made the shield and buckler, we shall dwell safely, and shall be quiet from fear of evil. That these words of the prophet were written for this time is plain; for in the same connection, he says: "I will wait upon the Lord, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him." These things therefore will come to pass when the time is to wait and look for the Lord. And this is exactly in accordance with the word of Christ, when, in giving these things as signs of his coming, he said: "When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." For the next thing that follows the "distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth," is "the powers of heaven shall be shaken, and then shall they see Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." Luke 21:25-28.

The heaven will depart as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island will be moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man, and every free man, will flee to the rocks and the mountains; 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." Rev. 6:14, 15, Isa. 2:19.

"When thus it shall be in the midst of the land among the people, there shall be as the shaking of an olive tree, and as the gleaning grapes when the vintage is done"—"two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost fruitful branches thereof"—"they shall lift up their voice, they shall sing for the majesty of the Lord, they shall cry aloud from the sea." Isa. 21:13, 14; 17:6. They shall say, "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.

"Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." And then, though the untied winds shall hurt the earth, the sea, and the trees (Rev. 7:1-3).

–"Though the yesty waves  
Confound and swallow navigation up;  
Though bladed even be hedged, and trees blown down;  
Though castles topple on their warders heads;  
Though palaces and pyramids do slope  
Their heads to their foundations; though the treasure  
Of nature's germins tumble altogether,  
Even till destruction sicken;"

"He shall be for a sanctuary;" "the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." "Blessed are all they that wait for him."

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jesus and Abraham. John 8:31-38, 41-59" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 22 , pp. 346, 347.**

(June 20.—John 8:31-38, 41-59.)

"IF ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." Jesus "became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5:9. Are we his disciples? If we continue in his word we are; if we bring forth much fruit we are. John 15:8. A disciple is a learner. A disciple of Christ is one who learns of Christ. And this is the Saviour's command, "Take my yoke upon you and *learn of me*." In him is a field of study that can never be exhausted. "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. Would we learn meekness, we must learn it of Christ. Would we learn gentleness, we must learn it of Christ. Would we learn of righteousness, we must learn it of Christ. Would we learn holiness, we must learn it of Christ. Would we learn of charity, we must learn it of Christ. Would we learn anything at all but that which is earthly, we must learn it of Christ; for "of God he 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." If thus we study the divine Saviour, and learn of him and continue in his word, then are we his disciples indeed. He that heareth the sayings of Christ and *doeth them* is the man who has built his house upon the rock; while he that heareth these sayings and doeth them not has built his house on the sand. Alas! how many there are even to-day as of old to whom the words of Christ come, "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 6:46.

IF thus we learn of Christ, we shall know the truth, for he is the Truth. He came to "bear witness unto the truth." The word of God is truth, and Christ is the word of God personified. We shall know the truth and the truth shall make us free; for "he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." The people who enter in through the gates of the eternal city, are those who have kept the truth. "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation

which keepeth the truth may enter in." Isa. 26:1, 2. Jesus tells us what is meant by the truth in this place; he says: "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. And David says: "Thy righteousness is an ev-

347

erlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." Ps. 119:142. It is only through Christ that we can keep the truth, the commandments of God. And Christ the Truth, must make us free from our obedience to the truth,—the law of God,—before we can do the truth.

"WHOSOEVER committeth sin is the servant of sin? Sin is the master and the sinner is the servant. The wages that the servant receives is death; "for the wages of sin is death." Sin is a cruel master, and pays a cruel price for the service that is rendered. He holds his servants in cruel bondage, with mighty strength, for the strength of sin is the law of God. "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The wages of sin is death, but Christ died for all. God "made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." He came to set at liberty them that are bound under the bondage of sin. He has conquered and condemned sin; he has broken the power of death. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." And he longs to make free all the servants of sin. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour." "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." Rom. 8:1, 2.

"IF ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." This is Christ's testimony of Abraham: "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Abraham believed God, and obeyed God; and those men, while asserting with all their power that they were the children of Abraham, were denying all the evidences that God could bring before them and in their rebellion were only waiting for a chance to kill the One whom God had sent, the promised seed of Abraham, in whom all the world should be blessed. If they had believed on Christ, they would have been indeed the children of Abraham, and would have been blessed with faithful Abraham. For "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." If they had been indeed the children of Abraham, they would have rejoiced to see the day when Jesus stood in the world, for Abraham rejoiced to see that day, and he saw it and was glad. Abraham rejoiced to see it even afar off, and by faith; while they would not see it before their eyes and present to their senses.

IN seeking to kill Christ, they were but doing the deeds of their father the devil, for "he that committeth sin is of the devil," and the devil was a murderer from the beginning. Jesus thus laid bare their wicked hearts, and the more they resisted the truth the more he exposed their hypocrisy, until their baseness became so glaring before all that the only thing they could do to hide it was to kill

him who so persistently and so unscathingly exposed it. A similar instance of their wickedness was shown in the case of Lazarus. After Jesus had raised Lazarus from the dead, many by seeing Lazarus believed on Jesus, so to prevent this the chief priests proposed to kill Lazarus. John 12:10, 11. And it was all brought about by their resistance to the truth in the first place. If they had received his word at the beginning; if they had diligently weighed his profession, and fairly examined his works with honesty of purpose to know the truth, they would have seen in him that which he really was. But because his appearance did not suit them, because he did not come as *they* thought the Messiah ought to come, they set their minds against him at once. And though he besought them not to judge according to appearances, but to judge righteous judgment, and though they believed not him, to believe the works yet it was all to no purpose. They had decided that they would not believe he was the Christ, and nothing should alter that decision. We should never condemn any doctrine, nor any profession, simply because it does not meet our opinion. Our opinion may be wrong, and if the doctrine be the truth, we wrong ourselves by rejecting it. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Bring everything to the test of the word of God, if it will not bear that test, it is wrong, and then cast it away as such. If it will bear the test of the word of God, then we dare not reject it, for it is the truth of God, and it is by knowing and continuing in the truth that we become Christ's disciples indeed. Be careful with the truth. Exalt it and it shall promote thee. Those that hate it love death.

AGAIN Jesus put them in a strait by the question, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Convince here signifies to convict. Which of you convicts me of sin? Here he throws the question of men in the fairest possible way, and it still remains so. Let the world be summoned, and who of the inhabitants can convict Jesus Christ of sin? Who can point to a single word ordered of wrong import? He has stood thus challenging the world for more than eighteen centuries; but as, with the Jews at the first, so has it ever been, no man can say, "I." And upon this comes, as the logical consequence, the question that he asked of them: "If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" If he cannot be convicted of sin, his whole course was that of truth. Why then do you not believe him? Do you not want to believe the truth? The challenge of Christ places upon every person the alternative of either believing that he is the Christ, or of refusing to believe the truth.

"BEFORE Abraham was, I am." Yea, before all things, he is; for he is "the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. 1:8.

J.

**June 17, 1886**

**"The Alemanni" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 23 , pp. 356, 357.**

OF all the barbarian nations that divided the Roman Empire, the *Alemanni* "were the first who removed the veil that covered the feeble majesty of Italy." But as their progress beyond the Rhine is so intimately connected with that of the Franks, we have reserved to this place the history of this people.

"They are first mentioned by Dion Cassius, who relates that the Emperor Caracalla gained, in 203 A.D., a victory over them on the banks of the *Maine*, and thence assumed the surname *Alemannicus*. The origin of this tribe, and the country from which they came, are unknown; but we have a distinct statement, which is apparently confirmed by the very name of the people, that they had flocked together from all parts, and were a mixed race. They proved most formidable enemies to the Romans as well as to the Gauls, their western neighbors, who to this day apply the name Alemanni (Allemands) to all the Germans indiscriminately, though the Alemanni, properly so called, occupied only the country between the Maine and the Danube. In the reign of Aurelian, 270 A.D., they attempted to invade Italy, but were repulsed. After the death of that emperor, however, they renewed their attacks by invading Gaul, and ravaging the country at different times. Several undertakings against them were of little avail, until in 357 A.D. the Emperor Julian completely defeated them in the neighborhood of Strasburg, where all their forces were assembled under seven chiefs. This and other defeats, however, did not break the power of the Alemanni, who, being pressed on by other barbarians in the North, were forced to advance southward and westward to conquer new countries for themselves. Hence, after the middle of the fifth century, we find them established not only in the country now called Suabia, but also in a part of Switzerland and in Alsace. In these countries the Alemanni have maintained themselves ever since, and the greater part of the modern Suabians and the northern Swiss are descendants of that ancient race."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. *Alemanni*.

"In the reign of the emperor Caracalla [A.D. 211-217], an innumerable swarm of Suevi appeared on the banks of the Mein, and in the neighborhood of the Roman provinces, in quest either of food, of plunder, or of glory. The hasty army of volunteers gradually coalesced *into a great and permanent* nation, and as it was composed from so many different tribes, assumed the name of Alemanni, or *Allmen*, to denote at once their various lineage and their common bravery. The latter was soon felt by the Romans in many a hostile inroad. The Alemanni fought chiefly on horseback; but their cavalry was rendered still more formidable by a mixture of light infantry, selected from the bravest and most active of the youth, whom frequent exercise had inured to accompany the horsemen in the longest march, the most rapid charge, or the most precipitate retreat.

"This warlike people of Germans had been astonished by the immense preparations of Alexander Severus [A.D. 234]; they were dismayed by the arms of his successor [Maximin, A.D. 235], a barbarian equal in valor and fierceness to themselves. But still hovering on the frontiers of the empire, they increased the general disorder that ensued after the death of Decius [A.D. 250]. They inflicted severe wounds on the rich provinces of Gaul; *they were the first who removed the veil that covered the feeble majesty of Italy.* A numerous body of the Alemanni penetrated across the Danube and through the Rhetian Alps into the plains of Lombardy, advanced as far as Ravenna, and displayed the victorious banners of barbarians almost in sight of Rome.

"The insult and the danger rekindled in the senate some sparks of their ancient virtue. Both the emperors were engaged in far distant wars, Valerian in the East, and Gallienus on the Rhine. All the hopes and resources of the Romans were in themselves. In this emergency, the senators resumed the defense of the republic, drew out the Pretorian guards, who had been left to garrison the capital, and filled up their numbers, by enlisting into the public service the stoutest and most willing of the Plebeians. The Alemanni, astonished with the sudden appearance of an army more numerous than their own, retired into Germany, laden with spoil; and their retreat was esteemed as a victory by the unwarlike Romans.

"When Gallienus received the intelligence that his capital was delivered from the barbarians, he was much less delighted than alarmed with the courage of the senate, since it might one day prompt them to rescue the public from domestic tyranny as well as from foreign invasion. His timid ingratitude was published to his subjects, in an edict which prohibited the senators from exercising any military employment, and even from approaching the camps of the legions. But his fears were groundless. The rich and luxurious nobles, sinking into their natural character, accepted, as a favor, this disgraceful exemption from military service; and as long as they were indulged in the enjoyment of their baths, their theatres, and their villas, they cheerfully resigned the more dangerous cares of empire to the rough hands of peasants and soldiers.

"Another invasion of the Alemanni, of a more formidable aspect, but more glorious event, is mentioned by a writer of the lower empire. Three hundred thousand are said to have been vanquished, in a battle near Milan, by Gallienus in person, at the head of only ten thousand Romans. We may, however, with great probability, ascribe this incredible victory either to the credulity of the historian, or to some exaggerated exploits of one of the emperor's lieutenants. It was by arms of a very different nature, that Gallienus endeavored to protect Italy from the fury of the Germans. He espoused Pipa, the daughter of a king of the Marcomanni, a

Suevic tribe, which was often confounded with the Alemanni in their wars and conquests. To the father, as the price of his alliance, he granted an ample settlement in Pannonia. The native charms of unpolished beauty seem to have fixed the daughter in the affections of the inconstant emperor, and the bands of policy were more firmly connected by those of love. But the haughty prejudice of Rome still refused the name of marriage to the profane mixture of a citizen and a barbarian; and has stigmatized the German princess with the opprobrious title of concubine of Gallienus.

"While the vigorous and moderate conduct of Aurelian restored the Illyrian frontier, the nation of the Alemanni violated the conditions of peace, which either Gallienus had purchased, or Claudius had imposed, and, inflamed by their impatient youth, suddenly flew to arms. Forty thousand horse appeared in the field, and the numbers of the infantry doubled those of the cavalry. The first objects of their avarice were a few cities of the Rhetian frontier; but their hopes soon rising with success, the rapid march of the Alemanni traced a line of devastation from the Danube to the Po.

"The emperor was almost at the same time [A.D. 270, Sept.] informed of the irruption, and of the retreat, of the barbarians. Collecting an active body of troops, he marched with silence and celerity along the skirts of the Hercynian forest; and the Alemanni, laden with the spoils of Italy, arrived at the Danube, without suspecting, that on the opposite bank, and in an advantageous post, a Roman army lay concealed and prepared to intercept their return. Aurelian indulged the fatal security of the barbarians, and permitted about half their forces to pass the river without disturbance and without precaution. Their situation and astonishment gave him an easy victory; his skilful conduct improved the advantage. Disposing the legions in a semicircular form, he advanced the two horns of the crescent across the Danube, and wheeling them on a sudden towards the center, enclosed the rear of the German host. The dismayed barbarians, on whatsoever side they cast their eyes, beheld, with despair, a wasted country, a deep and rapid stream, a victorious and implacable enemy.

"Reduced to this distressed condition, the Alemanni no longer disdained to sue for peace. Aurelian received their ambassadors at the head of his camp, and with every circumstance of martial pomp that could display the greatness and discipline of Rome. The legions stood to their arms in well-ordered ranks and awful silence. The principal commanders, distinguished by the ensigns of their rank, appeared on horseback on either side of the Imperial throne. Behind the throne the consecrated images of the emperor, and his predecessors, the golden eagles, and the various titles of the legions, engraved in letters of gold, were exalted in the air on lofty

pikes covered with silver. When Aurelian assumed his seat, his manly grace and majestic figure taught the barbarians to revere the person as well as the purple of their conqueror. The ambassadors fell prostrate on the ground in silence. They were commanded to rise, and permitted to speak. By the assistance of interpreters they extenuated their perfidy, magnified their exploits, expatiated on the vicissitudes of fortune and the advantages of peace, and, with an ill-timed confidence, demanded a large subsidy, as the price of the alliance which they offered to the Romans. The answer of the emperor was stern and imperious. He treated their offer with contempt, and their demand with indignation, reproached the barbarians, that they were as ignorant of the arts of war as of the laws of peace, and finally dismissed them with the choice only of submitting to this unconditional mercy, or awaiting the utmost severity of his resentment. Aurelian had resigned a distant province [Dacia] to the Goths; but it was dangerous to trust or to pardon these perfidious barbarians, *whose formidable power kept Italy itself in perpetual alarms.*

"Immediately after this conference, it should seem that some unexpected emergency required the emperor's presence in Pannonia. He devolved on his lieutenants the care of finishing the destruction of the Alemanni, either by the sword, or by the surer operation of famine. But an active despair has often triumphed over the indolent assurance of success. The barbarians, finding it impossible to traverse the Danube and the Roman camp, broke through the posts in their rear, which were more feebly or less carefully guarded; and with incredible diligence, but by a different road, returned towards the mountains of Italy. Aurelian, who considered the war as totally extinguished, received the mortifying intelligence of the escape of the Alemanni, and of the ravage which they already committed in the territory of Milan. The legions were commanded to follow, with as much expedition as those heavy bodies were capable of exerting, the rapid flight of an enemy whose infantry and cavalry moved with almost equal swiftness. A few days afterwards, the emperor himself marched to the relief of Italy, at the head of a chosen body of auxiliaries, (among whom were the hostages and cavalry of the Vandals,) and of all the Pretorian guards who had served in the wars on the Danube.

"As the light troops of the Alemanni had spread themselves from the Alps to the Apennine, the incessant vigilance of Aurelian and his officers was exercised in the discovery, the attack, and the pursuit of the numerous detachments. Notwithstanding this desultory

war, three considerable battles are mentioned, in which the principal force of both armies was obstinately engaged. The success was various. In the first, fought near Placentia, the

Romans received so severe a blow, that, according to the expression of a writer extremely partial to Aurelian, the immediate dissolution of the empire was apprehended. The crafty barbarians, who had lined the woods, suddenly attacked the legions in the dusk of the evening, and, it is most probable, after the fatigue and disorder of a long march. The fury of their charge was irresistible; but, at length, after a dreadful slaughter, the patient firmness of the emperor rallied his troops, and restored, in some degree, the honor of his arms. The second battle was fought near Fano in Umbria; on the spot which, five hundred years before, had been fatal to the brother of Hannibal. Thus far the successful Germans had advanced along the Emilian and Flaminian way, with a design of sacking the defenseless mistress of the world. But Aurelian, who, watchful for the safety of Rome, still hung on their rear, found in this place the decisive moment of giving them a total and irretrievable defeat. The flying remnant of their host was exterminated in a third and last battle near Pavia; and Italy was delivered from the inroads of the Alemanni."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 10, par. 26-30; chap. 11, par. 18-22.

J.

(*To be Continued.*)

**"The Authority of the Old Testament" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 23 , pp. 360, 361.**

THE Disciples not long since issued a pamphlet entitled, "Our Position." One part of their position is stated as follows:—

"We accept the Old Testament as true; . . . but as *a book of authority* to teach *us* what *we* are to do, the New Testament alone, as embodying the teachings of Christ and his apostles, is our standard."

Upon this the *Christian Intelligencer* makes the following excellent comment:—

"But they forget that in thus denying the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures they fly directly in the face of the teaching of Christ and his apostles. When the Saviour repelled the tempter in the wilderness it was by quoting the Old Testament. He said again and again, 'It is written; but if the words written had no authority, why were they cited? In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord said that he came not to destroy (abrogate) the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. But if the law and the prophets were not abrogated by him, then they are of binding authority still. When he was asked what was the great command, he answered, quoting the words of the Pentateuch which enjoin supreme love to God and to love our neighbor as ourselves, words which are unlimited either in time or place, and therefore are authoritative now, and evermore. When he

was asked about marriage, he quoted from Genesis the passage which settles the question for all time. When he was asked about the resurrection, he referred to the Old Testament as deciding the point not for Jews only but for all men. When he was asked about the way to eternal life, he gave the most explicit sanction to the decalogue, saying, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' It follows, then, that to deny the authority of the Old Testament is to deny the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"The apostle Paul throughout his epistles cites the old scriptures, not simply as illustration, but as confirmation of his utterances. Not only so, but he affirms that 'whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope,' and again, that 'they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.' He also and that 'ever scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness' (Revised Version); but how could it be this unless it were authoritative? In the conference at Jerusalem the apostle James quoted from the prophets as a means of settling the question which caused the assembling of the council, and in the epistle he refers to the royal law according to the Scripture as a decisive rule of action. The apostle Peter not only quotes the Old Testament as authority, but tells his brethren that they do well to take heed unto it as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, since they knew that its authors 'spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost.'

"It is clear, then, that they who restrict authority to the teachings of Christ and his apostles are counter to those very teachings. And they cut themselves off from three-fourths of the rule of faith which God has given. They also greatly disparage the divine wisdom. It pleased the Most High to make his revelation of himself gradual. Through a long course of years the disclosures were made, the late never superseding but supplementing the earlier, and the whole together constituting the divine directory for men. The Bible, the whole Bible, is one book, and it is needful in order to accomplish its purposes; but to deny authority to the greater part of it is sadly to mutilate the inspired rule of faith and practice. If the Old Testament has and was designed to have no grip upon the conscience of Christians, its use and advantage to them is woefully [*sic.*] abridged. In fact, it is reduced to the level of uninspired productions. It may contain many excellent things, but the reader is to sit in judgment upon their value to him just as he would in the case of any human production. Whatever is be, narrative, proverb, psalm, statute, or prophecy, he is to accept it if it commends itself to his mind, otherwise not. To all who hold such views one may well repeat the incisive words of our Lord, '*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.*'"

Yet as plain as all this is, the *Christian Standard* seriously sets about to controvert it, and begins by asking the ever mistaken question of that denomination, namely:—

"Who is now the Lawgiver in the spiritual universe? . . . *That* is the question. Moses or Christ—which? . . . Those scriptures were a standard to those *who lived under the authority of Moses*; but they cannot, in the nature of things, be a standard of authority to those *who live under the authority of Christ*."

We would ask the *Standard*, who, but God, has ever been the Lawgiver in the spiritual universe? Where was Moses ever a lawgiver in the spiritual, or in any other, universe? We challenge the *Standard* to show, from the hour that Moses saw the burning bush to the hour of his death, that he ever did anything upon his own authority, unless it be at the rock of Meribah, when he said, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" Num. 20:8-12. But as this forfeited his entrance into the promised land, we think that even the *Standard* would hardly present that as proof that Moses acted on his own authority. The calamity that came upon Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and all their company, was to demonstrate that the authority by which Moses acted as the authority of God. "Moses said, Hereby ye shall know that *the Lord hath sent me* to do all these works; for *I have not done them of mine own mind*." Num. 16:28.

Then by what right is it that the *Standard* speaks of the "authority of Moses"? None whatever but an assumed right. It is directly against the word of Moses, to speak of what he did as being the authority of Moses. From Exodus 3:4 to Deuteronomy 34:4, from the burning bush to Pisgah, always the word is, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying," "And the Lord said unto Moses," etc. So it is all through the Old Testament. The Lord spoke to Joshua, to the Judges, to Samuel, to David, to Nathan, to Isaiah, to Jeremiah, to Ezekiel, to Daniel, and to all the prophets. None of these spoke on their own authority, nor upon the authority of Moses, but ever by the authority of the Lord. None of these things ever purported to be the authority of Moses. Nobody ever obeyed them as of the authority of Moses, but always as of the authority of God. And this authority is *the authority of Christ*. It was the Spirit of Christ that was in all the prophets from Moses—yet, from Abraham, from Enoch—to Malachi. It was the Spirit of Christ that testified in all their writings, "search-

361

ing what, or what manner of time *the Spirit of Christ*, which was in them *did signify*, when *it* testified," etc. 1 Peter 1:11. The Old Testament, then, is the testimony of Christ, and the testimony of Christ is the testimony of God. Therefore, to deny the authority of the Old Testament is to deny the authority of Christ and of God.

But this will not suit the *Standard* at all; for according to it the authority of Christ did not begin till *after his resurrection*. It says:—

"It was *after* his resurrection that Jesus claimed the possession of 'all authority in Heaven and on earth,' . . . and from that time men are under the authority of the Lord Jesus."

It is true that it was after his resurrection—in fact, on the day of his ascension—that Jesus said this; but to claim that he had not this authority till that time is more than the record will justify. Nearly the beginning of his ministry, before the imprisonment of John the Baptist, the record is, "The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things* into his hand." John 3:35. And before the death of John the Baptist, Jesus said, "All things *are delivered unto me* of my Father." Matt. 11:27. "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. "Without him was not anything made that was made." John 1:3. Before he came into the world, he upheld "all things *by the word* of his power." Heb. 1:1-3. Now if the *Christian Standard* can conceive how Christ could have all things delivered to him, how he could create all things delivered to him, how he could uphold all things by the word of his power, and yet have no authority till after his resurrection, it has a power of conception that is truly phenomenal. Besides this, if the *Standard's* position were true, it would follow that no part of the New Testament even would be of authority except that which was spoken after the resurrection of Christ. For it was not till then that Christ "claimed the possession of authority."

In reply to the *Intelligencer's* instance of Jesus telling the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," the *Standard* again lets itself out after this fashion:—

"Let the reader carefully observe that this was the question of a *Jew*, propounded to one whom the questioner regarded as an *expounder of the law*; and therefore Jesus answers him *out of the law*. This certainly proves that the law of Moses was then authoritative. But does the *Intelligencer* mean to say that this is the way of life taught *in the gospel*? and that to deny this is 'to deny the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ'? We have not so learned Christ."

Then we say that the *Standard* has not properly learned Christ. This was not all that Jesus said to the young man. He said also to him, "Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and *come and follow me*." Was it as "a Jew," "an expounder of the law" to a Jew, that this was said by the Lord Jesus? No; it was said by the Saviour of the world, the One by whom comes eternal life, to one who honestly asked the way to eternal life, and one *whom Jesus wanted to follow him*. It was said to one whom Jesus *wanted to be his disciple*. Therefore, what Jesus told this young man to do is what *his disciples* must do that they may have eternal life. Had the young man done it, he would assuredly have been a disciple of Christ; therefore, to deny the commandments of God, *of the Old Testament*, is to deny an essential part of the duty of a disciple of Christ. The *Standard*, and the "Disciples" whom it represents, need to learn more thoroughly what constitutes a true disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ. The *Standard* needs to so learn Christ.

But aside from this special pleading, the *Standard* cannot make its own system work. In answer to the statement that "Jesus repelled the tempter by quoting the Old Testament," it says:—

"Those Scriptures *had* authority. Jesus was a Jew, 'born under the law,' and it was his office to 'magnify the law and make it honorable.' Not one jot or tittle of the law was to pass *until all was fulfilled*; and Jesus was then engaged in fulfilling it. What has that to do with the question concerning the *present* Lawgiver, whose authority we are to honor?"

And yet in an editorial on the same page, in reply to a Catholic on the worship of Mary, it says:—

"There are no hymns of praise, there is no worship, addressed to Mary in the Scriptures. 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,' is what the Son of Mary uttered as true doctrine."

But hold, Mr. *Standard*. Why may not the Catholic answer you in your own words, that it was as "a Jew 'born under the law,'" and "as an expounder of the law," and while he was "engaged in fulfilling it," that Jesus uttered these words? He was speaking to one who regarded him "as an expounder of the law, therefore Jesus answered him *out of the law*. This certainly proves that the law of Moses was the authoritative." But "what has that to do with the question concerning the *present* Lawgiver whose authority Catholics are to follow?"

Now why is not that argument as sound in behalf of the Catholics as the foregoing is in behalf of the Disciples? Or is it true that argument against the authority of the Old Testament is good for the Disciples alone, and is not to be used by other people? "It is a poor rule that will not work both ways." And as the *Standard's* rule, by its own application, will not work both ways, we set it down that the argument against the authority of the Old Testament is a poor, miserable shift to escape the obligation of the Law of God. J.

**June 24, 1886**

**"The Alemanni. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 24 , p. 372.**

IN January, A. D. 275, Aurelian was assassinated. Two emperors followed in quick succession—Tacitus for two hundred days, and Florianus for about three months—and August 3, A. D. 276, Probus succeeded to the purple, and held the Imperial authority till he was murdered—A. D. 282, August.

"Instead of reducing the warlike natives of Germany to the condition of subjects, Probus contented himself with the humble expedient of raising a bulwark against their inroads. The country which now forms the circle of Swabia had been left desert in the age of Augustus by the emigration of its ancient inhabitants. The fertility of the soil soon attracted a new colony from the adjacent provinces of Gaul. crowds [*sic.*] of adventurers, of a roving temper and of desperate fortunes, occupied the doubtful possession, and acknowledged, by the payment of tithes the majesty of the empire. To protect these new subjects, a line of frontier garrisons was

gradually extended from the Rhine to the Danube. About the reign of Hadrian, when that mode of defense began to be practiced, these garrisons were connected and covered by a strong intrenchment of trees and palisades. In the place of so rude a bulwark, the emperor Probus constructed a stone wall of a considerable height, and strengthened it by towers at convenient distances. From the neighborhood of Newstadt and Ratisbon on the Danube, it stretched across hills, valleys, rivers, and morasses, as far as Wimpfen on the Neckar, and at length terminated on the banks of the Rhine, after a winding course of near two hundred miles.

"This important barrier, uniting the two mighty streams that protected the provinces of Europe, seemed to fill up the vacant space through which the barbarians, and particularly the Alemanni, could penetrate with the greatest facility into the heart of the empire. But the experience of the world, from China to Britain, has exposed the vain attempt of fortifying any extensive tract of country. An active enemy, who can select and vary his points of attack, must, in the end, discover some feeble spot, on some unguarded moment. The strength, as well as the attention, of the defenders is divided; and such are the blind effects of terror on the firmest troops, that a line broken in a single place is almost instantly deserted. The fate of the wall which Probus erected may confirm the general observation. *Within a few years after his death, it was overthrown by the Alemanni.* Its scattered ruins, universally ascribed to the power of the Demon, now serve only to excite the wonder of the Swabian peasant."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 12, par. 20.*

The overthrow of the wall of Probus opened to the Alemanni the country of Vindelicia, which they soon overran, and established themselves on the right of the Rhine, from the Mein to the Lake of Constance, in possession of the country, known first by the name of Alemannia and afterward by the name of Swabia, which they and their lineal descendants have held till this day. We shall find that they afterward extended their power over other provinces, of some of which they were in later times deprived, but this they *never lost*. And it will be found that the country of Swabia was among the most important of Europe in the Middle Ages.

Probus was succeeded by Carus, who reigned till December 25, A. D. 283, and was then, at his death, succeeded by his two sons Carinus and Numerian. Numerian died, or was murdered, September 12, A.D. 284, and was succeeded by Diocletian September 17, and Carinus was murdered in the following May. In the reign of Diocletian occurred the next important inroad of the Alemanni. Diocletian re-established the defenses of the empire along the Rhine and the Danube, for protection against the barbarians,

"From the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Danube, the ancient camps, towns, and citidels, were diligently reestablished, and, in the most exposed places, new ones were skilfully constructed: the

strictest vigilance was introduced among the garrisons of the frontier, and every expedient was practiced that could render the long chain of fortifications firm and impenetrable. A barrier so respectable was seldom violated, and the barbarians often turned against each other their disappointed rage. The Goths, the Vandals, the Gepide, the Burgundians, the Alemanni, wasted each other's strength by destructive hostilities; and whosoever vanquished, they vanquished the enemies of Rome. The subjects of Diocletian enjoyed the bloody spectacle, and congratulated each other, that the mischiefs of civil war were now experienced only by the barbarians.

"Notwithstanding the policy of Diocletian, it was impossible to maintain an equal and undisturbed tranquillity during a reign of twenty years, and along a frontier of many hundred miles. Sometimes the barbarians suspended their domestic animosities, and the relaxed vigilance of the garrisons sometimes gave a passage to their strength or dexterity. Whenever the provinces were invaded, Diocletian conducted himself with that calm dignity which he always affected or possessed; reserved his presence for such occasions as were worthy of his interposition, never exposed his person or reputation to any unnecessary danger, insured his success by every means that prudence could suggest, and displayed, with ostentation, the consequences of his victory.

"In wars of a more difficult nature, and more doubtful event, he employed the rough valor of Maximian; and that faithful soldier was content to ascribe his own victories to the wise counsels and auspicious influence of his benefactor. But after the adoption of the two Cesars, the emperors themselves, retiring to a less laborious scene of action, devolved on their adopted sons the defence of the Danube and of the Rhine. The vigilant Galerius was never reduced to the necessity of vanquishing an army of barbarians on the Roman territory. The brave and active Constantius delivered Gaul from a very furious inroad of the Alemanni; and his victories of Langres and Vindonissa appear to have been actions of considerable danger and merit. As he traversed the open country with a feeble guard, he was encompassed on a sudden by the superior multitude of the enemy. He retreated with difficulty towards Langres; but, in the general consternation, the citizens refused to open their gates, and the wounded prince was drawn up the wall by the means of a rope. But, on the news of his distress, the Roman troops hastened from all sides to his relief, and before the evening he had satisfied his honor and revenge by the slaughter of six thousand Alemanni."—*Id.*, chap. 13, par. 12, 13.

While Constantine reigned as Cesar in Gaul (A. D. 306-312) a body of Franks and Alemanni invaded that province. Constantine defeated them, and "several of their princes," and "a great number of their youth," "were exposed by his order to

the wild beasts in the amphitheater of Treves."—*Id.*, chap. 14, par. 18. After this, both Franks and Alemanni seem to have remained on their own side of the Rhine till the time of Constantius, the son of Constantine, about 350-351 A.D. In the contest of Constantius with Magnentius, the usurper of Gaul, the emperor gave as a "perpetual grant," to the Alemanni and the Franks, "all the territories which they should be able to subdue." They therefore crossed the Rhine, and from its source to its mouth extended their conquests "above forty miles to the west of that river;" and thus the Alemanni obtained possessions which, although defeated in battle time and again, they still held in the time of Charlemagne.

"In the blind fury of civil discord, Constantius had abandoned to the barbarians of Germany the countries of Gaul, which still acknowledged the authority of his rival [Magnentius]. A numerous swarm of Franks and Alemanni were invited to cross the Rhine by presents and promises, by the hopes of spoil, and *by a perpetual grant of all the territories which they should be able to subdue*. But the emperor, who for a temporary service had thus imprudently provoked the rapacious spirit of the barbarians, soon discovered and lamented the difficulty of dismissing these formidable allies, after they had tasted the richness of the Roman soil. Regardless of the nice distinction of loyalty and rebellion, these undisciplined robbers treated as their natural enemies all the subjects of the empire, who possessed any property which they were desirous of acquiring. Forty-five flourishing cities, Tongres, Cologne, Treves, Worms, Spires, Strasburgh, etc., besides a far greater number of towns and villages, were pillaged, and for the most part reduced to ashes.

"The barbarians of Germany, still faithful to the maxims of their ancestors, abhorred the confinement of walls, to which they applied the odious names of prisons and sepulchers; and fixing their independent habitations on the banks of rivers—the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Meuse—they secured themselves against the danger of a surprise, by a rude and hasty fortification of large trees, which were felled and thrown across the roads. *The Alemanni were established in the modern countries of Alsace and Lorraine;* [A.D. 351] the Franks occupied the island of the Batavians, together with an extensive district of Brabant, which was then known by the appellation of Toxandria, and may deserve to be considered as the original seat of their Gallic monarchy. From the sources, to the mouth of the Rhine, the conquests of the Germans extended above forty miles to the west of that river, over a country peopled by colonies of their own name and nation: and the scene of their devastations was three times more extensive than that of their conquests. At a still greater distance the open towns of Gaul were deserted, and the inhabitants of the fortified cities, who trusted to their strength and vigilance, were obliged to content themselves with such supplies of corn as they could raise on the vacant land

within the enclosure of their walls. The diminished legions, destitute of pay and provisions, of arms and discipline, trembled at the approach, and even at the name of the barbarians.

"Under these melancholy circumstances, an unexperienced youth was appointed to save and to govern the provinces of Gaul, or rather, as he expressed it himself, to exhibit the vain image of Imperial greatness. The retired scholastic education of Julian, in which he had been more conversant with books than with arms, with the dead than with the living, left him in profound ignorance of the practical arts of war and government; and when he awkwardly repeated some military exercise which it was necessary for him to learn, he exclaimed with a sigh, 'O Plato, Plato, what a task for a philosopher!'"—*Id., chap. 19, par. 20, 21.*

J.

**"What Do You Call It?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 24 , p. 375.**

GOD gave commandment by his prophet that men should "call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." He attached a rich promise to the duty thus enjoined. Thus saith the Scriptures: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call 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. And God said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

Yet to-day the most of men, even of those who profess to be God's people, instead of calling the Lord's Sabbath "a delight," call it a burden and a token of bondage. Instead of calling it "the holy of the Lord," they call it "the old Jewish sabbath." Instead of its being called "honorable," it is despised and made a subject of reproach to those who would count it honorable. Surely there must be something wrong with the people, when the word of God is so reversed; when the day upon which he put honor, is persistently and intentionally dishonored; when the day which he blessed is cursed. But it would be well for all to remember the words of Balaam: "Behold I have received commandment to bless; and he hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it." Num. 23:20. Behold all men have received commandment to call the Sabbath a delight; God hath made it a delight, it was a delight to him (Ex. 31:17); and men cannot reverse it. God hath given commandment to call the Sabbath the holy of the Lord, and to keep it holy unto the Lord; and he hath made it holy; and men cannot reverse it. God hath given commandment to call the Sabbath honorable; and he hath put honor upon it; and men cannot reverse it.

Why should men attach disparaging epithets to that which God commands them to honor? Why should they call that the old Jewish sabbath, which God has commanded them to call "the holy of the Lord"? There can be but one answer;

there can be but one explanation of it; and that is the explanation that the Scripture gives: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God." Rom. 8:7. The carnal mind supposes that by making the Sabbath of the Lord the "Jewish sabbath" it can accomplish the feat of making the heathen Sunday the "Christian sabbath." But it can do the one no easier than it can do the other.

Sabbath means rest. The Sabbath day is the rest day; and "God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Heb. 4:4. When God says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath;" it is simply saying, Remember the rest day to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the rest of the Lord thy God. As therefore the seventh day is the day upon which God rested, that is the only day of that can be the rest day. God rested no other day of the week, therefore no other day of the week can be the rest day. Whenever anybody applies to Sunday the term sabbath—rest—it is simply to apply to it a false title, so far as the institution of God is concerned, for God did not rest on the first day of the week. It was the seventh day alone upon which God rested and it is the seventh day alone that can ever be the rest—the Sabbath—day of the Lord. And so long as it remains the fact that "God did rest the seventh day from all his works," so long it will be the truth that the seventh day is the Sabbath. This discovers the utter absurdity of the idea that is so prevalent, and which is so much talked, and printed, and spread abroad, that "the Sabbath has been changed." To speak of a real change of the Sabbath, is but to say that the rest of God has been changed from the day upon which he rested to one upon which he did not rest. In other words it is to say that the Lord rested upon a day upon which he did not rest. But that, it is impossible for even the Lord to do, for to call that a rest day upon which he worked would not be the truth, and it is impossible for God to lie.

The seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, rests upon facts, and it is impossible to change facts. Fact is from *factum*—that which is done. When a thing has been done, it will remain a fact to all eternity. To all eternity it will remain the truth that it was done. It may be undone yet the fact remains, that it was done. It is a fact that in six days God created the heavens and the earth and all things that are therein. This can never cease to be a fact. The universe might be relegated again to chaos, yet the fact would remain that in six days God did create it. It would likewise remain a fact that the Lord worked each of the six days. And as long as this universe stands, which was created in these six days, so long will it remain impossible truthfully to call any one of these six days the Sabbath, that is, the rest day, because there stands the *fact* that the Lord worked, and, we repeat, he himself cannot call a day in which he worked, a rest day. It is likewise a fact that God did rest the seventh day. And as long as the creation stands, so long the truth stands that the seventh day is the rest day, the Sabbath of the Creator; and that none other can be. Therefore it is the simple, plain, demonstrated truth that the seventh day of the week, and that day only of all in the week, is the Sabbath of the Lord; and that while creation stands it cannot be changed.

There is, however, a way, and only one conceivable way, in which the Sabbath could be changed; that is, as expressed by Alexander Campbell, *by creation being gone through with again*. Let us take Mr. Campbell's conception and suppose that creation is to be gone through with again for the purpose of changing the Sabbath; and suppose that the present creation is turned once more to chaos. In creating again, the Lord could of course employ as many, or as few, days as he pleased, according to the day which he designed to make the Sabbath. If he should employ nine days in the work of creation, and rest the tenth day, then the tenth day would be of course the Sabbath. Or if he should employ eight days or seven days in creation, and rest the ninth or the eighth, as the case might be, that day would be the Sabbath; or, employ four days, and rest the *fifth*; or three days, and rest the *fourth*; or two days, and rest the *third*; or one day, and rest the *second*; then the fifth, the fourth, the third, or the second, day, as the case might be, would be the Sabbath.

But suppose, to please the Sunday keepers and to conform to their will, it be designed by the Lord to change the Sabbath to the first day of the week. Could he do it? Not possibly. For suppose all things were created in one day, the day on which creation was performed would necessarily, and of itself be the first day, and the rest day, the Sabbath, therefore, could not possibly be earlier than the second day. The first day could not possibly be both a working day and a rest day. It matters not though only a portion of the day should be employed in the *work*, it would effectually destroy the possibility of its being a rest day. For that could not be truthfully called a rest day when a portion of it had been employed in work. So upon the hypothesis of a new creation, and upon that hypothesis alone, it is conceivable that the Sabbath could be changed; but even upon *that* hypothesis, it would be literally impossible to change the Sabbath from the seventh day to the *first day*.

People will talk and write glibly about the change of the Sabbath, never pausing to consider what is involved in the idea; never considering that heaven and earth would have to be removed before such a thing could be done. Even as Christ said, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." And, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law." In the prophecy which foretold this attempt to change the Sabbath, the word is not that he should change the law, but that, "He shall *think* to change times and laws" of the Most High. This might be expected of the power that should oppose and exalt himself above God (2 Thess. 2:3, 4); and it is perfectly in keeping with his character that in his thought to change the Sabbath of the Lord, he should pitch upon the very day to which, above all others, it would be impossible for the Lord himself to change it.

J.

**"Interpretation against Obedience" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 24 , pp. 375, 376.**

THE editor of the California *Christian Advocate* has been to Healdsburg lately. Of the Seventh-day Adventists there he writes as follows:—

"The Seventh-day Adventists have a strong colony here, and a college. The buildings are frame, but well proportioned and kept, and consist of a college building for school purposes, and a large, fine-looking house for a boarding-hall and dormitories. The Adventists are frugal, industrious, prosperous, and clannish. They do not mingle much with general society, and their devotees are kept strictly to their own work. They are building a large, fine church in a beautiful site. They, of course, keep Saturday for the Sabbath, and this causes breaks in business, and results in supreme disregard of the Christian Sabbath. The Adventists do not often attend services at other churches, and so missed hearing Dr. Briggs's unanswerable argument against their interpretation of the law of the Sabbath."

We thank the Doctor for his excellent notice. It is very fair indeed. We would, however, make a remark or two. He says our course in keeping the Sabbath "results in supreme disregard of the Christian Sabbath." Now we, Seventh-day Adventists, are Christians. We love and honor every Christian institution. We desire ever to do so, and that all our works may result in supreme regard for all Christian institutions, ordinances, and principles. Now we urgently request the editor of the *Advocate* to tell us by the Scriptures what is the "Christian Sabbath," and how it became such. He certainly ought to be willing, and even glad, to do so good a work in the interests of regard for the "Christian Sabbath."

We are sorry that our people at Healdsburg did not hear that "unanswerable argument against their interpretation of the law of the Sabbath." We are certain, however, that we can give the reason for their not hearing it. That reason is, there was no advertisement, nor public announcement, that the said argument would be made. If we are wrong in this, the *Advocate* can set us right. We assure the Doctor, that if such an announcement had been made known, the Seventh-day Adventists of Healdsburg would have filled the house. We know they would have been glad to hear it. In regard to the day of the Sabbath, we deny that Seventh-day Adventists have any interpretation of the law of the

376

Sabbath, or that there is any such interpretation allowable. Interpretation is "an explanation of what is unintelligible, not understood, or not obvious; translation; construction." We deny that the law of the Sabbath is unintelligible; we deny that it needs any translation; we deny the right of any construction; therefore we deny the right of any interpretation.

The law of the Sabbath says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." That is not unintelligible. It is plain, and needs no interpretation. Before ever it can be interpreted, it must be made unintelligible; and that is exactly what is done by every advocate of the Sunday sabbath. The plain, definite expression, "the seventh day," they make "a seventh part of time," "one day in seven, and no difference what day," or some other equally unintelligible conception, and *then* they can interpret it. And in no other way can there be an interpretation of the law of the Sabbath. "When words are plain in a written law there is an end to all construction. They must be followed."

That is law. To follow the plain words of a written law, *as they are written*, is neither interpretation nor construction; it is obedience. We hope the editor of the *Advocate* will never fall into the error that Doctor Briggs did, of making "an unanswerable argument" against Seventh-day Adventists' "interpretation" of the law of the Sabbath. We don't interpret it; we obey it. And we leave to those who disobey it the task of justifying their disobedience by an interpretation.

J.

**July 1, 1886**

**"The Alemanni. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 25 , p. 388.**

*(Continued.)*

"IMMEDIATELY after Julian had received the purple at Milan, he was sent into Gaul with a feeble retinue of three hundred and sixty soldiers. At Vienna, where he passed a painful and anxious winter in the hands of those ministers to whom Constantius had intrusted the direction of his conduct, the Caesar was informed of the siege and deliverance of Autun. That large and ancient city, protected only by a ruined wall and pusillanimous garrison, was saved by the generous resolution of a few veterans, who resumed their arms for the defense of their country. In his march from Autun, through the heart of the Gallic provinces, Julian embraced with ardor the earliest opportunity of signaling his courage. At the head of a small body of archers and heavy cavalry, he preferred the shorter but the more dangerous of two roads; and sometimes eluding, and sometimes resisting, the attacks of the barbarians, who were masters of the field, he arrived with honor and safety at the camp near Rheims, where the Roman troops had been ordered to assemble. The aspect of their young prince revived the drooping spirits of the soldiers, and they marched from Rheims in search of the enemy, with a confidence which had almost proved fatal to them.

"The Alemanni, familiarized to the knowledge of the country, secretly collected their scattered forces, and seizing the opportunity of a dark and rainy day, poured with unexpected fury on the rear-guard of the Romans. Before the inevitable disorder could be remedied, two legions were destroyed; and Julian was taught by experience that caution and vigilance are the most important lessons of the art of war. In a second and more successful action, he recovered and established his military fame; but as the agility of the Barbarians saved them from the pursuit, his victory was neither bloody nor decisive. He advanced, however, to the banks of the Rhine, surveyed the ruins of Cologne, convinced himself of the

difficulties of the war, and retreated on the approach of winter, discontented with the court, with his army, and with his own success. The power of the enemy was yet unbroken; and the Caesar had no sooner separated his troops, and fixed his own quarters at Sens, in the centre of Gaul, than he was surrounded and besieged, by a numerous host of Germans. Reduced, in this extremity, to the resources of his own mind, he displayed a prudent intrepidity, which compensated for all the deficiencies of the place and garrison; and the barbarians, at the end of thirty days, were obliged to retire with disappointed rage.

"The conscious pride of Julian, who was indebted only to his sword for this signal deliverance [A. D. 357], was embittered by the reflection, that he was abandoned, betrayed, and perhaps devoted to destruction, by those who were bound to assist him, by every tie of honor and fidelity. A very judicious plan of operations was adopted for the approaching campaign. Julian himself, at the head of the remains of the veteran bands, and of some new levies which he had been permitted to form, boldly penetrated into the centre of the German cantonments, and carefully reestablished the fortifications of Saverne, in an advantageous post, which would either check the incursions, or intercept the retreat, of the enemy. At the same time, Barbatio, general of the infantry, advanced from Milan with an army of thirty thousand men, and passing the mountains, prepared to throw a bridge over the Rhine, in the neighborhood of Basil.

"It was reasonable to expect that the Alemanni, pressed on either side by the Roman arms, would soon be forced to evacuate the provinces of Gaul, and to hasten to the defense of their native country. But the hopes of the campaign were defeated by the incapacity, or the envy, or the secret instructions, of Barbatio; who acted as if he had been the enemy of the Cesar, and the secret ally of the barbarians. The negligence with which he permitted a troop of pillagers freely to pass, and to return almost before the gates of his camp, may be imputed to his want of abilities; but the treasonable act of burning a number of boats, and a superfluous stock of provisions, which would have been of the most essential service to the army of Gaul, was an evidence of his hostile and criminal intentions. The Germans despised an enemy who appeared destitute either of power or of inclination to offend them; and the ignominious retreat of Barbatio deprived Julian of the expected support; and left him to extricate himself from a hazardous situation, where he could neither remain with safety, nor retire with honor.

"As soon as they were delivered from the fears of invasion, the Alemanni prepared to chastise the Roman youth, who presumed to dispute the possession of that country, *which they claimed as their*

*own by the right of conquest and of treaties.* They employed three days, and as many nights [A.D. 357, Aug.], in transporting over the Rhine their military powers. The fierce Chnodomar, shaking the ponderous javelin which he had victoriously wielded against the brother of Magnentius, led the van of the barbarians, and moderated by his experience the martial ardor which his example inspired. He was followed by six other kings, by ten princes of regal extraction, by a long train of high-spirited nobles, and by thirty-five thousand of the bravest warriors of the tribes of Germany. The confidence derived from the view of their own strength, was increased by the intelligence which they received from a deserter, that the Cesar, with a feeble army of thirteen thousand men, occupied a post about one-and-twenty miles from their camp of Strasburgh. With this inadequate force, Julian resolved to seek and to encounter the barbarian host; and the chance of a general action was preferred to the tedious and uncertain operation of separately engaging the dispersed parties of the Alemanni. The Romans marched in close order, and in two columns; the cavalry on the right, the infantry on the left; and the day was so far spent when they appeared in sight of the enemy, that Julian was desirous of deferring the battle till the next morning, and of allowing his troops to recruit their exhausted strength by the necessary refreshments of sleep and food. Yielding, however, with some reluctance, to the clamors of the soldiers, and even to the opinion of his council, he exhorted them to justify by their valor the eager impatience, which, in case of a defeat, would be universally branded with the epithets of rashness and presumption. The trumpets sounded, the military shout was heard through the field, and the two armies rushed with equal fury to the charge. The Cesar, who conducted in person his right wing, depended on the dexterity of his archers, and the weight of his cuirassiers. But his ranks were instantly broken by an irregular mixture of light horse and of light infantry, and he had the mortification of beholding the flight of six hundred of his most renowned cuirassiers. The fugitives were stopped and rallied by the presence and authority of Julian, who, careless of his own safety, threw himself before them, and urging every motive of shame and honor, led them back against the victorious enemy. The conflict between the two lines of infantry was obstinate and bloody. The Germans possessed the superiority of strength and stature, the Romans that of discipline and temper; and as the barbarians, who served under the standard of the empire, united the respective advantages of both parties, their strenuous efforts, guided by a skilful leader, at length determined the event of the day.

"The Romans lost four tribunes, and two hundred and forty-three soldiers, in this memorable battle of Strasburgh, so glorious to the Cesar, and so salutary to the afflicted provinces of Gaul. Six

thousand of the Alemanni were slain in the field, without including those who were drowned in the Rhine, or transfixed with darts while they attempted to swim across the river. Chnodomar himself was surrounded and taken prisoner, with three of his brave companions, who had devoted themselves to follow in life or death the fate of their chieftain. Julian received him with military pomp in the council of his officers; and expressing a generous pity for the fallen state, dissembled his inward contempt for the abject humiliation, of his captive. Instead of exhibiting the vanquished king of the Alemanni, as a grateful spectacle to the cities of Gaul, he respectfully laid at the feet of the Emperor [Constantius] this splendid trophy of his victory. Chnodomar experienced an honorable treatment; but the impatient Barbarian could not long survive his defeat, his confinement, and his exile."—*Id.*, chap. 19, par. 20-24.

The deliverance of Gaul, by the defeat of the Alemanni and the Franks, established the military fame of Julian; but—

"Unless he had been able to revive the martial spirit of the Romans, or to introduce the arts of industry and refinement among their savage enemies, he could not entertain any rational hopes of securing the public tranquillity, either by the peace or conquest of Germany. Yet the victories of Julian suspended, for a short time, the inroads of the barbarians, and delayed the ruin of the Western Empire."—*Id.*, par. 28.

J.

**"The Wise Shall Inherit Glory" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 25 , pp. 391, 392.**

"THE wise shall inherit glory," is the promise of the word of God. The wise are those who fear God; for "Unto man He said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom." Job 28:28. The promise therefore is that they who fear the Lord shall inherit glory. Glory is set before us as that for which we are to seek equally with immortality and the honor which God alone can give. Paul tells us that God, in rendering to every man according to his deeds, will give eternal life "to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality." Rom. 2:7. But what is the glory for which men are to seek, and which the wise shall inherit? It is not simply honor and exaltation; for the word which we have just quoted says we are to seek for glory *and honor*; it is something different from that, as it is also different from immortality, yet is associated with these blessed gifts which God will bestow upon the faithful.

This glory is the glory of God, and the glory of God is light. In Rev. 21:23, of the heavenly city, we read: "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it; *for the glory of God did lighten it.*" When Moses came down from the mount, after having been there the second time forty days and forty nights, his face shone so brightly that Aaron and the children of Israel were afraid and fled (Ex. 31:29-33); and Paul says that it was "glory" with which his

countenance shone. Peter says that Jesus "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 apostle here certainly makes direct reference to the transfiguration of Christ, and says that there he received "honor and glory." Now the record of that scene is that "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light;" "His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow so as no fuller on earth can white them." When Saul of Tarsus was on his way to Damascus, "suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven," and he heard a voice saying unto him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Paul, telling of this several years afterward, said: "At midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me." This light was the glory of the Lord Jesus. And so will he appear when he is revealed from Heaven. Says one who in holy vision saw it: "His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had bright beams coming out of his side, and there was the hiding of his power." Hab. 3:3, 4, margin. This is the glory that the wise shall inherit. This is the glory which they shall receive "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for" it.

Man once possessed this glory. When God made man, and all upon the earth, pronounced it all very good, and gave man dominion over it all, that is the time of which the psalmist speaks: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and and [*sic.*] hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands, thou hast put all things under his feet." Ps. 8:4-8. That this refers to the beginning when man was created, is made plain by Paul's comment on this text: "For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." From these scriptures it is clear that in the beginning, man was crowned with glory and honor, and that all things were put under him; but that by sin he lost all this, so that now we see it not so. Yet instead we see Jesus who has stepped into man's place—lower than the angels; we see him in man's place, crowned with the glory and honor which man lost; we see him standing thus to redeem man from death, and to crown him again with glory and honor. And as we have read from Peter that it was at the transfiguration that Christ was crowned with this "honor and glory," as then the glory of God shone from his countenance and enveloped all his figure; as he then stood in the place which the first Adam lost, it is evident that when man was in the beginning crowned with glory and honor, the glory of God beamed from his countenance and enveloped all his person, and that his appearance was like the appearance of Christ, though undoubtedly in a lesser degree of glory, when he stood on the holy mount crowned with glory and honor. From this it is likewise plainly apparent that when our first parents sinned, the glory departed, and *then* they knew they

were naked, and were ashamed. And so by sin man not only lost his life, but he literally lost the glory, and the honor, as well as the dominion which God gave him.

But, although all this was lost to the race by the unfaithfulness of the first Adam, it is all restored by the faithfulness of the second Adam, to all who will accept it at his worthy hands, and by patient continuance in well doing seek for it in him. Out of Christ, neither life, nor glory, nor honor, nor dominion, beyond this world can ever be obtained by any of the children of men; for he "was crowned with glory and honor that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." And "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." But "as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God." And "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." "There is suffering ere the glory."

But on this subject of suffering as compared with the glory, we have the estimate of one who was a pattern of longsuffering to all who should after believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul says: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." It was not in the form of a provincialism that Paul used the word "reckon," but in its real sense of making an estimate, of casting up an account, of striking a balance. He had experienced suffering such as it is safe to say no man since has endured. His life was a life of suffering, even as expressed by another, "a long martyrdom." Yet taking it all, and making the most of it, it was not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. In another place we see the account as he has drawn it out and shown the balance. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." There is the balance sheet of the life of the true Christian. *Glory* stands against *affliction*. A *weight* of glory stands against *light* affliction. An *eternal* weight of glory stands against a *moment* of light affliction. Nor is that the full computation. That is not the

392

full balance. Here it is: Against a moment of light affliction there stands "a *far more exceeding and eternal* weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4:17.

Notice particularly that Paul does not say that these sufferings are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed *to us*, but revealed *in us*; that is, of which we shall be partakers in ourselves, which shall be a part of us, and which shall shine forth from us. Now we shall offer a few scriptures showing when and how this shall be. Peter says: "Now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth. . . . might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." "And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 1:6, 7; 4:13; 5:4.

These texts show that it is at the coming of the Saviour in his glory that the wise inherit the glory and honor as well as the immortality which they seek.

As to how this is accomplished, John tells us: "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 3:2. "As he is," is this: His head and his hairs are white like wool, as white as snow; his eyes are as a flame of fire; his feet are like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his countenance is as the sun shineth in his strength. Rev. 1:14-16. And Paul says: "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." Phil. 3:20, 21. And the effect of this change will be as is suggested Paul in another place: "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead." 1 Cor. 15:41, 42. And as the Saviour himself says: "Then shall the righteous *shine forth as the sun* in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. 13:41. And by Daniel he says: "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." Dan. 12:3.

Nor is that all. Such are to dwell in that holy city of God which has the glory of God. They shall walk in the light of that beautiful city, which has no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, because the glory of God lightens it, and because the Lamb, whose glory is above the brightness of the sun, is the light thereof. And they and the bright city shall dwell upon the earth made new; when "the wilderness shall be like Eden, and the desert like the garden of the Lord;" where "joy and gladness shall be found, thanksgiving and the voice of melody" (Isa. 51:3); where "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Heb. 2:14); and when the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed because the Lord reigns "in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Isa. 24:23. "This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord." Isa. 54:17. *The wise shall inherit glory.*

"Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling; and to present you faultless *before the presence of his glory* with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen." Jude 24, 25.

J.

**July 8, 1886**

**"The Alemanni. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26 , p. 404.**

IT was "for a short time indeed "that the victories of Julian suspended the inroads of the barbarians." The Emperor Julian died of a wound June 27, A.D. 363. He was succeeded by Jovian, who reigned only till Feb. 17, A.D. 364, and ten days afterward Valentinian was chosen emperor, and "thirty days after his own elevation, he bestowed the title of Augustus on his brother Valens. "In the

castle, or palace, of Mediana, only three miles from Naissus, they executed the solemn and final division of the empire [A.D. 365, spring]. Valentinian bestowed on his brother the rich prefecture of the *East*, from the lower Danube to the confines of Persia; whilst he reserved for his immediate government the warlike prefectures of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Gaul*, from the extremity of Greece to the Caledonian rampart, and from the rampart of Caledonia to the foot of Mount Atlas.

"When the suffrage of the generals and of the army committed the scepter of the Roman Empire to the hands of Valentinian, his reputation in arms, his military skill and experience, and his rigid attachment to the forms, as well as spirit, of ancient discipline, were the principal motives of their judicious choice. The eagerness of the troops, who pressed him to nominate his colleague, was justified by the dangerous situation of public affairs; and Valentinian himself was conscious, that the abilities of the most active mind were unequal to the defense of the distant frontiers of an invaded monarchy. As soon as the death of Julian had relieved the barbarians from the terror of his name, the most sanguine hopes of rapine and conquest excited the nations of the East, of the North, and of the South.

"The ambassadors of the Alemanni had been offended [A.D. 365] by the harsh and haughty behavior of Ursacius, master of the offices; who by an act of unseasonable parsimony, had diminished the value, as well as the quantity, of the presents to which they were entitled, either from custom or treaty, on the accession of a new emperor. They expressed, and they communicated to their countrymen, their strong sense of the national affront. The irascible minds of the chiefs were exasperated by the suspicion of contempt; and the martial youth crowded to their standard. Before Valentinian could pass the Alps, the villages of Gaul were in flames; before his general Degalaiphus could encounter the Alemanni, they had secured the captives and the spoil in the forests of Germany. In the beginning of the ensuing year [A.D. 366, Jan.] the military force of the whole nation, in deep and solid columns, broke through the barrier of the Rhine, during the severity of a northern winter. Two Roman counts were defeated and mortally wounded; and the standard of the Heruli and Batavians fell into the hands of the Heruli and Batavians fell into the hands of the conquerors, who displayed, with insulting shouts and menaces, the trophy of their victory.

"The standard was recovered; but the Batavians had not redeemed the shame of their disgrace and flight in the eyes of their severe judge. It was the opinion of Valentinian, that his soldiers must learn to fear their commander, before they could cease to fear the enemy. The troops were solemnly assembled; and the trembling Batavians were enclosed within the circle of the Imperial army. Valentinian then ascended his tribunal; and, as if he disdained to

punish cowardice with death, he inflicted a stain of indelible ignominy on the officers, whose misconduct and pusillanimity were found to be the first occasion of the defeat. The Batavians were degraded from their rank, stripped of their arms, and condemned to be sold for slaves to the highest bidder. At this tremendous sentence, the troops fell prostrate on the ground, deprecated the indignation of their sovereign, and protested, that, if he would indulge them in another trial, they would approve themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans, and of his soldiers. Valentinian, with affected reluctance, yielded to their entreaties; the Batavians resumed their arms, and with their arms, the invincible resolution of wiping away their disgrace in the blood of the Alemanni.

"The principal command was declined by Dagalaiphus; and that experienced general, who had represented, perhaps with too much prudence, the extreme difficulties of the undertaking, had the mortification, before the end of the campaign, of seeing his rival Jovinus convert those difficulties into a decisive advantage over the scattered forces of the barbarians. At the head of a well-disciplined army of cavalry, infantry, and light troops, Jovinus advanced, with cautious and rapid steps, to Scarponna, in the territory of Metz, where he surprised a large division of the Alemanni, before they had time to run to their arms; and flushed his soldiers with the confidence of an easy and bloodless victory. Another division, or rather army, of the enemy, after the cruel and wanton devastation of the adjacent country, reposed themselves on the shady banks of the Moselle.

"Jovinus, who had viewed the ground with the eye of a general, made a silent approach through a deep and woody vale, till he could distinctly perceive the indolent security of the Germans. Some were bathing their huge limbs in the river; others were combing their long and flaxen hair; others again were swallowing large draughts of rich and delicious wine. On a sudden they heard the sound of the Roman trumpet; they saw the enemy in their camp. Astonishment produced disorder; disorder was followed by flight and dismay; and the confused multitude of the bravest warriors was pierced by the swords and javelins of the legionaries and auxiliaries. The fugitives escaped to the third, and most considerable, camp, in the Catalonian plains, near Chalons in Champagne; the straggling detachments were hastily recalled to their standard; and the barbarian chiefs, alarmed and admonished by the fate of their companions, prepared to encounter, in a decisive battle, the victorious forces of the lieutenant of Valentinian. The bloody and obstinate conflict lasted a whole summer's day, with equal valor, and with alternate success. The Romans at length prevailed, with the loss of about twelve hundred men. Six thousand of the Alemanni were slain, four thousand were wounded; and the

brave Jovinus, after chasing the flying remnant of their host as far as the banks of the Rhine, returned to Paris, to receive the applause of his sovereign, and the ensigns of the consulship for the ensuing year.

"The triumph of the Romans was indeed sullied by their treatment of the captive king, whom they hung on a gibbet, without the knowledge of their indignant general. This disgraceful act of cruelty, which might be imputed to the fury of the troops, was followed by the deliberate murder of Withicab, the son of Vadomair; a German prince, of a weak and sickly constitution, but of a daring and formidable spirit. The domestic assassin was instigated and protected by the Romans; and the violation of the laws of humanity and justice betrayed their secret apprehension of the weakness of the declining empire. The use of the dagger is seldom adopted in public councils, as long as they retain any confidence in the power of the sword."—*Id.*, 25, 16, 17, 18.

Valentinian died Nov. A.D. 375, and was succeeded by his son Gratian. When in A.D. 378 the Visigoths in the Eastern Empire had revolted from the authority of Valens, that emperor sent into the West to have Gratian with his legions to join the forces of the East in suppressing the rebellious Goths. Gratian agreed to do so, and as soon as the movement was known to the Alemanni they again poured into Gaul to recover the possessions of which they had been deprived by Julian, and which had been held by Valentinian. But unfortunately for the Alemanni they were too hasty, for the legions of Gratian had not gone so far but that they were recalled; and, having been gathered together in such numbers to assist Valens against the formidable Goths, they were enabled to inflict a severe defeat upon the Alemanni.

"After this signal victory, which secured the peace of Gaul, and asserted the honor of the Roman arms, the emperor Gratian appeared to proceed without delay on his Eastern expedition; but as he approached the confines of the Alemanni, he suddenly inclined to the left, surprised them by his unexpected passage of the Rhine, and boldly advanced into the heart of their country. The barbarians opposed to his progress the obstacles of nature and of courage; and still continued to retreat, from one hill to another, till they were satisfied, by repeated trials, of the power and perseverance of their enemies. Their submission was accepted as a proof, not indeed of their sincere repentance, but of their actual distress; and a select number of their brave and robust youth was exacted from the faithless nation, as the most substantial pledge of their future moderation. The subjects of the empire, who had so often experienced *that the Alemanni could neither be subdued by arms, nor restrained by treaties*, might not promise themselves any solid or lasting tranquillity: but they discovered, in the virtues of their young sovereign, the prospect of a long and auspicious reign."—*Id.*, 26, 29.

When in A.D. 406, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Alani, and the Burgundians, swept into Gaul, while the Franks, in behalf of the empire, vigorously opposed their passage of the Rhine, the Alemanni remained strictly neutral (Gibbon 30:18, 19); as they did also, it seems, in the raid of Attila (A.D. 453), into Gaul. In all this time however the power of the Alemanni steadily grew until, at the time of the death of Valentinian III., A.D. 455, they held nearly all of Rhetia, and equally with the Franks held all the country from the Rhine to the Seine.

"The deaths of Etius and Valentinian had relaxed the ties which held the barbarians of Gaul in peace and subordination. The sea-coast was infested by the Saxons; *the Alemanni and the Franks advanced from the Rhine to the Seine*; and the ambition of the Goths seemed to meditate more extensive and permanent conquests."—*Id.* 36:5.

Thus in the year A.D. 455, the Alemanni held all the country above the Moselle, from the Seine to the Rhine, and nearly, if not quite, all of the province of Rhetia; and with such prestige as a nation that a victory which Majorian, master-general of the cavalry and infantry of the empire, had gained over *nine hundred* of them (cir A.D. 457) was considered sufficiently meritorious to be rewarded with the Imperial power and office.—*Gibbon 56:9, note.*

J.

### **"Try the Spirits" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26 , pp. 406, 407.**

LAST week we inserted a note on the application by the *Golden Gate* of the text, "Try the Spirits;" we shall now enlarge somewhat upon the subject. Spiritualism has now become such a common thing; and in the last few years, as compared with its earlier history, has behaved itself so exceedingly well, for it; and as the immortality of the soul, the sole foundation of Spiritualism, is made so essential a part of the creeds of all the churches, it has in a measure disarmed the distrust in which it was very properly held in its early day while yet it was a new thing.

The source of Spiritualism is above the natural. No man ever yet believed in it because of its accordance with the natural, but solely because its phenomena is contrary to that which is natural. Therefore the only proper and trustworthy test by which the spirits can be tried is something whose source is likewise above the natural; and in the Bible this demand is fully supplied. *God spake* in time past unto the fathers by the prophets; afterward by his Son; and yet afterward by the apostles. Heb. 1:1, 2. This word came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Peter 1:21. Therefore we maintain that the testimony of the Bible is the true and only safe standard by which to try the spirits. To that word we appeal. To that word the appeal must ever be made, if Spiritualism, its phenomena, its tendency, and its final end would be understood at all.

It was with direct reference to Spiritualism that the prophet exclaimed, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because

there is no light in them." The whole passage is as follows: "And when they shall say unto you, "Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that matter; 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

407

is because there is no light in them." Most assuredly this scripture is applicable now. On every hand, and among all classes of people from the hovel to the courts of kings and the palaces of queens, they say unto you, "Seek unto them that have familiar spirits." And when this is so, the word says, "Should not a people seek unto their God?" By seeking unto God, men can learn more about Spiritualism than they can by seeking unto them that have familiar spirits. Then the prophet exclaims in a surprised inquiry, "For the living to the dead?" That is, Shall *the living* go to *the dead* to find out that which they wish to know? The living know something; the dead know nothing; and it certainly is matter of surprise that they who know something should go to them who know nothing to find out what they desire to know. Thus at the very threshold of Spiritualism, we are brought face to face with a flat contradiction of "this word" in accordance with which they must speak, or else stand proven to be from the source of darkness.

"This word," the word of God, says: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything. . . . Their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Eccl. 9:5, 6. But instead of speaking according to this word, these "familiar spirits" with whom Spiritualism deals purport to be people who have died in this world, but who now live in the "spirit world," and continue to know all and a good deal more about both this world and all others than they did while they lived. That is to say, a person knows a vast deal more when he is dead than when he is alive! In others words, if a man should be struck a moderately heavy blow and merely knocked, as the term is, senseless, he knows nothing, which is a fact; but if he be struck a crushing blow and killed outright, then he knows everything! then his knowledge is almost divine! Such stuff is according to the peeping and muttering nonsense of familiar spirits, but it is in no sense according to the word of God.

But this is by no means the only point in which Spiritualism conflicts with the word of God. In fact there is no agreement at all between them. It is well known that the very first of the first fruits of Spiritualism is to destroy confidence in the Bible. That there is no agreement, but rather direct conflict instead, between the teachings of the Bible, and those of Spiritualism, we have the positive evidence of prominent Spiritualists themselves. In the *Religio-Philosophical Journal* of April 25, 1885, there was printed an address delivered by Wm. Emmette Coleman, at the Metropolitan Temple, San Francisco, Cal., on the thirty-seventh anniversary of the advent of modern Spiritualism. The address is entitled, "A Comparison of the Scriptural and Spiritual Evidences of Man's Continued Existence;" but it is the worst kind of a misnomer to call it a *comparison*, for it would be impossible to show a clearer *contrast* between any two things than is shown in this address, between Spiritualism and the Scriptures. We are glad to see this contrast so

clearly defined by Spiritualism itself; for we propose to present a summary of it, and if we were to draw up such a one ourselves, some might think we were prejudiced even to bigotry.

We are sorry that we cannot present this summary in Mr. Coleman's own words, in full; but the truth is that in his presentation of the Bible side of the case, he sometimes uses language so extravagant, not to say scandalous, that we would not show such disrespect to our readers as to set it in our columns. We shall, however, as nearly as possible, present the matter as he did, only dropping his extravagances.

"The Scriptures teach the eternal punishment of wicked mortals and fallen angels in everlasting hell-fire; Spiritualism teaches the non-existence of the fallen angels and the lake of fire, and that there is no eternal punishment."

"The New Testament teaches the existence of a fixed, material Heaven, above the clouds, ruled autocratically by a local, personal God, seated on a throne, attended by hosts of non-human, winged angels; Spiritualism teaches that Heaven is a mortal condition,—happiness, harmony,—not a fixed location, and that in the spiritual world no trace can be found of a masculine potentate, enthroned in solemn awe, and that all angels are human spirits, devoid of wings, who have progressed into a high and pure condition from the lower spheres of the spirit realm."

"Jesus and the apostles evidently conceived Heaven to be created miraculously by the arbitrary fiat of Jehovah; Spiritualism pronounces all spirit-worlds to be evolved from material worlds, or from lower spiritual worlds, through laws eternal as nature.

"Christianity and the Bible threaten eternal damnation as a penalty for non-belief in Jesus; while Spiritualism declares that *the belief or non-belief in Jesus weighs nothing as against the soul's seduction*, the attainment of Heaven being dependent solely upon the character and aspiration of the individual, independent of all beliefs in speculative doctrines, and that, if any thing, *the belief in the supremacy of Jesus*, on earth and in Heaven, being an intellectual error, *will retard rather than advance the soul's progress* in light and love, purity and wisdom.

"The New Testament and Christianity teach that man's salvation, in a measure, depends upon his submission to the rite of baptism; Spiritualism affirms baptism to be of no avail, a foolish relic of ancient superstition, a belief in its efficacy cramping the mind and dwarfing the powers of the soul, inimical rather than favorable to the soul's purification.

"The New Testament teaches salvation by and through Christ; Spiritualism knows no salvation through Christ or any other person, male or female—the man Jesus being able to save himself only, every soul being its own saviour, assisted of course by other sympathizing souls like Jesus, Paul, and other philanthropists.

"Jesus and the apostles appear to have believed that the body and soul of man remained unconscious till the judgment day, when all material bodies would rise from the dead reanimated. Spiritualism affirms that the material body decomposes and is never restored to life, it having no place in the spirit world, it being impossible for purely material things to exist in that realm.

"Christ and the apostles taught that at the end of the world a general judgment would take place, with Christ as judge, seated on a cloudy throne, before which throne all that have ever lived on earth would be assembled, in their material bodies; that the records of each life kept by angels would be read, and the entire multitude be separated into two great divisions. Spiritualism shows this to be a fancy sketch,—that no material resurrection or judgment day will ever happen; that immediately after death each human soul enters upon its never-ending pathway through the spheres, upward and onward forever, the day of judgment in our sense taking place at the entrance of each soul into spirit life, and in a more extended sense in every day of the life of every soul, a constant fact in the consciousness of all. Also that Jesus has no connection with the judgment of any soul save his own, in any peculiar or special sense."

"Finally, Jesus taught that there was no marriage in the future life; while Spiritualism teaches that the domestic relations are eternal; that all true marital unions continue in the after life; that all souls have eternal soul-mates, the two being destined in time to be eternally conjoined as one; and that there is no such thing as bachelorhood [*sic.*] or old-maidism in the spirit country, except in the earlier experiences of some spirits, the very universe itself being redolent of nuptial unions in all departments of being, the sex principle being inherent in the eternal constitution of things.

"In no one particular, then, does the description of our future home found in the Bible correspond with the sublime and virtue-inspiring realities of spirit existence open to our gaze in this age of spiritual life and revelation."

Thus in trying the spirits, by the very first test that we apply, by this appeal "to the law and to the testimony," we find that "there is no light in them." Next week, if the Lord will, we shall try them further. J.

### **"What Is Death?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26 , p. 407.**

SOME time ago the following question appeared in the *Christian Union*, and the appended answer is by that paper:—

"Can you tell me how it is that learned Christian ministers call death the coming of the Lord? Can it be that the terrible 'enemy,' the dreaded foe to all our earthly hopes and loves, is the same as the 'bright appearing' of the 'great God and our Saviour Jesus

Christ,' the 'blessed hope' everywhere spoken of in the Scriptures as the event of joy, which we are to 'look for and hasten unto'? Who can say from the heart, 'O death, come quickly'?

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

"The coming of death cannot be said in any sense to fulfill that coming of the Lord which is in the New Testament so much the hope and expectation of God's children; but to those who believe that death brings them at once into the immediate presence of their Lord, that to depart is to be with Christ, which is far better, death is no longer the dreaded foe he once was, and in a true sense dying is going to the Lord."

What a mixture is here! "The coming of death cannot *in any sense* fulfill that coming of the Lord which is "the hope of the Christian; but, "in a true sense dying is going to the Lord." Now if dying is not in any sense the coming of the Lord, but is, on the contrary, a going to the Lord, then how can there ever be any such thing as "that coming of the Lord which is in the New Testament so much the hope and expectation of God's children"? For if dying is going to the Lord, then as a matter of hope the coming of the Lord is literally destroyed. But all such stuff as that "dying is going to the Lord" is worse than nonsense, it is a positive perversion of the plain word of the Lord Jesus. He said: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, *whither I go, ye cannot come*; so not I say to you." John 13:33. What he had said to the Jews was this: "Ye shall seek me, and ye shall die in your sins; whither I go, ye cannot come." John 8:21. As he said to those Jews, "Whither I go, ye cannot come," so now he said to his disciples, "Whither I go, ye cannot come." Therefore, if there is any one thing that is made positive by the Lord Jesus, it is that no one can go to him by dying. Yet in spite of this, here is an eminent Christian by publication which flatly says, "In a true sense dying is going to the Lord." But "to the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Again, the *Union* says: "To those who believe that death brings them at once into the immediate presence of the Lord . . . death is no longer the dreaded foe he once was." Now the Scripture is the word of God, and that word declares death to be an "enemy," pictures him armed with a dreadful "sting," and calls him "the king of terrors." He was one of the most eminent Christians who ever lived, who declared death to be an "enemy" (1 Cor. 15:26); and it was in portraying the victory of the triumphant Christian that he pictured this enemy as having the fatal "sting" (1 Cor. 15:15-57). He was a perfect and upright man, "one that feared God, and eschewed evil;" one who, out of the fullness of a sublime faith, could exclaim, "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" he it was who described death as "the king of terrors" (Job 18:12-14). And however much authoritative leaders of theological thought may draw upon pagan mythology and heathen superstition for material with which to dress it up in the beautiful flowing robes of a royal friend; yet as the word of God is true, it has been, and is, and ever will be, the truth, that death is an "enemy" and "the king of terrors." We repeat, "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. "Lo they have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them"? Jer. 8:9.

J.

**"The Death of Lazarus. John 11:1-16" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 26 ,  
pp. 410, 411.**

The Commentary

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON**

(July 18.—John 11:1-16.)

JESUS had often found the rest that his weary human nature required at the house of Lazarus, in Bethany. His first visit there was when he and his disciples were weary from a toilsome journey on foot from Jericho to Jerusalem. They tarried as guests at the quiet home of Lazarus, and were ministered unto by his sisters, Martha and Mary. Notwithstanding the fatigue of Jesus, he continued the instruction which he had been giving his disciples on the road, in reference to the qualifications necessary to fit men for the kingdom of Heaven. The peace of Christ rested upon the home of the brother and sisters. Martha had been all anxiety to provide for the comfort of her guests, but Mary was charmed by the words of Jesus to his disciples, and, seeing a golden opportunity to become better acquainted with the doctrines of Christ, quietly entered the room where he was sitting, and, taking her place at the feet of Jesus, drank in eagerly every word that fell from his lips.

The energetic Martha was meanwhile making ample preparations for the entertainment of her guests, and missed her sister's help. Finally she discovered that Mary was sitting at the feet of Jesus, and listening with rapt attention to what he was saying. Martha, wearied with many cares, was so vexed to see her sister calmly listening thus, that she forgot the courtesy due to her guests, and openly complained of Mary's idleness, and appealed to Jesus that he would not permit all the domestic duties to fall upon one.

Jesus answered these complaints with mild and patient words: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things; but one thing is needful, and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." That which Jesus indicated that Martha needed, was a calm, devotional spirit, a deeper anxiety to learn more concerning the future immortal life, and the graces necessary to spiritual advancement. She needed less anxiety for earthly things, which pass away, and more for heavenly things, which affect the eternal welfare of the soul. It is necessary to faithfully perform the duties of the present life, but

Jesus would teach his children that they must seize every opportunity to gain that knowledge which will make them wise unto salvation.

One of the dangers of the present age is devoting too much time to business matters and to unnecessary cares, which we create for ourselves, while the development of Christian character is neglected. Careful, energetic Marthas are needed for this time, who will blend with their prompt, decisive qualities that "better part" of which Christ spoke. A character of such combined strength and godliness is an unconquerable power for good.

A dark cloud now hung over this quiet home where Jesus had rested. Lazarus was stricken with sudden illness. The afflicted sisters sent a message to Jesus: "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." They made no urgent requirement for the immediate presence of Jesus, for they believed that he would understand the case and relieve their brother. Lazarus was a firm believer in the divine mission of Jesus; he loved him ardently and was in turn beloved by the blessed Master, whose peace had rested on his quiet home. The faith and love which the brother and sisters felt toward Jesus encouraged them to believe that he would not disregard their distress. Therefore they sent the simple, confiding message: "He whom thou lovest is sick."

When Jesus received the message, he said, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." He accordingly remained where he was for two days. After the messenger was sent, Lazarus grew rapidly worse. The sisters counted the days and hours that must intervene between the sending of the message and the arrival of Jesus to their aid. As the time approached when they should expect him, they anxiously watched the travelers who appeared in the distance, hoping to discover the form of Jesus. All their efforts for the recovery of their brother were in vain, and they felt that he must die unless divine help interposed to save him. Their constant prayer was, Oh! that Jesus would come! He could save our beloved brother!

Presently their messenger returns, but unaccompanied by Jesus. He bears to the sorrowing sisters the words of the Saviour, "This sickness is not unto death." But the hearts of the sisters fail them, for lo, their brother is already wrestling with the fierce destroyer, and soon closes his eyes in death.

Jesus, at the end of the two days, proposed to go to Judea, but his disciples endeavored to prevent him from doing so. They reminded him of the hatred manifested toward him when he was last there. Said they, "The Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?" Jesus then explained to them that he must go, for Lazarus was dead, adding, "And I am glad for your

sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." Jesus did not delay going to the relief of Lazarus through want of interest in the stricken family; but he designed to make the sorrowful event of the death of Lazarus an occasion to give undoubted proof of his divine power, and unite his disciples to him in a faith that could not be broken. Already some among them were questioning in their minds if they had not been deceived in the evidences of his di-

411

vine power; if he was really the Christ would he not have saved Lazarus whom he loved? Jesus designed to work a crowning miracle that would convince all who would by any means be convinced that he was the Saviour of the world.

The danger attaching to this expedition into Judea was great, since the Jews were determined to kill Jesus. Finding it was impossible to dissuade him from going, Thomas proposed to the disciples that they should all accompany their Master, saying, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." Therefore the twelve accompanied the Saviour. On the way, Jesus labored for the needy, relieving the suffering and healing the sick as was his custom. When he reached Bethany he heard from several persons that Lazarus was dead, and had been buried four days.—Mrs. E. G. White, in *Great Controversy*.

JESUS said "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." "Jesus spake of his death." "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." John 11:11-14. Yet nowadays there is hardly anything that will excite the opposition of the majority of professed Christians more quickly than to preach, according to these very words of Christ, that the dead are asleep. In these days to speak of death as sleep is to subject yourself to the bigoted epithet of "soul-sleeper," "materialist," "teach of infidelity," and what not. But here we have the plain record of the word of Christ, that when speaking of the *death* of a certain person he said, he "*sleepeth*," and then to make the matter certain that such is his meaning he said plainly, "Lazarus is *dead*." Nothing could be plainer than that the doctrine of the Lord Jesus is that the dead are asleep.

WITH this agrees the word of his apostles. Paul said that David, after he had served his own generation, "fell on sleep and was laid unto his fathers and saw corruption." This however is only what had been written before of the death of David: "David *slept* with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." 1 Kings 2:10. "And *he died* in a good old age." 1 Chron. 29:28. In writing to the Thessalonians Paul said, "We would not have you ignorant brethren concerning them which are asleep. . . . 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 [go before] them which are asleep." Why? For "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. 4:13-17. Thus the *dead in Christ* are those who *sleep in Jesus*. To the Corinthians he said, "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed, in a

moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52. In relating the death of Stephen, Luke says, "He fell asleep." Acts 7:60.

WITH all this, and more, agrees the word of the prophets, and other writers of the Old Testament. Twenty-five times the record made of the kings of Israel and Judah is, "He slept with his fathers and was buried," etc. Job says if he had died then he "should have slept;" and that, "man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 3:11, 13, 14:12. Daniel says, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. 12:2. That the dead are asleep, and they awake at the sound of the trump of God at the coming of Christ, and come forth at the resurrection of the dead, is the straightforward doctrine of the Bible. And however much men may sneer at it, as "soul-sleeping," "materialism," etc., it is the truth of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ. And it is the love of the truth by which we are saved.

J.

**July 15, 1886**

**"Establishment of the Vandals in Africa" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 27, p. 420.**

AFTER the partition of Gaul among the Franks, the Alemanni, the Visigoths, and the Burgundians, the next notable movement of any of the barbarians was the emigration of the Vandals from Spain into Africa. We have already traced the Vandals and the Suevi into Spain; and we have seen Wallia and his Visigoths (A.D. 415-418) sweep over eastern Spain from the Pyrenees to the Straits of Gibraltar. The effect of Wallia's power was, that,—

"He exterminated the Silingi, who had irretrievably ruined the elegant plenty of the province of Bútica. He slew, in battle, the king of the Alani; and the remains of those Scythian wanderers, who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, with whom they were ever afterwards confounded. The Vandals themselves, and the Suevi, yielded to the efforts of the invincible Goths. The promiscuous multitude of barbarians, whose retreat had been intercepted, were driven into the mountains of Gallicia; where they still continued, in a narrow compass and on a barren soil, to exercise their domestic and implacable hostilities.—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 31, par. 38.*

Wallia "restored his Spanish conquests to the obedience of Honorius," and returned into Southwestern Gaul, where, as we have shown, they "were established [A.D. 419], according to the faith of treaties, in the possession of the second Aquitain."

"After the retreat of the Goths, the authority of Honorius had obtained a precarious establishment in Spain; except only in the province of Gallicia, where the Suevi and the Vandals had fortified

their camps, in mutual discord and hostile independence. The Vandals prevailed; and their adversaries were besieged in the Nervasian hills, between Leon and Oviedo, till the approach of Count Asterius compelled, or rather provoked, the victorious barbarians to remove [A.D. 428] the scene of the war to the plains of Bútica. The rapid progress of the Vandals soon acquired a more effectual opposition; and the master-general Castinus marched against them with a numerous army of Romans and Goths. Vanquished in battle by an inferior army, Castinus fled with dishonor to Tarragona; and this memorable defeat, which has been represented as the punishment, was most probably the effect, of his rash presumption. Seville and Carthagená became the reward, or rather the prey, of the ferocious conquerors; and the vessels which they found in the harbor of Carthagená might easily transport them to the Isles of Majorca and Minorca, where the Spanish fugitives, as in a secure recess, had vainly concealed their families and their fortunes. The experience of navigation, and perhaps the prospect of Africa, encouraged the Vandals to accept the invitation which they received from Count Boniface; and the death of Gonderic served only to forward and animate the bold enterprise.

"In the room of a prince not conspicuous for any superior powers of the mind or body, they acquired his bastard brother, the terrible Genseric; a name, which, in the destruction of the Roman empire, has deserved an equal rank with the names of Alaric and Attila. The king of the Vandals is described to have been of a middle stature, with a lameness in one leg, which he had contracted by an accidental fall from his horse. His slow and cautious speech seldom declared the deep purposes of his soul; he disdained to imitate the luxury of the vanquished; but he indulged the sterner passions of anger and revenge. The ambition of Genseric was without bounds and without scruples; and the warrior could dexterously employ the dark engines of policy to solicit the allies who might be useful to his success, or to scatter among his enemies the seeds of hatred and contention. Almost in the moment of his departure he was informed that Hermanric, king of the Suevi, had presumed to ravage the Spanish territories, which he was resolved to abandon. Impatient of the insult, Genseric pursued the hasty retreat of the Suevi as far as Merida; precipitated the king and his army into the River Anas, and calmly returned to the sea-shore to embark his victorious troops. The vessels which transported [A.D. 429, May] the Vandals over the modern Straits of Gibraltar, a channel only twelve miles in breadth, were furnished by the Spaniards, who anxiously wished their departure; and by the African general, who had implored their formidable assistance.

"Our fancy, so long accustomed to exaggerate and multiply the martial swarms of barbarians that seemed to issue from the North,

will perhaps be surprised by the account of the army which Genseric mustered on the coast of Mauritania [A.D. 429]. The Vandals, who in twenty years had penetrated from the Elbe to Mount Atlas, were united under the command of their warlike king; and he reigned with equal authority over the Alani, who had passed, within the term of human life, from the cold of Scythia to the excessive heat of an African climate. The hopes of the bold enterprise had excited many brave adventurers of the Gothic nation; and many desperate provincials were tempted to repair their fortunes by the same means which had occasioned their ruin. Yet this various multitude amounted only to fifty thousand effective men; and though Genseric artfully magnified his apparent strength, by appointing eighty *chinarchs*, or commanders of thousands, the fallacious increase of old men, of children, and of slaves, would scarcely have swelled his army to the number of four-score thousand persons. But his own dexterity, and the discontents of Africa, soon fortified the Vandal powers, by the accession of numerous and active allies.

"The parts of Mauritania which border on the Great Desert and the Atlantic Ocean, were filled with a fierce and untractable race of men, whose savage temper had been exasperated, rather than reclaimed, by their dread of the Roman arms. The wandering Moors, as they gradually ventured to approach the seashore, and the camp of the Vandals, must have viewed with terror and astonishment the dress, the armor, the martial pride and discipline of the unknown strangers who had landed on their coast; and the fair complexions of the blue-eyed warriors of Germany formed a very singular contrast with the swarthy or olive hue which is derived from the neighborhood of the torrid zone. After the first difficulties had in some measure been removed, which arose from the mutual ignorance of their respective language, the Moors, regardless of any future consequence, embraced the alliance of the enemies of Rome; and a crowd of naked savages rushed from the woods and valleys of Mount Atlas, to satiate their revenge on the polished tyrants, who had injuriously expelled them from the native sovereignty of the land.

"The persecution of the Donatists was an event not less favorable to the designs of Genseric. Seventeen years before he landed in Africa, a public conference was held at Carthage, by the order of the magistrate. The Catholics were satisfied, that, after the invincible reasons which they had alleged, the obstinacy of the schismatics must be inexcusable and voluntary; and the emperor Honorius was persuaded to inflict the most rigorous penalties on a faction which had so long abused his patience and clemency. Three hundred bishops, with many thousands of the inferior clergy, were torn from their churches, stripped of their ecclesiastical

possessions, banished to the islands, and proscribed by the laws, if they presumed to conceal themselves in the provinces of Africa. Their numerous congregations, both in cities and in the country, were deprived of the rights of citizens, and of the exercise of religious worship. A regular scale of fines, from ten to two hundred pounds of silver, was curiously ascertained, according to the distinction of rank and fortune, to punish the crime of assisting at a schismatic conventicle; and if the fine had been levied five times, without subduing the obstinacy of the offender, his future punishment was referred to the discretion of the Imperial court.

"By these severities, which obtained the warmest approbation of St. Augustin, great numbers of Donatists were reconciled to the Catholic Church; but the fanatics, who still persevered in their opposition, were provoked to madness and despair; the distracted country was filled with tumult and bloodshed; the armed troops of Circumcellions alternately pointed their rage against themselves, or against their adversaries; and the calendar of martyrs received on both sides a considerable augmentation. Under these circumstances, Genseric, a Christian, but an enemy of the orthodox communion, showed himself to the Donatists as a powerful deliverer, from whom they might reasonably expect the repeal of the odious and oppressive edicts of the Roman emperors. The conquest of Africa was facilitated by the active zeal, or the secret favor, of a domestic faction; the wanton outrages against the churches and the clergy of which the Vandals are accused, may be fairly imputed to the fanaticism of their allies; and the intolerant spirit which disgraced the triumph of Christianity, contributed to the loss of the most important province of the West."—*Id. chap. 33, par. 5-7.*

J.

(Concluded next week.)

### **"Try the Spirits" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 27 , pp. 423, 424.**

WE showed last week that the only true rule by which to try the spirits is the word of God; that if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them; and that the Scriptures and the teaching of the spirits are in direct antagonism. We shall now present a further illustration of this.

The passage of Scripture in which is found the injunction to "try the spirits," reads in full thus: "Beloved believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

The Scriptures show that there are manifestations of the Spirit of God, and manifestations of the spirits of devils; that there are true prophets, and false prophets; that the true prophet is moved by the Spirit of God, and the false prophet is moved by a spirit that is not of God. The manifestations of the "spirits"

are by a number of spirits and are discordant, contradicting themselves and one another. Of the Spirit of God, "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit;" "differences of administrations, but the same Lord;" "and diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." 1 Cor. 12. While of "the spirits" there are diversities of spirits as well as diversities of gifts; differences of administrations of different lords; and diversities of operations with *no God at all*.

By the Spirit of God is given in one "the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; *but all these* worketh that *one and the selfsame* Spirit." While of the spirits, if there be words,—we shall not say of wisdom for there is no wisdom in them,—or gifts of healing, or miracles, or divers kinds of tongues, or any other manifestations, they are by a multitude of spirits, and with such diversity that there is no telling whether ever any two even of successive manifestations are by the same spirit, much less is it so that different manifestations at the same time are of the same spirit.

How then shall we know the true from the false? "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." 1 John 4:2, 3. Some may say that Spiritualism will bear this test, because Spiritualists admit that there lived a person called Jesus Christ. Yes, they do admit that there lived a person called by that name. But that is not enough. Jesus Christ is not simply the name of a person, as John Smith, or William Thompson, is a name. It is not only a name but a *tittle*,—a tittle which bears a depth of meaning. The words Jesus and Christ are both Greek transferred into English. If they were translated instead of transferred we should have no such word as either Jesus or Christ. It is evident therefore that we must know the meaning of the words, before we can tell what is demanded in the confession that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.

Jesus means Saviour, and its meaning upon him was given by the angel when he announced that he should be born. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS [Saviour, margin]; for he shall *save his people from their sins*." Matt. 1:21. "Christ" signifies "anointed," and is explained in John 1:41 with the margin. Speaking of Andrew, he says, "He first findeth his own brother Simon and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ." "Messias" is Hebrew, and interpreted into Greek is "the Christ," which, interpreted into English, is "the Anointed." Thus in the term "Christ Jesus" we have the real meaning "the Anointed Saviour," and as the angel said he shall save his people from their sins, we have the whole expressed by Paul, when he says: "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus; the Anointed Saviour, came into the world to save sinners." Therefore, what there is in this test of the spirits, is this: Every spirit that confesseth that the Anointed Saviour of sinners is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that the Anointed Saviour of sinners is come in the flesh is not of God.

To confess that the Anointed Saviour of sinners is come in the flesh is a test that Spiritualism will not bear. Spiritualism knows no sin; much less does it confess a Saviour. Andrew Jackson Davis said:—

"Sin indeed in the common acceptation of that term does not really exist." "In the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures it is affirmed that sin is the transgression of the law. But by an examination of nature, the true and only Bible, it will be seen that this statement is erroneous. It gives a wrong idea of both man and law. . . . It will be found impossible for man to transgress a law of God."

Why is it impossible? Simply because according to Spiritualism every man is his own God. Said J. B. Hall in a spiritualistic lecture:—

"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 account to his own nature—to himself."

As to its knowing no Saviour, we repeat a quotation from our article of last week:—

424

"Spiritualism declares that the belief or non-belief in Jesus weighs nothing as against the soul's salvation. . . . If anything, the belief in the supremacy of Jesus . . . will retard rather than advance the soul's progress." "Spiritualism knows no salvation through Christ or any other person, . . . every soul being its own saviour."

Thus it is plain that the spirits do not confess that Jesus Christ, the Anointed Saviour, is come in the flesh, and they are therefore false prophets. And then the word of God continues, "This is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." They are lying, seducing, wicked spirits. They lead to denial of God, and the Lord Jesus Christ; they lead away from the word of God; and the end of their course can only be perdition.

Here then, we have applied two of the tests which the word of God gives us by which to try the spirits—(1) They must speak according to the word of God; (2) They must confess that the Anointed Saviour is come in the flesh—and in both instances Spiritualism fails to be in any sense worthy of confidence. There are yet other tests which we shall apply.

J.

**July 22, 1886**

**"Establishment of the Vandals in Africa" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 28 , p. 436.**

GIBBON speaks above, of "the invitation which" the Vandals "received from Count Boniface." The way in which that invitation was brought about was this: In

the narrative which we have given of the Visigoths under Adolphus the successor of Alaric, Placidia will be remembered as the sister of the Emperor Honorius and the wife of Adolphus. After the death of her husband she was restored by Wallia, about A.D. 416, to her brother Honorius in exchange for 600,000 measures (about 150,000 bushels) of wheat. After her return she was given by Honorius, much against her will, in marriage to Constantius, a Roman general, and became the mother of a daughter—Honorina—and a son, who, at the age of six years, and under the title of Valentinian III., succeeded to the throne of the western empire. Honorius died Aug. 27, A.D. 423, and the vacant throne was usurped two years by John the Secretary. At this time Placidia was at Constantinople under the protection of her nephew Theodosius the Younger, and Theodosius resolved (A.D. 425) to place Valentinian on the throne of the West. Valentinian being only six years old, and his father being dead, upon Placidia was bestowed the important office of regent during the minority of her son; this authority she exercised twenty-five years—from A.D. to 450.

"Her armies were commanded by two generals, Etius and Boniface, who may be deservedly named as the last of the Romans. Their union might have supported a sinking empire; their discord was the fatal and immediate cause of the loss of Africa."

"Etius possessed an advantage of singular moment in a female reign; he was present: he besieged, with artful and assiduous flattery, the palace of Ravenna; disguised his dark designs with the mask of loyalty and friendship; and at length deceived both his mistress and his absent rival, by a subtle conspiracy, which a weak woman and a brave man could not easily suspect. He had secretly persuaded Placidia to recall Boniface from the government of Africa; he secretly advised Boniface to disobey the Imperial summons; to the one, he represented the order as a sentence of death; to the other, he stated the refusal as a signal of revolt; and when the credulous and unsuspecting count had armed the province in his defense, Etius applauded his sagacity in foreseeing the rebellion, which his own perfidy had excited. A temperate inquiry into the real motives of Boniface would have restored a faithful servant to his duty and to the republic; but the arts of Etius still continued to betray and to inflame, and the count was urged, by persecution, to embrace the most desperate counsels. The success with which he eluded or repelled the first attacks, could not inspire a vain confidence, that at the head of some loose, disorderly Africans, he should be able to withstand the regular forces of the West, commanded by a rival, whose military character it was impossible for him to despise. After some hesitation, the last struggles of prudence and loyalty, Boniface despatched a trusty friend to the court, or rather to the camp, of Gonderic, king of the Vandals, with the proposal of a strict alliance, and the offer of an advantageous and perpetual settlement."—*Id.*

These were the events and this "the invitation" that brought the nation of the Vandals into Africa. The treachery of Etius was discovered shortly afterward; but the mischief was done, and it was too late to remedy it.

"The long and narrow tract of the African coast was filled with frequent monuments of Roman art and magnificence; and the respective degrees of improvement might be accurately measured by the distance from Carthage and the Mediterranean. A simple reflection will impress every thinking mind with the clearest idea of fertility and cultivation; the country was extremely populous; the inhabitants reserved a liberal subsistence for their own use; and the annual exportation, particularly of wheat, was so regular and plentiful, that Africa deserved the name of the common granary of Rome and of mankind. On a sudden the seven fruitful provinces, from Tangier to Tripoli, were overwhelmed by the invasion of the Vandals; whose destructive rage has perhaps been exaggerated by popular animosity, religious zeal, and extravagant declamation.

"War, in its fairest form, implies a perpetual violation of humanity and justice; and the hostilities of barbarians are inflamed by the fierce and lawless spirit which incessantly disturbs their peaceful and domestic society. The Vandals, where they found resistance, seldom gave quarter; and the deaths of their valiant countrymen were expiated by the ruin of the cities under whose walls they had fallen. Careless of the distinctions of age, or sex, or rank, they employed every species of indignity and torture, to force from the captives a discovery of their hidden wealth. The stern policy of Genseric justified his frequent examples of military execution; he was not always the master of his own passions, or of those of his followers; and the calamities of war were aggravated by the licentiousness of the Moors, and the fanaticism of the Donatists.

"The court and the people were astonished by the strange intelligence, that a virtuous hero, after so many favors, and so many services, had renounced his allegiance, and invited the barbarians to destroy the province intrusted to his command. The friends of Boniface, who still believed that his criminal behavior might be excused by some honorable motive, solicited, during the absence of Etius, a free conference with the Count of Africa; and Darius, an officer of high distinction, was named for the important embassy. In their first interview at Carthage, the imaginary provocations were mutually explained; the opposite letters of Etius were produced and compared; and the fraud was easily detected.

"Placidia and Boniface lamented their fatal error; and the count had sufficient magnanimity to confide in the forgiveness of his sovereign, or to expose his head to her future resentment. His repentance was fervent and sincere; but he soon discovered that it was no longer in his power to restore the edifice which he had shaken to its foundations. Carthage and the Roman garrisons

returned with their general to the allegiance of Valentinian; but the rest of Africa was still distracted with war and faction; and the inexorable king of the Vandals, disdainful of all terms of accommodation, sternly refused to relinquish the possession of his prey. The band of veterans who marched under the standard of Boniface, and his hasty levies of provincial troops, were defeated with considerable loss; the victorious barbarians insulted the open country; and Carthage, Cirta, and Hippo Regius, were the only cities that appeared to rise above the general inundation.

"The generous mind of Count Boniface was tortured by the exquisite distress of beholding the ruin which he had occasioned, and whose rapid progress he was unable to check. After the loss of a battle he retired into Hippo Regius; where [A.D. 430, May] he was immediately besieged by an enemy, who considered him as the real bulwark of Africa. The maritime colony of *Hippo*, about two hundred miles westward of Carthage, had formerly acquired the distinguishing epithet of *Regius*, from the residence of Numidian kings; and some remains of trade and populousness still adhere to the modern city, which is known in Europe by the corrupted name of Bona. The military labors, and anxious reflections, of Count Boniface, were alleviated by the edifying conversation of his friend St. Augustine; till that bishop, the light and pillar of the Catholic church, was gently released, in the third month of the siege, and in the seventy-sixth year of his age, from the actual and the impending calamities of his country."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 33, par. 9, 8, 10.*

J.

(Concluded next week.)

**"Gone to Canossa" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 28 , pp. 438, 439.**

LAST winter, under the heading of "Going to Canossa," we inserted the following:—

"In 1075, A.D. Pope Gregory VII. Took it upon himself to interfere in the affairs of State of Germany. It was determined that any ecclesiastic who should accept office from the hands of a layman should be deposed, while the secular lord who should presume to bestow investiture, should be excommunicated. Henry IV. resisted the pope's pretensions, and so was brought on the war of investitures, and the memorable contest between Hildebrand and Henry. Henry first deposed the pope, and then was in turn deposed by the pope; then he went to Canossa, and, in the garb of a supplicant, stood three days and nights in the wintry blast, awaiting the pleasure of Hildebrand to receive his submission.

"In 1872, a similar contest arose between the German Chancellor Bismarck and Pope Pius IX. His contention went on quite bitterly; but in 1870 Prince Bismarck declared, 'We will not go to Canossa.'

"In 1885, a dispute sprang up, which, for a while, threatened war between Germany and Spain. He got out of the difficulty, Bismarck sought the mediation of the pope, and selected him as arbiter in his controversy. This so tickled the pope that he conferred upon the Chancellor the 'Decoration of the Order of Christ.' And that so pleased Prince Bismarck that his gratitude found vent in a remarkable letter to the pope."

And we then expressed the opinion that Bismarck was going to Canossa, but we had no idea then that we should so *soon* be called upon to report that he has actually gone on that historical journey. At that time we had not a copy of this notable letter, but only a press dispatch report of it. now, however, by the Catholic papers, which by the way is exulting loudly over it, we have the letter in hand. We here insert the most striking paragraphs of it:

"BERLIN, Jan. 13

"SIRE: The gracious letter which your Holiness did me the honor to write to me, as well as the high decoration which it was accompanied, has been to me the cause of great joy, and I beg your Holiness to accept the expressions of my deep gratitude. Any mark of approval connected with a labor undertaken for the sake of peace, and toward which I had been privileged to cooperate, is all the more precious to me that it gives deep satisfaction to His Majesty, my august master.

"Your Holiness says in your letter that nothing is more in conformity with the spirit and the nature of the Roman Pontificate than the work of peace-making. This same thought it was that guided me when I besought your Holiness to accept the noble trust of mediation in the dispute existing between Spain and Germany, and in proposing to the Spanish Government that we should, on both sides, agree to the decision given by your Holiness. . . There is, therefore, every reason to hope that the peace-making action of your Holiness will have lasting effects, and among these I reckon, before all the grateful memory which both parties must cherish of their august mediator.

"In so far as I am concerned, I shall always seize—and with the greatest eagerness—every occasion offered me in the fulfillment of my duty toward my master and my country to manifest toward your Holiness my deep gratitude and my most humble devotion.

"I am, with the feeling of the deepest respect, Sire, your Holiness's most humble servant.

"V. BISMARCK."

This is the translation of the letter which Father O'Reilly sent from Rome to the New York *Sun*. With it he also sent quite a long letter of his own, giving the view in which the transaction is held by

439

what he calls "the most thoughtful journalists" of Europe, and especially by the Papacy itself. From Father O'Reilly's letter we select the following significant paragraphs:—

"The truth is that the most thoughtful journalists in Great Britain and on the continent have agreed to consider the act of Spain and Germany as a direct recognition of the pope's sovereignty, while the extraordinary promptness with which Leo solved the difficulty and cut off all chance of war between the two countries, as well as the uncommon tact displayed in finding a basis of agreement acceptable to both, has revived a public opinion favorable to the restoration of the old-time mediatorship of the Holy See."

"Bismarck, in his answer to the pope's letter, has deviated from all previous customs, and instead of beginning his letter with 'Most Holy Father,' he says 'Sire,' thus designedly and of set purpose addressing him as king, as he would his own sovereign, the Emperor of Germany. Of course this will be another bitter pill for the Piedmontese rulers to have to swallow; in the Italian press it will be like a bomb falling into a powder magazine. It was confidently affirmed here that the insignia of the Order of Christ sent by Leo XIII. to the German Chancellor would be returned, as the Emperor would not grant the latter permission to wear them, and as the pope, not being a temporal sovereign, had no acknowledged right either to found such an order or to confer its honors. But the decrees of the Emperor William granting the desired permission and presenting it in the most honorary manner, soon set these doubts at rest. The German Empire recognizes Leo XIII. both as pope and king, and therefore as sovereign.

"All this is very important in international law; for the time must come, and is coming, when the Papacy will be to many acknowledged as the international institution par excellence, and when both its sovereignty temporal and spiritual, and the means necessary to secure its exercise, will be once more placed solemnly under the safeguard of all nations.

"Leo XIII., like Pius IX., may die restricted in his physical liberty to the Vatican and its garden; but the Papacy does not die. . . . The Papacy has buried many empires, kingdoms, and republics; it will outlive those now in existence."

But this acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the pope is not all of the story. The principal act of Germany in the contest of 1872 was, under the guidance of Bismarck, to pass what are known as the May Laws. "By these laws it was required that candidates for the clerical office should undergo a certain amount of secular

training at the universities, and that every ecclesiastical appointment should receive the sanction of the secular authorities." This legislation was denounced, and pronounced invalid, by the pope, and was disregarded by the Catholic bishops. Bismarck "imposed penalty after penalty in order to establish the supremacy of the State. Refractory bishops were imprisoned, deposed, and banished." It was in the midst of these heroic measures that Bismarck exclaimed, "We will not go to Canossa."

But lo! following hard upon the lead struck in his letter to the pope, the doughty Bismarck introduced into the German Parliament the "Prussian Ecclesiastical Laws Amendment Bill," which provides for the revision of the May Laws in such a way as in fact to amount to nothing less than their actual repeal. Nor was the Chancellor content with the mere introduction of the bill; but he never rested, nor gave the Parliament any rest, till he had pushed it to a successful issue, even carrying his energy to the extent of leading the Chamber to depart from the usage generally followed in dealing with important bills, and rushed it through the three readings without ever referring it to a committee.

In the debate on the bill, Bismarck "avowed that in his opinion, the whole system involved in the May Laws was useless, and, in many ways, mischievous." He assured the Chamber that the pope is "a venerable, wise, and good man, very friendly to Germany, much better disposed to forward the true interests of Germany than some of the politicians in the Prussian Diet and the Reichstag." He declared that he did "not see any use in maintaining the May Laws." He said he "sincerely wished for a reconciliation, so did the king, his master; so did all sensible people;" and that he had "unbounded confidence in the honor of the pope" that he would faithfully fulfill all his part of the conditions. He said that under the provisions of this bill the Prussian Government would go on with the work which they had commenced, and set about "a thorough revision of the May legislation." And to make the thing perfectly satisfactory to the pope, he actually proposed to submit the matter to him beforehand, and then work according to his orders. He said they would "submit their views to the pope," because "his final approval would be indispensable for success;" and so they had "better have his approval at the outset, and save time and discussion."

And this is the "Iron Chancellor"! This is the man who would not go to Canossa! It seems to us that the "iron" part of the Chancellor has become very malleable, and it is certain that V. Bismarck has *gone* to Canossa. If Henry IV. Cut any mere humiliating figure in the eleventh century than has Bismarck in the nineteenth, we should like for some one to show it, for as for ourselves, we fail to see it. J.

**July 29, 1886**

**"Establishment of the Vandals in Africa. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 29 , p. 452.**

*(Concluded).*

"BY the skill of Boniface, and perhaps by the ignorance of the Vandals, the siege of Hippo was protracted above fourteen months [A.D. 431]; the sea was continually open; and when the adjacent country had been exhausted by irregular rapine, the besiegers themselves were compelled by famine to relinquish their enterprise. The importance and danger of Africa were deeply felt by the regent of the West. Placidia implored the assistance of her eastern ally; and the Italian fleet and army were re-enforced by Asper, who sailed from Constantinople with a powerful armament. As soon as the force of the two empires was united under the command of Boniface, he boldly marched against the Vandals; and the loss of a second battle irretrievably decided the fate of Africa. He embarked with the precipitation of despair; and the people of Hippo were permitted, with their families and effects, to occupy the vacant place of the soldiers, the greatest part of whom were either slain or made prisoners by the Vandals. The count, whose fatal credulity had wounded the vitals of the republic, might enter the palace of Ravenna with some anxiety, which was soon removed by the smiles of Placidia. Boniface accepted with gratitude the rank of patrician, and the dignity of master-general of the Roman armies; but he must have blushed at the sight of those medals, in which he was represented with the name and attributes of victory.

"The discovery of his fraud, the displeasure of the empress, and the distinguished favor of his rival, exasperated the haughty and perfidious soul of Etius. He hastily returned from Gaul to Italy, with a retinue, or rather with an army, of barbarian followers; and such was the weakness of the government, that the two generals decided their private quarrel in a bloody battle. Boniface was successful; but he received in the conflict a mortal wound from the spear of his adversary, of which he expired [A.D. 433] within a few days, in such Christian and charitable sentiments, that he exhorted his wife, a rich heiress of Spain, to accept Etius for her second husband. But Etius could not derive any immediate advantage from the generosity of his dying enemy; he was proclaimed a rebel by the justice of Placidia; and though he attempted to defend some strong fortresses, erected on his patrimonial estate, the Imperial power soon compelled him to retire into Pannonia, to the tents of his faithful Huns. The republic was deprived, by their mutual discord, of the service of her two most illustrious champions.

"It might naturally be expected, after the retreat of Boniface, that the Vandals would achieve, without resistance or delay, the conquest of Africa. Eight years [A.D. 431-439] however, elapsed, from the evacuation of Hippo to the reduction of Carthage. In the midst of that interval, the ambitious Genseric, in the full tide of

apparent prosperity, negotiated a treaty of peace, by which he gave his son Hunneric for a hostage; and consented to leave the Western emperor in the undisturbed possession of the three Mauritaniae. This moderation, which cannot be imputed to the justice, must be ascribed to the policy, of the conqueror. His throne was encompassed with domestic enemies, who accused the baseness of his birth, and asserted the legitimate claims of his nephews, the sons of Gonderic. Those nephews, indeed, he sacrificed to his safety; and their mother, the widow of the deceased king, was precipitated, by his order, into the river Ampsaga. But the public discontent burst forth in dangerous and frequent conspiracies; and the warlike tyrant is supposed to have shed more Vandal blood by the hand of the executioner, than in the field of battle.

"The convulsions of Africa, which had favored his attack, opposed the firm establishment of his power; and the various seditions of the Moors and Germans, the Donatists and Catholics, continually disturbed, or threatened, the unsettled reign of the conqueror. As he advanced towards Carthage, he was forced to withdraw his troops from the Western provinces; the sea-coast was exposed to the naval enterprises of the Romans of Spain and Italy; and, in the heart of Numidia, the strong inland city of Corta still persisted in obstinate independence. These difficulties were gradually subdued by the spirit, the perseverance, and the cruelty of Genseric; who alternately applied the arts of peace and war to the establishment of his African kingdom. He subscribed a solemn treaty, with the hope of deriving some advantage from the term of its continuance, and the moment of its violation. The vigilance of his enemies was relaxed by the protestations of friendship, which concealed his hostile approach; and Carthage was at length surprised [A.D. 439, Oct. 9] by the Vandals, five hundred and eighty-five years after the destruction of the city and republic by the younger Scipio.

"A new city had arisen from its ruins, with the title of a colony; and though Carthage might yield to the royal prerogatives of Constantinople, and perhaps to the trade of Alexandria, or the splendor of Antioch, she still maintained the second rank in the West; as the *Rome* (if we may use the style of contemporaries) of the African world. That wealthy and opulent metropolis displayed, in a dependent condition, the image of a flourishing republic. Carthage contained the manufactures, the arms, and the treasures of the six provinces. A regular subordination of civil honors gradually ascended from the procurators of the streets and quarters of the city, to the tribunal of the supreme magistrate, who, with the title of proconsul, represented the state and dignity of a consul of ancient Rome. Schools and *gymnasia* were instituted for the

education of the African youth; and the liberal arts and manners, grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, were publicly taught in the Greek and Latin languages. The buildings of Carthage were uniform and magnificent; a shady grove was planted in the midst of the capital; the new port, a secure and capacious harbor, was subservient to the commercial industry of citizens and strangers; and the splendid games of the circus and theater were exhibited almost in the presence of the barbarians.

"The reputation of the Carthaginians was not equal to that of their country, and the reproach of Punic faith still adhered to their subtle and faithless character. The habits of trade, and the abuse of luxury, had corrupted their manners; but their impious contempt of monks, and the shameless practice of unnatural lusts, are the two abominations which excite the pious vehemence of Salvian, the preacher of the age. The king of the Vandals severely reformed the vices of a voluptuous people; and the ancient, noble, ingenuous freedom of Carthage (these expressions of Victor are not without energy) was reduced by Genseric into a state of ignominious servitude. After he had permitted his licentious troops to satiate their rage and avarice, he instituted a more regular system of rapine and oppression. An edict was promulgated, which enjoined all persons, without fraud or delay, to deliver their gold, silver, jewels, and valuable furniture or apparel, to the royal officers; and the attempt to secrete any part of their patrimony was inexorably punished with death and torture, as an act of treason against the state. The lands of the proconsular province, which formed the immediate district of Carthage, were accurately measured, and divided among the barbarians; and the conqueror reserved for his peculiar domain the fertile territory of Byzacium, and the adjacent parts of Numidia and Getulia."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 33, par. 11-14.*

Thus the kingdom of the Vandals was permanently fixed in Africa, where it remained as long as it was a kingdom at all, and as long as the Vandals were a nation.

J.

**"Restoration of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 29 , pp. 455, 456.**

IN Daniel 7:21, 22, we read: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." These are the closing words of Daniel's inquiry of the angel about the truth of the fourth beast, and of the horns which were in his head, and of the other *one* before whom three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots, and they apply to that *one* of which he said he had a mouth which spoke great things, and whose look was more stout than his fellows.

The specifications that are given in regard to this power are such that they absolutely fix to the Papacy the application of the prophecy. It is established after the development of the ten kingdoms, and upon the ruin of three of them; it speaks great words against the Most High; it wears out the saints of the Most High; thinks "to change the times and the law" of the Most High; and this dominion and power were to be held for "a time and times, and half a time,"—1260 years,—when the *dominion* should be taken away. But though the dominion was to be taken away "to consume and to destroy it unto the end," it appears that the power of persecution,—of making war upon the saints,—is only checked, or suspended, for a season, because, says the prophet, "The same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High."

Now, according to Rev. 20:4; 1 Cor. 6:3, and 4:5, judgment is not given to the saints in this life, but in the life to come. Rev. 20:4 says: "I saw thrones, and they [the "much people in Heaven," chap. 19:1-8] sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." 1 Cor. 6:2, 3 says: "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?" 1 Cor. 4:5 says: "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God." From these texts it is plain that the judgment that is given to the saints is a judgment both of the world and of angels (the evil angels); that it does not pertain to this life; that it is with Christ in Heaven, where they reign with him a thousand years; and that it is given to the saints at the coming of the Lord. This is made emphatic by the closing words of Daniel, quoted above: War was made with the saints till judgment was given them and till "the time came *that the saints possessed the kingdom.*"

As the Papacy has not for some time made, and is not now making, war upon the saints, and as the word of God declares that he does make war upon them at the time when they possess the kingdom, which is at the coming of the Lord, therefore it seems clear according to the prophecy that there is to be a revival of the persecuting power of the Papacy. This view is confirmed by the parallel scripture in Rev. 13. There it is said of this same power: "I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed." Verse 3. And in verse 10 it is said of him: "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity." In 1798 A.D., at the end of the 1260 years of its supremacy, the Papacy was abolished, and the Pope, Pius VI., carried into captivity, where he died the next year. There was given the deadly wound. In 1800 the dead wound was healed by the restoration of the Papacy in Pope Pius VII., but with its power greatly reduced; for then began the taking away of his dominion, which never ceased till the last vestige of it was swallowed up by Victor Emanuel in 1870.

As the light of the Reformation and its principles of liberty, civil and religious, gained in power among the nations, the persecuting power of the Papacy faded away. In the closing years of the sixteenth century, and the beginning of the

seventeenth, the persecuting power of the Papacy was at its height, and was almost resistless. "That England, Germany, and the Scandinavian kingdoms escaped the doom of Italy and Spain is one of the marvels of history." In the latter part of the seventeenth century, the average yearly number of victims gradually diminished; but as the numbers were enormous, the yearly average could gradually diminish for a great many years before the dreadful work finally ceased. Napoleon crushed the Inquisition, and destroyed its prisons wherever he came across them, but they were afterward renewed. It was after the middle of the nineteenth century before persecution entirely ceased; and it was not till the occupation of Rome, in 1870, drove the Papacy and the Inquisition into the Vatican, that men felt secure.

Yet it is after the captivity, after the healing of the deadly wound, after the taking away of his dominion, that the Scripture says, "All that dwelt upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. And it is just at the time when this power went into captivity, 1798, that the prophet sees another power arising, of which he says: "He exerciseth all the power of the first beast in his sight. And he maketh the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast whose death-stroke was healed." Thus there was seen a power arising which will exercise the power of the Papacy, in behalf of the Papacy, and which will compel people to obey the Papacy. This, power is called "the image to the beast." Verse 11. He causes the people to worship (obey) himself and the Papacy; in fact, the worship of himself will be the worship of the Papacy. And in the exercise of this power, he declares that no man may buy or sell save he who honors the Papacy, and even goes so far as to cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast *should be killed.*" Verse 15.

That this is immediately preceding the coming of the Lord, is plain from Rev. 14:9-15. There it is said: "If any man worship the beast and his image. . . the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixtures into the cup of his indignation." And immediately following this warning, it is said: "I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." Jesus himself said, "The harvest is the end of the world." These scriptures show that just before the end of the world all will be compelled, under pains and penalties, to honor and obey the papal power. And this corresponds exactly with Daniel's word that the "little

456

horn" "made war with the saints" "till the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." In view of these prophecies, we deem it certain that there will be a restoration of the Papacy to honor and power among the nations.

This we have believed for several years, and certain events which have occurred lately have greatly strengthened this belief. One of these, shown last week, is the voluntary humiliation of Prince Bismarck, and by him of Germany,

before the Pope, and the way in which it is viewed, not only by the Papacy, but by others. In addressing him as "Sire," Bismarck certainly did recognize in the Pope the dignity of a sovereign. This is nothing else than the court address of a sovereign. This piece of diplomacy, followed so soon by the revision of the May Laws, really by the Pope himself, is but the practical demonstration of the truth of Bismarck's declaration that "In so far as I am concerned, I shall always seize—and with the greatest eagerness—every occasion offered me in the fulfillment of my duty toward my master and my country to manifest toward your Holiness my deep gratitude and my most humble devotion." And we believe that it is but one step, which will be followed by other nations toward the restoration of the Papacy. Indeed, it has been followed already by our own nation.

Mention has been made in these columns of the action of our Government in furnishing the Catholic committee a revenue cutter, flying the papal flag, at the reception of the papal messengers as they bore the papal trappings to Cardinal Gibbons. The request that was sent to the secretary of the Treasury was that the "usual courtesies" should be shown by the Government. In the term "usual courtesies" there was nothing else meant than the usual courtesies which one nation, or one sovereign, shows in the ambassadors of another. And, as before remarked, when our Government extended the usual courtesies to these messengers of the Pope, it did just what Germany has done—acknowledged the sovereignty of the Pope, and placed him on an equality with other sovereigns. This, too, in the plainest way; for mark, these messengers were not from the Pope to *this Government*; then there might have been some excuse for extending the usual courtesies; but they were simply messengers from the Pope to a *private citizen* of this country, and at this a Government vessel must be sent off, with the papal flag in the place of honor, and with orders to show "the usual courtesies"!

Nor is this all. In Italy itself there is a movement looking to a "reconciliation between the Vatican and the Italian Kingdom." The example of Germany is appealed to. The champion of the movement, Signor Achill Fazzari, declares that reconciliation with the Papacy "is the only means to make Italy great, and win respect." He has reason for the declaration too. It was only a short time ago that Bismarck said it was not worth while negotiating with the Italians, for they were "only a race of singers and dancers." Yet he negotiates with the Pope, thus holding the Papacy above the Italian Kingdom. Now Signor Fazzari argues that if the Italian Kingdom can only come to an understanding with the Pope, and obtain his good offices, then Bismarck will recognize the Italians, and will be willing to negotiate with them as well as with the Papacy. Thus he argues the absolute "necessity of an understanding with the Papacy," not only on behalf of Italy in itself, but in "its relations to other nations." He declares that "*two hundred members*" of the late Italian Parliament "would have lent their aid to an understanding with the Vatican if only some had led the way."

Next week, if the Lord will, we shall pursue this study further. This is an important subject and we ask our readers to give it careful attention. There is that in it which concerns every one.

J.

**August 5, 1886**

**"The Saxons Enter Britain" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30 , p. 468.**

AFTER the settlement of the Vandals in Africa (A. D. 429-439) the Saxons were the next barbarians to plant themselves on the territory of what had been the majestic empire of Rome.

"For the fatherland of the English race we must look far away from England itself. In the fifth century after the birth of Christ the one country which we know to have borne the name of Angeln or England lay within the district which is now called Sleswick, a district in the heart of the peninsula that parts the Baltic from the Northern seas. Its pleasant pastures, its black-timbered homesteads, its prim little townships looking down on inlets of purple water, were then but a wild waste of heather and sand, girt along the coast with a sunless woodland, broken here and there by meadows that crept down to the marshes and the sea.

The dwellers in this district, however, seem to have been merely an outlying fragment of what was called the Engle or English folk, the bulk of whom lay probably in what is now Lower Hanover and Oldenburg. On one side of them the Saxons of Westphalia held the land from the Weser to the Rhine; on the other, the Eastphalian Saxons stretched away to the Elbe. North again of the fragment of the English folk in Sleswick lay another kindred tribe, the Jutes, whose name is still preserved in their district of Jutland. Engle, Saxon, and Jute, all belonged to the same Low German branch of the Teutonic family; and at the moment when history discovers them they were being drawn together by the ties of a common blood, common speech, common social and political institutions. There is little ground indeed for believing that the three tribes looked on themselves as one people, or that we can as yet apply to them, save by anticipation, the common name of Englishmen. But each of them was destined to share in the conquest of the land in which we live [England], and it is from the union of all of them, when its conquest was complete, that the English people has sprung.

"Of the temper and life of the folk in this older England we know little. But from the glimpses that we catch of it when conquest had brought them to the shores of Britain, their political and social organization must have been that of the German race to which they belonged. In their villages lay ready formed the social and political life which is round us in the England of to-day. A belt of forest or waste parted each from its fellow-villages, and within this boundary or mark the 'township,' as the village was then called, from the 'tun'

or rough fence and trench that served as its simple fortification, formed a complete and independent body, though linked by ties which were strengthening every day, to the townships about it and the tribe of which it formed a part. Its social center was the homestead where the etheling or corl, a descendant of the first English settlers in the waste, still handed down the blood and traditions of his fathers. Around this homestead or ethel, each in its little croft, stood the lowlier dwellings of freelings or ceorls. . . The corl was distinguished from his fellow-villagers by his wealth and his nobler blood; he was held by them in a hereditary reverence; and it was from him and his fellow-ethelings that host-leades, whether of the village or the tribe, were chosen in times of war. But this claim to precedence rested simply on the free recognition of his fellow-villagers. Within the township every freeman or ccorl was equal. It was the freeman who was the base of village society. He was the 'free-necked man' whose long hair floated over a neck which had never bowed to a lord. He was the 'weaponed man,' who alone bore spear and sword, and who alone preserved that right of self-redress or private war which in such a state of society formed the main check upon lawless outrage."

"The religion of these men was the same as that of the rest of the German peoples. . . . The common god of the English people was Woden, the war god, the guardian of ways and boundaries, to whom his worshipers attributed the invention of letters, and whom every tribe held to be the first ancestor of its kings. Our own names for the days of the week still recall to us the gods whom our fathers worshiped in their German home land. Wednesday is Woden's-day, as Thursday is the day of Thunder, the god of air and storm and rain. Friday is Frea's-day, the deity of peace and joy and fruitfulness, whose emblems, borne aloft by dancing maidens, brought increase to every field and stall they visited. Saturday commemorates an obscure god, Setere; Tuesday the dark god, Tiw, to meet whom was death. Eostre, the god of the dawn or of the spring, lends his name to the Christian festival of the resurrection. Behind these floated the dim shapes of an older mythology; 'Wyrð,' the death-goddess, whose memory lingered long in the 'Weird' of northern superstition; or the Shield-Maidens, the 'mighty women,' who, an old rhyme tells us, 'wrought on the battle field their toil and hurled the thrilling javelins.' Nearer to the popular fancy lay deities of wood and fell or hero-gods of legend and song; Nicor, the water-sprite who survives in our nixies and 'Old Nick;' Weland, the forger of weighty shields and sharp-biting swords, who found a later home in the 'Weyland's smithy' of Berkshire; Egil, the hero-archer, whose legend is one with that of Cloudesly or Tell."

"The energy of these people found vent in a restlessness which drove them to take part in the general attack of the German race on

the empire of Rome. For busy tillers and busy fishers as Englishmen were, they were at heart fighters, and their world was a world of war. Tribe warred with tribe, and village with village; even within the township itself feuds parted household from household, and passions of hatred and vengeance were handed on from father to son. Their mood was above all a mood of fighting men, venturesome, self-reliant, proud, with a dash of hardness and cruelty in it, but ennobled by the virtues which spring from war,—by personal courage and loyalty to plighted word, by a high and stern sense of manhood and the worth of man. A grim joy in hard fighting was already a characteristic of the race. War was the Englishman's 'shield-play' and 'sword-game;' the gleeman's verse took fresh fire as he sang of the rush of the host and the crash of the shield line. . . .

"And next to their love of war came their love of the sea. Everywhere throughout Beowulf's song, as everywhere throughout the life that it pictures, we catch the salt whiff of the sea. The Englishman was as proud of his seacraft as of his war-craft; sword in teeth he plunged into the sea to meet walrus and sea-lion; he told of his whale-chase amid the icy waters of the North. Hardly less than his love for the sea was the love he bore to the ship that traversed it. In the fond playfulness of English verse the ship was 'the wave-floater,' the 'foam-necked,' 'like a bird' as it skimmed the wave-crest, 'like a swan' as its curved prow breasted the 'swan-road' of the sea.

"Their passion for the sea marked out for them their part in the general movement of the German nations. While Goth and Lombard were slowly advancing over the mountain and plain, the boats of the Englishmen pushed faster over the sea. Bands of English rovers, outdriven by stress of flight, had long found a home there, and lived as they could by sack of vessel or coast. Chance has preserved for us in a Sleswick peat-bog one of the war-keels of seventy feet long and eight or nine feet wide, its sides of oak boards fastened with bark ropes and iron bolts. Fifty oars drove it over the waves with a freight of warriors whose arms, axes, swords, lances, and knives, were found heaped together in its hold. Like the galleys of the Middle Ages such boats could only creep cautiously along from harbor to harbor in rough weather; but in smooth water their swiftness fitted them admirably for the piracy by which the men of these tribes were already making themselves dreaded. Its flat bottom enabled them to beach the vessel on any fitting coast; and a step on shore at once transformed that boatmen into a war-band. From the first the dring of the English race broke out in the secrecy and suddenness of the pirate's swoop, in the fierceness of their onset, in the careless glee with which they seized either sword or oar. 'Foes are they,' sang a Roman poet of the time, 'fierce

beyond other foes and cunning as they are fierce; the sea is their school of war and the storm their friend; they are sea-wolves that prey on the pillage of the world!"

"Of the three English tribes the Saxons lay nearest to the empire, and they were naturally the first to touch the Roman world; before the close of the third century, indeed, their boats appeared in such force in the English Channel as to call for a special fleet to resist them. The piracy of our fathers had thus brought them to the shores of a land which, dear as it is now to Englishmen, had not as yet been trodden by English feet. This land was Britain. When the Saxon boats touched its coast, the island was the westernmost province of the Roman Empire. In the fifty-fifth year before Christ a descent of Julius Cesar revealed it to the Roman world; and a century after Cesar's landing, the Emperor Claudius undertook its conquest. The work was swiftly carried out. Before thirty years were over, the bulk of the island had passed beneath the Roman sway, and the Roman frontier had been carried to the Firths of Forth and of Clyde. . .

"For three hundred years the Roman sword secured order and peace without Britain and within; and with peace and order came a wide and rapid prosperity. Commerce sprang up in ports, among which London held the first rank; agriculture flourished till Britain became one of the corn-exporting countries of the world; the mineral resources of the province were explored in the tin mines of Cornwall, the lead mines of Somerset or Northumberland, and the iron mines of the Forest of Dean. But evils which sapped the strength of the whole empire, told at last on the province of Britain."—*Green's Larger History of England, chap. 1, par. 1, 2, 11, 13-16.*

J.

**"Restoration of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30 , pp. 470, 471.**

WE have seen how that Germany and the United States have acknowledged the sovereignty of the Pope, and have noted the movement in Italy, follow suit. After Germany and Italy, of the powers of Western Europe, there only remains England whose acknowledgment would be of any significance. And when Germany and Italy, which have been the most bitter of the opponents of the Papacy, are now so ready to bring about a reconciliation on which grants the sovereignty of the Pope, it is not at all difficult to believe that occasion may arise at which England would be ready to engage his good offices by also recognizing his sovereignty as Germany has done, and as Italy desires to do.

This will the more readily appear when the motive is seen which has led Germany to humble herself before the Pope, and which is leading Italy to take

the same course. This is so clearly stated by Signor Fazzari, that we shall give it in his own words:—

"In my mind, the necessity and possibility of the understanding with the Papacy, follows from the present condition of Italy and the monarchy, both in itself and its relations with other nations; and this *all the more*, and *most particularly* from a consideration of *the ever-spreading spirit of anarchy*, and the condition of political degradation, which we all lament in Italy, and which certainly will not be ended by the alternative of Right and Left [the Italian Parliament] at the helm of State, so long as the ideas hitherto held by these parties are still entertained."—*The Monitor (S. F.), June 23, 1886.*

This same "ever-spreading spirit of anarchy," it was that caused Bismarck to "go to Canossa." In his speech in the German Parliament, the Chancellor said that there are "political parties in their own assemblies who put forward demands, and advocated views which would ruin Germany far more quickly than any papal pretensions;" and that "the Pope is a wise, venerable, and good man, very friendly to Germany, much better disposed to forward the true interests of Germany than some of the politicians in the Prussian Diet and the Reichstag." In these expressions Bismarck clearly betrays the cause that induced him to seek the friendship of the Papacy. Socialism is rife in Germany, and has a large representation in the Parliament. It is the Socialists who "put forward demands and advocate views that would ruin Germany;" and so even the "iron" Chancellor is compelled to bend, and makes haste to enlist the Pope on his side in the impending and imminent contest with the "spirit of anarchy."

Nor is it alone in Germany and Italy that the spirit of anarchy prevails. Even while we are writing this article, there comes to hand the San Francisco Sunday *Chronicle*, July 25, 1886, and entitled, "The Red Specter." We here insert the first few sentences:—

"Socialism is the red specter of Europe. It is ever in the thought of kings; it clogs the wheels of legislation in parliaments; it alarms the thoughtful and far-seeing, and it is in all European countries a disturbing element in politics and society. Governments, politicians, the press, and writers of books, are more and more taking it into account, availing themselves of its influence, or using the material which it furnishes. The question is constantly asked, Is it extending? The reasons for believing that it is are many. The strongest is that it is feared. In France the Ministry acts timidly in presence of its occult power. Bismarck, who hoped that his law of 1878, proscribing Socialism, would accomplish its work, and effectually lay the specter in five years, has been compelled to renew it. There are more Socialists deputies to-day in the German Parliament than in 1878. In Russia, Socialism, less defined in principle than elsewhere, threatens the life of the Czar and the annihilation of all existing social and political forms. In Austria, Italy, Spain, and England, the public is continually made aware of its operations by

the expressed discontent of the working classes and the imminency of revolutions."

Thus "the ever-spreading spirit of anarchy," in the presence of which statesmen turn pale, and Governments tremble, is the secret of the movement for the restoration of the Papacy. In times of such difficulties as these, it is with peculiar force that the Papacy suggests itself to the minds of statesmen as the source of greatest help. In times of anarchy and revolution, when the very foundations of States, and even of society itself, seem to be moved, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman grasps the hand of the Papacy. The Papacy has passed through revolution after revolution, and complete anarchy itself is no terror to her. She saw the fall of the Roman Empire. And as that empire was the "mightiest fabric of human greatness" ever seen by man, so its fall was the most fearful ever seen in history. Yet the Papacy not only passed through and survived it all, but she gathered new strength from it all. When Alaric and Genseric—Goth and Vandal—poured destruction upon destruction upon the devoted city, the Papacy came forth from it with no weakness upon her, and the wrath of the terrible Attila was turned away by the efforts and the personal presence of the Pope. When the flood of barbaric rage swept over all Western Europe, spreading destruction, misery, and anarchy for centuries, instead of disturbing the Papacy, it was but her opportunity. The Papacy thrives on revolutions; the perplexities of States are her fortune to her anarchy is better than order. Therefore, we repeat, when revolution is imminent, and anarchy threatens, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman grasps the hand of her who mastered the anarchy of the Middle Ages, and the revolutions of fifteen centuries. And if England gets out of her dynamite-Irish troubles without the help of the Papacy, it is more than we expect.

We see then that the prophecies reveal a restoration of the Papacy. We see the steps already taken in that direction by the two nations principally concerned. We see, in the ever-spreading spirit of anarchy, the cause which has impelled these nations to these steps, and which, in the nature of the case, must induce others to follow their lead; and all such advances can end in nothing else than the aggrandizement of the Papacy, and its re-assertion of power. For as surely as any person or power enters into negotiations with the Papacy upon an equal basis, that person or power will be over-reached. Negotiations backed by force may succeed, but not otherwise, and even then only but a time; because, though a pope may be beaten

471

and die, the Papacy lives and works. We believe Macaulay's words express the literal truth:—

"It is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. . . . The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

The statement of the Bible on this point is that it is "the mystery of iniquity," and that "through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." Dan. 8:25. Craft always has prospered in his hand, and in his present efforts for the renewal of his power, his vast experience in this bad accomplishment will not fail him; for the Papacy is only too willing to do its part in this matter. As an instance of this, we may mention that in the matter of the negotiations with Bismarck, the agreement was that if Prussia would revise the May Laws, the Pope would then direct the Catholic officials in Germany to show proper obedience to the laws. But he was so willing to show his sincerity in the scheme of reconciliation that he went beyond his part of the agreement, and gave the requisite order *before* the German Parliament had agreed to a revision of the obnoxious laws. This was then used by Bismarck as an effectual answer to those who opposed his bill out of suspicion that the Pope was not really sincere. But the Papacy would not be itself if it were really sincere in anything else than the one grand project of its own aggrandizement. That is all the sincerity that it has ever shown in history. That is all the sincerity it is capable of showing. Yet with all the dreadful history of the Papacy before them, not only unapologized for, but prided upon, statesmen and Governments are compelled by "the ever-spreading spirit of anarchy" to shut their eyes to it all, to forget it all, and, for their own safety, to make firm alliances with the embodiment of that polity which is the perfection of "contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind."

As, therefore, the spirit of anarchy is the principal cause of these advances toward the renewed recognition of the Papacy in national and international affairs, and as this spirit is universal, so we are certain that this recognition of the Papacy in one form or another, as suits it best, will be universal. And we believe that Father O'Reilly stated the exact truth when he said:—

"The time must come, and is coming, when the Papacy will be formally acknowledged as the international institution *par excellence*, and when both its sovereignty . . . and the means necessary to secure its exercise, will be once more placed solemnly under the safeguard of all nations."

We believe it because it is in accordance with the Scripture: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Then can she indeed say "in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow." Rev. 18:7. And as sure as the sure word of prophecy itself, just so surely will there be persecution. The Papacy is ever the same. The disposition to "root out heresy" is the same in all places and in all ages. All that is now lacking is the power, and when that shall be restored to her, then will be fulfilled the prophecy: "The same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of Days came; and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

But it will not be for long. For just at the time when she, because of her restoration to preference and power, is glorifying herself, is living deliciously, and congratulating herself, saying "in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" just then, and "therefore shall her plagues come in one day,

death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18:7, 8. The restoration of the Papacy is the one great event that stands between the world and the Judgment. That restoration is now in progress; the elements are rife that will assure its accomplishment; war upon the saints is impending; and the time that the saints possess the kingdom is at the doors.

Next week we shall examine this subject in connection with our own country.

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jesus Teaching Humility. John 13:1-27" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 30 , pp. 474, 475.**

(August 15.—John 13:1-17.)

IN the lesson for to-day Jesus taught humility, by an example which he is to be imitated by his followers. Said he, "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." Yet as plain as are the words of the Master, not one in a thousand of those who profess to be his disciples, follow the example given by him. They do not do as he did. In this neglect, or refusal, there is a serious slighting of both the example and the command of the Lord Jesus. This example was given by Jesus to be followed by doing as he did, and not by doing something else,—"*that ye should do as I have done to you.*" That is what the example means, and if it is not followed in the way that he did it, it is not followed at all.

The common explanation of the fact of the washing of feet is, that, as in those days the people wore sandals, it was the part of the host to wash the feet of his guests. But the Bible itself is the best evidence of the customs of Bible times, and the Bible shows that such an explanation is not the truth. When the angels came to Abraham, he said: "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and *wash your feet.*" Gen. 18:1-5. When two of the same ones went on to Sodom, Lot "rose up to meet them." "And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house, and tarry all night, *and wash your feet*, and ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways." Gen. 19:1, 2. When Abraham's servant went to the city of Nahor to obtain a wife for his master's son, and came to the house of Bethuel, Laban said: "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord; wherefore standest thou without? for I have prepared the house, and room for the camels. And the man came into the house and he ungirded his camels, and gave straw and provender for the camels, and water *to wash his feet*, and the men's feet that were with him." Gen. 21:31, 32. When Joseph's brethren went down to Egypt, "The man brought the men into Joseph's house, and gave them water, and *they washed their feet*; and *he* gave their asses provender." Gen. 43:24.

In the days of the Judges, a Levite with his servant and concubine, was journeying from Bethlehem-Judah to the side of Mount Ephraim, and came to Gibeah, and the old man whom he met said: "Peace be with thee; howsoever, let all thy wants be upon me; only lodge not in the street. So he brought him into his

house, and gave provender unto the asses; and *they washed their feet*, and did eat and drink." Judges 19:20, 21. In the song of Solomon it is said: "I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on? *I have washed my feet*; how shall I defile them?" chap. 5:3. When Jesus said at meat in the house of Simon the Pharisee, he did not say to Simon, Thou didst not wash my feet; but he did say, "Thou *gavest me* not water *for my feet*." Luke 7:44. While the woman who had many sins had even washed his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. And the very contrast which Jesus makes in this instance shows that for one person to wash another's feet was entirely out of the usual order. In any case this token of love of the penitent Mary could not be construed as an act of hospitality. See the whole narrative in Luke 7:36-50.

The truth is, then, that while in all Bible times there are instances of persons giving to others water with which they washed their own feet, there is not in all the Bible a single instance of one person's washing another's feet, except that of Jesus in this lesson, and of those who followed his example as thus given. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Peter did not know why the Lord should wash their feet; for Jesus said, "What I do thou knowest not now." If such was the common practice in those days, it is most singular that Peter did not know about it. The fact is, there was no such custom, and that the act of Jesus was entirely out of the known order. We believe that Jesus spoke the truth when he said "What I do thou knowest not now."

Yet He said "But thou shalt know hereafter." "So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well; for so I am. 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." Here, then, is the Lord's own explanation of an act of which they did not know the meaning. And that explanation is, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Why? Because "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."

Not as Mr. Peloubet says in his "Select Notes on the International Lessons:" "He that serves others; he that does the humblest service in order to relieve their wants, or cleanse their souls from sin; he that . . . seeks out the poor, the wick, the obscure, the unpopular, to be their friend and helper,—he does to them as Christ did to the disciples." But did not Christ do that to everybody? Had he not been doing all these things before the eyes of his disciples, and had he not been teaching them all these things for three years and a half? In the temple, in the presence of a multitude, Jesus, in words spoken directly to his disciples, could exalt the poor widow and her two mites above all the rich of Jerusalem; he could go to the house of Zaccheus the publican, and of Simon the leper, and eat meat there; he could lead his disciples away over to the borders of Tyre and Sidon, apparently for the sole purpose of helping the poor woman of Canaan, whose daughter was grievously vexed with a devil; he could show his gracious favor to the poor Mary "whose sins were many;" he could feed thousands of the hungry, twice, because "he had compassion on them;" he could cleanse the lepers, cause the lame to walk, the blind to see, the deaf to hear, he could bring from the

dead "the only son of his other, and also a widow," because "he had compassion on her;" he could heal the wick numbering thousands, all day, till he was wearied out, day after day; all these things, and more he could do year in and year out, and could send forth his disciples themselves to do them all; and yet, according to Mr. Peloubet, after all this, the disciples still lacked an example of Jesus, "serving others," and of his seeking out "the poor, the sick, the obscure, the unpopular, to be their friend and helper, and to relieve their wants"! And then when he does give them such an example, lo, he does it by washing their feet!! And "he who seeks out the poor, the sick, the obscure, the unpopular, to be their friend and helper,—he does to them as Christ did to his disciples"! He who does these things does as Christ did to all; but to do these things is *not* to do as Christ did to his disciples, nor to follow his example, when he washed their feet.

Here are the words of Christ: 1. "I have washed your feet." 2. "I have given you an example, that *ye should do as I have done* to you." 3. "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Therefore it is certain that no man follows the example of Christ as he gave it on this occasion, unless he washed the feet of a disciple of Christ.

Here are the words of Christ again: "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." "Ye should do as I have done to you." "If ye know these things, happy [blessed] are ye if ye do them." *Ought* is the old English past tense of *owe* and means "under obligation to pay." *Should* is the imperative of *shall* and means "you must, you are bound to." "To owe, to be under obligation to do a thing." "OUGHT, SHOULD—Both words imply obligation, but *ought* is the stronger." *Obligation*—"That which constitutes legal or moral duty." See *Skeat's Etymological Dictionary*, and *Webster*. Therefore if Christ's words mean anything at all, they mean that the washing of one another's feet is a duty which the disciples of Christ owe to one another and to him. And so long as any of His disciples fail to do this, they fail to do their whole duty as his disciples. Nor will the performance of some other duty meet the obligation to perform this duty. To visit the sick is a duty. To seek out the poor and the obscure, to be their friend and helper,

475

is a duty, whether they be disciples or not, Christ taught all this all his life as a teacher; but till that night, the last one before his death, he never taught them nor anybody else, that they should wash anybody's feet. But there in the last fast fleeting hours of his earthly life, just before dark Gethsemane, in his last tender meeting with his disciples, he gave this example of humility, and said to his beloved disciples, "Ye ought to wash one another's feet." "Ye should do it." Reader, if you are a disciples of Christ, and have not done this, why don't you do it? He says, "Blessed are ye if ye do."

We know that this duty is refused, and its obligation bitterly resented, by many and many of those who profess to be his disciples. But we feel fully assured that if there were anywhere any single expression of Christ such as that, Ye ought to keep holy the first day of the week; or, Ye should keep the first day of the week as Sabbath; or, Happy are ye if ye keep the first day of the week as the Lord's day;—we are perfectly certain that were there any single saying such as any one of these, there could not be found in this world a solitary person who keeps

Sunday who would not cite it as of sufficient authority to settle all dispute that might arise on that question. And it would be sufficient authority to settle all dispute that might arise on that question. And it would be sufficient authority for such service too. Then when all three of these expressions—"Ye ought to;" "Ye should do;" "Happy are ye if ye do,"—are used with direct reference to the washing of feet, why is it that there are among those who profess to be his disciples, any at all who will not do this duty so repeatedly laid upon them? But no, a thing which neither Christ nor his apostles ever mentioned or showed by any example—the keeping of the first day of the week—is exalted and clung to as though it were the chiefest token of allegiance to Christ; while this duty, having for its obligation his example and his thrice expressed injunction, is neglected, despised, and condemned, by those for whom the rite was instituted. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be." We assure you that whenever we find the words of Christ saying "ye ought to," concerning anything, that thing we are going to do. And when his word to his disciples concerning the washing of one another's feet, is, Ye ought to do it, Ye should do it, and Happy are ye if ye do it, we are going to do it.

But it may be asked is there any further notice of this in the writings of the New Testament? There is. In 1 Tim. 5:3-16, Paul gives directions concerning the duty of the Church toward widows. And of those who are to be taken into the charge of the Church, he says: "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, *if she have washed the saints' feet*, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work." Verses 9, 10. This shows that the washing of the saints' feet was practiced in the Church as late as A.D. 65; that it was one of the things that a disciple of Christ must do to have the favor of the Church; and that it was to continue in the Church; because it was a part of the directions which Timothy was to follow in setting in order the things in the churches; and it was one of the things which he was to "commit to faithful men who should be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. 2:2. And it is not according to the will of Christ that this example should be neglected by his followers to-day. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which say?" Luke 6:46. It also shows that Mr. Peloubet's teaching before quoted is wrong; for they were to be received, if they had lodged strangers, if they had relieved the afflicted, *and* if they had *washed the saints' feet*. Relieving the afflicted covers all of Mr. Peloubet's examples; but that is not to wash the saints' feet, nor is it to do, either in letter or in spirit, as Christ did when he washed the disciples' feet.

Why then is it neglected by so many of his professed followers to-day. The answer is easily given: It is Christ's ordinance of humility, but his professed Church has become too proud to practice it. This is shown in his own words: "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." The servant has become greater than his lord, and so considers himself free from the example and obligation of his Lord; he that is sent has become

greater than He that sent him, and counts himself at liberty to dispense with the ordinance instituted by his Lord. When the churches were despised and persecuted, they were humble enough to not despise Christ's lesson of humility. But now the Church is courted by the world; now she is "rich and increased with goods and hath need of nothing." But she needs the humility of Christ. The "International Lesson" for to-day is entitled "Jesus Teaching Humility"; how many will learn the real lesson which he teaches? how many will practice the lesson which he taught, as he taught it? "I have washed your feet." "I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." "If ye know these things, happy [blessed] are ye if ye do them."  
J.

**August 12, 1886**

**"The Saxons Enter Britain" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 31 , p. 484.**

"WHILST Italy was ravaged by the Goths, and a succession of feeble tyrants oppressed the provinces beyond the Alps, the British island separated itself [A.D. 409] from the body of the Roman empire. The regular forces, which guarded that remote province, had been gradually withdrawn; and Britain was abandoned without defense to the Saxon pirates, and the savages of Ireland and Caledonia. The Britons, reduced to this extremity, no longer relied on the tardy and doubtful aid of a declining monarchy. They assembled in arms, repelled the invaders, and rejoiced in the important discovery of their own strength. . . Britain was irrecoverably lost. But as the emperors wisely acquiesced in the independence of a remote province, the separation was not embittered by the reproach of tyranny or rebellion; and the claims of allegiance and protection were succeeded by the mutual and voluntary offices of national friendship. This revolution dissolved the artificial fabric of civil and military government; and the independent country, during a period of forty years, till the descent of the Saxons, was ruled by the authority of the clergy, the nobles, and the municipal towns."—*Gibbon, Dec. and Fall, chap. 31, par. 41, 42.*

"Here, then, in the year 409, was our England an independent State. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle—the curious but meager record of early events, which is supposed to have existed in the time of Alfred, and even to have been partly compiled by that great king—there is the following entry which singularly agrees with the chronology of Greek and Latin historians:—

"A. 409.—This year the Goths took the city of Rome by storm, and after this the Romans never ruled in Britain, and this was about eleven hundred and ten years after it was built. Altogether they ruled in Britain four hundred and seventy years since Caius Julius

first sought the land."—*Knight's History of England, chap. 4, last paragraph.*

"It was to defend Italy against the Goths that Rome in the opening of the fifth century withdrew her legions from Britain, and from that moment the province was left to struggle unaided against the Picts. Nor were these its only enemies. While marauders from Ireland, whose inhabitants then bore the name of Scots, harried the West, the boats of Saxon pirates, as we have seen, were swarming off its eastern and southern coasts. For forty years Britain held bravely out against these assailants; but civil strife broke its powers of resistance, and its rulers fell back at last on the fatal policy by which the empire invited its doom while striving to avert it,—the policy of matching barbarian against barbarian. By the usual promises of land and pay a band of warriors was drawn for this purpose from Jutland in 449, with two caldermen, Hengist and Horsa, at their head. *If by English history we mean the history of Englishmen in the land which from that time they made their own, it is with this landing of Hengist's war-band that English history begins.* They landed on the shores of the Isle of Thanet at a spot known since as Ebbsfleet. No spot can be so sacred to Englishmen as the spot which first felt the tread of English feet."—*Green's England, chap. 1, par. 17.*

"Hengist and Horsa, who, according to the Anglo-Saxon historians, landed in the year 449 on the shore which is called Ypwinesfleet, were personages of more than common srot. 'They were the sons of Wihtgils; Wihtgils son of Witta, Witta of Weccta, Wecta of Woden.' So says the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and adds, 'From this Woden sprung all our royal families.' These descendants, in the third generation, from the great Saxon divinity, came over in three boats. They came by invitation of Wyrtegeone—Vortigern—king of the Britons. The king gave them land in the southeast of the country, on condition that they should fight against the Picts; and they did fight, and had the victory wheresoever they came. And then they sent for the Angles, and told them of the worthlessness of the people and the excellences of the land. This is the Saxon narrative."—*Knight's England, chap. 5, par. 6.*

"The work for which the mercenaries had been hired was quickly done, and the Picts are said to have been scattered to the winds in a battle fought on the eastern coast of Britain. But danger from the Pict was hardly over when danger came from the Jutes themselves. Their fellow-pirates must have flocked from the Channel to their settlement in Thanet; the inlet between Thanet and the mainland was crossed, and the Englishmen won their first victory over the Britons in forcing their passage of the Medway at the village of Aylesford. A second defeat at the passage of the Cray drove the British forces in terror upon London; but the ground was

soon won back again, and it was not till 465 that a series of petty conflicts which had gone on along the shores of Thanet made way for a decisive struggle at Wippedsflett. Here, however, the overthrow was so terrible that from this moment all hope of saving Northern Kent seems to have been abandoned, and it was only on its southern shore that the Britons held their ground. Ten years later, in 475, the long contest was over, and with the fall of Lymne, whose broken walls look, from the slope to which they cling, over the great flat of Romney Marsh, the work of the first English conqueror was done."—*Green's England, chap. 1, par. 18.*

Other such events followed fast, of which we will now have Gibbon to tell the story, and close the narrative of the Saxon conquest of Britain:—

"While the kingdoms of the Franks and Visigoths were established in Gaul and Spain, the Saxons achieved the conquest of Britain, the third great diocese of the Prefecture of the West."

"About forty years after the dissolution of the Roman government, Vortigern appears to have obtained the supreme, though precarious command of the princes and cities of Britain. That unfortunate monarch has been almost unanimously condemned for the weak and mischievous policy of inviting a formidable stranger, to repel the vexatious inroads of a domestic foe. . . . Vortigern could only balance the various perils, which assaulted on every side his throne and his people; and his policy may deserve either praise or excuse, if he preferred the alliance of *those* barbarians, whose naval power rendered them the most dangerous enemies and the most serviceable allies. Hengist and Horsa, as they ranged along the eastern coast with three ships, were engaged, by the promise of an ample stipend, to embrace the defense of Britain; and their intrepid valor soon delivered the country from the Caledonian invaders.

"The Isle of Thanet, a secure and fertile district, was allotted for the residence of these German auxiliaries, and they were supplied, according to the treaty, with a plentiful allowance of clothing and provisions. This favorable reception encouraged five thousand warriors to embark with their families in seventeen vessels, and the infant power of Hengist was fortified by this strong and seasonable reenforcement. The crafty barbarian suggested to Vortigern the obvious advantage of fixing, in the neighborhood of the Picts, a colony of faithful allies: a third fleet of forty ships, under the command of his son and nephew, sailed from Germany, ravaged the Orkneys, and disembarked a new army on the coast of Northumberland, or Lothian, at the opposite extremity of the devoted land. It was easy to foresee, but it was impossible to prevent, the impending evils. The two nations were soon divided and exasperated by mutual jealousies. The Saxons magnified all that they had done and suffered in the cause of an ungrateful

people; while the Britons regretted the liberal rewards which could not satisfy the avarice of those haughty mercenaries. The causes of fear and hatred were inflamed into an irreconcilable quarrel. The Saxons flew to arms; and if they perpetrated a treacherous massacre during the security of a feast, they destroyed the reciprocal confidence which sustains the intercourse of peace and war.—*Gibbon, Dec. and Fall, chap. 38, par. 32, 33.*

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The Restoration of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 31 , pp. 486, 487.**

THAT our own country will play an important part in the restoration of the Papacy to that place where it can make war upon the saints, we are fully satisfied. And that causes are now at work which will bring it about, we regard as certain. Not that the Papacy as such will gain power here, for that we do not believe. But that the organization that does secure the power will exert it in favor of the institutions of the Papacy, and by the help of the Papacy. In the words of the prophecy, he "causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Rev. 13:12.

In this country the spirit of anarchy is rife as well as in Europe. The conflict between labor and capital is growing more and more bitter. The so-called labor element is so unsteady, and so violent in its methods, that capitalists are becoming afraid to invest in large enterprises, and capital by the millions lies unused in bank vaults. In connection with these things there is a large train of evils which all see and which many dread, but which we cannot here take time to trace. Now in the midst of all these troubles, and upon them in great measure as its capital, there is rapidly rising into prominence a party which traces all these evils directly to the "secular character of the Constitution of our country," and proposes to rectify all these difficulties by a religious amendment to that instrument. This party argues that God is not once named in the Constitution; that neither Christ nor his religion is recognized there; that the Bible receives no legal sanction as the law of the Nation; that under this order of things the tests of the Christian religion are not applied in this country; that, consequently, the land is filling up with multitudes of foreigners who bring the baser elements of European society with them; that all the troubles that afflict the land—the strikes, the floods, the cyclones, &c., &c.,—are but the judgments of God upon the Nation for its terrible shortcoming in the matter of the deplorably secular Constitution; and that the *only* remedy, the only possible escape, is to so amend the National Constitution that in it God will be declared to be the Sovereign, Christ, the King, and the Bible the law, of the Nation, and so "place all Christian laws, institutions and usages of our Government upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This is not a Catholic movement. It is essentially Protestant; it originated with Protestants, and is carried on by Protestants, though willing to enlist the Catholics wherever practicable. And though directly contrary to Protestant principles, it is favored by almost all denominations of Protestants. It will be seen at a glance that such a scheme, if successful, would be nothing short of union of Church and State. For when Christian laws, Christian institutions, and Christian usages become a part of the fundamental law of the land, the State becomes the great conservator of the Christian religion. Religious tests must be applied, obedience to religious precepts must be enforced, and in all disputes the State becomes the expounder of Christianity; the State by its judicial authority decides what is, and what is not, a Christian law, a Christian institution, or a Christian usage. For the main question is not whether such a movement, if successful, would be a union of Church and State, this is conceded by all, except those who advocate it, and it is not to be expected that they would concede it; but the question is, Will it be successful. We verily believe that it will. The great majority of the nation do not yet so believe. Thousands do not believe that it will succeed; other thousands do not believe that, even were it successful, there would ever any such evil follow, that any such menace to liberty would attend it, as has always attended such an illicit connection. And in this very unbelief lies one of the most probable elements of its success. With the history before them, of all such unions, it is difficult for men in this enlightened age to realize that there could be any danger of a repetition of such things. But all such doubts rest upon an overweening confidence in human nature. Human nature is the same in all ages. Religious bigotry and priestly ambition are ever the same whether found in the sixteenth century or in the nineteenth. Clothed with the civil power Protestant religionists who are ambitious to obtain it, and their oppressiveness will be as cruel as would be that of Catholics in like circumstances.

What then are the evidences of the success of the religious amendment movement?—First, and the greatest of all is, of course, the prophecy. There stands the scripture, Rev. 13:11-17, which describes the rise and work of a power in the earth, and every specification of the scripture is fully met by our own nation, and not one of the specifications is met by any other nation. That scripture speaks of this power "saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword and did live." The beast is the representative of that union of Church and State which formed the Papacy. An image to the beast, therefore, could not be formed otherwise than by a union of Church and State, and with such union formed by Protestants. For if formed by Catholics it would be but a part of the beast itself and not a likeness. But when such a union is formed by Protestants, as it is in defiance of Protestant principles, it is simply a formation of an image, a likeness, to the Papacy. It is true that while the prophecy is an evidence to us who believe in this application of it, it can be an evidence to others only by our giving to them evidence of the justness of the application. But when the prophecy so plainly points out that such a thing shall be; and we see working before us in this nation the very thing which the prophecy shows; then with confidence we point to this as proof that our application of the prophecy is correct.

Aside from this however, there are many evidences which point strongly towards the success of

486

the movement. We repeat, Almost all the Protestant churches favor it. The Prohibition Party in most of the States favors it. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union favors it. True the women cannot vote; but they can influence a multitude of votes. But it is not absolutely certain that the women will not yet have the right to vote—the party which is working for the religious amendment, favors woman suffrage also; and if they do obtain the right, they will vote for the religious amendment. The movement will have the almost undivided support of the workingmen throughout the nation. And besides all these the Catholics favor it. Yea, the men who lead in the movement are willing, and even glad, to receive the support of the Catholic Church. Now take the churches, the Prohibition Party, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the workingmen, the Catholics, and all the politicians who will go as they see the tide going, and bring all these together at the polls and the movement would carry. The probability that it would be increased by another element that enters largely into the subject. That is, the argument that is swung in on every possible occasion by the advocates of this amendment, to the effect that to oppose this movement is to support atheism, and that, in fact, all such opposition *is* atheism. There are thousands of people who might not really favor the amendment, yet rather than to be set down and treated as atheists, they would hesitate to oppose it.

There is one thing that yet remains to be mentioned,—the thing that underlies this whole subject; the one thing upon which all these parties, churches, and people, heartily unite; the one thing that is the key of the whole movement; the one thing which in itself carries the evidence of the success of the proposition to form a religious amendment to the Constitution,—that is, *the Sunday and its protection, the "American sabbath," and its preservation*. This has already been the leading question in States, and it is fast becoming the leading question in the Nation. Almost all the pulpits of the land denounce the "desecration" of Sunday and demand laws for its protection; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union works earnestly for Sunday and for laws to enforce its observance; the Prohibitionists resolve that man needs the Sunday sabbath; the workingman in all occupations must have his Sunday rest, and to make it sure he must have half of Saturday besides; the Catholic Plenary Council earnestly appeals to all Catholics without distinction to use their influence and power as citizens to assist in the movement for a better observance of Sunday; politicians in political conventions will move, and give, rousingly, "three cheers for the triumph of this great principle" of the religious Sunday enforced by law; the Spiritualists join in the cry; and the National Reform Party gathers them all into one grand movement to amend the National Constitution so that Sunday, the one grand distinguishing institution of the Papacy, may be declared by law to be the Christian sabbath, and so that all people shall be compelled to observe it as such. Now we say, Let this question be agitated but a few years more, and let it be brought to a vote with the Sunday as the test, as it surely will be, *and its success is certain*.

And just as surely as its success is certain, the union of Church and State is sure and persecution inevitable. Thus will be formed the image to the beast—the likeness to the Papacy—and he "causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast [the Papacy], whose deadly wound was healed." So shall apostate Protestantism exalt the Papacy in this country and compel all, under civil pains and penalties, to do her honor. When this question is viewed in the light of these events of fact which are occurrent before the eyes of all people, the imminence of the terrible ordeal that is involved in it is startling.

The discussion of the question of persecution, we are compelled to defer to another article.

J.

**"The End of the Tribulation of Those Days" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 31 , p. 487.**

"WHEN, where, and who, was the last martyr? My neighbor thinks it was in 1778, but we cannot find it in any book that we have. Christ said: 'Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light.' Now what we want to get at is, What great event shows the end of the days of tribulation?"

S.H.

Your neighbor is mistaken; there have been several martyrs since 1778. In 1780 there was a woman burned by the Inquisition in Spain; and in the same country, in 1826, a Jew was burned, and a Quaker schoolmaster hanged by the same power. In Italy, as late as 1850-1855, there was severe persecution, and at Fermo one person died under torture. This is the latest martyrdom of which we know; and we think that it is the last one. You will find it mentioned in Eugene Lawrence's "Historical Studies," in the article "Dominic and the Inquisition," fifth paragraph from the end. In the same article you will find mention of the woman burned in 1780; and in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," article "Inquisition," you will find mention of the deaths of the Jew and the Quaker.

It is a mistake to so interpret the scripture referred to as to make it reach to the last martyr. The scripture says, "after the *tribulation* of those days." Now occasional and local persecution, with three or four, or a half-dozen martyrs in a century, could not properly be called tribulation, much less could it be the tribulation referred to in the text. "Such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Matt. 24:21, 29. This could be no less than universal, a flood poured upon the whole church, and so great that, except the days had been shortened, there had been none "elect" surviving. Therefore when this great general persecution ceased, then it may be said the *tribulation* ended. This brings us to your last question: "What great event shows the end of the days of the tribulation?"

We believe there is an event clearly marked by a date upon which we may definitely fix as the end of the tribulation upon the church. The Inquisition was the great arm—the *tribulum*, threshing sledge—of the Papacy in the dreadful tribulation

which it laid upon the church of Christ for ages; and the Order of the Jesuits was the strength of the Inquisition. On this point we could present a volume of evidence, but we have space for hardly more than a word. Here is one testimony:—

"A Jesuit plotted with Mary of Scotland for the assassination of Elizabeth. Another strove to blow up James I. and the English Parliament with gun-powder. The Jesuits were charged with being constantly on the watch to assassinate William of Orange, and Henry of Hanover. Anthony Passevin, a Jesuit, is stated by ManroviEFF, the church historian of Russia, to have taught the Polish Catholics to persecute the Greek Christians, and to have plunged Russia and Poland in an inexpiable war. Jesuits were constantly gliding over Europe from court to court, engaged in performing the mandates of popes and kings; and, if we may trust the records of history, the fatal vow of obedience was often employed by their superiors to crush the instincts of humanity and the voice of conscience."—*Historical Studies, Loyola and the Jesuits.*

Here is another:—

"To what country of Europe shall we turn where we are not able to track the Jesuit by his bloody foot-prints? What page of modern history shall we open and not read fresh proofs that the papal doctrine of killing excommunicated kings was not meant to slumber in forgotten tomes, but to be acted out in the living world? We see Henry III. falling by the dagger. Henry IV. [both of France] perishes by the same consecrated weapon. The King of Portugal dies by their order. The great prince of Orange is despatched by their agent, shot down at the door of his own dining-room. How many assassins they sent to England to murder Elizabeth, history attests. That she escaped their machinations is one of the marvels of history. . . In the Gunpowder Plot we see them deliberately planning to destroy at one blow the nobility and gentry of England. To them we owe those civil wars which for so many years drenched with blood the fair provinces of France. They laid the train of that crowning horror, the St. Bartholomew Massacre. Philip II. and the Jesuits share between them the guilt of the 'Invincible Armada,' which instead of inflicting the measureless ruin and havoc which its authors intended, by a most merciful Providence became the means of exhausting the treasures and overthrowing the prestige of Spain. What a harvest of plots, tumults, seditions, revelations, torturings, poisonings, assassinations, regicides, and massacres has Christendom reaped from the seed sown by the Jesuits."—*Wylie's History of Protestantism, book 15, chap. 5, par. 5.*

And here is one more:—

"Its [the Order of Jesuits] services to Roman Catholicism have been incalculable. The Jesuits alone rolled back the tide of Protestant advance when that half of Europe which had not already

shaken off its allegiance to the Papacy, was threatening to do so, and the whole horrors of the counter-reformation are theirs singly."—  
*Encyclopedia Britannica, art., Jesuits, par. 11.*

As the Inquisition was the *tribulum* by which the Papacy inflicted such sore tribulation upon the church, and as the Order of the Jesuits was the strength of the Inquisition, therefore we believe that *the abolition of the Order of the Jesuits* is the event that marks the end of the tribulation. They had been expelled from Portugal in 1753, from France in 1761, and from Spain in 1767; but these decrees could not be permanently successful as long as the Jesuits retained their Order intact, and had the support of the Pope. But it was not long before the Pope was forced to turn against them, and the final crash came. Of this event we give the following narrative:—

"At last came the final blow that was to shatter into pieces the great army of Loyola. For more than two centuries the Jesuits had been lighting the battles of Rome. To exalt the supremacy of the Pope, they had died by thousands in English jails and Indian solitudes, had pierced land and sea to carry the strange story of the primacy to heathen millions, and to build anew the medieval church in the heart of Oriental idolatry. And now it was the Pope and Rome that were to complete their destruction. BY a cruel ingratitude, the deity on earth whom they had worshiped with a fidelity unequaled among men, was to hurl his anathemas against his most faithful disciples. France and Spain elected Pope Clement XIV. upon his pledge that he would dissolve the Order. He issued his bull July 21, 1773, directing that, for the welfare of the church and the good of mankind, the institution of Loyola should be abolished."—*Historical Studies, Id.*

For these reasons we believe that the abolition of the Order of Jesuits is the event, and July 21, 1773, is the date, when "the tribulation of those days" ended.  
J.

NOTE.—The Jesuits were restored in 1814, by Pope Pius VII.; but not to their persecuting power. In the different countries of Europe since that time the Order has been expelled and restored several times, and even by the Papacy once. But Pius IX., after his return from Gaeta in 1849, gave them its entire confidence till the day of his death, and in his Vatican decrees is seen the crowning triumph of Jesuit Ultramontanism.

## **August 19, 1886**

### **"The Saxons Enter Britain" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 32 , p. 500.**

"HENGIST, who boldly aspired to the conquest of Britain, exhorted his countrymen to embrace the glorious opportunity; he painted in lively colors the fertility of the soil, the wealth of the cities, the pusillanimous temper of the natives, and the convenient

situation of a spacious solitary island, accessible on all sides to the Saxon fleets. The successive colonies which issued, in the period of a century [A.D. 455-582] from the mouths of the Elbe, the Weser, and the Rhine, were principally composed of three valiant tribes or nations of Germany; the *Jutes*, the *old Saxons*, and the *Angles*. The Jutes, who fought under the peculiar banner of Hengist, assumed the merit of leading their countrymen in the paths of glory, and of erecting, in Kent, the first independent kingdom. The fame of the enterprise was attributed to the primitive Saxons; and the common laws and language of the conquerors are described by the national appellation of a people, which, at the end of four hundred years, produced the first monarchs of South Britain. The Angles were distinguished by their numbers and their success; and they claimed the honor of fixing a perpetual name on the country, of which they occupied the most ample portion.

"The barbarians, who followed the hopes of rapine either on the land or sea, were insensibly blended with this triple confederacy; the *Frisians*, who had been tempted by their vicinity to the British shores, might balance, during a short space, the strength and reputation of the native Saxons; the *Danes*, the *Prussians*, the *Rugians*, are faintly described; and some adventurous *Huns*, who had wandered as far as the Baltic, might embark on board the German vessels, for the conquest of a new world. But this arduous achievement was not prepared or executed by the union of national powers. Each intrepid chieftain, according to the measure of his fame and fortunes, assembled his followers; equipped a fleet of three, or perhaps of sixty, vessels; chose the place of the attack; and conducted his subsequent operations according to the events of the war, and the dictates of his private interest. In the invasion of Britain many heroes vanquished and fell; but only seven victorious leaders assumed, or at least maintained, the title of kings. Seven independent thrones, the Saxon Heptarchy, were founded by the conquerors, and seven families, one of which has been continued, by female succession, to our present sovereign [George III.], derived their equal and sacred lineage from Woden, the god of war. It has been pretended, that this republic of kings was moderated by a general council and a supreme magistrate. But such an artificial scheme of policy is repugnant to the rude and turbulent spirit of the Saxons: their laws are silent; and their imperfect annals afford only a dark and bloody prospect of intestine discord.

"While the continent of Europe and Africa yielded, without resistance, to the Barbarians, the British island, alone and unaided, maintained a long, a vigorous, though an unsuccessful, struggle, against the formidable pirates, who, almost at the same instant, assaulted the Northern, the Eastern, and the Southern coasts. The cities which had been fortified with skill, were defended with

resolution; the advantages of ground, hills, forests, and morasses, were diligently improved by the inhabitants; the conquest of each district was purchased with blood; and the defeats of the Saxons are strongly attested by the discreet silence of their annalist. Hengist might hope to achieve the conquest of Britain; but his ambition, in an active reign of thirty-five years, was confined to the possession of Kent; and the numerous colony which he had planted in the North, was extirpated by the sword of the Britons.

"The monarchy of the West Saxons was laboriously founded by the persevering efforts of three martial generations. The life of Cerdic, one of the bravest of the children of Woden, was consumed in the conquest of Hampshire, and the Isle of Wight; and the loss which he sustained in the battle of Mount Badon, reduced him to a state of inglorious repose. Kenric, his valiant son, advanced into Wiltshire; besieged Salisbury, at that time seated on a commanding eminence; and vanquished an army which advanced to the relief of the city. In the subsequent battle of Marlborough, his British enemies displayed their military science. Their troops were formed in three lines; each line consisted of three distinct bodies, and the cavalry, the archers, and the pikemen, were distributed according to the principles of Roman tactics. The Saxons charged in one weighty column, boldly encountered with their shord swords the long lances of the Britons, and maintained an equal conflict till the approach of night. Two decisive victories, the death of three British kings, and the reduction of Cirencester, Bath, and Gloucester, established the fame and power of Ceaulin, the grandson of Cerdic, who carried his victorious arms to the banks of the Severn.

"After a war of a hundred years, the independent Britons still occupied the whole extent of the Western coast, from the wall of Antoninus to the extreme promontory of Cornwall; and the principal cities of the inland country still opposed the arms of the barbarians. Resistance became more languid, as the number and boldness of the assailants continually increased. Winning their way by slow and painful efforts, the Saxons, the Angles, and their various confederates, advanced from the North, from the East, and from the South, till their victorious banners were united in the center of the island. Beyond the Severn the Britons still asserted their national freedom, which survived the heptarchy, and even the monarchy, of the Saxons. The bravest warriors, who preferred exile to slavery, found a secure refuge in the mountains of Wales: the reluctant submission of Cornwall was delayed for some ages; and a band of fugitives acquired a settlement in Gaul, by their own valor, or the liberality of the Merovingian kings.

"Resistance, if it cannot avert, must increase the miseries of conquest; and conquest has never appeared more dreadful and destructive than in the hands of the Saxons; who hated the valor of

their enemies, disdained the faith of treaties, and violated, without remorse, the most sacred objects of the Christian worship. The fields of battle might be traced, almost in every district, by monuments of bones; the fragments of falling towers were stained with blood; the last of the Britons, without distinction of age or sex, was massacred, in the ruins of Anderida; and the repetition of such calamities was frequent and familiar under the Saxon heptarchy. The arts and religion, the laws and language, which the Romans had so carefully planted in Britain, were extirpated by their barbarous successors. After the destruction of the principal churches, the bishops, who had declined the crown of martyrdom, retired with the holy relics into Wales and Armorica; the remains of their flocks were left destitute of any spiritual food; the practice, and even the remembrance, of Christianity were abolished; and the British clergy might obtain some comfort from the damnation of the idolatrous strangers.

"The kings of France maintained the privileges of their Roman subjects; but the ferocious Saxons trampled on the laws of Rome, and of the emperors. The proceedings of civil and criminal jurisdiction, the titles of honor, the forms of office, the ranks of society, and even the domestic rights of marriage, testament, and inheritance, were finally suppressed; and the indiscriminate crowd of noble and plebeian slaves was governed by the traditionary customs, which had been coarsely framed for the shepherds and pirates of Germany. The language of science, of business, and of conversation, which had been introduced by the Romans, was lost in the general desolation. A sufficient number of Latin or Celtic words might be assumed by the Germans, to express their new wants and ideas; but those *illiterate* Pagans preserved and established the use of their national dialect. Almost every name, conspicuous either in the church or state, reveals its Teutonic origin; and the geography of England was universally inscribed with foreign characters and appellations. The example of a revolution, so rapid and so complete, may not easily be found."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 38, par. 44, 46, 37, 39.*

From that time the history of the Angles and Saxons—the Anglo-Saxons—has been but the history of England—Augersland—and, having so far separated from the other nations that shared in the breaking up of the Roman Empire, we shall not have occasion to mention them again.

J.

**"Restoration of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 32 , pp. 503, 504.**

LAST week we showed that the National Reform movement, if successful, would be the union of Church and State in this Government. And we showed that

in the union of all churches and organizations in favor of the Sunday, and its enforcement by law, lies the assurance of the success of the National Reform movement. This movement being carried forward by Protestants, when it succeeds, being the formation of the union of Church and State, it will be a likeness to the Papacy, an image to the beast. It is true that its advocates deny that it has the slightest tendency toward a union of Church and State; and argue that it is merely for the recognition and establishment by law of the Christian religion, of Christianity in the abstract, with no reference whatever to any particular church, and that, consequently, it cannot be a union of Church and State. But that is all that Constantine did. He simply made the Christian religion, Christianity in the abstract, the religion of the Empire. And that has been always viewed as the union of Church and State. But whatever it was, either in theory or in fact, there is one thing about it which admits of no shadow of dispute, that is, *out of it grew the Papacy*. And when this nation, following in the steps of Constantine, makes Christianity the religion of the State, out of such action will grow the living image of the Papacy—the image of the beast. This result is just as certain as that "like causes produce like effects." History *does* repeat itself, and that it is going to do so in this matter we deem just as certain as that two and two make four.

This brings us then to the question, Will there not be persecution? Assuredly there will be. In the very nature of the case that must be the inevitable result. When the question as to what constitutes Christianity becomes a matter of judicial decision instead of conscientious conviction, such decisions to be of any force at all must be respected. And if there should be any who decline to accept a Christianity that is thus made to order, the decision of the court must be enforced. Of course in the idea of the court, and of the majority, such enforcement would not be persecution, oh no,—it would only be punishment for contempt of court.

Now Sunday being the one question upon which all classes unite, that can be wielded by the National Reform leaders; Sunday being the one question upon which turns the whole Constitutional Amendment movement,—when Sunday becomes the national sabbath, and laws are enacted for the enforcement of its observance upon all, without exception, as the Christian sabbath, then to refuse to keep it is to disobey the law; and therefore, if the law, or the amendment, is to be of any effect at all such dissidents must be compelled to keep it. Because this having been constitutionally declared to be a Christian nation, and Sunday being the Christian sabbath—the great badge of our national profession—for a person to refuse to keep it is to deny Christianity, and so to place himself beyond the protection of the Government. Not only beyond its protection, but subject to its severest displeasure; because as it is, and will be, held that all the judgments that come upon the Nation are because of the desecration of Sunday, whoever refuses to observe it thereby becomes doubly guilty—guilty not only of violating the law but of bringing disaster and perhaps death upon the innocent, and therefore how can punishment be too severe? Especially so when the disobedience is persisted in in spite of penalties; lighter penalties will be laughed at, heavier ones will be defied, and if the Nation is to maintain its position there will be nothing left for it to do but to rid itself of such persons. It will not matter in

the least that in defense of their conduct they cite the plain letter of the law of God, and of the Constitution itself, that, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" the State, at the dictation of the Christian Church, will have declared that Sunday is the sabbath; this declaration must stand, the State cannot yield to a few seventh-day fanatics, and the preservation of the State will be held to depend upon its riddance of them. Of course such action would not, on the part of the State, be considered persecution, but only punishment for violation of the law, and for obstinate rebellion.

Again, the purpose of the Religious Amendment is to declare that God is Sovereign. Then when the amendment has been made, the argument will be this: 1. God is now Constitutionally Sovereign. 2. "The keeping of the sabbath is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God over us." 3. Sunday is declared by national law to be the sabbath. 4. Conclusion, whoever refuses to keep Sunday denies the sovereignty of God. That is the inevitable conclusion. There can be no other from the premises. And these are the premises which even now are maintained by the Religious Amendment Party. But, when God shall have been Constitutionally declared to be the Sovereign of this Government, to deny and refuse to submit to this sovereignty as defined by the law *will be treason*. Then if the State is to maintain its position, what is there left for it to do but to impose the penalty which attaches to treason? There can be no other alternative. This is exactly the length to which the Nation will be driven just assure as it adopts the Religious Amendment to the Constitution; and the adoption of the amendment we consider is as sure as that this is a nation. This last step, like all the others, would not be considered by the authorities as persecution, it would be but the punishment of treason.

But all such argument in justification of such actions, is well named by Robert Baird in his "Religion in America," when he calls it a "miserable excuse." Here are his words:—

"The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death, and banished the 'Antinomians' and 'Anabaptists,' not because of their religious tenets but because of their violations of the civil laws. This is the justification which they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the law of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal."—*P. 69.*

To arrive at treason by the course which we have marked would not be the first instance in America. Two hundred and forty years ago, in New England, Christianity, in the garb of Congregationalism, was the religion of the land, and says Bancroft:—

"Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished *as a civil offense*. The State was a model of Christ's kingdom; the very thing which the National Reformers declare that this Government shall

now be made by the Religious Amendment on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ. . . . The creation of a national uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which had disgrace their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged."—*History of the United States, chap. 10, under 1651, July 20.*

But, although the "miserable excuse" may be made, that such punishments are only for infractions of the civil law, the fact remains that all such conduct on the part of the State is persecution; and for the very good reason that the State has no business

504

to have any such civil laws; the State has no right to make religion a part of the civil law. But all these evils always have followed, and they always will follow, such an illicit union. Gibbon's words are fitting advice to-day to those men who seek for the Religious Amendment to the Constitution:—

"It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime, of the offender. The fine which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment.—*Decline and Fall, chap. 37, par. 23.*

That the authors of persecution will support it in the last extreme is a foregone conclusion, because none but religious bigots ever attempt it, and they are always ready to go to any length that circumstances may demand, in support of whatever degree of power it may be with which they succeed in clothing themselves.

Now what connection with the Papacy or its restoration has this Religious Amendment and its outcome? Just this, the Sunday institution, the protection of which is the main object of the amendment, is the institution *par excellence* of the Papacy, it rests solely on the authority of the Papacy. No man can present any authority of Scripture for the observance of Sunday; and all attempt to do so is only a perversion of Scripture. The keeping of Sunday by Protestants, "is an homage they pay in spite of themselves to the authority of the Catholic Church;" so says "the Church" and Protestants cannot deny it. Therefore when American Protestantism, and its allied powers, by national enactment enforce upon all the observance of Sunday, it enforces the observance of a papal institution, and compels men to honor and obey the Papacy. And so he "causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." The cruel culmination to which we have traced the working of the Religious Amendment, when it shall have been carried, is the inevitable logic of the question; and the justness of our deduction is confirmed by the prophecy which we are discussing. "And he had power to give life unto the image of the

beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Rev. 13:15.

The course which we have outlined in this article is the one which will be pursued in the working of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Very few people believe it. But it is the truth if nobody at all believes it. Events themselves will confirm what we here have shown, or else the events of all history have been enacted in vain and no lesson can be drawn from what has been. We have yet more to say upon this subject.

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jesus Comforting His Disciples.  
John 14:1-14" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 32 , pp. 506, 507.**

(August 29. John 14:1-14.)

"LET not your heart be troubled." Jesus was about to leave his disciples. He had just told them that he would be with them but a little while, and that whither he was going they could not come. So they were troubled for two reasons, first, that he was going away from them, and secondly, that where he should go they could not come. The disciples had learned to love and trust him as the Son of God, as the Messiah that should come into the world, and now that they were to be separated from him and left thus in the world, troubled them. But the tender Saviour did not leave them, nor us, comfortless. True, he said, "In the world you shall have tribulation," but he also said, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you." Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." Verse 27. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." Verse 16. This is what should comfort his disciples for his *absence*,—the first reason *in* their sorrow.

BUT there was not comfort in this on the second reason, "Whither I go ye cannot come." John 13:33. Yet Jesus did not leave his disciples comfortless on this question either. He said: "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."

"I GO to prepare a place for you." Where did Jesus go? Luke tells us that on the day of His ascension, "It came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven." Luke 24:51. On the same occasion Mark says: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into Heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." Mark 16:19. When Stephen was about to die, he said, "Behold, I see the Heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Acts 7:56. Jesus then has gone to Heaven where God is, and he has gone there to prepare a place for his disciples,—for all who put their trust in him. Heaven, therefore, is a place, and not an imaginary, immaterial, intangible nothing, "beyond

the bounds of time and space." The people of God are to be taken to a real place. "That I may excise those that love me to inherit *substance*," saith Wisdom. Prov. 8:21. And Paul says that a certain people took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, "knowing in yourselves that ye have in Heaven a better and an enduring substance." Heb. 10:34. There is then in Heaven a substantial place for the believers in God and in Christ.

NOW HE gives the word that comforted them, and that comforts all his people, upon the words "Whither I go ye cannot come." "If I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again and take you unto myself.*" We cannot go where he is, but he will come and take us to himself. This is the comfort that he gives his disciples. This he gives as the hope of the righteous dead, and as the comfort of the righteous living who sorrow because of the wounds that death has inflicted. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. . . . 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; 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. Wherefore *comfort* one another *with these words.*"

HOW many are there of His professed followers who obey this plain command? On occasions of death, how many "comfort one another *with these words*"? Very few, very few indeed. Now a-days, instead of "with these words" that which is offered as comfort is in such words as, "He is in Heaven now;" "She is safe in the arms of Jesus now;" "The little child is an angel now," etc., etc. But all such comfort is a deceptive comfort, because it is not true. People do not go to Jesus, nor to Heaven, nor do they become angels, when they die. Jesus said, "Whither I go ye cannot come," and men cannot reverse it. Paul says that the Lord shall descend from Heaven, the dead shall rise, the living shall be changed and caught up together with them to meet the Lord, and "so shall we ever be with the Lord." "So," means in this manner, in this way. In this way it is, and in no other way, that Christ's people shall ever be with him.

THIS is further shown by the words of Jesus. "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; *that* where I am, there ye may be also." The word "that," in such a connection, means *in order that*. I will come again, and take you unto myself, *in order that* where I am, there ye may be also. Such are Christ's words; such is the order which he has established, and men cannot reverse it. All other ways are mere theories, and false at that. The way that Christ says, is the only way in which anybody can ever be with him where he is, and that way is by his coming again. Nor was that coming at his own resurrection, nor "on the day of Pentecost," nor is it in his "spiritual presence in our midst," nor "at the day of our death;" but *only* at his coming in glory, with all the holy angels with him, when all the righteous dead arise, and all the righteous living are changed,—all to immortality,—and are all caught up by the angels to meet the Lord in the air, and

all the wicked in all the earth are terrified; that, and that alone, is the coming of the Lord which he has promised.

PROOF: The angels, when he ascended, said, "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." Acts 1:11. 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. And Jesus himself says: "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." Matt. 16:27. "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. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. 24:30, 31. This is the coming of the Lord that is referred to in the lesson to-day. It is the promise of this coming with which he comforted his disciples that dismal night, and with which he commands his disciples now to comfort one another. But alas! the comfort which the Lord offers is neglected, and forsaken for theories of men. Brethren this thing ought not so to be.

"JESUS Comforting His Disciples" is the International Sunday school lesson for to-day. Will the comfort Jesus gave to the disciples of old, be given to his disciples in all the Sunday-schools to-day? Will they all be told that Jesus is coming in his glory, that the righteous dead shall rise, and the righteous living be changed, and that all shall be caught up by the angels together, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall they ever be with the Lord? Will they all be comforted "with these words"? If not, why not?

J.

**August 26, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths Enter the Western Empire" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 33 , p. 516.**

FOUR years after the Saxons set their feet on the soil of Britain the OSTROGOTHS established their independence [A.D. 453] in the Western Empire, where they remained as long as they were a nation. It will be remembered that before the permanent separation of the Visigoths from their eastern brethren, the whole Gothic nation—both Ostro and Visi was subject to the great Hermanric whose dominions extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea; that the great body of the united nations dwelt in the country drained by the river Dnieper; that in A.D. 375 the inundation of the Huns swept away the Alani who dwelt between the Volga and the Don, and poured like a mighty flood upon the dominions of Hermanric. We have already traced the Visigoths from there to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean; we now return to the Ostrogoths, of whom, at the attack of the Huns it is said:—

"The Ostrogoths submitted to their fate; and the royal race of the Amali will hereafter be found among the subjects of the haughty Attila.—*Gibbon's Dec. and Fall, chap. 26, par. 12.*

The power of the Huns steadily spread until the reign of Attila (A.D. 423-453), whose dominions extended from the Black Sea and the Lower Danube to the Baltic, and from the Upper Danube to unknown limits in the steppes of Scythia; over "an empire which did not contain in the space of several thousand miles a single city."—*Id., chap. 34, par. 13.* The capital "an accidental camp which by the long and frequent residence of Attila, had insensibly swelled into a huge village"—seems to have been near, if not at the place, where Tokay is situated in Austria.

"In the proud review of the nations who acknowledged the sovereignty of Attila, and who never entertained, during his lifetime, the thought of a revolt, the Gepidae and the Ostrogoths were distinguished by their numbers, their bravery, and the personal merits of their chiefs. The renowned Ardaric, king of the Gepide, was the faithful and sagacious counselor of the monarch, who esteemed his intrepid genius, whilst he loved the mild and discreet virtues of the noble Walamir, king of the Ostrogoths. The crowd of vulgar kings, the leaders of so many martial tribes, who served under the standard of Attila, were ranged in the submissive order of guards and domestics round the person of their master. They watched his nod; they trembled at his frown; and at the first signal of his will, they executed, without murmur or hesitation, his stern and absolute commands. In time of peace, the dependent princes, with their national troops, attended the royal camp in regular succession; but when Attila collected his military force, he was able to bring into the field an army of five, or, according to another account, of seven hundred thousand barbarians."—*Id., chap. 34, par. 5.*

In A.D. 451 Attila, with an immense army, made a raid into Gaul, and the Ostrogoths went with him; the way in which it was brought about was this; Theodoric was at that time king of the Visigoths, in their country in south-western Gaul; his two daughters "were given in marriage to the eldest sons of the kings of the Suevi and of the Vandals, who reigned in Spain and Africa." The one who married the son of the king of the Vandals, thus became the daughter-in-law of the terrible Genseric.

"The cruel Genseric suspected that his son's wife had conspired to poison him; the supposed crime was punished by the amputation of her nose and ears; and the unhappy daughter of Theodoric was ignominiously returned to the court of Thoulouse in that deformed and mutilated condition. This horrid act, which must seem incredible to a civilized age drew tears from every spectator; but Theodoric was urged, by the feelings of a parent and a king, to revenge such irreparable injuries. The Imperial ministers, who always cherished the discord of the barbarians, would have supplied the Goths with arms, and ships, and treasures, for the African war; and the cruelty

of Genseric might have been fatal to himself, if the artful Vandal had not armed, in his cause, the formidable power of the Huns. His rich gifts and pressing solicitations inflamed the ambition of Attila; and the designs of Etius and Theodoric were prevented by the invasion of Gaul."—*Id.*, chap. 35, par. 4.

Thus it was at the request of Genseric that Attila poured his "hostile myriads" into Gaul.

"The kings and nations of Germany and Scythia, from the Volga perhaps to the Danube, obeyed the warlike summons of Attila. From the royal village, in the plains of Hungary his standard moved [A.D. 451] towards the West; and after a march of seven or eight hundred miles, he reached the conflux of the Rhine and the Neckar, where he was joined by the Franks, who adhered to his ally, the elder of the sons of Clodion. A troop of light barbarians, who roamed in quest of plunder, might choose the winter for the convenience of passing the river on the ice; but the innumerable cavalry of the Huns required such plenty of forage and provisions, as could be procured only in a milder season; the Hercynian forest supplied materials for a bridge of boats; and the hostile myriads were poured, with resistless violence, into the Belgic provinces. . . . From the Rhine and the Moselle, Attila advanced into the heart of Gaul, crossed the Seine at Auxerre; and after a long and laborious march, fixed his camp under the walls of Orleans."

"Orleans had been strengthened with recent fortifications; and the assaults of the Huns were vigorously repelled by the faithful valor of the soldiers, or citizens, who defended the place. The pastoral diligence of Anianus, a bishop of primitive sanctity and consummate prudence, exhausted every art of religious policy to support their courage, till the arrival of the expected succors. After an obstinate siege, the walls were shaken by the battering rams; the Huns had already occupied the suburbs; and the people, who were incapable of bearing arms, lay prostrate in prayer. Anianus, who anxiously counted the days and hours, despatched a trusty messenger to observe, from the rampart, the face of the distant country. He returned twice, without any intelligence that could inspire hope or comfort; but, in his third report, he mentioned a small cloud, which he had faintly descried at the extremity of the horizon. "It is the aid of God!" exclaimed the bishop, in a tone of pious confidence; and the whole multitude repeated after him, "It is the aid of God." The remote object, on which every eye was fixed, became each moment larger, and more distinct; the Roman and Gothic banners were gradually perceived; and a favorable wind blowing aside the dust, discovered, in deep array, the impatient squadrons of Aetius and Theodoric, who pressed forwards to the relief of Orleans."

"On their approach the king of the Huns immediately raised the siege, and sounded a retreat to recall the foremost of his troops from the pillage of a city which they had already entered. The valor of Attila was always guided by his prudence; and as he foresaw the fatal consequences of a defeat in the heart of Gaul, he repassed the Seine, and expected the enemy in the plains of Chalons, whose smooth and level surface was adapted to the operations of his Scythian cavalry. . . . The nations from the Volga to the Atlantic were assembled on the plain of Chalons; but many of these nations had been divided by faction, or conquest, or emigration; and the appearance of similar arms and ensigns, which threatened each other, presented the image of a civil war."

"Cassiolorus, however, had familiarly conversed with many Gothic warriors, who served in that memorable engagement; 'a conflict,' as they informed him, 'fierce, various, obstinate, and bloody; such as could not be paralleled either in the present or in past ages.' The number of the slain amounted to 162,000, or, according to another account, 300,000 persons; and these incredible exaggerations suppose a real and effective loss sufficient to justify the historian's remark, that whole generations may be swept away by the madness of kings, in the space of a single hour. . . . The Huns were undoubtedly vanquished, since Attila was compelled to retreat. . . . It was determined, in a general council of war, to besiege the king of the Huns in his camp, to intercept his provisions, and to reduce him to the alternative of a disgraceful treaty or an unequal combat. But the impatience of the barbarians soon disdained these cautious and dilatory measures; and the mature policy of Etius was apprehensive that, after the extirpation of the Huns, the republic would be oppressed by the pride and power of the Gothic nation. [As Theodorus had been killed in the battle]. The patrician exerted the superior ascendant of authority and reason to calm the passions, which the son of Theodoric considered as a duty; represented, with seeming affection and real truth, the dangers of absence and delay and persuaded Torismond to disappoint, by his speedy return, the ambitious designs of his brothers, who might occupy the throne and treasures of Thoulouse. After the departure of the Goths, and the separation of the allied army, Attila was surprised at the vast silence that reigned over the plains of Chalons; the suspicion of some hostile stratagem detained him several days within the circle of his wagons, and his retreat beyond the Rhine confessed the last victory which was achieved in the name of the Western Empire."—*Id.*, chap. 35, par. 7, 8, 10, 11.

J.

(To be continued.)

**"Restoration of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 33 , pp. 519, 520.**

IN the course of the discussion of this subject we have stated once or twice that the Religious Amendment party is willing and even anxious to enlist the Catholic Church in behalf of the movement. Now we give the proof. Says Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881:—

"This common interest [of all religious people in the sabbath'—Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determination to work and our readiness to cooperate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation."

And the *Statesman* itself, in an editorial, Dec. 11, 1884, said:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the Protestants, all on the side of the Religious Amendmentists. They are not only willing to make the advances, but are willing to be subjected to "rebuffs," and to "make repeated advances" to overcome the coquetry, and to gain the favor, of the "mother of harlots." And why?—Because, "It is one of the *necessities* of the situation"—and the italics are his. Was there ever in the world a more humiliating, a more contemptible, surrender to the Papacy.

But it is true as Mr. Scovel says, they do receive cool treatment and some rebuffs. The Catholic Church does not to any considerable extent directly aid in the movement. She is too crafty for that. She knows as well as they, that "it is one of the necessities of the situation," and she is determined to have the surrender come from Protestantism. Only a few days ago, one of our brethren riding on the railroad, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, "What is your church going to do with the Religious Amendment movement? are you going to vote for it?" "Oh," said the priest, "we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants, we let them do all that. They are all coming to us, and we only have to wait."

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and such it will to all appearances remain until the Protestants have done the work, till Protestantism, by repeated advances and in spite of repeated "rebuffs," has come to her and made the proper surrender. Because she knows that were she now to actively engage in the enterprise its success would be seriously compromised. But let Protestants do the work, as they are doing, and bring the matter to the point of being voted upon, then there will be found at the polls every Catholic voter in the United States, casting his ballot for the Religious Amendment which is to place Sunday where its observance can be enforced by law. This is what all Catholics

are commanded to do, by the present Pope. In his Encyclical published only last year Leo XIII. says:—

"All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church, and all Catholic writers and journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the view of the above prescriptions."

The work of the National Reform party is to cause the United States Constitution, and legislation under it, to be modeled upon the principles of the Catholic Church; and although that church apparently takes no active interest in the work itself, we may rest assured that there is not a single writer, nor a single official, of the Catholic Church, from the Pope to the lowest priest, who ever, "for an instant," loses sight of the movement, or of the "prescriptions" which the Pope has given in view of it. And therefore, by the authority of the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., when the matter comes to the vote, we repeat, every Catholic in the United States will be at the polls to do his duty to the Pope and to the Catholic Church, in the task of modeling our Constitution and legislation "upon the principles of the true church" and the consequent enforcement of the Catholic institution of Sunday upon all people, not only in honor of the Roman Church but *by* the Roman Church as well as by Protestants. For when the matter comes to the enforcement of the laws what is to hinder the Catholics from doing it, and that too in the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our own cities and at our very doors, defends the "Holy Inquisition." And when, by Constitutional Amendment, the refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the Protestants shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to surrender to the Catholics, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws by Catholics if by nobody else. This view of the case, alone, ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

We stated, a few lines above, that it would not be in the power of the Protestants, *even were it in their disposition* to repeal the laws to prevent persecution by the Catholics, but let no one suppose that by this we would imply that such a thing would be in their disposition or that the enforcement of the laws, even in the last extreme, will be left to the Catholics. And for positive proof that such will not be the case we refer the reader to the article, "The Sunday Law and the Sabbath Persecution," on page 5 of this paper, which shows that Protestants can be just as mean, just as petty, just as treacherous, and just as persistent, in the persecuting enforcement of the Sunday laws, as any Catholics could possibly be. This shows that we are not fighting a shadow, when in the interests of human right and human liberty we oppose the Religious Amendment movement. It shows that there is just cause for dread in the event of the success of that movement. Thus the result of enforcing religious observances by the civil powers can be nothing else than persecution and that of the meanest kind. Because, as George Bancroft well says (we quote from memory): "The humane always shrink

from enforcing such laws, and consequently their enforcement falls to the fanatic or the savage." Nor is that all, for when the enforcement of such laws, thus falls to the fanatic or the man of savage disposition, it becomes not only the meanest persecution but also the most severe and the most savage.

We need to present no further evidence that the success of the Religious Amendment movement will be to form in this Nation the living image of the Papacy, with all that that involves. And all this is for the express and sole purpose of compelling all people here to keep Sunday, which is wholly a Catholic institution. Thus will the Papacy—the beast—be exalted to honor in this Government, and "the earth and them which dwell therein" will be compelled to worship the beast and his image, even to "the last extreme;" for "he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark,

520

or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Rev. 13:12, 15-17. And we make the distinct and direct charge that the work of the National Reform party will yet be to compel all people under this Government to receive their doctrine from a hierarchy inspired by the "Mystery of Iniquity;" to compel all, through the observance of the Sunday, to render homage to the "man of Sin;" and thus to cause all to worship the Papacy—"the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live."

So much for our own Nation's part in the restoration of the Papacy. We must now revert for a moment to Europe. We have shown the reconciliation between Germany and the Papacy, and the proposed reconciliation between Italy and that power. We have also shown the cause—"the ever-spreading spirit of anarchy"—which impels these two nations to this step, and which in the very nature of the case must cause others to follow their lead. But all this is entirely political so far, with no religious element apparent in it anywhere; while the restoration of the Papacy which we are discussing and which the prophecy contemplates is pre-eminently to religious power—he made war with the saints till they possessed the kingdom. Dan. 7:21: "and all that dwell on the earth *shall worship* him, whose names are not written in the book of life." Rev. 13:8. How then are we to expect its restoration to religious supremacy in Europe? Exactly as in this country, except that in Europe it will be the Papacy direct while here it is the Papacy under the guise of National Reform Protestantism. That is to say, the thing by which the Papacy is lifted to the place of honor in this country—the Sunday, that same thing it is by which the Papacy is to be restored to religious power in Europe.

In Europe the Sunday question is fast assuming a place as the leading question, even as it is in the United States. In September, 1876, there was held at Geneva, Switzerland, the International Sabbath—Sunday Congress. It consisted of the representative friends of Sunday, from different lands, who met "to report and confer as to the condition of things in their several localities, and to

unite in one organization for the promotion of the observance of the Lord's day." At this congress there were represented "the Swiss Cantons, Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Italy, Roumania, Scotland, England, and the United States." "The German Emperor delegated his ambassador to Switzerland—Count Rosler—to sit as his representative. The king of Wurtemberg, and the Duke of Baden were also represented. The Vicomte de la Panous, Inspector-general of the Orleans Railway, M. L. Charlier, chairman of the Roumanian Railways, Messrs Andre and Arnaud of the Paris and Lyons Railways, represented their several companies. Various societies for Home Missions sent their directors or prominent members. Members of Chambers of Commerce, lawyers, bankers, editors, numerous physicians, commercial men, the consuls at Geneva, of Great Britain, the United States, Spain, Brazil, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, sat as members of the congress, to the number of *four hundred*. Many other prominent men of Europe, several of the leading railway companies, and various associations, sent communications expressing interest in the movement, among which was a letter of warm sympathy from the Archbishop of Canterbury."

A permanent International Federation was organized. A committee was appointed to formulate a basis and plan of action for the Federation. The first paragraph of the "Declaration of Principles" reads:—

"The Federation founded by the congress held at Geneva, at its meeting of the 29th of September, 1876, proposes, by the help of God, to labor to restore for the good of all, a better observance of the day of rest, known under the old covenant by the name of the Sabbath, and *transferred by the primitive church*, under the name of the Lord's Day, to the first day of the week, in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ."

The Federation calls for laws to make Sunday a public holiday and for its protection as a day of rest; laws for the protection of public worship; laws that will insure a good example of the observance of the day in Government offices and in public works; and "finally that it shall be provided by law that every concession of special privileges to individuals or companies shall be accompanied by adequate guarantees in favor of Sunday rest for those employed in their respective enterprises."

In active harmony with the International Federation are the Catholics of Europe, though they carry on their part of the work in an organization of their own. This organization is patterned after that of the Jesuits for the "Propagation of the Faith." The object as stated is, "To stop the scandal of the profanation of Sunday, and the four feasts of obligation." The duties of the members of the Association are, "Not to buy on Sundays and feast days, nor to send others to buy; not to work and not to make others work; to give the preference to merchants, workmen, and manufacturers who neither sell nor work on Sundays; to propagate the Association with zeal and perseverance; to endeavor to secure the closing of stores, shops, and manufactories on Sunday and feast days; not to be contented with a low-mass on Sundays and feast days, but to be present at high-mass and at the services and instructions of the parish; to avoid travel and

parties of pleasure which would occupy the larger part of Sunday or a great feast day, and to avoid such great efforts at ordering and cleaning as make a notable increase in the duties of the domestics; and to do each month some good works, such as hearing mass on a week-day, communing, reciting chaplets, offering one's labor, etc., in atonement for the profanation of Sunday."

The Association publishes a monthly called "*The Catholic Sunday*." Besides their own publications the Association uses the Sunday publications of the International Federation. One member of the Association asked the Federation for a thousand of their publications. Another member asked for "several hundreds" saying, "They are Protestant in their origin, but *essentially Catholic in their meaning*." And then the representative of the Federation *naively* adds, "We are far from denying this since for us true Protestantism is the Catholicism of the primitive Christians." For a full account of this see the *Christian Statesman* referred to at the beginning of this article. It was the work of this Catholic Association, which stirred up Mr. Scovel of the National Reform party to recommend to that organization repeated advances and the suffering of rebuffs to gain the co-operation of their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens in this country in behalf of the Catholic Sunday and the enforcement of its observance.

This European movement in behalf of Sunday-keeping has now been going on these ten years, and the latest report of its progress, which we have seen, is the following from the San Francisco *Bulletin*, August 14:—

"The agitation in Central and Northern Europe in favor of better observance of the Lord's day is gaining in breadth and depth. In Alsace-Lorraine two petitions in favor of the reform have lately been circulated. The first one, *originating in Roman Catholic circles*, has already 140,845 names, but many on this monster petition are Protestants. The second petition was started by the Protestant Pastoral Conference at Strasburg, and has now 6,367 subscribers. In Paris the 'Society for the Better Observance of Sunday' recently offered prizes for the best popular discussion in pamphlet form of the Sunday question, the condition being that only workingmen were to send in their essays. No less than forty-one manuscripts were received, five of which took prizes."

This is the report of but a single province, and from it may be gathered some idea of the "breadth and depth" of the movement when all the nations named above are considered.

"The everspreading spirit of anarchy" is causing the restoration of the Papacy to political preference; the everspreading spirit of the Catholic Sunday is likewise causing its restoration to religious power enforced by the secular arm; and thus there stands at the very threshold of human events the complete RESTORATION OF THE PAPACY.

And *then* what saith the Scripture? "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

Again, no one can fail to see that the one religious thing in the observance of which all nations agree is the Sunday. They all likewise agree that its observance shall be enforced by law. Switzerland, Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Italy, Roumania, Scotland, England, the United States, Denmark, Brazil, Scandinavia, Australia, and even Japan—Catholic, heathen, and so-called Protestant alike—all agree in the exaltation of Sunday to the highest place in human affairs, and in compelling all to observe it so. But, we repeat, the Sunday is the institution *par excellence* of the Papacy—that which "the Church" sets forth as the sign of her authority; and when the nations exalt Sunday and compel its observance, they thereby cause men to honor, obey, and do homage to the Papacy; the "man of sin" is made once more the fountain of authority and the source of doctrine; all men are compelled, under pains and penalties, to recognize it as such, and so "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The worship of the beast and his image menaces the world to-day, and God says, "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." Rev. 14:9, 10.

What then shall we do? The Lord does not leave us in doubt, he tells us exactly what to do. And that we shall discuss in future numbers.

J.

**September 2, 1886**

**"The Ostrogoths Enter the Western Empire. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34 , p. 532.**

*(Concluded).*

IN another place we shall have to give in full the history of Attila; here we can only give that portion which is essential to the understanding of the establishment of the independence of the Ostrogoths. Suffice it therefore, to say, in this place, that before the raid into Gaul, Attila had demanded the hand of the Princess Honoria—the daughter of Placidia sister to Valentinian III.—and his offer was rejected. The next year after the battle of Chalons he renewed his demand, and it being again rejected, he, A.D. 452, again took the field; passed the Alps; invaded Italy, ravaging the country as he went; took possession of the royal palace of Milan; and "declared his resolution of carrying his victorious arms to the gates of Rome." Valentinian III. had fled to Rome, and it was there decided by him, the Senate, and the people, to send a "solemn and suppliant embassy," headed by Pope Leo the Great, to deprecate the wrath of Attila. "The barbarian monarch listened with favorable, and even respectful attention; and *the deliverance of Italy was purchased by the immense ransom, or dowry, of the Princess Honoria.*"

"Before the king of the Huns evacuated Italy, he threatened to return more dreadful, and more implacable, if his bride, the princess Honoria, were not delivered to his ambassadors within the term stipulated by the treaty. Yet, in the mean while, Attila relieved his tender anxiety, by adding a beautiful maid, whose name was Ildico, to the list of his innumerable wives. Their marriage was celebrated with barbaric pomp and festivity, at his wooden palace beyond the Danube; and the monarch, oppressed with wine and sleep, retired at a late hour from the banquet to the nuptial bed. His attendants continued to respect his pleasures, or his repose, the greatest part of the ensuing day, till the unusual silence alarmed their fears and suspicions; and, after attempting to awaken Attila by loud and repeated cries, they at length broke into the royal apartment. They found the trembling bride sitting by the bedside, hiding her face with her veil, and lamenting her own danger, as well as the death [A.D. 453] of the king, who had expired during the night. An artery had suddenly burst: and as Attila lay in a supine posture, he was suffocated by a torrent of blood, which, instead of finding a passage through the nostrils, regurgitated into the lungs and stomach.

"The revolution which subverted the empire of the Huns, established the fame of Attila, whose genius alone had sustained the huge and disjointed fabric. After his death, the boldest chieftains aspired to the rank of kings; the most powerful kings refused to acknowledge a superior; and the numerous sons, whom so many various mothers bore to the deceased monarch, divided and disputed, like a private inheritance, the sovereign command of the nations of Germany and Scythia. The bold Ardaric felt and represented the disgrace of this servile partition; and his subjects, the warlike Gepide, with the Ostrogoths, under the conduct of three valiant brothers, encouraged their allies to vindicate the rights of freedom and royalty. In a bloody and decisive conflict on the banks of the River Netad, in Pannonia, the lance of the Gepide, the sword of the Goths, the arrows of the Huns, the Suevic infantry, the light arms of the Heruli, and the heavy weapons of the Alani, encountered or supported each other; and the victory of the Ardaric was accompanied with the slaughter of thirty thousand of his enemies.

"Ellac, the eldest son of Attila, lost his life and crown in the memorable battle of Netad: his early valor had raised him to the throne of the Acatzires, a Scythian people, whom he subdued; and his father, who loved the superior merit, would have envied the death of Ellac. His brother, Dengisich, with an army of Huns, still formidable in their flight and ruin, maintained his ground above fifteen years on the banks of the Danube. The palace of Attila, with the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian hills to the Euxine, became the seat of a new power, which was erected by Ardaric,

king of the Gepide. *The Pannonian conquests from Vienna to Sirmium, were occupied by the Ostrogoths*; and the settlements of the tribes, who had so bravely asserted their native freedom, were irregularly distributed, according to the measure of their respective strength.—*Id., chap. 35, par. 15, 16.*

From their Pannonian possessions the Ostrogoths first exert and enlarge their power at the expense of the Eastern Empire; afterwards, in A.D. 488, they turn from that entirely, and enlarge their dominions toward the West.

"When the Hunnish Empire broke in pieces on the death of Attila [A.D. 453], *the East-Goths recovered their full independence.* They now entered into relations with the Empire, *and settled on lands in Pannonia.* During the greater part of the latter half of the fifth century, the East-Goths play in Southeastern Europe nearly the same part which the West-Goths played [there] in the century before. They were seen going to and fro in every conceivable relation of friendship and enmity with the Eastern Roman power, till, just as the West Goths had done before them, they pass from the East to the West."—*Encyclopædia Britannica, article Goths, par. 14.*

It was under the reign of the great Theodoric that the Ostrogothic power was extended into the West; and of the course of events from the establishment of their independence, up to his accession to the Gothic throne, A.D. 475, we read as follows:—

"Theodoric the Ostrogoth, the fourteenth in lineal descent of the royal line of the Amali, was born in the neighborhood of Vienna [A.D. 455] two years after the death of Attila. A recent victory had restored the independence of the Ostrogoths; and the three brothers, Walamir, Theodemir, and Widimir, who ruled that warlike nation with united counsels, had separately pitched their habitations in the fertile though desolate province of Pannonia. The Huns still threatened their revolted subjects, but their hasty attack was repelled by the single forces of Walamir, and the news of his victory reached the distant camp of his brother in the same auspicious moment that the favorite concubine of Theodemir was delivered of a son and heir. In the eighth year of his age, Theodoric was reluctantly yielded by his father to the public interest, as the pledge of an alliance which Leo, emperor of the East, had consented to purchase by an annual subsidy of three hundred pounds of gold. The royal hostage was educated at Constantinople with care and tenderness. His body was formed to all the exercises of war, his mind was expanded by the habits of liberal conversation; he frequented the schools of the most skillful masters; but he disdained or neglected the arts of Greece, and so ignorant did he always remain of the first elements of science, that a rude mark was contrived to represent the signature of the illiterate king of Italy.—The four first letters of his name (THEOSOD) were inscribed on a gold plated card when it was fixed on the paper, the king drew

his pen through the intervals.—[Note.] As soon as he had attained the age of eighteen, he was restored to the wishes of the Ostrogoths, whom the emperor aspired to gain by liberality and confidence.

"Walamir had fallen in battle; the youngest of the brothers, Widimir, had led away into Italy and Gaul an army of barbarians, and the whole nation acknowledged [A.D. 455-475] for their king the father of Theodoric. His ferocious subjects admired the strength and stature of their young prince; and he soon convinced them that he had not degenerated from the valor of his ancestors. At the head of six thousand volunteers, he secretly left the camp in quest of adventures, descended the Danube as far as Singidunum, or Belgrade, and soon returned to his father with the spoils of a Sarmatian king whom he had vanquished and slain. Such triumphs, however, were productive only of fame, and the invincible Ostrogoths were reduced to extreme distress by the want of clothing and food. They unanimously resolved to desert their Pannonian encampments, and boldly to advance into the warm and wealthy neighborhood of the Byzantine court, which already maintained in pride and luxury so many bands of confederate Goths. After proving, by some acts of hostility, that they could be dangerous, or at least troublesome, enemies, the Ostrogoths sold at a high price their reconciliation and fidelity, accepted a donative of lands and money, and were intrusted with the defense of the Lower Danube, under the command of Theodoric, who succeeded after his father's death to the hereditary throne of the Amali."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 39, par. 2.*

Although Gibbon says they "resolved to desert their Pannonian encampments," it must not be understood that this is spoken of the whole nation, nor that these renounced either their claim or their possessions there; because the history that follows as we shall see later, clearly shows that the Ostrogoths dwelt there and that their superior power was exercised and gratefully acknowledged over all Pannonia, during the whole fifty one-years' reign of Theodoric. But before following the Ostrogoths further, we must find the remaining ones of the ten kingdoms.

J.

**"The Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34 , pp. 535, 536.**

HAVING shown the manner of the impending restoration of the Papacy, and the inevitable result of it, namely, the renewal of the war upon the saints, and so the enforced worship of the beast; having shown the progress, and the assured prospect of success of the Religious Amendment movement to form a union of Church and State in the United States, and so to create an image to the beast, and to enforce here the worship of the beast and his image, even to the last

extreme of civil pains; it now becomes necessary to inquire what is involved in this, and what it means to the people who are now living, and who will have an active part in the work, either for or against it.

This is clearly revealed. In Rev. 14:9-12 are these words: "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. Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

This is the most dreadful warning that is found in the Bible. It is not alone that the worshipers of the beast and his image shall receive the punishment which is the common lot of all the wicked of all ages, but besides this they "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." That is, they shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God in this life, and then receive in the lake of fire the punishment which befalls all the wicked of all times. This it is that is pronounced by the word of God upon whosoever shall "worship the beast and his image;" while on the other hand, the powers represented by the beast and his image pronounce that whoever will not worship the beast and his image "should be killed." The contest then will be no light one. It is either to yield to the power of man and suffer the wrath of God, or to brave the wrath of man even to the utmost, and by the power of God to obtain the victory over the beast and his image, and enjoy the everlasting salvation of God. All who do resist the wrath of these powers of earth will obtain the victory, and this salvation; for saith the prophet: "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2.

But it may be asked, Can we be sure that this contest is yet in the future? We are well assured that we can. We shall give some reasons.

The warning says that "If any man shall worship the beast and his image. . . . the same shall drink of the *wine of the wrath of God*." Rev. 14:9. Now Rev. 15:1 says, "I saw . . . seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God." Notice the direct connection: In the seven last plagues is filled up the wrath of God; and whoever worships the beast and his image, shall drink of the wrath of God. Therefore, it is evident that they who worship the beast and his image are to suffer the seven last plagues. Note further, they are the seven *last* plagues. These plagues are the last that the world will ever see, at least in this life. This of itself shows that all this is yet future.

But there is more. Under the sixth plague the world is to be gathered "to the battle of the

great day of God." Rev. 16:12-14. And when the seventh is poured out, there comes "a great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. . . . And there was a great earthquake such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great. . . . And the cities of the nations fell. . . . And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found." Rev. 16:17-20. No one can possibly say but that these things are in the future.

But we have positive proof that they are yet future. This removing of the mountains and islands is referred to in Rev. 6:14-17 in these words: "And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And 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, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said 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; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" With this agrees the word of Isaiah: "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. 2:19-21.

Most assuredly these things are yet future. But these things are only the terrors of the last of the seven plagues; the seven last plagues are the wine of the wrath of God; and whoever worships the beast and his image, suffers the *seven* last plagues,—the first one as well as the last one; for when the *first* angel of the seven poured out his vial, "there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image." Rev. 16:2. This then shows it to be certain that the worship of the beast and his image is yet future, and, consequently, that the contest over that question is yet future.

There is another line of argument that shows the same thing. By reference to Rev. 14:6-12 it will be seen that there are mentioned the messages of three angels in succession. The first one of the three says among other things, to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, "Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Following this one, there was another angel saying, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Then "the third angel *followed them*, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image," etc. And then following this third angel's message, with only the intervention of a verse pronouncing a blessing upon the dead who die in the Lord from this time onward, we read: "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped."

Now this same Jesus, who comes thus upon the white cloud with the sharp sickle in his hand to reap the harvest of the earth, he himself said, "The harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39. Therefore it is plain that this third angel's message is the last work of God that precedes the coming of Christ on the cloud of his glory, and the end of the world. But this message warns against the worship of the beast and his image, under penalty of the wine of the wrath of God, which is the seven last plagues. But the seven last plagues end, as we have shown, with the end of the world. This then shows that the enforcement of the worship of the beast and his image under the final penalty of death, will be the last oppression of the people of God that shall ever be seen. And this corresponds exactly with what we showed as the result of the restoration of the Papacy: He "made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, *until the Ancient of Days came*, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and *the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.*"

As this oppression, this war with the saints, continues till the saints possess the kingdom, and as the saints possess the kingdom only at the coming of the Lord, this view not only answers to those scriptures which show that the third angel's message reaches to the end of the world, but it answer perfectly to those scriptures which show the end of the beast and his image. Dan. 7:11 says: "I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, *and given to the burning flame.*" Paul says of the same power, the "mystery of iniquity," "that Wicked," "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy *with the brightness of his coming.*" 2 Thess. 2:8. And both Daniel and Paul are explained by Rev. 19:11-20: "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 the beast*, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And *the beast was taken*, and with him the false prophet [the image to the beast, Rev. 13:12-14] that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had *received the mark of the beast*, and *them that worshiped his image*. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

This shows that the beast and his image will be the last powers that will be on this earth, and that they will be living powers when Christ and the end of the world come. But the life of the image to the beast is given him *that* he "should both speak, and cause that as many as would not *worship the image of the beast* should be killed." Rev. 13:15. He likewise "causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Verse

12. And the beast on his own part is restored to power to make war on the saints till they possess the kingdom. All these facts fix the matter to an absolute certainty that the worship of the beast and his image, and the contest over the worship is yet future; and that that contest when it begins will continue till the end of the world, and will be decided only by the coming of the Lord in his glory, when the beast and his image will be given to the burning flame, and when those who shall have kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, will, by the power of Christ, get the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and will stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. The Mission of the Spirit. John 14:5-20" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 34 , pp. 538, 539.**

(September 12. John 16:5-29.)

IN the promise of the Spirit, Jesus spoke of him as the Comforter. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." John 14:16. "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost." Verse 26. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." It is by the Holy Spirit that the Lord comforts his disciples. Says Paul, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ." 2 Cor. 1:3-5. Thus consolation abounds by the Holy Spirit which Christ sends. So his mission is:—

1. TO WITNESS of Christ. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." John 15:26. This Spirit is given only to those who are Christ's. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Rom. 8:9. "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter. . . . even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you. . . . If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:15-23. One part of the mission of the Holy Spirit, therefore, is to witness of the presence of God and of Christ with his disciples.

2. A WITNESS of the forgiveness of sins, and that thus we are the children of God. "The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;" then he said, "And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. 10:15-17. "The

Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16.

3. AN earnest of our inheritance. "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." Eph. 1:13, 14. An *earnest* is "a part paid beforehand on a contract, as security for the whole." God enters into covenant with men, and to those who will accept his Son, he promises an inheritance. But the time is not yet come when the inheritance can be given; it is not yet redeemed. So until that time does come, until it is redeemed, he gives to his people the Holy Spirit as the earnest, the security of the inheritance. Another definition is, that "an earnest gives assurance that more is coming of the same kind." By receiving the Holy Spirit we become partakers of the divine nature, and by this "earnest" God gives assurance that more is coming of the same kind, even so much more, that, "when he shall appear, *we shall be like him*, for we shall see him as he is.

4. AS A guide into the truth. "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 14:26. The Holy Spirit then is to teach us the things that Christ has said. And as the Spirit of Christ spoke the Old Testament as well as the New (1 Pet. 1:10-12), this is to say that the Holy Spirit is to teach us the word of God. This is confirmed by John 16:13. "Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." And as Jesus said, "Thy word is truth," it is plain that the Spirit is to guide us into the word of God. Again, "He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." Verse 15. The Holy Spirit therefore, as teacher of the word of God, as guide into the word of God, is to take these things of God and show them unto us, to show us their breadth of meaning, that we may know how to apply them to our lives and conform our ways to them. Compare Ps. 119:18; Eph. 1:17, 18; and Acts 26:18.

Just here is where those fail who claim sanctification. Even granting, for the sake of the argument (and for that reason only), that they have received the Holy Spirit, instead of allowing him to fulfill his office of teacher of the word of God; instead of having him take the things of the word of God, and show unto them instead of allowing him to guide them into the word of God; they seek to make him the guide *independent of the word of God*; and not only that, but in many instances *directly contrary* to the plainly written word which he himself has spoken. Such spirit is not the Spirit of God, such is not his office; he is not divided against himself. Again, this makes him the end in stead of the means, which is to pervert the way of the Lord. In no single instance, in this connection, is he made the end; but in every instance he is set forth as the *means* by which we may reach the end which God has in view for us. And again, to make him the guide independent of the word, is to make him speak of (from) himself. But Christ plainly declares, "He *shall not* speak of [from] himself." John 16:13.

5. TO CONVINCe of sin. "And when he is come, he will convince the world of sin." Verse 8. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. And the Holy Spirit can convict no man of sin before God, except by the law of God, "for by the law is

the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20. And without conviction there can be no conversion. So the matter stands just thus: There can be no conversion without conviction; and there can be no conviction without the law; therefore, where the law of God is despised there can be no conversion; hence neither sanctification nor salvation, *call* it what they will.

6. TO CONVINCING of righteousness. He shall convince the world "of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more." "All unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5:17. "Sin is the transgression of the law." Righteousness is the opposite of unrighteousness. And as unrighteousness is transgression of the law, righteousness is obedience to the law, but this only through the faith and merit of Christ. Therefore, in convincing of righteousness, the

539

Holy Spirit convince of *obedience to the law of God*, by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

7. TO CONVINCING of judgment. He shall convince the world "of judgment." "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." Rom. 2:12, 16. "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:12. As, therefore, in the Judgment men's acts are to be compared with the law of God, the office of the Holy Spirit in convincing of judgment is to enable us to see the law of God as it is, that we may have our transgressions washed away by the blood of Christ, and that we may obey the law as we ought; thus to convince us of judgment now while there is hope, that when we shall stand before the Judgment seat of Christ, our lives may be found in perfect harmony with the holy law of God, and that so we may stand in the judgment.

8. TO SHED abroad the love of God. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5:5. This again points directly to the law of God, and to the keeping of that law: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3.

By all these evidences we see that the office of the Holy Spirit, in every instance in the life of the Christian, is to spread the law and word of God before him, and to impress upon him the duty and knowledge of *obedience*. Additional evidence of this point is given by Peter. "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the . . . elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, *unto obedience*." 1 Peter 1:1, 2. This teaches plainly that the Holy Spirit is given to us *to teach us to obey* the written word of God, and, that true sanctification of the Spirit is *unto obedience* to that written word.

9. THIS also reveals to us another part of the mission of the Spirit. That is as the Sanctifier. A great deal is made nowadays of a certain kind of sanctification, but any sanctification that is not "unto obedience" to the law of God, is spurious sanctification; it is a deception and a snare.

CHRIST prayed, "Sanctify them through the truth," and then immediately added, "Thy word is truth." John 17:17. This shows that sanctification is through

the word of God, but it can only be through the word of God *by the aid of the Spirit*. The text quoted just above from Peter, tells of sanctification of the Spirit "unto obedience." Here we have another text from Peter on the same subject: "Seeing ye have purified [sanctified] your souls in *obeying the truth through the Spirit*." 1 Pet. 1:22. Men are elect through sanctification of the Spirit *unto* obedience, but they are not sanctified until they *have obeyed* the truth, the word of God, through the Spirit. The truth of God cannot be obeyed except through the Holy Spirit. The law of God is spiritual (Rom. 7:14), the word of Christ is spirit (John 6:36), but man is carnal. Therefore "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:7-9. The Holy Spirit is given to take away the carnal mind, and make us spiritually minded, that so we may discern the things of God (1 Cor. 2:9-16), and thus he takes the things of God and shows them unto us. Thus by the Spirit of God, we can know our duty in the truth of God and then we can obey that truth through the Spirit, and so we are sanctified through the truth.

J.

**September 9, 1886**

**"The Lombards" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35 , p. 548.**

THE Lombards fixed their name forever upon a part of the fallen empire of Western Rome. Lombardy in the north of Italy perpetuates the name of this nation, which at one time even spread its name over all Italy. Although in Italy was the place where the Lombards permanently fixed their kingdom, and to which their name was given, that was not their first settlement within the Western Empire. They, as well as the Ostrogoths, had been subjects of the empire of Attila and obtained their freedom, settling in Noricum on the Danube, at the death of that savage warrior. They were of Vandal blood and were the kindred of the Heruli and Burgundians. See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. 10, par. 8.

"The name *Lombard* is the Italianized form of the national name of a Teutonic tribe, *Lomgobardi*, itself an Italian arrangement based on a supposed etymology of the Teutonic *Langbard*, *Langobardi*, the form used when they are first named by the Roman writers—Velleius and Tacitus. The etymology which made the name mean *Longbeard* is too obvious not to have suggested itself to the Italians, and perhaps to themselves; it is accepted by their first native chronicler, Paul the Deacon, who wrote in the time of Charles the Great [Charlemagne]. But the name has also been derived from the region where they are first heard of. On the left bank of the Elbe, 'where B<sup>^</sup>rde or Bord still signifies a fertile plain by the side of a river,' a district near Magdeburg is still called the

*Lange B̃rde*; and lower down the Elbe, on the same side, about Lüneburg. *Bardengau*, with its *Bardewik*, is still found; it is here that Velleius, who accompanied Tiberius in his campaign in this part of Germany, and who first mentions the name places them. As late as the age of their Italian settlement [A.D. 568] the Lombards are called *Bardi* in poetical epitaphs, though this may be for the convenience of metre.

"Their own legends bring the tribe as worshipers of Odin [Woden] from Scandinavia to the German shore of the Baltic, under the name of *Winili*, a name which was given to them in a loose way as late as the twelfth century. By the Roman and Greek writers of the first two centuries of our era they are spoken of as occupying, with more or less extension at different times, the region which is now Hanover and the Altmark of Prussia. To the Romans they appeared a remarkable tribe; '*gens etiam Germans feritate ferocior*' (fierce, Germans), says Velleius, who had fought against them under Tiberius; and Tacitus describes them as a race which, though few in numbers, more than held their own among numerous powerful neighbors by their daring and love of war. In the quarrels of the tribes they appear to have extended their borders; in Ptolemy's account of Germany, in the second century, they fill a large space among the races of the northwest and north."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Lombards, par. 2, 3.*

"The Lombards. This corrupt appellation has been diffused in the thirteenth century by the merchants and bankers, the Italian posterity of these savage warriors: but the original name of *Langobards* is expressive only of the peculiar length and fashion of their beards. I am not disposed either to question or to justify their Scandinavian origin; nor to pursue the migrations of the Lombards through unknown regions and marvelous adventures. About the time of Augustus and Trajan, a ray of historic light breaks on the darkness of their antiquities, and they are discovered, for the first time, between the Elbe and the Oder. Fierce, beyond the example of the Germans, they delighted to propagate the tremendous belief, that their heads were formed like the heads of dogs, and that they drank the blood of their enemies, whom they vanquished in battle. The smallness of their numbers was recruited by the adoption of their bravest slaves; and alone, amidst their powerful neighbors, they defended by arms their high-spirited independence. In the tempests of the north, which overwhelmed so many names and nations, this little bark of the Lombards still floated on the surface; they gradually descended towards the south and the Danube, and, at the end of four hundred years, they again appear with their ancient valor and renown. Their manners were not less ferocious.—*Decline and Fall, chap. 42, par. 2.*

When Attila united under his dreadful sway the kingdoms of both Germany and Scythia, the nation of the Lombards was certainly comprised in the number of his subjects. And although Gibbon does not mention them by name, as indeed he so mentions very few, when "the kings and nations of Germany and Scythia obeyed the warlike summons of Atilla," to invade the Western Empire, A.D. 451-453, yet we consider it impossible that a nation so war-loving, so "fierce beyond the example of the Germans," should have been left behind by Attila when he went on such an important expedition as this,—an expedition in which he knew that he needed every obtainable element of warlike strength. If we had no more definite account than this general narrative of Gibbon's, we believe we would by it be justified in the conclusion that the "ferocious" warriors of the Lombard nation were numbered with the forces with which Attila invaded Gaul and Italy; and that that nation among others regained their freedom at the death of Attila. But besides this probable and just deduction, we have definite authority to this effect:—

"Attila's sudden death, either by hemorrhage, or the vengeance of his Burgundian bride, checked the progress of the Hunnish Empire. The Ostrogoths, the Gepide, and the Langobards obtained their independence after a severe struggle, whilst the remains of the nomadic Huns were last in the rich pastoral steppes of Southern Russia."—*Weber's Outlines of Universal History, sec. 180.*  
[Dr. Geo. Weber was professor and director of the High School of Heidelberg, Germany.]

To show more clearly not only the position of the Lombards after the battle of the Netad, but also that of the principal nations which had been subject to Attila, we would state:—

1. On the left bank of the Danube where it flows south, Attila's brother, Dengisich, with the remains of the Huns, "maintained his ground above fifteen years," in a kingdom that was "confined to the circle of his wagons." In A.D. 455, these Huns crossed the river and made an attack upon the Ostrogoths, but were repulsed by a single division of the Ostrogoths under Walamir. About A.D. 468, Dengisich, with his "kingdom," invaded the Eastern Empire, but lost his life, and his brother Irnae led the remnant of the Hunnish nation away into the Lesser Scythia, whence their fathers had come nearly a hundred years before."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 35, par. 16; chap. 39, par. 2.*

2. The Scyrri, whose king, Edecon,—the father of Odoacer—"enjoyed the favor of Attila," and whose part it was in their turn to guard the royal village, remained in alliance with Dengisich for about thirteen years, when in a second bloody battle with the Ostrogoths, about A.D. 465, Edecon was killed and the Scyrri were defeated and dispersed.—*Id., chap. 36, par. 29.*

3. The wooden palace of Attila, on the Teyss, with the plains of what is now Upper Hungary, and "the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian hills [and after Dengisich left, even from the Danube] to the Euxine [Black Sea], became the seat of a new power which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepide," and was possessed by that nation about a hundred years."—*Id., chap. 35, par. 16; chap. 42, par. 2.*

4. North of the Gepide, and extending into "the southern provinces of Poland," was the country of the Heruli.—*Id.*, chap. 42, par. 2.

5. On the west side of the Danube, as already shown, the Ostrogoths held "the Pannonian conquests from Vienna to Sirmium," [Sirmium was near the mouth of the Save.]

6. On the Danube above the Vienna, and as best we can make out, possessing for awhile at least both banks of the river, was seated the Lombards, who, as we have seen, regained their independence at the death of Atilla, A.D. 458. Some time afterward, at the command of the daughter of the king of the Lombards, the brother of the king of the Heruli was assassinated while a royal guest at the Lombard palace, apparently as a suitor for the hand of the Lombard princess. This brought on a war and the Heruli were successful in imposing upon the Lombards "a tribute, the price of blood." We know not to a certainty how long the tribute was paid. We only know that the success of the Heruli made them insolent, and that their insolence was paid for by their ruin. The narrative of these troubles and the result, is given by Gibbon in a few words:—

"The assassination of a royal guest was executed in the presence, and by the command, of the king's daughter, who had been provoked by some words of insult, and disappointed by his diminutive stature; and a tribute, the price of blood, was imposed on the Lombards, by his brother the king of the Heruli. Adversity revived a sense of moderation and justice, and the insolence of conquest was chastised by the signal defeat and irreparable dispersion of the Heruli, who were seated in the southern provinces of Poland."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 42, par. 2.

This expedition carried the main body of the Lombards beyond the Danube for awhile, but they only the more firmly established their power which was afterward further displayed in the extirpation of the Gepide, as will be related further on. For the present we shall merely state that, in A.D. 526-536, they took entire possession of Noricum and Pannonia, which they held till A.D. 566, when they removed to Italy and established their kingdom in the valley of the Po. The causes and the course of these events will be related in connection with the establishment of the Papacy.

J.

**"The Time of the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35 , pp. 551, 552.**

HAVING shown that the Third Angel's Message ends with the end of the world, and that the events of which it speaks and against which it pronounces warning are the events which immediately precede the end of the world, we propose now to find by the Scriptures as nearly as possible the time when this message should begin. We believe that the Scriptures reveal the time, and it is only reasonable to expect that they should. For under the threat of the most dreadful penalties, the Third Angel's Message warns all people against the worship of the beast and his image; and if it could not be known when the

message should be given, or when it were given, it would be impossible for any one to take advantage of the warning and escape the judgments threatened. From this it would follow that the message could never be given, and consequently it would have been written in vain.

But not so. The message was not written in vain. It will surely be given to the world. It will surely gather out a people who will not worship the beast and his image, but who will "worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters;" and so will get "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name," and will "stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Jesus said, "The Scripture cannot be broken." John 10:35. Then as surely as this scripture has been written, so surely will this message be given to the world, warning them against the worship of the beast and his image; and calling them to the worship of God, by keeping "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." But for such a message to be given, it must be known; and it can be known only by the word of God—the word of God must reveal the time when it is due to the world.

Now let us study this point. Turn to Revelation 14. There, in verse 9, we read: "The third angel followed them." Followed them?—Why certain angels that had gone before. The eighth verse says, "There followed another angel." As this angel likewise "followed" some one, we must go yet farther back. So in the sixth verse we read, "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." We must know then, the time of the angel of the sixth verse, before we can know the time of the angel of the eighth, or of the ninth verse; for the angel of verse 8 *follows* the angel of verse 6, and the third angel of verse 9, follows both these. Therefore the time of the angel of verse 6 must be known, to know the time of the third angel, verse 9.

Notice again verse 6. It does not read, And I saw an angel, but it reads, "And I saw *another* angel." By this word "another," there is direct reference made to some angel or angels that the prophet had seen before. Tracing backward in the book to find what will answer to this we find none until we come to chapter 10:1, where we read, "And I saw another mighty angel." But this text also uses the word "another," and therefore we must go further back. So we go on backward till we come to chapter 8:13, where we read, "And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven." Here the word "another" is not used, but simply, "I beheld, and heard *an angel*." This, then, is the first of certain angels which the prophet saw which the language used will connect directly with the angel of chapter 14:6, thus: "I beheld, and heard an angel" (chap. 8:13). "And I saw *another* mighty angel" (10:1). "And I saw *another* angel" (14:16).

Notice further that these angels appear upon the scene in the midst of the events that accompany the last three of the seven trumpet angels. In chapter 8:2, John saw seven angels to whom were given seven trumpets; and in verse 6 he says, "And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves

to sound." Then after the first four had sounded, this angel of chapter 8:13 appears, when the prophet says, "And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpets of the three angels, which are yet to sound." Now as this angel is connected, by the expressions used, with the angel of chapter 14:6, and as this angel appears just before the sounding of the fifth trumpet, the sounding of the fifth trumpet is a proper starting point to find the time of the message of chapter 14:6. If we can find the time of the first trumpet, we can find the time of the angel of chapter 14:6.

In chapter 9:1-11 is the prophecy of the events of the fifth trumpet, of which says Albert Barnes, "With surprising unanimity, commentators have agreed in regarding this as referring to the empire of the Saracens, or to the rise and progress of the religion and the empire set up by Mohammed." We cannot see how any one who will read the prophecy, and Gibbon's history of Mohammed and his successors in the light of it, can disagree with the application of the prophecy to the Mohammedans. We cannot here go into a detailed explanation and application of the different points of the prophecy, for that, see the work, "Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation," or "The Seven Trumpets," both published at this office—we can here only notice *the time* referred to in the prophecy. The rise of Mohammedanism is shown under the symbol of a cloud of locusts, but in verses 7-9 the symbol is explained by the words, "The shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; . . . and their faces were as the faces of men; . . . and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle." And says the Scripture, "Their power was to hurt men five months." Five months are one hundred and fifty days; this being prophetic time—a day for a year—equals one hundred and fifty years, during which they were to hurt men.

This one hundred and fifty years is to be counted from the time that they had a king over them, as says verse 11. "They had a king over them . . . whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon (margin a destroyer)." For more than six hundred years the Mohammedans had no regularly organized government, and recognized no such dignity as that which answers to the title of king. Each tribe, under its own chief, was independent of all the others and came and went as it pleased. While this was the case it is evident, and it is the fact too, that their character as "a destroyer," was not, and could not be, such as it was after they were solidly united in one government under the sway of a ruler recognized by all. This is made more apparent when it is seen what was to be destroyed by this "destroyer." The first four trumpets show the ruin of the Western empire of Rome, and the fifth relates to the destruction of the Eastern Empire. And it is in the character of the final destroyer of the last remains of the Roman Empire that this power acts. It was not as a destroyer of men as such, for of them it is said "that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months," "and their power was to hurt men five months." It is evident then that his character and work as "a destroyer," relates to the final destruction of the Roman Empire which was then represented in the Eastern Em-

pire with the capital at New Rome—Constantinople.

Othman was the caliph who established the organized Government of the Mohammedans, and from him is descended the name and title of the *Ottoman Empire*. It was under the organized power of Othman that the work of the destroyer began. In closing his account of the devastating rage of the Moguls and Tartars under Zingis Khan and his generals, Gibbon says:—

"In this shipwreck of nations [A.D. 1240-1304], some surprise may be excited by the escape of the Roman Empire, whose relics, at the time of the Mogul invasion, were dismembered by the Greeks and Latins."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 64, par. 13.*

But when the decline of the Moguls gave free scope to the rise of the Moslems, under Othman, of him he says:—

"He was situate on the verge of the Greek Empire; the Koran sanctified his *gazi*, or holy war, against the infidels; and their political errors unlocked the passes of Mount Olympus, and invited him to descend into the plains of Bithynia. . . . It was on July 27, A.D. 1299, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia; and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster."—*Id., par. 14.*

The work of destruction, then, which was to subvert the last remains of the Roman Empire began July 27, 1299, and never ceased till the imperial power passed into the hands of Amurath July 27, 1449. Then the first woe was passed, verse 12, and the sixth angel sounded, and the four angels of the Euphrates were loosed "which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year." This also being prophetic time each day represents a year. A year 360 years, a month 30 years, a day 1 year, an hour, the twenty-fourth part of 360 -15 days, altogether = 360+30+—391 years and 15 days. This, from July 27, 1449, onward, gives us August 11, 1840, when the imperial power passed out of the hands of the Ottoman Emperor into the hands of the Great Powers of Europe, just as it passed into his hands 391 years and fifteen days before. Then it was that the second woe passed, and behold the third woe was to come *quickly*. Chap. 11:14.

Then it is between the second and third woes, in the space marked by the word "quickly," that Rev. 10:1 applies: "And I saw *another* mighty angel come down from Heaven, clothed with a cloud; . . . and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the earth. . . . And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by Him that liveth forever and ever, who created Heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Notice that this angel refers to the sounding of the seventh trumpet as then future—"the seventh angel, *when he shall begin to sound.*" Of that sounding we read in chapter 11:15: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in Heaven, saying, The

kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever."

The kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ at the second coming of Christ. Says Paul: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at *his appearing and his kingdom*, Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1. When He comes, "He hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." Now mark, the sixth trumpet and the second woe ended August 11, A.D. 1840. Then saith the word of God, the third woe and the seventh trumpet comes quickly; and when that comes, the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. This is at the coming of Christ, and the coming of Christ is the end of the world. The first four trumpets mark the downfall of the Western Empire of Rome; the fifth marks the destruction of the Eastern Empire of Rome; and the seventh trumpet marks the downfall of all empires, all kingdoms, and all nations; for when the God of Heaven sets up is kingdom, "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." Dan. 2:44. The woe of the fifth trumpet was called by Gibbon the "shipwreck of nations;" but the woe of the seventh trumpet will be not only the shipwreck of nations, but of the great globe itself; for in Rev. 11:19, among the events of the seventh trumpet—one third woe—are that earthquake by which every mountain and island are moved out of their places, and that great hail, both of which comes in the seventh plague, when God "ariseth to shake terribly the earth," and the great voice is heard out of the temple of Heaven from the throne, saying, It is done. Rev. 16:17-21.

Further consideration of this subject must be deferred until next week.

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jesus Interceding. John 17:1-3, 11-21" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35 , pp. 554, 555.**

(September 19.—John 17:1-3, 11-21.)

THIS is Jesus's prayer for his disciples wherever found in all the world to the end of time. He says, "Neither pray I for these [the eleven] alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." Here in this prayer is expressed the tender love and considerate care which the divine Saviour has for those who believe on him. Before departing out of the world he left this prayer to be recorded for the consolation and confirmation of his children who are left in the world. When his children are afflicted if they would remember more than they do this prayer of the Saviour for them, there would be more peace and comfort and joy in the Christian course.

CHRIST once said to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." Shall we not believe that in this sifting, in this tossing about, which Peter experienced, he was strengthened by the consciousness that Jesus had prayed for him? Certainly. But Peter is not the only one of Christ's followers whom Satan

has desired; he is not the only one who needed to be sifted as wheat; and, far better than this, he is not the only one for whom Jesus has prayed. Notice, he did not pray for Peter that he might escape the sifting, he prayed that his faith should not fail, while being sifted. Peter needed the sifting, so do we. He needed the faith to endure it, so do we. He had the prayer of the precious Saviour that his faith might not fail, so have we.

"THAT he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Eternal life is in Christ, and that alone for those who are his. "The gift of God is eternal life *through Jesus Christ* our Lord." Rom. 6:23. "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. "*He that believeth on the Son* hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." John 3:36. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6:53. "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*." 1 John 5:11, 12. These scriptures show, and indeed the Scripture altogether shows, that there is life only in Christ. Out of him there is no life, for the wages of sin is death. But Christ died for sinners, and through faith in him there is forgiveness of sin. Without faith in him there is no escape from sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death. And death is death—the second death—and not eternal life in misery. Out of Christ there is no such thing as eternal life, in misery nor anywhere else. "*This* is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." And when He appears in his glory he takes "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 [not with everlasting misery] from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1:8, 9. In Christ is life literal and eternal. Out of Christ is death literal and eternal. Choose Christ that you may live.

"HOLY Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me." It is not the Saviour's wish, nor is it the Father's wish that any should fall away. "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. 5:9. And, "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. Notice, the word is not, How shall he with him freely give us all, but it is, "How shall he *not*." If God so loved us that while we were yet enemies he gave his dear Son to die for us, now, being reconciled and his friends, how shall he not with him freely give us all needed grace to keep us. Oh, how great is his goodness, and how great his mercy. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, Amen." Jude 24, 25.

"THEY are not of the world." These are they for whom this prayer is made, and who can claim the comfort and the strength which it promises. For he said that in this prayer he prayed not for the world. "I pray for them. I pray not for the world, but for them which

thou hast given me." It is plain therefore that no one can have the world, and the benefits of this prayer at the same time, nor even off and on. We must be Christ's. We must be not of the world. "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." "The friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4. "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2:16, 15. Therefore, "Be not conformed to this world; *but be ye transformed* by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." Rom. 12:2.

"I PRAY not that thou shouldst take them out of the world." No. They are the light of the world; they are the salt of the earth; they are epistles which Christ writes to the world to tell the world of him, of his goodness, his holiness, his purity, his righteousness—in short to tell the world that he is Christ, the sent of God, in whom God reconciled the world unto himself. They are in Christ's stead in the world, for he said, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." And when Christ's work is done for the world,—when he ceases to be priest upon his Father's throne, and becomes king upon his own throne; when he lays off the garments of the intercessor, and puts on the "garments of vengeance for clothing;" when the cup of salvation shall be emptied, and the cup of wrath filled; when the mystery of God shall be finished—then he will appear upon the white cloud, and call to the heavens above and to the earth, "Gather my saints together unto me;" and "shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;" then and thus he will take them out of the world.

"THAT they all may be one." The unity of his disciples is the strong point of the Saviour's prayer, this wish being expressed no less than five times in it—"That they may be one, as we are;" "That they all may be one;" "That they also may be one in us;" "That they may be one, even as we are one;" "That they may be made perfect in one." Surely then the oneness of his disciples is the greatest wish of their Lord. This unity is accomplished and maintained by the Holy Spirit; as he says, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in me." On this Paul says, "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering forbearing one another in love; endeavoring *to keep the unity* of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and through all, and in you all." Eph. 4:1-6. Again, in 1 Cor. 1:10, he says, "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." See also Rom. 15:5, 6; 12:16; Phil. 2:2, 5; 1 Peter 3:8.

AND the object of this unity for which he so earnestly prayed, and upon which, through Paul, he so strongly insists, is, "That the world may believe that

thou hast sent me;" and "That the world may know that thou hast sent me." If his disciples everywhere had met, or if they would meet, the wish expressed in this prayer, the world could not deny that God sent his Son into the world. But alas, even in the very days of the apostles, there were those who loved to have the pre-eminence, 3 John 9, and from among the churches they themselves established, there should "men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:30. Jude however exposes the secret of all such things then and in all ages. "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, *having not the Spirit.*" Verse 19. Absence of the Spirit of Christ, destroys the unity which should characterize the disciples of Christ. For this cause Paul beseeches us to *endeavor to keep* "the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace;" and Jude continues, "But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, *praying in the Holy Ghost*, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."

J.

**"Fowler" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 35 , p. 558.**

FOWLER—Died at Woodland, August 23, 1886. William Fowler, aged 82 years, 10 months, and 8 days. Brother Fowler made a profession of Christianity at the age of twenty; united with the Disciple Church, in which connection he live until about ten years ago when he accepted the truths of the Third Angel's Message. He was ever faithful in his practice of the truth, and in his attendance on the services of the church. Unless hindered by physical disability, he was always in his place at the church on the Sabbath day, and was ready with a cheering testimony for the Master. Sixty-three years of faith in Christ is a good record. Services by the writer.

J.

**September 16, 1886**

**"The Herulian Kingdom of Italy" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 36 , p. 564.**

THE Heruli were a Vandalic tribe of ancient Germany. The first historic mention of them is about the beginning of the third century. In the great movement of the Goths from the Baltic to the Black Sea, the Heruli and the Burgundians are particularly mentioned. (See Decline and Fall, chap. 10, par. 10, note.) They fixed their habitation on "the marsh lands near the Lake Meotis [Sea of Azov]; were renowned for their strength and agility; and the assistance of their light infantry was eagerly solicited, and highly esteemed, in all the wars of the barbarians."—*Id.*, chap. 25, par. 31.

In the third naval expedition of the Goths, about A.D. 260, when Cyzicus was ruined; when Athens was sacked; when Greece was desolated; and when the temple of Diana at Ephesus was destroyed; the Heruli bore a most prominent

part. Indeed it is stated by one historian—Syncellus—that this expedition "was undertaken by the Heruli" (*Id.*, chap. 10, par. 37, note). And when the barbarian host had spread "the rage of war, both by land and by sea, from the eastern point of Sunium to the western coast of Epirus," and had "advanced within sight of Italy;" and when the Emperor Gallienus "appeared in arms and checked the ardor of the enemy;" "Naulobatus, a chief of the Heruli, accepted an honorable capitulation; entered with a large body of his countrymen into the service of Rome; was invested with the ornaments of the consular dignity;" and so was the first barbarian that ever held the office of Roman consul.—*Id.*, chap. 10, par. 38.

When the great Hermanric—A.D. 331-361—subjected all the nations from the Black Sea to the Baltic, "the active spirit of the Heruli was subdued by the slow and steady perseverance of the Goths; and after a bloody action, in which the king was slain, the remains of that warlike tribe became a useful accession to the camp of Hermanric."—*Id.*, chap. 25, par. 31.

When in A.D. 375-6, the nation of the Huns overran the Alani, subdued the Ostrogoths, and forced the Visigoths over the Danube, the Heruli retired from the coast of the Sea of Azov, into the forests of central Germany where we find them under the dominion of Attila; and when "the nations on the plain of Ch-lons," the Heruli, under the standard of Attila, bore no interior part in that memorable conflict.—*Id.*, chap. 35, par. 9.

After the death of Attila, when the battle of Netad had restored to their independence the subject nations, a multitude of the youth of those nations enlisted in the service of the empire, and became "the defense and the terror of Italy," and finally subverted the Western Empire. Gibbon says:—

"The nations who had asserted their independence after the death of Attila, were established, by the right of possession or conquest, in the boundless countries to the north of the Danube; or in the Roman provinces between the river and the Alps. But the bravest of their youth enlisted in the army of confederates, who formed the defense and the terror of Italy; and in this promiscuous multitude, the names of the Heruli, the Scyrri, the Alani, the Turcilingi, and the Rugians, appear to have predominated."—*Chap. 36, par. 28.*

In this "promiscuous multitude" the Heruli predominated, even above those tribes which were predominant, and being so conspicuous both in numbers and in valor, their name was given to the whole body of "confederates," and the power which they soon established in Italy was called the kingdom of the Heruli. These confederates seem to have gone to Italy A.D. 454-456, for we find them already there in 457, when the Emperor Majorian, in preparing an expedition against the Vandals, was compelled to hire, in addition to them, "many thousands of their former comrades in the service of Attila.

"Majorian, like the weakest of his predecessors, was reduced to the disgraceful expedient of substituting barbarian auxiliaries in the place of his unwarlike subjects; and his superior abilities could only be displayed in the vigor and dexterity with which he wielded a dangerous instrument, so apt to recoil on the

hand that used it. *Besides the confederates, who were already engaged in the service of the empire, the fame of his liberality and valor attracted the nations of the Danube, the Borysthenes, and perhaps of the Tanais. Many thousands of the bravest subjects of Attila, the Gepidae, the Ostrogoths, the Rugians, the Burgundians, the Suevi, the Alani, assembled in the plains of Liguria; and their formidable strength was balanced by their mutual animosities.*"—*Id., chap. 36, par. 12.*

In the negotiations between Attila and Theodosius the younger, A.D. 446-448, Attila sent five or six successive embassies to the court of Constantinople, and the last two ambassadors were the fathers of the two men who were, respectively, the last Roman emperor of the West, and the first barbarian king of Italy.

"The two last ambassadors of the Huns, Orestes, a noble subject of the Pannonian province, and Edecon, a valiant chieftain of the tribe of the Scyrri, returned at the same time from Constantinople to the royal camp. Their obscure names were afterwards illustrated by the extraordinary fortune and the contrast of their sons; the two servants of Attila became the fathers of the last Roman emperor of the West, and of the first barbarian king of Italy."—*Id., chap. 34, par. 12.*

Following the example of the "confederates" Orestes also went to Italy, but not till A.D. 475.

"The example of these warriors was imitated by Orestes, the son of Tatullus, and the father of the last Roman emperor of the West. Orestes, who has been already mentioned in this history, had never deserted his country. His birth and fortunes rendered him one of the most illustrious subjects of Pannonia. When that province was ceded to the Huns, he entered into the service of Attila, his lawful sovereign, obtained the office of his secretary, and was repeatedly sent ambassador to Constantinople, to represent the person, and signify the commands, of the imperious monarch. The death of that conqueror restored him to his freedom; and Orestes might honorably refuse either to follow the sons of Attila into the Scythian desert, or to obey the Ostrogoths, who had usurped the dominion of Pannonia. He preferred the service of the Italian princes, the successors of Valentinian; and as he possessed the qualifications of courage, industry, and experience, he advanced with rapid steps in the military profession, till he was elevated, by the favor of [the Emperor] Nepos himself, to the dignities of patrician, and master-general of the troops. These troops had been long accustomed to reverence the character and authority of Orestes, who affected their manners, conversed with them in their own language, and was intimately connected with their national chieftains, by long habits of familiarity and friendship. At his solicitation they rose in arms against the obscure Greek, who presumed to claim their obedience; and when Orestes, from some

secret motive, declined the purple, they consented, with the same facility, to acknowledge his son Augustulus as the emperor of the West. By the abdication of Nepos, Orestes had now attained the summit of his ambitious hopes; but he soon discovered, before the end of the first year, that the lessons of perjury and ingratitude, which a rebel must inculcate, will be resorted to against himself; and that the precarious sovereign of Italy was only permitted to choose, whether he would be the slave, or the victim, of his barbarian mercenaries.

"The dangerous alliance of these strangers had oppressed and insulted the last remains of Roman freedom and dignity. At each revolution, their pay and privileges were augmented; but their insolence increased in a still more extravagant degree; they envied the fortune of their brethren in Gaul, Spain, and Africa, whose victorious arms had acquired an independent and perpetual inheritance; and they insisted on their peremptory demand, that a *third* part of the lands of Italy should be immediately divided among them. Orestes, with a spirit, which, in another situation, might be entitled to our esteem, chose rather to encounter the rage of an armed multitude, than to subscribe the ruin of an innocent people. He rejected the audacious demand; and his refusal was favorable to the ambition of Odoacer; a bold barbarian, who assured his fellow-soldiers, that, if they dared to associate under his command, they might soon extort the justice which had been denied to their dutiful petitions. From all the camps and garrisons of Italy, the confederates, actuated by the same resentment and the same hopes, impatiently flocked to the standard of this popular leader; and the unfortunate patrician, overwhelmed by the torrent, hastily retreated to the strong city of Pavia, the episcopal seat of the holy Epiphanius. Pavia was immediately besieged, the fortifications were stormed, the town was pillaged; and although the bishop might labor, with much zeal and some success, to save the property of the church, and the chastity of female captives, the tumult could only be appeased by the execution of Orestes. His brother Paul was slain in an action near Ravenna; and the helpless Augustulus, who could no longer command the respect, was reduced to implore the clemency, of Odoacer."—*Id.*, chap. 36, par. 28.

J.

**"The Time of the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 36 , pp. 567, 568.**

SAID the angel, "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Rev. 10:7. This refers to the last of the seven trumpet

angels, and the third woe, and, as shown last week, was to come "quickly" after the ending of the sixth trumpet, and the second woe. Rev. 11:14. These being prophetic days—each day for a year—the expression means, In the years of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound. As will be seen further on, the seventh trumpet, and third woe, covers all the woe that will ever be on this earth from the time when this trumpet begins to sound. But the mystery of God is to be finished in the years *when it begins*—not at the latter part, nor at the end, but in the beginning. Whenever, therefore, the seventh angel begins to sound the finishing of the mystery of God is close at hand.

But what is the mystery of God? The mystery of God is the gospel. Proof: in Eph. 3:3, Paul says, "By revelation he made known unto me the mystery." And in Gal. 1:11, 12 he says, "The gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught I, but by revelation of Jesus Christ." Here we have the statement that the *gospel* was given him *by revelation*, and also that *by revelation* there was made known to him "*the mystery*, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; *that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs*, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ *by the gospel*. . . . 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*; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of *the mystery*, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now . . . might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. . . . 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." "For in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Eph. 3:3-11, 17-19; Col. 2:9.

From these texts it is evident that the eternal purpose of God, which he purposed in Christ for us; that the unsearchable riches of Christ which are brought to the children of men; that the immeasurable love of Christ and of God for men; that the love of Christ and of God which passeth knowledge; *is the mystery of God*. But this is nothing else than the gospel. The preaching of the gospel is only the effort of God to reveal this mystery, and to bring its depths to the comprehension of men.

Again: in Eph. 6:19, Paul calls preaching the making known the mystery of the gospel, saying: "Praying . . . for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the *mystery of the gospel*, for which I am an ambassador in bonds." To the Colossians likewise he said, "Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the *mystery of Christ*, for which I am also in bonds." Col. 4:3. And to the Romans, "Now to him that is of power to stablish you *according to my gospel*, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, *according to the revelation of the mystery* which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting

God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. 16:25, 26. There can be no question that the mystery of God is the gospel of God, that the mystery of Christ is the gospel of Christ; for it is called the "gospel of God" as well as the "gospel of Christ," 1 Pet. 4:17; 1 Thess. 2:2, 9; 1 Tim. 1:11, and properly enough so, for Christ is "God with us," Matt. 1:23, and "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19.

The mystery of God being the gospel, when the angel said that the mystery of God should be finished, it was but saying, according to these scriptures, that *the gospel* should be finished. Paul said that the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation;" therefore to say that the mystery of God—the gospel—should be finished is but to say that the power of God for the salvation of men will cease to be exercised. So then, according to the explanation given in these scriptures, the angel of Rev. 10:7 says, In the days—the years—of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the gospel should be finished, the power of God for the salvation of men shall cease to be exercised, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.

The sanctuary of the Levitical law was a figure of the sanctuary of the gospel. Heb. 9:9, 11, 23. That was on earth, this is in Heaven; that was made with hands and pitched by man, this was made without hands and pitched by the Lord. Heb. 9:9, 23, 24; 8:2; 9:11. The service of that sanctuary was by the men of the Levitical priesthood, and with the blood of beasts; the service of this sanctuary is by Christ the Lord, of the Melchizedic priesthood, and with the blood of Christ. Heb. 7; 9:6, 9, 12-14, 22-26; 8:1. The service of that sanctuary was completed once a year; the service of this when completed is once for all. Heb. 9:25, 25; 10:3, 10. The last work of the annual service in that sanctuary was upon what was called the day of atonement, and the service was called the cleansing of the sanctuary—the taking away of all the sins that had been conveyed into the sanctuary by the service of the priests at the confessions and sacrifices of the people during the year that then ended. Lev. 23:27-32; 16:2-34. The last work of the once-for-all service of the heavenly sanctuary will be the great day of everlasting atonement, and the service will be to take away forever all the sins which have been borne by our High-priest, at our confession and the offering of Him by faith as our sacrifice, as he offers himself in fact in our behalf. This also is called the cleansing of, not the earthly, but the heavenly sanctuary. As the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was the last work for that year in behalf of that people, so the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary will be the last work forever in behalf of any people. As the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was the very last day of that annual round of service, so whenever the world shall have reached the time of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, the world will then have entered upon the very last days of the work of the gospel, and when the sanctuary shall—will "be finished as He hath declared to his servants the prophets."

Now when, according to the Scriptures, should the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary begin? In Daniel 8:14, from a certain time, it is said, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." This also being prophetic

time each day stands for a year, and is, therefore, two thousand and three hundred years. From what time? "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." Dan. 9:25. Seventy weeks—four hundred and ninety years—were cut off from the two thousand three hundred, and appropriated to Daniel's people, the Jews, and the beginning of the four hundred and ninety years is the beginning of the two thousand and three hundred. This beginning, as quoted above, was at the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, which was in the year 457 B.C. Ezra 7. Although Ezra with the decree, started from Babylon in the first month, it was not till the fifth month that he reached Jerusalem; and as the decree was to the treasurers "beyond the river" Euphrates and in Palestine, it was of no force till he reached that country, so about half the year was gone before the decree could be said to go forth to restore and to build the city, which would make it about the middle of the year 457, or really 456½ B.C. brings us to 2300—456½—1843½ after Christ. Eighteen hundred and forty-three and a half years after Christ carries us into the year 1844 A.D. Then it was, the angel said to Daniel, that the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary should be: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

That this cannot be applied to the earthly sanctuary is made certain by the statement in Dan. 9:26, that after the cutting off of the Messiah, the people of the prince that should come (the Romans) "should destroy *the city and the sanctuary*," and Christ said that when it should be destroyed Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Luke 21:24. As that city and that sanctuary were to be destroyed, and were destroyed but a few years after the expiration of the four hundred and ninety years, it is impossible that that should be the sanctuary that was to be cleansed at the expiration of the two thousand and three hundred years. Consequently the sanctuary that was to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred years was the heavenly sanctuary, because it is the only one that was then in existence. Therefore it is certain that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in A.D. 1844. (For an extended and thorough treatment of the subject of the sanctuary and connected dates, see "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing," for sale at this office.)

The cleansing of the sanctuary, the work of the atonement under the Levitical law, was a work of judgment. For said the scripture, "Whatsoever soul if be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people." Lev. 23:29. Whoever did not make confession of sin that day could have no part in the atonement that was made that day; and when the sanctuary had been cleansed, and atonement made, he was to be cut off without mercy, he had no other chance, his probation was gone. So, likewise, in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, in the atonement made once for all, whosoever shall not confess his sins, and be partakers of the intercession of Christ, can have no part in the atonement of Christ, and when that sanctuary shall have been cleansed, and that atonement made, he will be cut off without mercy, he will have no other opportunity, his probation will be ended. Of such it will be said, "He that is unjust,

let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still." No longer will the precious cleansing blood be applied. These are they who shall wring out and drink the dregs of the cup that is in the hand of the Lord (Ps. 75:8); these are they who "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Rev. 14:10.

This cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in A.D. 1844, and in the very nature of the case must soon close. We are now living in the great day of atonement. Now is the time when it is urgent upon every soul to confess his sins, to put away all his transgressions, to be partaker of the intercession of Christ, to wash his robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb. For soon the mystery of God will be finished, the work of the gospel will be closed, and the unmixed wrath of God and the Lamb will be poured upon all the wicked of the earth.

Next week, if the Lord will, we shall gather together in one the evidences that *now* is the time of the Third Angel's Message. The points which we have shown in this article and the one before it, were necessary to a clear understanding of the one which is to follow. J.

### **"Significant Facts" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 36 , p. 568.**

THE *Christian Statesman* reports that the Church of the United Brethren has put a National Reform preacher into the field, Rev. R. Rock by name, and will support him; and that a preacher, Rev. J. P. Mills by name, from the Methodist Episcopal Church, will enter upon the National Reform work, on the same terms, about Sept. 1, 1886.

The late General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, by its Committee on National Reform, expressed its gratification "to learn that the presentation of the Christian theory of civil government by the advocates of National Reform, is educating the people to recognize that civil government is an ordinance of God; . . . that Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, is . . . the Ruler of nations, and has laid down in his word the fundamental enactments by which the enactments of our civil code are to be tested; and that *this word ought to be recognized as the fundamental law of the Nation*, and be incorporated *into its very Constitution*." It regards "the continued advocacy of this Reform as imperatively necessary;" and by resolution commends "to the generous financial support of our people the secretaries and advocates of this movement."

The Ocean Grove Assembly set apart Wednesday, July 21, as National Reform Day, which, say the *Statesman*, "will afford a fine audience of the best people, without effort or cost on the part of the friends of the cause." Likewise the Chautauqua Assembly management granted the morning and afternoon sessions of Friday, July 23, to National Reform. This the *Statesman* correctly called "another magnificent opportunity for the presentation of the principles of the National Reform Association."

Nor is this all. For more than a year the National Reform party has been specially and assiduously courting the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and it has succeeded in so far rhyiming itself into these ladies' favor that

we are quite certain it will never reason itself out again. Joint conventions are now being held by the two bodies, and we see their vital union virtually consummated. Already in their joint convention held at Canonsburg, Pa., May 19, an address of welcome was delivered "by Mrs. Rev. J. F. Hill, in which *the oneness of the two organizations* was very ably set forth." Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. West, and Mrs. Hoffman, are all Vice-Presidents of the National Reform Association. Mrs. Woodbridge made a straight-out National Reform speech both at Ocean Grove and at Chautauqua, on the occasions referred to above.

Besides this Mrs. Woodbridge was appointed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to carry to the Cleveland Convention of the Knights of Labor, last May, "the salutations of the Union, and a brief argument in behalf of the cause of temperance"; but the lady allowed her National Reform zeal to carry her beyond her appointed mission and she closed her speech to the Assembly with these words:—

"Thus would the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union join hands with the Knights of Labor in placing this 'Government upon the shoulders of Him who is Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' and in crowning Christ, our Lord, as the Ruler of nations."

This the *Christian Statesman* pronounces a "cause for rejoicing," and "an especial gratification to the friends of National Reform."—See *Statesman June 8, 1886*.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done noble work, in which we have rejoiced and should ever rejoice, while she kept in the line of her legitimate and chartered work. But just as soon as she proposes to sell herself to work the iniquity of lifting the National Reform party into power in its union of Church and State, and the establishment of its hierarchy in this country, then we are prepared to write of her, "The glory is departed."

The Prohibition Party also is coming up to the work. The New Jersey Prohibition Convention, and that of Washington County, Pa., adopted resolutions which the *Statesman* says read like the resolutions of a National Reform Convention. The Maine Prohibitionists declare that "we aim, in a word, at the application of Christian principles to political life. . . . The application of Christian principles to politics would secure an equal voice, without regard to sex, in making laws which all must alike obey." The Illinois platform declares that, "We reverently recognize the supreme authority of Almighty God. . . . We regard the Christian Sabbath as a boon so valuable to humanity, that the State cannot be true to its trusts which neglects to guard it from desecration."

The Reformed Presbyterian Church, which from the beginning has borne the National Reform party upon her sides and dandled it upon her knees, contributed to the work last year "almost \$7,000;" and at its late Synod, held at Rochester, New York, it recommended "that the sum of \$10,000 be raised for the treasury of

the National Reform Association, by the churches under the care of this Synod," the coming year.

Besides all these distinct organizations, the churches, as such, almost all favor it; and the National Reformers are willing, if not anxious, to make advances even to the Catholic Church to gain her favor—and they will get it. Now we say: With the general breaking up of parties, and the casting about for new issues upon which to catch the votes of the multitude, let this movement be agitated for but a very few years at most, and then brought to a vote upon some one leading question under which can be veiled the real issue, and we should like to see the one who can show what is to hinder the success of the National Reform movement, and in that the union of Church and State with all that that involves as the ultimate result.

In view of these facts, which simply show the fast-growing power, and the wide-spreading influence of the National Reform movement, we submit to any candid mind whether the AMERICAN SENTINEL has not a mission, in its determined opposition to that movement. Do we not well to expose the fallacies, to lay bare the sophistries, and to uncover the insidious iniquity of this scheme of Church and State? Do we not well to call the attention of the American people to this menace to human liberty and human right? We know precisely what it is about which we are talking. We know exactly what we are doing. But we very much fear that the American people will not realize till it is too late, the danger that lies in the National Reform movement. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but Americans have forgotten it. May God help the people to awake and be vigilant.—*American Sentinel*.

**September 23, 1886**

**"The Herulian Kingdom of Italy. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 37 , p. 580.**

*(Concluded).*

"THAT successful barbarian [Odoacer] was the son of Edecon; who, in some remarkable transactions, particularly described in a preceding chapter, had been the colleague of Orestes himself. The honor of an ambassador should be exempt from suspicion; and Edecon had listened to a conspiracy against the life of his sovereign. But this apparent guilt was expiated by his merit or repentance; his rank was eminent and conspicuous; he enjoyed the favor of Attila; and the troops under his command, who guarded, in their turn, the royal village, consisted of a tribe of Scyrri, his immediate and hereditary subjects. In the revolt of the nations, they still adhered to the Huns; and more than twelve years afterwards, the name of Edecon is honorably mentioned, in their unequal contests with the Ostrogoths; which was terminated, after two

bloody battles, by the defeat and dispersion of the Scyrri. Their gallant leader, who did not survive this national calamity, left two sons, Onulf and Odoacer, to struggle with adversity, and to maintain as they might, by rapine or service, the faithful followers of their exile. Onulf directed his steps towards Constantinople, where he sullied, by the assassination of a generous benefactor, the fame which he had acquired in arms.

"His brother Odoacer led a wandering life among the barbarians of Noricum, with a mind and a fortune suited to the most desperate adventures; and when he had fixed his choice, he piously visited the cell of Severinus, the popular saint of the country, to solicit his approbation and blessing. The lowness of the door would not admit the lofty stature of Odoacer; he was obliged to stoop; but in that humble attitude the saint could discern the symptoms of his future greatness; and addressing him in a prophetic tone, "Pursue" (said he) "your design; proceed to Italy; you will soon cast away this coarse garment of skins; and your wealth will be adequate to the liberality of your mind." The barbarian, whose daring spirit accepted and ratified the prediction, was admitted into the service of the Western empire, and soon obtained an honorable rank in the guards. His manners were gradually polished, his military skill was improved, and the confederates of Italy would not have elected him for their general, unless the exploits of Odoacer had established a high opinion of his courage and capacity. Their military acclamations saluted him with the title of king [A.D. 476, Aug. 23]; but he abstained, during his whole reign, from the use of the purple and diadem, lest he should offend those princes, whose subjects, by their accidental mixture, had formed the victorious army, which time and policy might insensibly unite into a great nation.

"Royalty was familiar to the barbarians, and the submissive people of Italy was prepared to obey, without a murmur, the authority which he should condescend to exercise as the vicegerent of the emperor of the West. But *Odoacer had resolved to abolish that useless and expensive office*; and such is the weight of antique prejudice, that it required some boldness and penetration to discover the extreme facility of the enterprise. The unfortunate Augustulus was made the instrument of his own disgrace; he signified his resignation to the senate; and that assembly, in their last act of obedience to a Roman prince, still affected the spirit of freedom, and the forms of the constitution. An epistle was addressed, by their unanimous decree, to the emperor Zeno, the son-in-law and successor of Leo; who had lately been restored, after a short rebellion, to the Byzantine throne. *They solemnly disclaim the necessity, or even the wish, of continuing any longer the Imperial succession in Italy*; since, in their opinion, the majesty of a sole monarch is sufficient to pervade and protect, at the same

time, both the East and the West. In their own name, and in the name of the people, *they consent that the seat of universal empire shall be transferred from Rome to Constantinople*; and they basely renounce the right of choosing their master, the only vestige that yet remained of the authority which had given laws to the world.

"The republic (they repeat that name without a blush) might safely confide in the civil and military virtues of Odoacer; and they humbly request, that the emperor would invest him with the title of Patrician, and the administration of the diocese of Italy.' The deputies of the senate were received at Constantinople with some marks of displeasure and indignation: and when they were admitted to the audience of Zeno, he sternly reproached them with their treatment of the two emperors, Anthemius and Nepos, whom the East had successively granted to the prayers of Italy. 'The first' (continued he) 'you have murdered; the second you have expelled; but the second is still alive, and whilst he lives he is your lawful sovereign.' But the prudent Zeno soon deserted the hopeless cause of his abdicated colleague. His vanity was gratified by the title of sole emperor, and by the statues erected to his honor in the several quarters of Rome; he entertained a friendly, though ambiguous, correspondence with the patrician Odoacer; and he gratefully accepted the Imperial ensigns, the sacred ornaments of the throne and palace, which the barbarian was not unwilling to remove from the sight of the people.

"In the space of twenty years since the death of Valentinian, nine emperors had successively disappeared; and the son of Orestes, a youth recommended only by his beauty, would be the least entitled to the notice of posterity, if his reign, *which was marked by the extinction of the Roman empire in the West*, did not leave a memorable era in the history of mankind. The patrician Orestes had married the daughter of Count Romulus, of Petovio in Noricum; the name of *Augustus*, notwithstanding the jealousy of power, was known at Aquileia as a familiar surname; and the appellations of the two great founders, of the city and of the monarchy, *were thus strangely united in the last of their successors*. The son of Orestes assumed and disgraced the names of Romulus Augustus; but the first was corrupted into Momyllus, by the Greeks, and the second has been changed by the Latins into the contemptible diminutive Augustulus. The life of this inoffensive youth was spared by the generous clemency of Odoacer; who dismissed him, with his whole family, from the Imperial palace, fixed his annual allowance at six thousand pieces of gold, and assigned the castle of Lucullus, in Campania, for the place of his exile or retirement.

"Odoacer was the first Barbarian who reigned in Italy, over a people who had once asserted their just superiority above the rest

of mankind. The disgrace of the Romans still excites our respectful compassion, and we fondly sympathize with the imaginary grief and indignation of their degenerate posterity. But the calamities of Italy had gradually subdued the proud consciousness of freedom and glory. In the age of Roman virtue the provinces were subject to the arms, and the citizens to the laws, of the republic; till those laws were subverted by civil discord, and both the city and the province became the servile property of a tyrant. The forms of the constitution, which alleviated or disguised their abject slavery, were abolished by time and violence; the Italians alternately lamented the presence or the absence of the sovereign, whom they detested or despised; and the succession of five centuries inflicted the various evils of military license, capricious despotism, and elaborate oppression. During the same period, the barbarians had emerged from obscurity and contempt, and the warriors of Germany and Scythia were introduced into the provinces, as the servants, the allies, and at length the masters, of the Romans, whom they insulted or protected. The hatred of the people was suppressed by fear; they respected the spirit and splendor of the martial chiefs who were invested with the honors of the empire; and the fate of Rome had long depended on the sword of those formidable strangers. The stern Ricimer, who trampled on the ruins of Italy, had exercised the power, without assuming the title, of a king; and the patient Romans were insensibly prepared to acknowledge the royalty of Odoacer and his barbaric successors.

"The king of Italy was not unworthy of the high station to which his valor and fortune had exalted him: his savage manners were polished by the habits of conversation; and he respected, though a conqueror and a barbarian, the institutions, and even the prejudices, of his subjects.

"Like the rest of the barbarians, he had been instructed in the Arian heresy; but he revered the monastic and episcopal characters; and the silence of the Catholics attest the toleration which they enjoyed. The peace of the city required the interposition of his prefect Basilius in the choice of a Roman pontiff; the decree which restrained the clergy from alienating their lands was ultimately designed for the benefit of the people, whose devotions would have been taxed to repair the dilapidations of the church. Italy was protected by the arms of its conqueror; and its frontiers were respected by the barbarians of Gaul and Germany, who had so long insulted the feeble race of Theodosius. Odoacer passed the Adriatic, to chastise the assassins of the emperor Nepos, and to acquire the maritime province of Dalmatia. He passed the Alps, to rescue the remains of Noricum from Fava, or Feletheus, king of the Rugians, who held his residence beyond the Danube. The king was vanquished in battle, and led away prisoner; a numerous colony of

captives and subjects was transplanted into Italy; and Rome, after a long period of defeat and disgrace, might claim the triumph of her Barbarian master."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 36, par. 26-46.*

Thus by the establishment of the Herulian Kingdom of Italy A.D. 476 the final destruction of the Western empire was accomplished. Rome, that mighty "fabric of human greatness, was fallen. That power, "the fourth kingdom" "strong as iron" which had broken in pieces and subdued all kingdoms was now divided. Ten kingdoms, ten distinct and independent nations, no more, no less, had fixed themselves within the boundaries of Western Rome, and the prophecy, spoken and written more than a thousand years before, was literally fulfilled. "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth;"—nations rise and nations fall, empires rule the world and are brought to ruin, but over it all there appears the fact that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men," and in it and by it all there is illustrated not only the truth that "the grass withereth, the flower fadeth," but also that, "the word of our God shall stand forever." Isa. 40:6-8; Dan. 4:17, 25, 32, 8, 40-43.

J.

**"The Time of the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 37 , pp. 583, 584.**

WE have shown that the sixth of the seven trumpet angels ceased to sound August 11, 1840, and that then, says the Scripture, "the second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." Rev. 11:14. The third woe and the seventh trumpet are identical. And when the seventh angel sounded, said the prophet, "There were great voices in Heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." He also said, "The nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament; and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail." Verses 18, 19.

Now we want it to be clearly seen, and it may be, that the events here named are identical with those of Rev. 14:6-20; 16:1-21, and that the latter are but an explanation in full of the former. To show this we shall here bring together the statements of Rev. 11:18, 19, and the corresponding ones of chapters 14 and 16.

1. "And the nations were angry, and *thy wrath is come.*" Rev. 11:18. The third angel says, "If any man worship the beast and his image. . . . the same shall drink of the wine of *the wrath of God.*" Chapter 14:9, 10. And in the seven last plagues *is filled up* the wrath of God. 15:1, 6-8; 16.

2. "The time of the dead, that *they should be judged.* Rev. 11:18. "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven. . . . saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for *the hour of his Judgment is come.*" Chapter 14:6, 7.

3. "That thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great." Rev. 11:18. This time of reward is at the coming of Christ; for he says: "Behold, *I come* quickly; and *my reward is with me*, to give every man according as his work shall be." Chapter 22:12. Again he said: "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14. But his coming follows immediately the Third Angel's Message; for says the prophet, "I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle." "And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." Rev. 14:14, 16. This harvest is the end of the world. Matt. 13:39.

4. "And shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Rev. 11:18. "Another angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and cried with a loud cry to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe. And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God." Rev. 14:17-19.

Here are shown two reapings. One is by the Son of God reaping the harvest of the earth, gathering the wheat into the garner of God. The other is to gather together those who are to be cast into the wine-press of the wrath of God. The former are the fruits of the true Vine, Christ Jesus. For he says: "I am the true Vine." "I am the Vine, ye are the branches." This is the *Vine of Heaven*; for Christ, the true Vine, came down from Heaven to do his Father's will; and of the Vine the "Father is the Husbandman." All who abide in Christ, the true Vine, will be gathered by the angels into the kingdom of God, when he comes on the white cloud to reap the harvest of the earth. The others are called the clusters of the vine of *the earth*. Those have no communion with the heavenly Vine, but are of the earth, earthy. And when the clusters of this vine are gathered, it is only to be cast into the wine-press of the wrath of God.

This same result is shown by John the Baptist under another figure: "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; 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." Matt. 3:11, 12.

5. "And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." Rev. 11:19. Why is this called the ark of his testament? Because within it is his testimony, as there was in the earthly temple, which was a pattern of the heavenly. "In the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee." Ex. 25:21. But what was the testimony or testament that was put in the ark? "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 the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 32:16. These tables Moses broke when he came down from the mount and found the people given up to idolatry. Then said the Lord to Moses: "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 breakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark." Then says Moses: "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. This ark was called the ark of the testimony or testament because that in it were the tables of the testimony which God gave to Moses, and that testimony was the ten commandments. It is this alone which gave it the title of the ark of the testimony.

Now we have shown that this sanctuary or temple on the earth was only a pattern or figure of the sanctuary or temple in Heaven. Therefore, that testimony which gave to the ark of the earthly sanctuary the title of the ark of the testament must be identical with the testimony which gives to the ark in Heaven the title of the ark of His testament, that is; the ten commandments. Now this temple of God in Heaven is opened at the sounding of the seventh trumpet. There is shown the heavenly ark of his testament; and connected directly with this stands Rev. 11:12. The Third Angel's Message says: "Here are they that *keep the commandments of God*."

6. "And there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail." Rev. 11:19. This is identical with the record of the events of the seventh plague. For says the Scripture, "And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were *voices*, and *thunders*, and *lightnings*; and there was a *great earthquake*, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great." "And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a *great hail* out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent; and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Rev. 16:17, 18, 20, 21.

But the seven last plagues compose the wrath of God. This wrath is poured upon those who worship the beast and his image, upon those who refuse to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And the Third Angel's Message is to warn men against that worship that they may escape this wrath, and calls them especially to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. These things show that these three messages of Revelation 14, and the wrath which is foretold by the third of these, and the coming of the Lord which follows the third, represent events referred to as occurrent when the seventh angel shall sound. It is therefore absolutely certain that in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the Third Angel's Message of Revelation 14 is due to the world.

Here we must refer again to Rev. 10:7, where the angel declares with an oath that "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound,

the mystery of God should be finished." We have shown that the mystery of God is the gospel, and that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and that therefore in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he begins to sound, the power of God for the salvation of man shall cease to be exercised. Note especially that this is in the days when the seventh angel *begins* to sound. From the texts presented in former articles, as well as all already given in this, it is plain that the events connected with the Third Angel's Message end with the end of the world. Therefore the Third Angel's Message is the means by which God makes his last effort for the salvation of men. Thus it becomes of

584

the utmost importance to the children of men to know when the Third Angel's Message is due to the world. In our article last week, in discussing the subject of the mystery of God and its finishing, we cited the sanctuary and its services, the Levitical law, and showed that they were typical of the heavenly sanctuary, and the work of Christ in his priesthood. We showed that the services ended with the cleansing of the sanctuary, and that Christ's priestly service ends at the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, and we showed that this cleansing began in 1844. Therefore this last service of the gospel, the finishing of which is identical with the finishing of the mystery of God, began in 1844.

Again: we showed that the cleansing of the sanctuary was really a work of judgment. It was so understood by the people who performed the service; it was so intended to be understood by the Lord who established the service. This is made certain by the voice which instanced that whosoever was not partaker of the services that day was cut off without mercy when the services closed. He had no further chance. His probation was gone. This was but typical of the work of Christ once for all, and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary must be likewise a work of the Judgment. This answers exactly to the words which describe the scenes of the seventh trumpet when it begins to sound, that then was come "the time of the dead, that they should be judged." And as we have seen, this cleansing of the sanctuary, this work of judgment, this time of the dead, that they should be judged, began in 1844.

But this time of the dead, that they should be judged, is the same time referred to in Rev. 14:6, 7, in that message which carries still the everlasting gospel to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, yet saying with a loud voice to all, Fear God, and give glory to him; for *the hour of his Judgment* is come. Paul preached this same gospel, but not that the hour of his Judgment was come, but simply a judgment *to* come. Acts 21:25, and 17:31. But when the time comes when the seventh angel shall begin to sound, then it is declared in accordance with the same gospel, the hour of his Judgment *is* come. But this, as we have shown, is identical with the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary which began in 1844. Therefore it is certain that the seventh angel began to sound in 1844. That this hour of Judgment is not the day of Judgment which comes at the end of the world, but is a time which precedes the end of the world, answering to the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, is shown by the fact that two other messages follow this one *before* the coming of the Lord and the end of the world. But these two do follow this one,

and the third of these is the Third Angel's Message which warns all men against the worship of the beast and his image, and against receiving his mark, under the dreadful penalty of having to drink the wine of the wrath of God, and which at the same time calls all to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

This wine of the wrath of God is the seven last plagues, with the last of which come the lightnings, and voices and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail, which come at the sounding of the seventh trumpet. These commandments are the testimony of God which was brought forth prominently when the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament. And all these things are but the events that occur in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he begins to sound. And as we have found that this seventh angel began to sound in 1844, then it was and onward the Third Angel's Message is due to the world. When this message is finished, the mystery of God will be finished. When this message closes, the work of the gospel will be closed. And when the seven last plagues which are pronounced by this message against those who worship the beast and his image, shall be poured out upon them which shall have the mark of the beast, and upon them which worship his image,—with the pouring out of the last of these comes the end of the world.

Therefore *now is the time* when there is danger of being drawn into the worship of the beast and his image. The people now living are the ones who are concerned in this. The people now living are they who will be called upon to make an image to the beast, and to worship the beast and his image. These are also the people who will be warned by the message of God against all those things under penalty of suffering the seven last plagues, and will be called to the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. J.

**September 30, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 38 , p. 596.**

WE have now described the origin, traced the course, and marked the establishment, of the ten kingdoms that arose upon the destruction of the Western empire of Rome. The ten as we have found them are the Burgundians, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Visigoths, the Franks, the Alemanni, the Saxons, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards, and the Heruli. Eight of these are designation by Gibbon in a single paragraph; in giving the history of the conversion of the barbarians he says:—

"The formidable *Visigoths*, universally adopted the religion of the Romans, with whom they maintained a perpetual intercourse, of war, of friendship, or of conquest. In their long and victorious march from the Danube to the Atlantic Ocean, they converted their allies; they educated the rising generation; and the devotion which reigned in the camp of Alaric, or the court of Thoulouse, might edify or disgrace the palaces of Rome and Constantinople. During the same period, Christianity was embraced by *almost all the*

*barbarians, who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western empire; the Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and the various bands of mercenaries [Heruli], that raised Odoacer to the throne of Italy. The Franks and the Saxons still persevered in the errors of Paganism; but the Franks obtained the monarchy of Gaul by their submission to the example of Clovis; and the Saxon conquerors of Britain were reclaimed from their savage superstition by the missionaries of Rome.*—*Decline and Fall, chap. 37, par. 18.*

In the same chapter, he names another, the Lombards after their removal from the Danube to Italy. He mentions their recent conversion to Christianity, and their final adoption of the Catholic faith instead of Arianism, as follows:—

"Gregory, the spiritual conqueror of Britain, encouraged the pious Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, to propagate the Nicene faith among the victorious savages, whose recent Christianity was polluted by the Arian heresy. Her devout labors still left room for the industry and success of future missionaries; and many cities of Italy were still disputed by hostile bishops. But the cause of Arianism was gradually suppressed by the weight of truth, of interest, and of example; and the controversy, which Egypt had derived from the Platonic school, was terminated, after a war of three hundred years, by the final conversion of the *Lombards* of Italy."—*Id., par. 29.*

We have already given his designation of the *Alemanni* as "a great and permanent nation."—*chap. 10, par. 26*—a specific title which he has, in form, applied to no other of the barbarian nations.

Assuredly no one can suppose for a moment that Gibbon wrote with any intentional reference to an exposition of the prophecy. Nevertheless we believe that he has given an exposition of it, because he has written the one single authoritative history of the times of the fulfillment of the prophecy, and that history *is itself* an exposition, and the very best one, of the prophecy in question. Therefore all that we have attempted to do is simply to retrace from his writing, the history of the ten kingdoms, is the correct list according to the prophecy. We believe that this list will bear the test of legitimate criticism; and that it is the only list that will bear it. A number of lists have been made of what are proposed as the ten kingdoms. Perhaps it would be well to notice the principal ones, and, where they disagree with the list which we have drawn from Gibbon, show why they are defective. It would not be at all difficult to make up any moderate number of lists of ten names each, and each different from the others, composed of the names of tribes or nations that played some part in the destruction of the Western empire. In fact we have now before us five proposed lists of the ten kingdoms, no two of which are alike. It is not enough, however, to find ten nations which participated in the overthrow of the empire; but *did such nations establish kingdoms?* Now is it enough to say that they did establish kingdoms; but did they establish kingdoms *within the bounds of the Western empire?* Nor yet is it enough to say that they established kingdoms within the bounds of the Western

empire; but can these ten nations be found within the period marked by the prophecy? and do all remain that the prophecy demands shall remain?

The fulfillment of prophecy is not hap-hazard. "For the prophecy came not at any time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1:21 margin. By the word of the prophets God has declared what should be in the "course of empire;" and the history of the course of empire declares, according to the prophecy, what has been. God has spoken and accordingly it must be; and the points of prophecy may be pressed as closely as any just interpretation may demand, and they will not fail, *provided* the interpreter has all the facts.

In Dan. 2:41, of the fourth kingdom it is said: "Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, *the kingdom shall be divided.*" We have before proved that this division is to be into ten parts, corresponding to the "toes" of the image; because Dan. 7:7, 24, which is the complement of 2:41, says that the fourth beast had ten horns, that the fourth beast is "the fourth kingdom," and that the ten horns "are ten kings that shall arise." Further, when the ten horns had appeared Daniel says: "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." Dan. 7:8. Then after the angel had said that these "ten horns" "are ten kings," he continued: "And another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." Verse 24.

From these texts it is clear, (a) that the ten kingdoms first appear; (b) that *after that*, three of these are "plucked up by the roots," and (c) that *only these* are so plucked up. It is evident therefore that the *ten* are all in sight, before any of the three are "plucked up." Now the three that were plucked up by the roots were the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths; and the date of the plucking up of the first of the three, is March 5, A.D. 493, and of the last, March A.D. 538—this will be fully demonstrated when we come to the illustration of Dan. 7:8 itself. Therefore,—

1. Any list purporting to be that of the ten kingdoms, that contains the names of any that never were established within the bounds of the Western empire, cannot be a correct list.

2. Any such list containing the names of any that arose later than A.D. 493, cannot be a correct list.

3. Any such list that contains the names of *more than three* nations that perished—"were plucked up *by the roots*"—cannot be a correct list.

To state it in the alternative form: The ten kingdoms must all be in sight in A.D. 493; they must establish themselves within the bounds of the Western empire; three, and only three, of them must be plucked up *by the roots*; and the other seven must remain, through their lineal descendants, to the time when all kingdoms shall give place to the kingdom of God. The list of the ten kingdoms that meets these specifications *must be* the correct list.

Not that the remaining seven must all, always remain equally powerful kingdoms; not that no one of them shall ever be brought low; not that no one shall ever be made tributary to another; not that no one shall ever have to acknowledge the overlordship of another; because in this same prophecy, in the very next verse—Dan. 2:42—we read that, "As the *toes of the feet* were part of

iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken"—brittle, margin. That is, part of them shall be strong, and part shall be brittle—easily broken; part of them will retain the strength of iron, while part will show more of the weakness of clay. But though part of them may be weak, though they may even "be broken," yet they are never plucked up by the roots; for "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 forever." Dan. 2:44. We shall hereafter, in its proper place, sketch the history of these kingdoms from the fall of the Western empire—A.D. 476—through the Middle Ages; we shall now notice some of the lists that have been given as those of the ten kingdoms.

J.

**"The Extent and Purpose of the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 38 , pp. 599, 600.**

HAVING shown that now is the time—immediately following A.D. 1844, and onward—when the Third Angel's Message is due to the world, it now remains to study the import of that message. It is a world-wide message; for (1) The first of the three angels (Rev. 14:6, 7), spake with a loud voice to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people; the second angel *followed* this one, and the third angel *followed them*. As, therefore, the first one was to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, and as the third one follows, it likewise must go to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people. (2) The third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, "*If any man* worship the beast and his image," etc. This phrase, "If any man" shows that it is spoken to all men; that it is a universal message. (3) Of the beast it is said, "*All that dwell upon the earth* shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. And the work of the image of the beast is but to cause the worship of the beast; true, he compels men to worship himself, the image of the beast; but as he derives his authority, and draws his inspiration, from the beast, the worship of the image is but indirectly the worship of the beast. Now as the worship of the beast is to be by "all that dwell upon the earth;" as the Third Angel's Message is the warning against the worship of the beast and his image; and as obedience to this warning is the only means of escaping that worship and the wrath of God; therefore the Third Angel's Message must go to "all that dwell upon the earth,"—the warning must be as extensive as is the worship. It is therefore evident that this thing will not be done in a corner.

This message says: "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." We have before cited the scriptures which show this wrath to be the seven last plagues, and which show that with the seventh of these plagues comes the end of the world. But all do not worship the beast and his image. There are some who get "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over

the number of his name;" and these are seen standing "on the sea of glass," before the throne of God, having the harps of God, and they sing a song which none can learn but they, and it is the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb. Rev. 4:6; 15:2, 3. How do these get the victory? Notice; the message not only warns all men against the worship of the beast and his image, but it tells how to avoid that worship; it not only tells men what they shall not do, but it tells them what to do; it not only calls men to the conflict with the beast and his image, but it tells them how to get the victory; and this is contained in the words, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

Here, then, is a message which is now due, which is to go "to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people," calling upon all to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The purpose of this message is to gather out from "all that dwell upon the earth" a people of whom it can truly be said, "*Here* are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus;" and that so, such may escape the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. This makes it incumbent upon all *now* to study the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus as they have never studied these before, asking themselves the question, "Am I one of whom this scripture speaks? Am I one who truly keeps the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus?" And, as this message is world-wide, these considerations plainly show that under the power of the Third Angel's Message there will be such a world-wide study of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, as there has not been since holy John stood on the Isle of Patmos.

What, then, is meant by "The commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus"? First, as to the commandments of God. In a certain sense, there is no doubt that every injunction of the Bible is a commandment of God; for the Bible is the word of God. Yet, besides this, there is a certain part of the Bible that must be admitted to be the commandments of God above every other part. That certain part is the TEN COMMANDMENTS. Whereas, in giving all other parts of the Bible, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21), in giving the ten commandments "God spake all these words." The whole nation of Israel was assembled at the base of Sinai, and "Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire;" "and all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet," "and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake." And there, amid those awful scenes, God personally spoke the ten commandments, with a voice that shook the earth. Heb. 12:26. Nor was that all. After having so spoken these great words unto all the people, "The Lord said unto Moses, 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. . . . And Moses went up into the mount of God." Ex. 24:12, 13. "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. When Moses came down to the people, he found they had made a golden calf, and were worshiping it after the manner of Egypt; "and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount." "And the Lord said unto Moses. Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest. And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning unto Mount Sinai." Ex. 34:1, 2. Then says Moses: "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, 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." Deut. 10:3, 4.

Thus we find not only that God *spoke* the ten commandments but that he *wrote* them *twice* upon tables of stone. Although holy men of God, when moved by the Holy Ghost, could speak the message of God, none could be found holy enough to speak the words of the ten commandments in their deliverance to the children of men. Although the Spirit could say to the holy prophets, "Write," no such word could be given to any man when the ten commandments were to be given in tangible form to the children of men. But, instead, God said, "I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which *I* have written." And again the second time, when these tables were broken, *I* will write the words that were in the first tables.

Nor was this all. God did not come down upon Mount Sinai alone; but thousands upon thousands of the holy angels were with Him there. "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." Deut. 33:2. "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place." Ps. 68:17. This array of angels is that to which Stephen referred when he said to his persecutors that they had "received the law by the disposition of angels." Acts 7:53. The Greek word here rendered *disposition*, signifies, "to set in order; draw up an army; posted in battle order."—*Liddell and Scott*. When, therefore, God came down upon Mount Sinai to deliver the ten commandments, He was surrounded with the heavenly host of angels, drawn up in orderly array. Four-faced and four-winged cherubim, six-winged seraphim, and glorious angels with glittering, golden chariots,—all these, by the tens of thousands, accompanied the Majesty of Heaven as in love He gave to sinful men his great law of love. Deut. 33:3. Than at the giving of the law of ten commandments, there certainly has been no more majestic scene since the creation of the world. Well, indeed, might Paul name "the giving of the law" among the great things that pertain to Israel. Rom. 9:4.

In view of all these things, it is assuredly the truth that the ten commandments are very properly distinguished as the commandments of God, above every other part of the Bible, although all the Bible is the word of God. This is according to

that word itself: "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of they life: but teach them thy sons, and thy son's sons; *specially the day that thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb*, when the Lord said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, *that they may learn to fear me* all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children. . . . And He declared unto you His covenant, which He commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and He wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4:9-13. Here in impressing upon the people the things they should diligently remember, "specially" to be remembered were the day that God came down upon Sinai, and the words that were then heard; and those words were *the ten commandments*.

This is of equal importance to the world to-day; for all is summed up by Solomon when he says: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter [margin, the end of the matter, even all that hath been heard, is]: *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. Men are to be judged by the law of God; that law is the ten commandments; and the words of Solomon are emphasized in the First and Third Angel's Messages of Rev. 14. The first

600

angel says: "*Fear God*, and give glory to Him; for the hour of *his Judgment is come*;" and the third angel follows, saying: "*Here are they that keep the commandments of God*, and the faith of Jesus." The Third Angel's Message embraces Sinai and Calvary; the law of God and the gospel of Christ; God the Father and God the Son; and when this message ends the work of God for the salvation of men—the mystery of God—will be finished.

Reader, are you keeping the ten commandments, with the faith of Jesus? Read them carefully and see. Read them earnestly and prayerfully, for God will soon bring every work into Judgment, and every work that will not bear the test of the ten commandments will be found wanting.

J.

**October 7, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 39 , p. 612.**

BISHOP NEWTON, in his "Dissertations on the Prophecies," pp. 209, 210, has given three distinct lists, all proposed as the ten kingdoms, besides his own; viz, one by Mede, one by Sir Isaac Newton, and one by Bishop Chandler, endorsed by Bishop Lloyd. Mede's list he gives as follows:—

"Mr. Mede, whom a certain writer esteemed as a man divinely inspired for the interpretation of the prophecies, reckons up the ten kingdoms thus in the year A.D. 456, the year after Rome was sacked by Genseric, king of the Vandals: (1) The Britons; (2) the Saxons in Britain; (3) the Franks; (4) the Burgundians in France; (5)

the Visigoths in the south of France and part of Spain; (6) the Sueves and Alans in Galicia and Portugal; (7) the Vandals in Africa; (8) the Alemanes in Germany; (9) the Ostrogoths, whom the Longobards succeeded, in Pannonia, and afterward in Italy; (10) the Greeks in the residue of the empire."

There are two points in this list that are manifestly wrong: *First*, in naming the Britons. These could perhaps properly be named in A.D. 456, the date at which Mede makes his list, because then the Saxons had only been seven years on British soil. But in the end, the Saxons utterly swept away not only the power of the Britons, but the Britons themselves. Of the conquest of Britain, Green says:—

"With the victory of Deorum [A.D. 577] the conquest of the bulk of Britain was complete. . . . Britain had in the main become England. And within this new England a Teutonic society was settled on the wreck of Rome. So far as the conquest had yet gone, it was complete. *Not a Briton remained* as subject or slave on English ground. . . . It is this that distinguishes the conquest of Britain from that of the other provinces of Rome. The conquest of Gaul by the Franks, or that of Italy by the Lombards, proved little more than a forcible settlement of the one or other among tributary subjects who were destined in the long course of ages to absorb their conquerors. . . . But the English conquest of Britain up to the point which we have reached *was a sheer dispossession* of the people whom the English conquered. . . . So far as the English sword in these earlier days had reached, Britain had become England, a land, that is, not of Britons, but of Englishmen. Even if a few of the vanquished people lingered as slaves round the homesteads of their English conquerors, or a few of their household words mingled with the English tongue, doubtful exceptions, such as these, leave the main facts untouched. The key-note of the conquest was firmly struck. When the English invasion was stayed for a while by the civil wars of the invaders, *the Briton had disappeared from the greater part of the land which had been his own*; and the tongue, the religion, the laws of his English conquerors reigned without a break from Essex to Staffordshire, and from the British Channel to the Frith of Forth."—*History of the English People, chap. 2, par. 1-5.*

"Their conquest was not the settlement of armed conquerors amidst a subject people, but the *gradual expulsion*—it might almost seem *the total extirpation*—of the British and the Roman-British inhabitants. Christianity receded with the conquered Britons into the mountains of Wales, or toward the borders of Scotland, or took refuge among the peaceful and flourishing monasteries of Ireland. On the one hand, the ejection, more or less complete, of the native race, shows that the contest was fierce and long; the reoccupation of the island by paganism is a strong confirmation of the *complete*

*expulsion of the Britons.*"—*Milman's Latin Christianity, Book IV., chap. 3, par. 4.*

It is evident, therefore, that for this reason, if for no other, the Britons can not be counted as one of the ten kingdoms. But there is another important consideration that forbids it. The Britons were themselves a part of the body of the Roman Empire, which was conquered and broken up by the new peoples who came in. And if in Britain it were proper to count as a kingdom the conquered equally with the conquerors, then why not also in all the other parts of the empire, and, as Mr. Green shows, with more propriety. If we count the Britons *and* the Saxons in Britain, we may with equal propriety count the Gauls and the Franks in France, the Spanish and the Suevi in Spain, the Africans and the Vandals in Africa, and so on through the list, which would give *twenty* kingdom instead of ten! Plainly, Mr. Mede's insertion of the Britons is erroneous. The latter consideration, too, demonstrates the impropriety of counting any part of the old empire of Rome as one among the ten which were to arise. The prophetic word is marking the rise and fall of distinct nations; and when Rome has risen, run her course, and is brought to ruin by the rise of ten other kingdoms, it were unreasonable to count a part of that which is *fallen*, as one of those which were to *arise*. No, Rome had run her course, as had the empires before her; she had twice exhausted the catalogue of iniquities, and had even covered her iniquities with the profession of the gospel of righteousness; and in the ten kingdoms God raised up new peoples by whom He would fulfill his purposes.

*Secondly*, Mr. Mede's list is defective in another place. He counts as his tenth kingdom, "The Greeks in the residue of the empire." We have shown, and this agrees with Bishop Newton exactly, that the ten kingdoms must arise within the bounds of the Western Empire. But Mr. Mede fills the Western Empire with *nine* nations, and lumps all the rest of the empire in one. But in A.D. 456 there were divisions in the Eastern, or Greek, Empire as well as in the Western, and we cannot see by what right they can be summed up in one, any more than could those in the Western Empire, for the empire at that time still existed in the West as it did in the East. In short, two things are certain, either of which excludes Mede's tenth kingdom; (*a*) we can not rightly go outside of the limits of the Western Empire to count the ten kingdoms; and, (*b*) if we do go beyond those limits, we can not rightly lump together as one kingdom all that were in the bounds of the Eastern Empire, and that would give again considerably more than ten.

The others that are named in this list are in the main correct; one minor point may be mentioned, *i.e.*, "the Alemanes *in Germany.*" Simply to prevent misapprehension it may be remarked that if Mede meant, as he probably did, the Alemanni in what is *now* Germany, he is correct, for the Alemanni were the root of the present nation of Germany. That part of the present Germany which lies south of the river Main and the Moselle, including about half of Bavaria, is the country taken from the Roman Empire by the Alemanni. Of the Roman Empire it formed the provinces of Rhetia, and a part of Gaul. Of what was *then* Germany, none lay south of the Main or of the Danube. The Emperor William of Germany is directly descended from a prince of the Alemanni.

The next is Sir Isaac Newton's list, thus:—

"(1) The kingdom of the Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa; (2) the kingdom of the Suevans in Spain; (3) the kingdom of the Visigoths; (4) the kingdom of the Alans in Gallia; (5) the kingdom of the Burgundians; (6) the kingdom of the Franks; (7) the kingdom of the Britons; (8) the kingdom of the Huns; (9) the kingdom of the Lombards; (10) the kingdom of Ravenna."

We know not at what date Sir Isaac found these, only that, as he names "the kingdom [exarchate] of Ravenna," it must have been somewhere between A.D. 554 and 752, for that is the time of the existence of the exarchate of Ravenna. But that comes into history too late to be counted as one of the ten. They must all be seen before A.D. 493. He too names the Britons, but it is most likely that he uses that name for that of the Saxons, as England is even now called Britain, and the English sometimes Britons. His mention of the "Alans in Gallia [Gaul]" as one of the ten kingdoms, is more than their history will justify. It is true that of the Alani that crossed the Rhine in A.D. 406, with the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, a portion settled near Valence and Orleans in Gaul, while the body of the nation went on into Spain; but soon after the battle of Châlons "their separate national existence in Gaul was merged in that of the Visigoths;" [Encyc. Brit., art. "Alani"]; and when, in A.D. 508, the Visigoths were, by the Franks, driven from their Gallic possessions into Spain, (Gibbon, chap. 38, par. 13, 29), this body of the Alani were lost to history, if not to the world. The Huns likewise can not properly be numbered as one of the ten kingdoms; but as they are named in other lists we shall defer the notice of them till later.

Bishop Newton makes up his list in the "eighth century," which is more than *two hundred years too late*, and that of itself destroys its value as a correct list. Nevertheless we shall insert his list as well as the others; of course it is not altogether wrong, as it would be scarcely possible to name ten kingdoms at any time after the middle of the fifth century without including some of the right ones. He names them thus:—

"(1) Of the Senate of Rome, who revolted from the Greek emperors, and claimed and exerted the privilege of choosing a new Western emperor; (2) of the Greeks in Ravenna; (3) of the Lombards in Lombardy; (4) of the Huns in Hungary; (5) of the Alemanes in Germany; (6) of the Franks in France; (7) of the Burgundians in Burgundy; (8) of the Goths in Spain; (9) of the Britons; (10) of the Saxons in Britain."

This list, being drawn in the eighth century, is after the establishment of the Papacy, and, consequently, is after the rooting up of the three that were displaced that it might be set up. And as the prophecy plainly says that "three of the first horns"—three of the ten—should be "plucked up by the roots," it is certainly a vain effort to try to find *ten* after three of them have been taken entirely away. Therefore, so far is the Bishop's list from being of any real value as that of ten kingdoms, that it is worthless as such, because it is made at a time when the prophecy allows but seven besides the papacy. As for these seven, however, his list contains them all but one—the Suevi. Of the seven, he gives us the Lombards,

the Alemanni, the Franks, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and the Saxons.  
J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The Faith of Jesus" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 39 , pp. 614, 615.**

IN the matter of the duty of keeping the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus, it is not to be understood that the two can for a moment be separated. The commandments cannot be kept acceptably to God except by faith in Jesus Christ; and faith in Christ amounts to nothing—is dead—unless it is manifested, made perfect, in good works, and these good works consist in the keeping of the commandments of God. Christ kept the commandments of God: "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love." John 15:10. By his obedience it is that many must be made righteous. "For as by one man's [Adam's] disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one [Christ] shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5:19. But these are made righteous only by faith in Him, thus having "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." Rom. 3:22, 23.

All have sinned; and "sin is the transgression of the law." As all have thus transgressed the law, none can attain to righteousness by the law. There is righteousness in the law of God; in fact, the word says, "All thy commandments *are* righteousness;" but there is no righteousness there *for the transgressor*. When any one has transgressed the law, then if righteousness ever comes to one who has transgressed the law, it must come from some source besides the law. And as all in all the world, have transgressed the law, to whomsoever, therefore, in all the world, righteousness shall come, it must be from another source than from the law, and that source is Christ Jesus the Lord. This is the great argument of Rom. 3:19-31: "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*. 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."

Then the question comes in, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Notice, he has already said that although this righteousness of God is without the law, and by faith of Christ, yet it is "*witnessed by the law* and the prophets." It is a righteousness that accords with the law; it is a righteousness to which the law can bear witness; it is a righteous-

ness with which the law in its perfect righteousness can find no fault. And that is the righteousness of Christ he wrought out for us by his perfect obedience to the commandments of God, and of which we become partakers by faith in him; for "by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous." Thus we become the

children of God by faith in Christ; by faith in him the righteousness of the law is met in us, and we do not make void, but we establish the law of God, by faith in Christ.

This is further shown in Rom. 8:3-10: "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 the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." What was it that the law could not do? 1. The law was ordained to life (Rom. 7:10) but it could not give life, because all had sinned—transgressed the law—and the wages of sin is death. 2. The law was ordained to justification (Rom. 2: 13), but it will justify only the *doers of the law*, but of all the children of Adam there have been no doers of the law; all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. 3. The law was ordained to righteousness (Rom. 10:5), but it can count as righteous only the obedient, and all the world is guilty of disobedience before God. Therefore because of man's failure, because of his wrong doings, the law could not minister to him life, it could not justify him, it could not accept him as righteous. So far as man was concerned, the purpose of the law was entirely frustrated.

But mark, what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the sinful flesh, God sent His Son to do, in the likeness of sinful flesh. What the law could not do, Christ does. The law could not give life, because by transgression all had incurred its penalty of death; the law could not give justification, because by failure to do it all had brought themselves under its condemnation; the law could not give righteousness, because all had sinned. But instead of this death, Christ gives life; instead of this condemnation, Christ gives justification; instead of this sin, Christ gives righteousness. And for what? that henceforth the law might be despised by us? Nay, verily! But "that the righteousness of the law *might be fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, *but to fulfill*," said the holy Son of God. And so "Christ is the end [the purpose] of the law *for righteousness* to everyone that believeth." Rom. 10:4. For of God, Christ Jesus "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.

Again, says the Scriptures, "The law is spiritual," and "the carnal mind [the natural mind, the minding of the flesh] is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." Rom. 7:14; 8:7, 8. How then shall we please God? How shall we become subject to the law of God? The Saviour says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and we have just read in Romans that it is "sinful flesh," this is why they that are in the flesh can not please God. But the Saviour says, further, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Therefore it is certain that except we are born of the Spirit, we can not please God, we cannot be subject to the law of God, which is spiritual, and demands spiritual service. This, too, is precisely what the Saviour says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

We know that some will say that the kingdom of God here referred to is the kingdom of glory, and that the new birth, the birth of the Spirit, is not until the resurrection, and that then we enter the kingdom of God. But such a view is altogether wrong. Except a man be born of the Spirit, he must still remain in the flesh. But the Scripture says, "They that are in the flesh can not please God." And the man who does not please God will never see the kingdom of God, whether it be the kingdom of grace or of glory. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." The kingdom of God, whether of grace or of glory, is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Rom. 14:17. Except a man be born again, he can not see nor enter into the righteousness of God; he can not see nor enter into the peace of God, which passes all understanding; and except he be born of the Spirit of God, *how can he* see, or enter into, that "joy in the Holy Ghost"? Except a man be born again—born of the Spirit—before he dies, he will never see the resurrection unto life. This is shown in Rom. 8:11. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you. It is certain, therefore, that except the Spirit of Christ dwells in us, we can not be raised from the dead to life. But except His Spirit dwells in us, we are yet in the flesh. And if we are in the flesh, we can not please God. And if we do not please God, we can never see the kingdom of God, either here or hereafter.

Again, it is by birth that we are children of the first Adam; and if we shall ever be children of the last Adam, it must be by a new birth. The first Adam was natural, and we are his children by natural birth; the last Adam is spiritual, and if we become His children, it must be by spiritual birth. The first Adam was of the earth, earthy, and we are his children by an earthly birth; the second Adam is the Lord from Heaven, from above, and if we are to be his children it must be by a heavenly birth, a birth from above. For "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." The earthy is "natural" of the flesh, but "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" "because they are spiritually discerned," and "they that are in the flesh can not please God." Such is the birthright, and all the birthright, that we receive from the first Adam. But "as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly." The heavenly is spiritual; he is "a life-giving Spirit;" and the spiritual man receives the things of the Spirit of God, because they are spiritually discerned; he can please God because he is not in the flesh, but in the Spirit; for the Spirit of God dwells in him; he is, and can be, subject to the law of God, because the carnal mind is destroyed, and he has the mind of Christ, the heavenly. Such is the birthright of the second Adam, the one from above. And all the privileges, the blessings, and the joys of this birthright are ours when we are born from above. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born from above." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born from above, he can not see the kingdom of God." With the argument of this paragraph, please study 1 Cor. 15:45-48; John 3:3-8; 1 Cor. 3:11-16; Rom. 8:5-10.

Thus in briefest outline we have drawn a sketch of the faith of Jesus which must be kept, and by means of which alone the commandments of God can be

kept. He who keeps this will live the life of the just, as it is written, "The just shall live by faith." Then can he say with the great 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. And when his course is finished, he can say with both the great apostle and the beloved disciples, "I have fought a good fight [it is the fight of faith, 1 Tim. 6:12], . . . I have kept the faith." "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 2 Tim. 4:7; 1 John 5:4.

We thank God for the message which calls upon all men to "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

J.

**October 14, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40 , p. 628.**

(Continued.)

BISHOP CHANDLER'S list, professedly made up from Machiavelli's "History of Florence," is as follows:—

"(1) The Ostrogoths in Músia; (2) the Visigoths in Pannonia; (3) the Sueves and Alans in Gascoigne and Spain; (4) the Vandals in Africa; (5) the Franks in France; (6) the Burgundians in Burgundy; (7) the Heruli and Turingi in Italy; (8) the Saxons and Angles in Britain; (9) the Huns in Hungary; (10) the Lombards, at first upon the Danube, afterward in Italy."

So far as the *names* are concerned this list is correct, with the exception of the Huns. As this list is the one which has been most generally accepted, it will be necessary to give quite fully to give the reasons which have compelled us to reject the Huns as one of the ten. In justification we submit the following *facts*: 1. It is a fact that the only part of what is now Hungary that was ever within the Western empire, is that portion that lies west of the Danube, and which formed part of the province of Pannonia. 2. It is a fact that the people who formed what is now the kingdom of Hungary, and from whom that country took its name of *Hungary*, never appeared in Europe till A.D. 884, and in 889 A.D. overran the country which bears their name. 3. It is a fact that they were not Huns, but *Magyars* "(Ovyypoi, Ugri, Wengri, Ungri, Ungari, Hungari)." See Encyc. Brit., art. "Hungary," History; Gibbon, chap. 55, par. 4-8; Hallam, Middle Ages, chap. 1, part 1, sec. 12. Therefore, to name the "Huns in Hungary," as though Hungary received its name from the Huns, and as though it were a continuation of the kingdom of the Huns, is decidedly wrong.

This is confirmed by additional facts. 1. It is a fact that the true Huns—the Huns of Attila—first entered the province of Pannonia about A.D. 380; that Pannonia was abandoned to them by the patrician Etius about A.D. 424, and was

confirmed to them by a treaty with Theodosius II about A.D. 430, that Attila, with his brother Bleda, succeeded his uncle Rugilas in the rule of the Huns in A.D. 433, and died in A.D. 453. 2. It is a fact that shortly after the death of Attila the power of the Huns was broken to pieces. 3. It is a fact that from the battle of Netad onward, the Huns never possessed any portion of territory within the Western Empire. 4. And it is a fact that the empire, the kingdom, and the nation of the Huns of Attila were "extinguished." Gibbon states in a single paragraph, these last three facts; he says:—

"The revolution which *subverted the empire of the Huns* established the fame of Attila, whose genius alone had sustained the huge and disjointed fabric. . . . Ellac, the eldest son of Attila, lost his life and crown in the memorable battle of Netad; his early valor had raised him to the throne of the Acatzires, a Scythian people, whom he subdued; and his father, who loved the superior merit, would have envied the death, of Ellac. His brother, Dengisich, with an army of Huns, still formidable in their flight and ruin, maintained his ground above fifteen years on the banks of the Danube. *The palace of Attila*, with the old country of Dacia, from the Carpathian Hills to the Euxine, *became the seat of a new power* which was erected by Ardaric, king of the Gepide. *The Pannonian conquests*, from Vienna to Sirmium *were occupied by the Ostrogoths*; and the settlements of the tribes, who had so bravely asserted their native freedom, were irregularly distributed according to the measure of their respective strength. Surrounded and oppressed by the multitude of his father's slaves, *the kingdom of Dengisich was confined to the circle of his wagons*; his desperate courage urged him to invade the Eastern Empire, he fell in battle, and his head, ignominiously exposed in the hippodrome, exhibited a grateful spectacle to the people of Constantinople. "Attila had fondly or superstitiously believed that Irnac, the youngest of his sons, was destined to perpetuate the glories of his race. The character of that prince, who attempted to moderate the rashness of his brother Dengisich, was more suitable to the declining condition of the Huns; and Irnac with his subject hordes retired into the heart of the Lesser Scythia. [The Lesser Scythia—now the Dobrudscha—was that little piece of country lying between the Black Sea and the Danube, along the course of that river where it flows northward, near its mouth. It contains about 2,900 square miles.] They were soon overwhelmed by a torrent of new barbarians, who followed the same road which their own ancestors had formerly discovered. The *Geougen*, or Avars, whose residence is assigned by the Greek writers to the shores of the ocean, impelled the adjacent tribes; till at length the Igours of the North, issuing from the cold Siberian regions which produce the most valuable furs, spread themselves over the desert as far as the Borysthenes [Dnieper] and the Caspian gates; *and finally extinguished the empire of the Huns.*"—*Decline and Fall, chap. 35, par. 16.*

The "Encyclopaedia Britannica" tells of the death of Attila in A.D. 453, and then says:—

"*Almost immediately afterward, the empire* he had amassed, rather than consolidated, *fell to pieces*. His too numerous sons began to quarrel about their inheritance, while Ardaric, the king of the Gepide, was placing himself at the head of a general revolt of

the dependent nations. The inevitable struggle came to a crisis near the river Netad in Pannonia, in a battle in which 30,000 of the Huns and their confederates, including Ellak, Attila's eldest son, were slain. *The nation*, thus broken, *rapidly dispersed*; one horde settled under Roman protection in Little Scythia (the Dobrudscha), others in Dacia Ripensis (on the confines of Servia and Bulgaria) or on the southern borders of Pannonia. *The main body*, however, appear to have *resumed the position on the steppes of the river Ural*, which they had left less than a century before."—Article "Huns."

"Chambers's Cyclopaedia" says:—

"With the death of Attila the power of the Huns *was broken in pieces*. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded to him; but there was strife everywhere among the several nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns especially never regained their power."

Adams's "Historical Chart" says:—

"The fall of the empire of the Huns begins with the death of Attila, A.D. 453. Their power was broken, and *the nation was soon extinguished*."

The very latest authority on the subject says:—

"Whilst the Magyars continued to dwell quietly along the Don, the Huns proceeded with an immense army, each tribe contributing ten thousand men, against western Europe, conquering and rendering tributary, in the course of their wanderings, numerous nations, and finally settled on the banks of the Theiss and Danube. Later on, however, in the middle of the fifth century, when the world-renowned Attila, 'the scourge of God,' came into power, the Huns carried their victorious arms over a great part of the western world. The immense empire, however, which had been founded by King Attila, was destined to be but of short duration after the death of its founder. His sons Aladar and Csaba, in their contention for the inheritance, resorted to arms. The war ended with *the utter destruction of the nation*." "Whilst the sons of Attila were contending with each other for the possession of the empire, the Germanic populations fell upon the divided Huns, and drove them back to the Black Sea."

"All of the followers of Aladar perished; Csaba, however, succeeded in escaping from the destroying arms of the neighboring nations, who had fallen on the quarreling brothers, with about fifteen thousand men, to the territories of the Greek Empire. . . . *He returned afterward with the remainder of his people to the home of his ancestors, on the banks of the Don*, where, up to the time of his death, he never tired of inciting the Magyars to emigrate to Pannonia and to revenge themselves on their enemies by reconquering the empire of Attila."

"The Gepide remained now the masters of the country east of the Danube, whilst the Ostrogoths occupied the ancient Roman province. The latter, however, under the lead of their king, Theodoric, migrated in a body to Italy, crossing the Alps, and founded there, on the ruins of the Roman Empire, a Gothic kingdom. *The Gepide remained, in consequence, the sole ruling people in Hungary.*"—*The Story of Hungary, chap. 3, par. 5, 6; chap. 2, par. 5, 6.*

[This book was written by Arminius Vambery, Professor at the University of Buda Pesth the capital of Hungary, and was printed August, 1886, by Putnam's Sons, New York].

The Gepide continued to be the sole ruling people in Hungary for about one hundred years, until A.D. 566, when that nation was obliterated by the united powers of the Lombards and the Avars. The Avars, who are sometimes called Huns, first heard of the Roman Empire in A.D. 558, and were first seen by Europeans when an embassy came from them to Constantinople, in the reign of Justinian, that same year. After the destruction of the Gepide, the Lombards gave up all their Pannonian possessions to the Avars, A.D. 567, and went to Italy. The Avars inhabited and ruled the country until the invasion of the Magyars, A.D. 889, who still inhabit the country which from them bears the name of Hungary. See *Decline and Fall*, chap. 42, par. 6; chap. 45, par. 2-4.

By these evidences it is certain that after the battle of the Netad—A.D. 453,—there was never within the Western Empire a vestige of the power known to history as that of the Huns. Therefore they certainly cannot rightfully be counted among the ten kingdoms. And as the Magyars who formed the kingdom of Hungary never appeared in history till they entered Europe in A.D. 884, nor did they ever enter the country that bears their name till A.D. 889, it is literally impossible that they could be counted one of the ten kingdoms which the prophecy demands should be in existence at least 396 years before; that is, in A.D. 493.

J.

*(Concluded next week.)*

**October 21, 1886**

**"The Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40 , pp. 631, 632.**

"IF any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5:17. As a new creature he lives a new life, a life of faith. "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." But it is a faith that works; for without works faith is dead. "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? 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*." James 2:14-18.

In Christ nothing avails but a new creation; he lives by faith; it is a faith that works, and the work is the keeping of the commandments of God. Thus saith the Scripture:—

1. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but *a new creature*." Gal. 6:15.

2. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh by love*." Gal. 5:6.

3. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but *the keeping of the commandments of God*." 1 Cor. 7:19.

Again, it is "faith which worketh by love," that avails; and "this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments." 1 John 5:3. And "love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:10. Therefore, in Christ Jesus the faith that avails is the faith that keeps the commandments of God, the faith that fulfills the law of God.

Once more: "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:10. "Created in Christ Jesus," is to be made a "new creature" in Christ Jesus. But we are created in him "unto good works," and these good works are those which God hath *before* ordained that we should walk in them. That is to say, God before ordained good works in which we should walk. But we have not walked in them. Now He creates us anew in Christ, so that we may walk in these good works in which before we failed to walk. These good works are the commandments, the law, of God. These commandments express the whole duty of man, but man has failed to do his duty; "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." But now Christ is manifested to take away our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. 5:21. We are made new creatures in Him, that in Him and by Him we may perform acceptable service, and do the duty, keep the commandments of God, which before we failed to do, and which, out of Christ, all must ever fail to do. For He Himself said, "Without me ye can do nothing." This is according to that which we have before shown: "What the law could not do," "God sending His own Son" did, "that the righteousness of the law *might be fulfilled in us*, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

Therefore, when the Third Angel's Message calls, as it now does call, upon all men to "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," it simply calls all men to the performance of the whole duty of man—as he now exists. And when, under this message, we urge men to keep the commandments of God strictly according to the letter, we mean that they must keep these commandments strictly according to the Spirit, too. When we press upon all the obligation of keeping the commandments of God, it is always the obligation of keeping them the only way in which they can be kept, that is, by faith of Jesus Christ; it is always the commandments of God *and the faith of Jesus*; it is that all must be made perfect by His perfect righteousness; and that all our righteousness must be the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, and that righteousness witnessed by the law and the prophets.

This is strictly according to the teaching of Christ and the apostles. When the young man came to Jesus, asking, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Jesus answered, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," and cited the second table of the ten commandments. The young man replied: "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt *be perfect*, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come, follow me." As the record says that Jesus "looking upon him loved him," and as Jesus asked him to follow him, it is evident that the young man was a person of good intentions and honesty of purpose, and he undoubtedly supposed that he had really kept the commandments. But it is not our own estimate that is the standard of what constitutes obedience to the law; it is God's estimate that is the standard. We might conform so strictly to the law that, according to our own estimate, we could see no point of failure; yet when our actions should be measured by God's estimate, weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, we should be found utterly wanting.

It is not according as we see, but according as God sees, that the question of our keeping the commandments of God is to be decided. And as God sees it, it has been recorded; "All have sinned, *and come short* of the glory of God." No doubt the young man, when measured by his own standard, stood at the full stature of moral character. But God's standard declares that he had "come short." Even granting all the righteousness that the young man might claim by the keeping of the commandments alone, and there are yet many like him, yet to him and to all who, like him, expect righteousness by the law, the word of Christ is, "One thing thou lackest yet." All such lack the justifying blood, they lack the sanctifying power of the perfect obedience of the Son of God. In short, they lack the faith of Jesus, and so must ever come short until, by accepting Christ, they attain to the righteousness of God which is by faith. It is in Christ alone that man can reach the full stature of moral character in the sight of God. "Till we all come in the unity of *the faith*, and of the *knowledge of the Son of God*, unto a perfect man, unto *the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ*." Eph. 4:13. However hard a man may strive for righteousness by keeping the law, yet, until he accepts Christ and finds in Him the righteousness which is of God by faith, against him the word will ever stand, thou hast "come short of the glory of God," "one thing thou lackest yet." So we see then that

632

Jesus taught that those who would be His disciples must keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

Again, in His sermon on the mount, Jesus said, "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: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven. 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. 5:19, 20. Happily, we have the record of the best Pharisee that ever lived, and in his experience we have the inspired illustration of these words of Jesus.

Says Paul of himself, "As touching the law, a *Pharisee*; . . . touching *the righteousness* which is in the law, *blameless*." Yet this was not enough; for as he says in another place, "I know nothing against myself; yet am I not hereby justified; but He that judgeth me is the Lord." 1 Cor. 4:4. So even though he might, so far as he could see, be blameless, yet that was not proof that he was justified; for it is God who judges; it is God's standard of righteousness, and not our own, that we must meet, to be justified; and that standard is the righteousness of Christ, to which we can attain only by faith. So says Paul, "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: . . . and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, *but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*." Phil. 3:7-9. This is a righteousness which he had not when he was a Pharisee. This, then, is the righteousness which exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees; and this righteousness of faith we must have while *doing* and *teaching* the commandments. In his sermon on the mount, therefore, Christ positively taught the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

James says, "My brethren, have not *the faith of* our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the Lord of glory, *with respect of persons*. . . . If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [margin, 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. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. . . . What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? . . . 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." Thus James shows that the faith of Jesus is shown by works, and that these works are the doing of the law of God. He declares that we are not to have the faith of Jesus with respect of persons; and respect of persons he declares to be sin, the transgression of the law. We are not to have the faith of Jesus, therefore, with the conscious breaking of the commandments of God, *even in a single point*. In other words, James teaches as strongly as it is possible to teach, that those who have the faith of Jesus keep the commandments of God *and* the faith of Jesus.

John says, "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ* is born of God; and every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the children of God, when we *love God*, and *keep his commandments*. For this *is* the love of God, *that we keep his commandments*; and his commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith*. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that *believeth that Jesus is the Son of God*?" 1 John 5:1-5. The beloved disciple therefore also teaches that

Christianity, the love of God, is the keeping of the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

We have not the space and time would fail us to give all the scriptures even in the New Testament which teach the same thing. We shall close by simply saying that Christ said, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed are they that *do HIS [God's] commandments*, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:13, 14. He also said, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life." Christ said, "If thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*;" he also said, "*He that believeth on the Son* hath everlasting life." The Third Angel's Message, the last message from God that the world will ever hear, embodies in a single sentence these sayings of Christ: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." In the Third Angel's Message is embodied the very gospel of Christ, wherein "is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Rom. 1:16, 17. When the Third Angel's Message shall be finished, then the mystery of God—the gospel—shall be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets. And those who truly obey the Third Angel's Message will get the victory over the beast and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and will, at the last, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God; and without fault before the throne of God; and it all will be through "him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Unto him be glory and dominion forever and ever. J.

### **"How Sin Is Condemned" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 40 , p. 633.**

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This article has no initials tagged to it. However, it appears in the editorial columns. Both EJW and ATJ were co-editors of the Signs for this date. It is attributable to ATJ or EJW.]

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Congregationalist* writes to that paper as follows:—

"There is one thing which I cannot comprehend, and that is, why, if the New Departure doctrine of probation after this life is not true, it is not more distinctly condemned in the Scriptures."

We don't propose to make to the comment on the doctrine of future probation, which many professed Christians have recently borrowed from the Papacy and Paganism, but to clear up the very common difficulty, which is implied in the above quotation. That is, the plea that a thing is our wrong unless the Bible distinctly names that thing in terms of condemnation. This is a grave error. The Bible condemns error in two ways. First, by prohibiting it in express terms. By this means we know that it is wrong to steal, to lie, break the Sabbath, etc. Second, by inculcating something which is directly the opposite of the objectionable thing. One of these ways is really no stronger way of condemning error than the other. If the Bible tells us that a certain thing is true, it by that means just this forcibly

tells us that everything which in any way differs from the thing commended is wrong.

Thus the Bible does not say in express terms that it is wrong to keep the first day of the week; but it plainly says: "Six days shalt thou labor and all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work." The command to keep the Sabbath is a prohibition against keeping in the other day. And so we might go through the whole list. One thing, however will be notice by everyone who was carefully and conscientiously studies the Bible, and that is, that in reality both methods of teaching are used on almost every subject. While by the commendation of good all evil is condemned, it is a fact that there is no form of evil that is not in some place in the Bible distinctly condemned.

**October 28, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 41 , pp. 644, 645.**

*(Concluded).*

BUT some may ask, Does not Gibbon name Attila, as of equal importance with Alaric and Genseric, in the ruin of the Roman Empire? We answer, Yes, and Gibbon therein states the exact truth. Then it may be asked, Why not allow the Huns a place among the ten kingdoms equally with the Visigoths and the Vandals? We reply that the place of the Visigoths and among the ten kingdoms does not depend upon Alaric and Genseric alone. Suppose that at the death of Alaric the nation of the Visigoths had left the Western Empire, and had never entered its territories again, and in a few years had ceased to have any distinct existence as a nation, who would think for an instant of counting them as one of the ten kingdoms of the Western Empire. No one, assuredly. But this is precisely the case of the Huns, then by what right ought they to be counted as one? Plainly by no right. Attila, Alaric, and Genseric were of equal note in hastening the ruin of the Roman Empire, and they have an important place in prophecy, but that place is not in the prophecy of Daniel, it is in Rev. 8:7-11. Again it might be asked, Did not the Huns do as much as any other people in weakening the empire and hastening its downfall? We answer, Yes. Then why may they not be counted for that reason? Because that is not reason enough. The prophecy says, "The kingdom [Rome] shall be *divided*," and that into ten distinct kingdoms. Therefore the question is not, Did the Huns, or any others, *weaken* the empire? but, Did they *decide* it? Did they divide from the Western Empire any portion of its territory and establish there a kingdom that remained? The only answer that history gives is a decided, No. Then it is certain that the Huns cannot of right have any place among the ten kingdoms.

The evidence and the authorities which we have now given would, doubtless, be considered by all as sufficient to justify us in refusing to the Huns a place in the list of the ten kingdoms. But these are not all that we have to offer. In addition

to these we have the positive evidence of Machiavelli, himself, from whom Bishop Chandler is said to have made his list. From a casual reading some have supposed that Machiavelli himself named the ten kingdoms as such. This, however, is not the case, as appears from Bishop Newton's words. He says: "Machiavel, *Little thinking what he was doing* (as Bishop Chandler observes), hath given us their names." It is plain, therefore, that the responsibility for Bishop Chandler's list lies not with Machiavelli, but with Bishop Chandler himself. Machiavelli was a Florentine, who lived A.D. 1469-1527. He wrote a history of Florence, and in the first two chapters he very briefly sketched the barbarian invasions, and the fall of the Western Empire, in which he, simply as a matter of history, gave the names of the nations which invaded the empire.

Now the question is, Was there in Machiavelli's history sufficient evidence to justify Bishop Chandler in setting down the Huns as one of the ten kingdoms that arose on the fall of Western Rome? We shall here insert all that Machiavelli says directly about the Huns, and it will be seen that it answers this question in the negative. After the mentioning the inroads of the Visigoths, Burgundians, Alani, Suevi, Vandals, and Franks, he says:—

"Thus the Vandals ruled Africa; the Alans and Visigoths, Spain; while the Franks and Burgundians not only took Gaul, but each gave their name to the part they occupied; hence one is called France, the other, Burgundy. The good fortune of these brought fresh peoples to the destruction of the empire, one of which, the Huns, occupied the province of Pannonia, situated upon the nearer [western] shore of the Danube, and which, from their name, is still called Hungary.

"The Huns, who were said to have occupied Pannonia, joining with other nations, as the Zepidi, Eruli, Turingi, and Ostro, or Eastern, Goths, moved in search of new countries, and, not being able to enter France, which was defended by the forces of the barbarians, came into Italy under Attila their king. . . . Attila, having entered Italy, laid siege to Aquileia, where he remained without any obstacle for two years, wasting the country and dispersing the inhabitants. . . . After the taking and ruin of Aquileia, he directed his course toward Rome, from the destruction of which he abstained at the entreaty of the pontiff, his respect for whom was so great that he left Italy and retired into Austria, where he died. After the death of Attila, Velamir, king of the Ostrogoths, and the heads of the other nations, took arms against his sons, Henry and Uric, *slew the one, and compelled the other with his Huns to repass the Danube, and return to their country*; whilst the Ostrogoths and Zepidi established themselves in Pannonia, and the Eruli and the Turingi upon the farther [eastern] banks of the Danube.

"After the deaths of many emperors, the Empire of Constantinople devolved upon Zeno, and that of Rome upon Orestes and Augustulus his son. . . . Whilst they were designing to hold by force what they had gained by treachery, the Eruli and

Turingi, who after the death of Attila, as before remarked, had established themselves upon the farther bank of the Danube, united in a league under Odoacer, their general. In the districts which they left unoccupied, the Longobards or Lombards, also a northern people, entered, led by Gondogo their king. Odoacer conquered and slew Orestes near Pavia; but Augustulus escaped. After this victory, that Rome might with her change of power also change her title, Odoacer, instead of using the imperial name, caused himself to be declared king of Rome."—*Chap. 1, par. 6, 7.*

The bare facts here stated by Machiavelli are clearly against the propriety of counting the Huns among the ten kingdoms. He says, (1) that the Huns occupied *Pannonia*, on the western bank of the Danube; (2) that after the death of Attila, the Ostrogoths and other nations "compelled Uric with his Huns to repass the Danube and return to their country;" (3) that the Ostrogoths and Gepidae established themselves in Pannonia; (4) that the Heruli and Turingi occupied the eastern bank of the Danube; (5) that when these latter went to Italy, they left their country *unoccupied*; (6) and then it was occupied by the Lombards.

So by this word, we have the Ostrogoths, the Gepidae, the Heruli, the Turingi, and the Lombards occupying all of Pannonia and both banks of the Danube,—that is, all the country that had been occupied by the Huns, and that is now Hungary,—and the Huns returned to their own country on the shores of the Black Sea and in the country of the Volga and the Don. It is true that he says the country on the western shore of the Danube "from their name is still called Hungary;" but, even granting the correctness of this statement, his whole narrative shows that it is so called only from their name and not from their continued occupation; for in another place, when telling of the entrance of the Avars, A.D. 566, whom he calls Huns, he repeats the statement that the Huns after the death of Attila "returned to their country." It appears, however, from all the other authorities which we have cited, that in the matter of the *name* of Hungary, Machiavelli is mistaken, that name coming from the Magyars, and not from the Huns.

Then where, in Machiavelli's history, or within the bounds of the Roman Empire, did Bishop Chandler find a kingdom of the Huns?—He did not find them there at all, for Machiavelli himself, in harmony with every other authority on the subject, did not place them there. This also is confirmed by Machiavelli:—

"At this time [the reign of Odoacer, A.D. 476] the ancient Roman Empire was governed by the following princes: Zeno, reigning in Constantinople, commanded the whole of the Eastern Empire; the Ostrogoths ruled Moesia and Pannonia; the Visigoths, Suevi, and Alans held Gascony and Spain; the Vandals, Africa; the Franks and Burgundians, France; and the Eruli and Turingi, Italy. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths had descended to Theodoric, nephew of Velamir. . . . Leaving his friends the Zepidi in Pannonia, Theodoric marched into Italy, slew Odoacer and his son, and . . . established his court at Ravenna, and, like Odoacer, took the title of king of Italy. . . . The Lombards, as was said before, occupied those places

upon the Danube which had been vacated by the Eruli and Turingi when Odoacer their king led them into Italy."—*Chap. 2, par. 1, 10.*

Here, then, is Machiavelli's own list of the princes and peoples who ruled in both the Eastern and the Western Empire between A.D. 476 and 493, and the Huns are not named at all. By what right, then, did Bishop Chandler number the Huns as one of the ten kingdoms, and cite Machiavelli as authority for it?—By no right whatever. The good Bishop made a mistake, that is all. And solely on the authority of his name, the mistake has been perpetuated now these one hundred and fifty-eight years.

To these kingdoms as named by Bishop Chandler, Bishop Lloyd affixed certain figures as marking the date of their rise. We quote Bishop Newton's account of it. He says:—

"That excellent chronologer, Bishop Lloyd, exhibits the following list of the ten kingdoms with the time of their rise: (1) Huns, about A.D. 356; (2) Ostrogoths, 377; (3) Visigoths, 378; (4) Franks, 407; (5) Vandals, 407; (6) Sueves and Alans, 497; (7) Burgundians, 407; (8) Herules and Rugians, 476; (9) Saxons, 476; (10) Longobards began to reign in Hungary A.D. 526, and were seated in the northern parts of Germany about the year 483."

Why Bishop Lloyd should be given the title of "that excellent chronologer," we can not imagine; for not more than half his dates are correct. He dates the Huns "about A.D. 356," whereas about A.D. 356 they were away in the depths of Scythia above the Caspian Sea; they did not cross the Volga till about A.D. 375-375; and their first appearance to the eyes of the Romans was in A.D. 376. (Gibbon, chap. 26, par. 12, 13.)

He dates the Ostrogoths A.D. 377. If that was intended to be the date when Alatheus and Saphrax, with their army, crossed the Danube, it is well enough, but in that case, his dating the Visigoths in A.D. 378 is wrong, because they crossed the Danube a year *before*, instead of a year after, the Ostrogoths. Besides this, of the Ostrogoths who crossed the Danube in A.D. 377, the last remains were slain January 3, A. D. 401, while trying, under the leadership of Gainas, to make their way back into the countries beyond the Danube [Gibbon, chap. 26, par. 31, 32 compared with 32:5-7), and therefore are not the Ostrogoths at all who formed one of the ten kingdoms; those being the main body of the nation who submitted to the Huns in A.D. 376, and regained their independence at the battle of the Netad, A.D. 453. (Id., chap. 19, par. 20, with Note, and 38:3.)

He dates the rise of the Saxons A.D. 476, when the fact is that they entered Britain, in A.D. 449, and never left it. [Id., chap. 31, par. 41, 42; 38:33; Green's England, chap. 1, par. 17; Knight's England, chap. 5, par. 6; Mosheim's Church History, Fifth Cent., part 1,

645

chap. 2, sec. 3, par. 3; Encyc. Brit., England, History, par. 15).

He names the Lombards as "in the northern parts of Germany about" A.D. 483, and says that they began to reign in Hungary A.D. 526. Whereas they were in the northern parts of Germany "about the time of Augustus and Trajan," (Gibbon, chap. 42, par. 2), were in Pannonia A.D. 453, and settled on the banks of the Danube after the battle of the Netad the same year. In the date A.D.

526 he is not so far wrong; as soon after that they had gained possession of all Noricum and Pannonia.

"Lyman's Historical Chart" gives the ten kingdoms as follows:—

"Vandals, Alani, Suevi, Visigoths, Burgundians, Franks, Saxons, Heruli Ostrogoths, Lombards."

With the exception of the Alani, this is correct. But this same chart says of them in A.D. 418, "The Goths nearly exterminated them," and of those who escaped after the death of their king, Gibbon says:—

"The remains of those Scythian wanderers who escaped from the field, instead of choosing a new leader, humbly sought a refuge under the standard of the Vandals, *with whom they were ever afterward confounded.*"—*Chap. 31, par. 38.*

As this was only twelve years after they crossed the Rhine, it is certain that the Alani are not entitled to a place among the ten kingdoms.

After viewing thus the lists of the ten kingdoms as named by others, we repeat, and we do it with the stronger assurance, that the ten nations named by Gibbon as the ones "who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire," are the ones, and the only ones, that form the ten kingdoms of the prophecy of Daniel 2:41-43, and 7:7, 8, 19, 24.

For convenience of the reader we shall draw out here in tabulated form, the ten kingdoms as named by Gibbon, with the dates of their entering the Western Empire, the place of settlement, and the historical references by which names, dates, and places can be verified.

ALEMANNI, A.D. 351, Swabia, Alsace, and Lorraine. (Gibbon, chap. 10, par. 26; 12:20; 19:20; 26:5; 49:22.)

FRANKS, A.D. 351, N.E. Gaul. (Id., chap. 19, par. 20; 36:5.)

BURGUNDIANS, December 31, A.D. 406 (Id., chap. 30, par. 17); in Burgundy A.D. 420 (Id., chap. 31, par. 39).

VANDALS, December 31, A.D. 406 (Id., chap. 36, par. 17); in Spain, A.D. 409 (chap. 31, par. 36); in Africa, May, A.D. 429 (chap. 33, par. 35).

SUEVI, December 31, A.D. 406 (Id., chap. 30, par. 17); in Spain, A.D. 409 (chap. 31, par. 36).

VISIGOTHS, A.D. 408 (Id., chap. 31, par. 2, 14), in S. W. Gaul, A.D. 419 (chap. 31, par. 39); in Spain, A.D. 467 (chap. 36, par. 22; 38:2; 2:29).

SAXONS, A.D. 449, Britain. (Id., chap. 31, par. 41, 42; 38:33; Green's England, chap. 1, par. 17; Knight's England, chap. 5, par. 6.)

OSTROGOTHS, A.D. 453, in Pannonia (Gibbon, chap. 35, par. 16); in Italy A.D. 489, final conquest A.D. 493 (chap. 39, par. 7, 8).

LOMBARDS, A.D. 453 in Pannonia and Noricum, banks of Danube (Weber's Universal History, sec, 180; Gibbon, chap. 42, par. 2; Encyc. Brit., art. "Lombards"); in Lombardy, A.D. 567-8 (Gibbon, chap. 45, par. 5-7; Machiavelli, History of Florence, chap. 1, 2).

HERULI, A.D. 475-6 in Italy (Gibbon, chap. 36, par. 28-33).

J.

**"The Enemy of the Workingman" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 41 , pp. 646, 647.**

THE following is the greater part of an editorial of the San Francisco *Chronicle*, September 19, 1886, on "Errors of the Labor Party." It shows how absolutely a man sells himself into slavery, and pledges himself, his wife, and his children, to want, when he joins one of those unions.

"The decision of the masons, plasterers, and carpenters at Charleston to raise wages 50 cents to \$1.00 a day in consequence of the increased demand for labor resulting from the earthquake, illustrates the tendency of unions to commit errors of policy when they are not under intelligent guidance. Of course the house owners of Charleston are less able than ever to pay increased wages to labor, and thus the result of the ill-advised proceeding of the unions will be twofold—first, it will check the repairs of injured buildings, and thus retard the recovery of the city and protract the period of enforced idleness among classes whose employment depends on a resumption of business; and secondly, it will attract to Charleston an influx of masons, plasterers, and carpenters from other States, and in a little while the supply of labor will be in excess of the demand and wages will fall down lower than they were before the earthquake. Instead of helping the classes whom the policy of the unions was designed to serve, it cannot but injure them.

"Unions must be guided by broad, liberal, far-seeing principles of policy, or they will prove a curse instead of a blessing. It is a serious matter for a workman who has a wife and children dependent on him to part with the control of his own actions in favor of a body in which he is a mere unit. If there is any danger that the plan of action which he binds himself to pursue is going to be dictated to him by a party of men who are not real workingmen, but are mere politicians and stump speakers—who have no regular job to lose, and who calculate to make their living as agitators, by levying assessments on men who do work, then he had far better not join any union at all. It is on him and not on the union that the responsibility of feeding his wife and children rests. It is nothing to the union if they starve. It ought to be a good deal to him.

"There is a man walking the streets of San Francisco to-day who until lately had a steady job in one of the largest manufacturing establishments in this city. He had held his job for thirteen years.

647

He was a good, steady workman; his employers thought well of him and paid him good wages. One day there arose a dispute between these employers and a union of which he was a member, and the union ordered him out. He had no quarrel with his bosses, no complaint to make, no grievance to urge; but he had bound himself

to obey the orders of his union, and when it ordered him out he laid down his tools and out he went. The controversy lasted some weeks. When it was finally adjusted the workman went back and asked for his old job. He was told that his place had been filled by a man from the East. The firm had contracts which they were bound to fulfill under heavy penalty, and when their old hands deserted them they sent East and got new men. They could not now discharge these to make room for hands that had left them of their own free will. So this man—an honest, sober, industrious, competent workman—walks the streets of San Francisco to-day with nothing to do. How his family lives perhaps the neighbors could tell.

"Surely cases of this kind—and we are told that the workman in question is one of 150 in the same calling who are out of a job—ought to lead unions and assemblies of labor to pause before they order men out on strike on trivial grounds, or in the vain pursuit of an object which cannot be attained. It is a grand thing, no doubt, to be revenged upon a grasping employer by leaving him without a working force just when he needs it the most to fulfill his contracts. But revenge is a luxury in which few can afford to indulge. It generally costs more than it yields. If the employer needs his hands to fulfill his contracts, the workman needs his employer to feed his family. And this country is getting to be so full of people that it is a good deal easier to find a new workman than a new employer. An advertisement in a New York or a Chicago paper will cause workmen to spring up by the thousand, eager for steady work and ready to take the place of strikers without the smallest regard for unions or Knights of Labor. Where the effect of a strike is merely to transfer a steady job from a San Franciscan to an Eastern man, how is the former benefited?

"The great industrial machine is so complicated that it cannot be trifled with without serious consequences. Results flow from rash acts which their authors did not for a moment foresee. The railway hands on the Gould system of railways felt sure that they were going to dictate terms to the managers of the roads, or to stop their running—but what is the result? The roads are running as usual, and Sedalia and East St. Louis are full of hungry children of railway hands out of a job. Looking back over the causes which produced these results, is it not time for workmen to insist on their executive assemblies going a little slow in ordering men to throw up their jobs in order to assert a principle which may be unsound or impracticable?

"Unsuccessful experiment is expensive. While it is being worked out to failure, men and women must live, and they cannot live without work. It is dry work chanting hymns to labor, with an empty stomach."

The real enemy of the laboring man is not the employer, but the tyrannical managers, and the scheming manipulators, of the despotic unions, whose beck or nod he binds himself to obey. The laboring man must have an employer, if it is not himself it must be somebody else; the employer must have workman, or else his business comes to a standstill; but the manager of the union has nothing at stake, nor to do, but to maintain the power and standing of the union, and by that his own power, while he laughs in his sleeve at the real toiling workingman, and grows fat on the assessments and monthly dues of the order.

J.

**November 4, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 42 ,  
p. 660.**

HAVING shown the establishment of the ten kingdoms as independent nations upon the ruins of Western Rome, we propose not to follow, briefly, their fortunes after the date of the fall of the Western empire, A.D. 476. This is necessary to a full understanding of the prophecy, for it says, "In the days of these kings [the ten kingdoms] shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom," which "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." It is important then that we know what became of these kingdoms and where they are now to be found; for it is certain that this kingdom of God has not yet been set up, and it is just as certain that it is very soon to be set up.

Of the kingdoms after the division of the empire, the prophet said: "And as the toes of the feet [the ten kingdoms] were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken [margin, *brittle, i.e.,* easily broken, weak]." Dan. 2:42. This would imply that the power of some of these would become so strong that it would overshadow others, who would be weak in comparison. And the history of Western Europe from A.D. 476 onward is in perfect accord with the words of the prophet, which he spake more than a thousand years before, in relation to this very period.

### **THE VISIGOTHS AND THE SUEVI**

The Visigoths were the first to make their power predominant amongst the kingdoms of the West. It will be remembered that under Wallia they had gained, as early as A.D. 419, a permanent seat in southwestern Gaul, from the Mediterranean Sea to the Bay of Biscay and from the Loire to the Rhone. From that time onward—

"The kingdom established by the Visigoths in the southern provinces of Gaul, had gradually acquired strength and maturity; and the conduct of those ambitious barbarians, either in peace or war, engaged the perpetual vigilance of Etius. After the death of Wallia, the Gothic scepter devolved to Theodoric [A.D. 419-451],

the son of the great Alaric; and his prosperous reign of more than thirty years, over a turbulent people, may be allowed to prove, that his prudence was supported by uncommon vigor, both of mind and body. Impatient of his narrow limits, Theodoric aspired to the possession of Arles, the wealthy seat of government and commerce; but the city was saved by the timely approach of Etius; and the Gothic king, who had raised the siege with some loss and disgrace, was persuaded, for an adequate subsidy, to divert the martial valor of his subjects in a Spanish war."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 35, par. 4.*

Theodoric was killed in the battle of Chalons A.D. 451, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Torismond, who was murdered in A.D. 453, by his younger brother, Theodoric II., who reigned till A.D. 466. In A.D. 456 he invaded Spain and carried his arms as far as Merida, but was recalled "before he could provide for the security of his conquests."—*Id., chap. 36, par. 7.*

"And the design of extinguishing the Roman empire in Spain and Gaul was conceived, and almost completed, in the reign of Euric, who assassinated his brother Theodoric, and displayed, with a more savage temper, superior abilities, both in peace and war. He passed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, subdued the cities of Saragossa and Pampeluna, vanquished in battle the martial nobles of the Tarragonese province, carried his victorious arms into the heart of Lusitania, and *permitted the Suevi to hold the kingdom of Galicia under the Gothic monarchy of Spain.* The efforts of Euric were not less vigorous, or less successful, in Gaul; and throughout the country that extends from the Pyrenees to the Rhone and the Loire, Berry and Auvergne were the only cities, or dioceses, which refused to acknowledge him as their master."—*Id., par. 22.*

"As soon as Odoacer had extinguished the Western Empire, he sought the friendship of the most powerful of the barbarians. The new sovereign of Italy resigned to Euric, king of the Visigoths [A.D. 446-485], all the Roman conquests beyond the Alps as far as the Rhine and the ocean; and the Senate might confirm this liberal gift with some ostentation of power, and without any real loss of revenue or dominion. The lawful pretensions of Euric were justified by ambition and success; and the Gothic nation might aspire, under his command, to the monarchy of Spain and Gaul. Arles and Marseilles surrendered to his arms; he oppressed the freedom of Auvergne; and the bishop condescended to purchase his recall from exile by a tribute of just, but reluctant praise. Sidonius waited before the gates of the palace among a crowd of ambassadors and suppliants; and their various business at the court of Bordeaux attested the power and the renown of the king of the Visigoths. The Heruli of the distant ocean, who painted their naked bodies with its cerulean color, implored his protection; and *the Saxons* respected

the maritime provinces of a prince who was destitute of any naval force. The *tall Burgundians* submitted to his authority; nor did he restore *the captive Franks* till he had imposed on that fierce nation the terms of an unequal peace. The Vandals of Africa cultivated his useful friendship; and *the Ostrogoths* of Pannonia were supported by his powerful aid against the oppression of the neighboring Huns. The North (such are the lofty strains of the poet) was agitated or appeased by the nod of Euric; the great king of Persia consulted the oracle of the West; and the aged god of the Tyber was protected by the swelling genius of the Garonne."—*Id.*, chap. 38, par. 2.

The next of these kingdoms to extend its power over the others was the kingdom of the Franks; and the extension of the dominion of the Franks was the suppression of the Visigothic power in Gaul.

"The fortune of nations has often depended on accidents; and France may ascribe her greatness to the premature death of the Gothic king, at a time when his son Alaric was a helpless infant, and his adversary Clovis an ambitious and valiant youth.

"While Childeric, the father of Clovis, lived an exile in Germany, he was hospitably entertained by the queen, as well as by the king, of the Thuringians. After his restoration, Basina escaped from her husband's bed to the arms of her lover; freely declaring, that if she had known a man wiser, stronger, or more beautiful, than Childeric, that man should have been the object of her preference. Clovis was the offspring of this voluntary union; and, when he was no more than fifteen years of age, he succeeded [A.D. 481], by his father's death, to the command of the Salian tribe. The narrow limits of his kingdom were confined to the island of the Batavians, with the ancient dioceses of Tournay and Arras; and at the baptism of Clovis the number of his warriors could not exceed five thousand. The kindred tribes of the Franks, who had seated themselves along the Belgic rivers, the Scheld, the Meuse, the Moselle, and the Rhine, were governed by their independent kings, of the Merovingian race; the equals, the allies, and sometimes the enemies of the Salic prince. But the Germans, who obeyed, in peace, the hereditary jurisdiction of their chiefs, were free to follow the standard of a popular and victorious general; and the superior merit of Clovis attracted the respect and allegiance of the national confederacy. When he first took the field, he had neither gold and silver in his coffers, nor wine and corn in his magazine; but he imitated the example of Cesar, who, in the same country, had acquired wealth by the sword, and purchased soldiers with the fruits of conquest."

"It would be superfluous to praise the valor of a Frank; but the valor of Clovis was directed by cool and consummate prudence. In all his transactions with mankind, he calculated the weight of interest, of passion, and of opinion; and his measures were

sometimes adapted to the sanguinary manners of the Germans, and sometimes moderated by the milder genius of Rome, and Christianity. He was intercepted in the career of victory, since he died in the forty-fifth year of his age [A.D. 511]; but he had already accomplished, in a reign of thirty years, the establishment of the French monarchy in Gaul.

"The first victory of Clovis had insulted the honor of the Goths. They viewed his rapid progress with jealousy and terror; and the youthful fame of Alaric was oppressed by the more potent genius of his rival. Some disputes inevitably arose on the edge of their contiguous dominions; and after the delays of fruitless negotiation, a personal interview of the two kings was proposed and accepted. This conference of Clovis and Alaric was held in a small island of the Loire, near Amboise. They embraced, familiarly conversed, and feasted together; and separated with the warmest professions of peace and brotherly love. But their apparent confidence concealed a dark suspicion of hostile and treacherous designs; and their mutual complaints solicited, eluded, and disclaimed, a final arbitration. At Paris, which he already considered as his royal seat, Clovis declared [A.D. 507] to an assembly of the princes and warriors, the pretense, and the motive, of a Gothic war. 'It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile provinces.' The Franks, who were inspired by hereditary valor and recent zeal, applauded the generous design of their monarch; expressed their resolution to conquer or die, since death and conquest would be equally profitable; and solemnly protested that they would never shave their beards till victory should absolve them from that inconvenient vow.

"The enterprise was promoted by the public or private exhortations of Clotilda. She reminded her husband how effectually some pious foundation would propitiate the Deity, and his servants: and the Christian hero, darting his battle-axe with a skilful and nervous band, 'There,' said he, 'on that spot where my *Francisca*, shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles.' This ostentatious piety confirmed and justified the attachment of the Catholics, with whom he secretly corresponded; and their devout wishes were gradually ripened into a formidable conspiracy. The people of Aquitain were alarmed by the indiscreet reproaches of their Gothic tyrants, who justly accused them of preferring the dominion of the Franks; and their zealous adherent Quintianus, bishop of Rodez, preached more forcibly in his exile than in his diocese. To resist these foreign and domestic enemies, who were fortified by the alliance of the Burgundians, Alaric collected his troops, far more numerous than the military powers of Clovis. The

Visigoths resumed the exercise of arms, which they had neglected in a long and luxurious peace; a select band of valiant and robust slaves attended their masters to the field; and the cities of Gaul were compelled to furnish their doubtful and reluctant aid. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, who reigned in Italy, had labored to maintain the tranquillity of Gaul; and he assumed, or affected, for that purpose, the impartial character of a mediator. But the sagacious monarch dreaded the rising empire of Clovis, and he was firmly engaged to support the national and religious cause of the Goths."—*Id.*, par. 2, 3, 11.

J.

**"The Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 42 , pp. 662, 663.**

WE have shown that from A. D. 1844 onward is the time when the Third Angel's Message must be given to the world. We have shown that the beast and his image, against the worship of which this message warns the world, are the Papacy and the United States Government, when this Government, under the lead of the National Reform party, and by Constitutional Amendment, shall have formed a union of Church and State after the manner of the Papacy. We have shown that the keeping of "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," to which the world is by this message called, is the keeping of the ten commandments in the only way in which they can be kept by the people on this earth, that is, through the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have shown that any attempt to keep the ten commandments, without faith in Christ, is a vain attempt. We have likewise shown by the Scriptures that faith in Christ must be shown by good works, and that these good works are the keeping of the commandments of God, in order to do which we are made new creatures—born again—in Christ Jesus, so that our fruit may be "unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Rom. 6:22. Thus in the Third Angel's Message is embodied the everlasting gospel, the grand purpose of which is to bring men to obedience to the holy law of God. And thus, as we have also shown, is given God's last call of men to obedience to his commandments, through faith in Christ, and this because "the hour of his Judgment is come," and this judgment is to be "by the law" and according to the gospel. Rev. 14:7; Rom. 2:12, 16.

Certainly if there ever was a time when the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus should be most urgently insisted upon, that time is now. We stand now in the days of which the Scripture speaks, and the wickedness of which it portrays in a terrible list, the fitness of which can

663

be seen by any one who will give attention to the subject. We refer to the Scripture, 2 Tim. 3:1-5, which reads: "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: from such turn away."

The list that is here drawn out shows a condition of affairs that is frightfully bad; and instead of there being in it any promise of anything better, there stands the record that it will be "worse and worse." Yet there is a way of escape, and that is given in this word, "From such turn away." Such a torrent of wickedness shall not be allowed to flow except the Lord shall do somewhat. "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." Isa. 59:19. By this quotation which we have made from 2 Tim. 3, it is plain that in the last days, the enemy does come in, in a perfect flood of iniquity, and the standard which the Spirit of the Lord lifts up against him is the Third Angel's Message. And those who from this iniquity turn away, and flee to the standard thus lifted up by the Spirit of the Lord, gain "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name," and stand upon the glassy sea "having the harps of God." For, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, *and unto them that turn from transgression* in Jacob, saith the Lord." Isa. 59, 20. This coming of the Redeemer follows closely upon the close of the Third Angel's Message, and when he comes it is to take unto himself those who have turned from transgression, to the keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Rev. 14:14; 15:2. Again we say that the Third Angel's Message is the standard which the Spirit of the Lord lifts up against the iniquity of the last days. The inscription upon that standard is, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus;" and to that standard, and to it alone, there attaches "*victory* over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name."

We have shown that under the Third Angel's Message there will be a world-wide study of the ten commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus Christ, such as there has not been since John stood on the Isle of Patmos. By this the question is brought to every one, and, reader, we ask you this question, Are you keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus? We ask it in view of the word of God by James, that, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10. We ask it in view of the words of Christ, that, "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." Matt. 5:19. And in answering this question all must be guided by the commandments themselves, and not by custom, nor by men's opinions of the commandments. For thus saith the Lord, "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. The question on this must be, How has God commanded to do? What does the word of God say?

We are to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus in view of the fact that "the hour of his Judgment is come; and also in view of this fact we are commanded to "worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:7. Now the only one of the commandments of

God which brings to view "him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters" is the fourth commandment, which reads thus:—

"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."

Thus in reading together the First and the Third Angels' Message, it is evident that the attention of men is by them directed particularly to the keeping of the fourth commandment. For, as the first message commands to worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters; and as the third message directs attention to the commandments of God; and as the fourth commandment is the one and the only one which brings God to view as the one who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and this in the very words of the first message; therefore we say it is evident that in these messages the attention of men is to be directed particularly to the fourth commandment. And they are to be urged to keep the fourth commandment, not independent of all the others, but in addition to all the others, and as well as all the others. For to keep all and yet "offend in one point" vitiates all.

In the fourth commandment God has plainly commanded the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord. In this commandment, he has not only told men that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and commanded them to keep it as such, but he has also given the reason for its existence, and the reason why it should be kept. And yet in spite of all this, the great majority of people, professed Christians as well as others, utterly disregard the Sabbath of the Lord. Although he has commanded that in the seventh day, "thou shalt not do any work," they yet go on with their work on that as on any other day. Such conduct is certainly just anything but the keeping of the commandment.

It is true that those who profess to be the Lord's people offer for their disobedience the excuse that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh day to the first day of the week; and that they keep the first day in obedience to the commandment. But if the first day of the week is now the Sabbath, and should be kept as such according to the commandment, then why is not the commandment made to read thus:—

Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the *first day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work; . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the *first day*; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

Now if that commandment were so printed anywhere in the world where the Bible is known, everybody would say at once that it was printed wrong. But that is precisely the way that people pretend to keep it. Therefore if to *print* the commandment so would be *wrong*, how can the *keeping* of it so be *right*? In short, if it would be wrong, as everybody knows that it would be, to print the

fourth commandment or any other, even in a single letter different from the way in which God wrote it and as it is printed in the Bible, then the keeping of the commandment in any way different from the way in which God wrote it cannot possibly be right. This is precisely the teaching of Christ on this subject: "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot [the smallest letter] or one tittle [the smallest point of a letter] shall in *no wise* pass from the law." Then he enforces as the conclusion, this, "Whosoever *therefore*," for this reason, because not the smallest letter nor the smallest point of a letter shall pass from the law. "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; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matt. 5:18, 19.

From the premise which the Saviour lays down,—that one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law,—it is evident that his conclusion enforces the doctrine that for men to swerve, even to the extent of one jot or one tittle, from the perfect integrity of a commandment of God, is to break that commandment; and that the keeping of the commandments is to conform to the perfect integrity of the law, in every jot and tittle of every commandment. Reader, God wrote, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." To not keep the seventh day is to break the commandment of God, and the Third Angel's Message now calls for those who will "turn from transgression in Jacob," for those who will keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. To these the Redeemer will come, and give triumphant victory in his glorious Heaven, in the presence of his throne. Isa. 59:20; Rev. 15:2.

J.

**November 11, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. Visigoths and Suevi.  
(Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 43 , p. 676.**

**VISIGOTHS AND SUEVI**

*(Continued.)*

"THE accidental, or artificial, prodigies which adorned the expedition of Clovis, were accepted by a superstitious age, as the manifest declaration of the divine favor. He marched from Paris [A.D. 507]; and as he proceeded with decent reverence through the holy diocese of Tours, his anxiety tempted him to consult the shrine of St. Martin, the sanctuary and the oracle of Gaul. His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the Psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church. Those words most fortunately expressed the valor and victory of the champions of Heaven, and the application was easily

transferred to the new Joshua, the new Gideon, who went forth to battle against the enemies of the Lord. Orleans secured to the Franks a bridge on the Loire; but, at the distance of forty miles from Poitiers, their progress was intercepted by an extraordinary swell of the River Vienne or Vienne; and the opposite banks were covered by the encampment of the Visigoths.

"Delay must be always dangerous to barbarians, who consume the country through which they march; and had Clovis possessed leisure and materials, it might have been impracticable to construct a bridge, or to force a passage, in the face of a superior enemy. But the affectionate peasants who were impatient to welcome their deliverer, could easily betray some unknown or unguarded ford: the merit of the discovery was enhanced by the useful interposition of fraud or fiction; and a white hart, of singular size and beauty, appeared to guide and animate the march of the Catholic army. The counsels of the Visigoths were irresolute and distracted. A crowd of impatient warriors, presumptuous in their strength, and disdainful to fly before the robbers of Germany, excited Alaric to assert in arms the name and blood of the conquerors of Rome. The advice of the graver chieftains pressed him to elude the first ardor of the Franks; and to expect, in the southern provinces of Gaul, the veteran and victorious Ostrogoths, whom the king of Italy had already sent to his assistance. The decisive moments were wasted in idle deliberation the Goths too hastily abandoned, perhaps, an advantageous post; and the opportunity of a secure retreat was lost by their slow and disorderly motions.

"After Clovis had passed the ford, as it is still named, of the *Hart*, he advanced with bold and hasty steps to prevent the escape of the enemy. His nocturnal march was directed by a flaming meteor, suspended in the air above the cathedral of Poitiers; and this signal, which might be previously concerted with the orthodox successor of St. Hilary, was compared to the column of fire that guided the Israelites in the desert. At the third hour of the day, about ten miles beyond Poitiers, Clovis overtook, and instantly attacked, the Gothic army; whose defeat was already prepared by terror and confusion. Yet they rallied in their extreme distress, and the martial youths, who had clamorously demanded the battle, refused to survive the ignominy of flight. The two kings encountered each other in single combat. Alaric fell by the hand of his rival; and the victorious Frank was saved by the goodness of his cuirass, and the vigor of his horse, from the spears of two desperate Goths, who furiously rode against him to revenge the death of their sovereign. The vague expression of a mountain of the slain, serves to indicate a cruel though indefinite slaughter; but Gregory has carefully observed, that his valiant countryman Apollinaris, the son of Sidonius, lost his life at the head of the nobles of Auvergne. . . .

"The decisive battle of Poitiers was followed by the conquest of Aquitain. Alaric had left behind him an infant son, a bastard competitor, factious nobles, and a disloyal people; and the remaining forces of the Goths were oppressed by the general consternation, or opposed to each other in civil discord. The victorious king of the Franks proceeded without delay to the siege of Angoulême. At the sound of his trumpets the walls of the city imitated the example of Jericho, and instantly fell to the ground; a splendid miracle, which may be reduced to the supposition, that some clerical engineers had secretly undermined the foundations of the rampart. At Bordeaux, which had submitted without resistance, Clovis established his winter quarters; and his prudent economy transported from Thoulouse the royal treasures, which were deposited in the capital of the monarchy.

"The conqueror penetrated as far as the confines of Spain; restored the honors of the Catholic church; fixed in Aquitain a colony of Franks; and delegated to his lieutenants the easy task of subduing, or extirpating, the nation of the Visigoths. But the Visigoths were protected by the wise and powerful monarch of Italy. While the balance was still equal, Theodoric had perhaps delayed the march of the Ostrogoths; but their strenuous efforts successfully resisted the ambition of Clovis; and the army of the Franks, and their Burgundian allies, was compelled to raise the siege of Arles, with the loss, as it is said, of thirty thousand men. These vicissitudes inclined the fierce spirit of Clovis to acquiesce in an advantageous treaty of peace. The Visigoths were suffered to retain the possession of Septimania, a narrow tract of sea-coast, from the Rhone to the Pyrenees; but the ample province of Aquitain, from those mountains to the Loire, was indissolubly united to the kingdom of France.

"The Visigoths had resigned to Clovis the greatest part of their Gallic possessions; but their loss was amply compensated by the easy conquest, and secure enjoyment, of the provinces of Spain. *From the monarchy of the Goths, which soon involved the Suevic kingdom of Galicia, the modern Spaniards still derive some national vanity.*"—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 38, par. 12, 13, 29.*

As from this time (about A.D. 508) onward, the Visigothic kingdom occupied Spain; and the Suevi occupied a "part of the peninsula which now forms Portugal," the future history of these two nations is the history of Spain and Portugal, and it cannot be expected that we should follow the history of these two great nations throughout. Besides this it is only our purpose upon the best authorities to fix under the modern names of Western Europe the descent of the barbarian nations which founded their kingdoms upon the ruins of Western Rome. Therefore by the following quotation we shall take our leave of the Visigoths and the Suevi:—

"In Spain the Goth supplies an important element in the modern nation. And that element has been neither forgotten nor despised. Part of the unconquered region of northern Spain the land of Asturia, kept for a while the name of Gothia, as did the Gothic possessions in Gaul and Crim. The *name* of the people who played as great a part in all souther Europe, and who actually ruled over so large a portion, has now wholly passed away; but *it is in Spain that its historical impress is to be looked for.*"—*Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Goths, par. 18.*

## THE FRANKS

In keeping the connection in the story of the Visigoths, we have been obliged to anticipate the important movements in the earlier history of Clovis. There was a small portion of Gaul, embracing the cities of Rheims, Troyes, Beauvais, Amiens, and the city and diocese of Soissons, which was still fairly Roman, and was ruled by Syagrius, a Roman, under the title of Patrician, or, as some give it, king of the Romans. "The first exploit of Clovis was the defeat of Syagrius," in A.D. 486, and the reduction of the country which had acknowledged his authority. By this victory all the country of Gaul below the Moselle, clear to the Seine, was possessed by the Franks. Up to this point the Franks and the Alemanni had made almost an equal progress in Gaul, and had made their conquests in that province, apparently in perfect national friendliness. But now both nations had become so powerful it was impossible that two such fierce and warlike nations should subsist side by side without an appeal to arms for the decision of the question as to which should have the supremacy. Here also the scale turned in favor of the Franks, as likewise it did soon afterward in the contest with the Burgundians, and still later with the Lombards. But though the Franks defeated, and established their supremacy over, all these, yet they all were allowed to still maintain their own national existence, and were governed according to their own manners and institutions, only acknowledging the overlordship of their more powerful rivals. The defeat of the Alemanni was by Clovis in A.D. 496, and is related by Gibbon as follows:—

"From the source of the Rhine to its conflux with the Mein and the Moselle, the formidable swarms of the Alemanni commanded either side of the river, by the right of ancient possession, or recent victory. They had spread themselves into Gaul, over the modern provinces of Alsace and Lorraine; and their bold invasion of the kingdom of Cologne summoned the Salic prince to the defence of his Ripuarian allies. Clovis encountered the invaders of Gaul in the plain of Tolbiac, about twenty-four miles from Cologne; and the two fiercest nations of Germany were mutually animated by the memory of past exploits, and the prospect of future greatness. The Franks, after an obstinate struggle, gave way; and the Alemanni, raising a shout of victory, impetuously pressed their retreat. But the battle was restored by the valor, and the conduct, and perhaps by the

piety, of Clovis; and the event of the bloody day decided forever the alternative of empire or servitude. The last king of the Alemanni was slain in the field, and his people were slaughtered or pursued, till they threw down their arms, and yielded to the mercy of the conqueror. Without discipline it was impossible for them to rally: they had contemptuously demolished the walls and fortifications which might have protected their distress; and they were followed into the heart of their forests by an enemy not less active, or intrepid, than themselves. The great Theodoric congratulated the victory of Clovis, whose sister Alboflada the king of Italy had lately married; but he mildly interceded with his brother in favor of the suppliants and fugitives, who had implored his protection. The Gallic territories, which were possessed by the Alemanni, became the prize of their conqueror; and the haughty nation, invincible, or rebellious, to the arms of Rome, acknowledged the sovereignty of the Merovingian kings, who graciously *permitted them to enjoy their peculiar manners and institutions, under the government of official, and, at length, of hereditary, dukes.*"—Chap. 38, par. 5.

J.

(To be continued.)

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 43 , p. 678, 679.**

IN the thoughts of man there are a great many questions which arise concerning himself. Some of these are highly important. So important indeed are they that the word of God itself has recorded them. Nor is that all. This word has not only recorded the questions, but it has also recorded the answers to the questions. And when the word of God asks a question and answers it, then in the answer we have the absolute truth on that question, and there is an end of all dispute, there is no room for controversy. For "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go." Isa. 48:17. Therefore whatever the Lord teaches is profitable teaching. Whether we believe it, or whether we like it or not, makes no difference so far as the teaching is concerned. The teaching is profitable, and everything that conflicts with it is unprofitable. The way the Lord leads is the way that we should go, and to follow any other lead is to go in the way that we should not.

In the eighth psalm and the fourth verse is this question, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" Of course there are more ways than one in which this question can be referred to man, but the thing about man upon which we wish now to bring it to bear is that of immortality. "What is man?" is he mortal or immortal? We have not far to go for an answer. "Shall *mortal man* be more just than God?" Job 4:17. "O Lord, thou art our God; let not *mortal man* prevail against thee." 2 Chron. 14:11, margin. Thus we find in answer to the question

that the word of God calls man mortal, and everything that the Bible says directly about immortality is consistent with this answer.

Says this word in 1 Timothy, "Now unto the King eternal, *immortal*, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen." Chap. 1:17. Here it is shown that immortality is an attribute of God, equally with eternity, wisdom, honor, glory, etc. None of these belong to man as he is.

Again, speaking of the appearing of Jesus Christ, the word says, "In his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, the Lord of lords; *who only hath immortality*, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." 1 Tim. 6:15, 16.

Christ has brought this immortality to light. Says the word, the purpose and grace of God "is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought *life* and *immortality* to light *through the gospel*." 2 Tim. 1:10. What the gospel is, in a few words, is shown by 1 Cor. 15:1-4: "I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you. . . . for I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how 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." Thus, then, in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ is summed up the gospel; and "through the gospel" it is said Christ "brought life and immortality to light." Certainly it was not by dying nor being buried that either life or immortality was brought to light, for both these things were familiar to all men; but to rise again from the dead and bring with him a multitude of the dead, who also appeared unto many (Matt. 27:52, 53) that was to bring to light something that had never been seen before; that was to bring life and immortality to light indeed. Therefore it is through the resurrection that Christ has brought immortality to light.

Again, the Scripture says that God will render eternal life "to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor *and immortality*." Rom. 2:6, 7. Now as immortality is to be sought for, and as God is the only one who has it, and as Christ is the only one who brought it to light, it follows that immortality must be sought *of God, through Christ*. Even so says the Scripture, "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." "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." Rom. 6:23; 1 John 5:11, 12.

Having then sought and found immortality in Christ, when is it bestowed upon us as our own? "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. . . . But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 15:51-57.

Thus the story which the word of God tells about immortality is this: Man, being mortal, has it not; God has it; Christ has brought it to light through the

gospel; man is to seek for it of God, through Christ, and will obtain it at the resurrection of the

679

dead; for *then* it is that this *mortal* puts on *immortality*; then it is that death is swallowed up in victory. This comes "at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible," and the living shall be changed. But when is it that the last trumps sounds? It is when the Lord Jesus comes in his glory. "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.

Immortality is obtained of God, through Christ, at the resurrection of the dead. It is the sound of the last trump that awakes the dead. That trump is sounded at the coming of the Lord. Therefore without the second coming of the Lord Jesus we shall never receive immortality. For this reason we long for his glorious appearing. We watch, we wait for him, who shall change our "vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," for "we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." "Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

J.

### **"Why Will They Do It?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 43 , p. 679.**

LAST week we made the inquiry that if the first day be the Sabbath why then is not the commandment printed so? We believe that every one will agree with us in the answer which we gave, that to print the fourth commandment so that it would read first day instead of seventh day as God wrote it would be wrong. Now we ask in all seriousness, for it is a serious thing, If it would be wrong to *print* the commandment so as to read first day instead of "seventh day," then how can it be right to *teach* the commandment as *though* it read, first day?

With but two exceptions, all professed Christian churches throughout the world teach that the first day of the week is the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment. This too in the very face of the commandment as God wrote it, and as it stands printed in the Bible. In the Sunday-schools, everywhere, and in the Bands of Hope, the fourth commandment is given to the children as a task to be learned. The children are told that that is the word of God; that God wrote it himself, and that it is sin to do contrary to it. The children learn the commandment as God wrote it, and as they find it printed, and that is, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" they recite it so in their classes, very often in concert; and then when any of them innocently ask, as they often do, "Why do we not keep the seventh day," immediately they are told by their teacher that the seventh day is *not* the Sabbath. We personally know of a Sunday-school concert wherein a part of the exercise was, that the whole school should in concert repeat the fourth commandment. They did it, and did it correctly. Then the minister, a presiding elder he was too, by the way, asked

some questions on the commandment, one of which was this: "Which day is the Sabbath?" And in the very words of the Lord and of the commandment, the young voices in concert rang out loud and clear the answer, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." *Then* the minister said to them, "O no! the first day is the Sabbath." Now we say that such is not fair dealing with the children nor with the word of God. First the children are required to learn that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and then they are required immediately to unlearn it. First they are required to learn that the words of the commandment are the words of God, and then they are required immediately to put away the words of the Lord and accept the words of man instead.

If the seventh day is not the Sabbath of the Lord, then why are the children required both to learn and to unlearn that it is? If the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord, then, to learn it, why are the children sent to the commandment that says the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord? Why not teach them at once and directly, that the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord? Why not at once point them to the scripture that says, "The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work," and have them learn that? Oh, every one will say, There is no such scripture. True enough. Then why are the poor innocent children taught it, as though it *were* scripture? It is true that there is no such scripture. It is true that such is *not* the word of God. It is equally true that such *is* the word of man; then why not have the children learn it as such? "Oh," it is said, "it would never do to teach the children to accept the word of man instead of the word of God." But that is precisely what is done now. To require them to learn the word of God in the fourth commandment, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and then require them immediately to put that away and accept the word of man that the first day is the Sabbath, is nothing else than to teach them to accept the word of man instead of the word of God. It is nothing else than to teach them to disobey the commandment of God as he spoke it with his own voice and wrote it with his own hand, and to follow the word of man. And by the inculcation of the idea that the Lord says one thing and means another, the way is opened wide for the introduction of any scheme that the mind of man can invent, and the effect is to destroy the word of God as of authority. To those who are sure that the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord—the rest day of God—again we say, Why do you not print the fourth commandment so that it shall read so? But they and everybody else will say that they dare not do it. Then how dare they teach what they shall not print?

J.

**"Dr. Clarke and the First Written Document" *The Signs of the Times*  
12, 43 , pp. 679, 680.**

ED. SIGNS: I find that Dr. Clarke teaches that the law of ten commandments is the first instrument in writing ever seen by man. Is this true in the light of revelation and history?  
INQUIREE.

It is too often the case that, in exalting the merit of some person or thing which they greatly admire, and which they want others to admire, and which is really admirable in itself, men overdo the matter and really belittle the subject of their admiration. An instance of this which we recall, occurred in relation to General Grant about the time of his death. In illustrating the General's evenness of temper, and his gentleness under great provocation, an instance was cited which should really be no provocation to any person, and which, if it had worked as this person supposed it naturally should in General Grant's case, would simply show him to have been little and spiteful and mean. And the narrator instead of by his narrative illustrating General Grant's greatness, only exposed his own lack of capacity to appreciate greatness.

Another notable instance is that wherein ministers and others in portraying the merit of the Saviour, quote Napoleon's estimate of him. We have known one preacher in particular who apparently never lost an opportunity to parade Napoleon's opinion of Christ. As though the approval, or even the admiration of such a character as Napoleon, would be a recommendation of anybody, much less of the perfect goodness of the divine Saviour. For our part we should rather by a vast degree have Christ's opinion of Napoleon, than to have Napoleon's opinion of Christ.

But the most singular instance of this overdoing the thing that we have ever seen is the one referred to by our correspondent. We know not by whom it was originated, but the idea is sanctioned, as our correspondent says, even by Dr. Adam Clarke, that the decalogue was the first *written* document on earth! It is singular that so eminent a scholar as was Dr. Clarke,—a biblical scholar too,—should be led to indorse such an idea. And that the idea still passes current as though it were a piece of astonishingly exceptional wisdom, is a singular instance of the facility with which a thing passes on from generation to generation by sheer "reiteration and no examination." Dr. Clarke, in his comment on Ex. 31:18, "tables of stone, written with the finger of God," attributes the idea to Dr. Winder, saying:

"Dr. Winder, in his 'History of Knowledge,' thinks it probable that this was the first writing in alphabetical characters ever exhibited to the world."

But in his "Key to the Bible," Dr. Clarke himself gives it the weight of his own authority. In speaking of the Scriptures, he says:—

"They contain the most ancient writings in the world, *the decalogue*, or ten commandments, a part of the book of Exodus, *being probably the first regular production in alphabetical characters ever seen by man.*"

That might look very well as a theory, but there are a multitude of *facts* which go to show that it is but a figment of the imagination. It cannot be expected that we should attempt to give all the facts, for that would require that we should write a book. But we shall give a few which we hope may be useful on this point.

Here is the English of part of a document that was written at Babylon nearly fifty years before the tables of stone were seen by man. It was written by

Khammu-rabi, king of Chaldea, or his scribe, whose reign was about B.C. 1546 to 1520. He says:

"I have caused to be dug the canal of Khammu-rabi, a blessing to the men of Babylonia. I have directed the waters of its branches over the desert plains; I have caused them to run in their channels, and thus given unfailing waters to the people. I have distributed the inhabitants of the land of Shumir and Accad [Gen. 10:10] among distant cities. I have changed desert plains into well-watered lands. I have given them fertility and abundance, and made them the abode of happiness.—Lunnemand's, *"Ancient History of the East,"* Book IV, chap. 1, sec. 67; Rawlinson's *Monarchies, First Mon.*, chap. 8, par. 29, 30.

But there was writing away beyond that. The great Sennacherib, king of Assyria, who invaded Palestine B.C. 713, began to reign about B.C. 716. About the tenth year of his reign (cir. B.C. 707), he set up a monument with an inscription stating that he had recovered from Babylon certain images of gods which had been carried there by a king of Babylon, who took them from Tiglath-Pileser I., king of Assyria, 118 years before. This carries us back,  $707+418=1125$  years before Christ. Now this same Tiglath-Pileser wrote a long account of his wars, his conquests, his buildings, etc., and this document is in the British Museum. In it Tiglath-Pileser says that he rebuilt a temple in Assyria which had been torn down sixty years before, after it had stood 641 years from its foundation by Shamas-Val, son of Ismi-Dagon. He rebuilt this temple at the beginning of his reign, which was about ten years before his war with the king of Babylon in which he lost his gods. This would give,  $1125+10=1135$  years B.C. But the temple had then been in ruins sixty years, after standing 641, which would give,  $1135+60+641=B.C. 1836$  for the foundation of the temple by Shamas-Vul. But he says Shamas-Vul was the son of Ismi-Dagon, which would demand at least thirty years more for the reign of Ismi-Dagon, which would give, without a single missing link, B.C. 1866 for the beginning of the reign of Ismi-Dagon, which was 375 years before the tables of stone were "ever seen by man."

And *Ismi-Dagon*, or his scribe, *could write*. And he did write, he and his two sons, Gurguna, who succeeded him as king in Ur of the Chaldees whence Abraham came, and Shamas-Vul, who reigned as viceroy in Assyria. And their writings

680

are now in the British Museum and are known and read of all Assyriologists. But these are not exceptions in the matter of writing. Writing was a familiar thing in the countries of Chaldea and Assyria, even a long while beyond the day of Ismi-Dagon. There were Arioch of Genesis 14:1, king of Ellasar, and Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, who invaded the borders of Palestine in the days of Abraham. Both are mentioned on the monuments, and this very Arioch is written, "King of Ellasar," and we are told that his father's name was Chedormabug, and that his grandfather's name was Simtihilhak. Writing that was written not only in the days of Abraham, but even before that, is now familiar, to oriental scholars. Writing

was a familiar thing in Chaldea 450 years before the tables of stone were seen by Israel.

The same is true of Egypt. The following is the English of a document written by a discontented warrior, who was an officer in the army of the king "which knew not Joseph" (Ex. 1:8), or in the army of that king's father:—

"When you receive the verses I have written may you find the work of the scribe agreeable.

"I wish to depict to you the numberless troubles of an unfortunate officer of infantry.

"While still a youth he is entirely shut up in a barrack, a tight suit of armor encases his body, the peak of his helmet comes over his eyes;

"The visor is over his eyebrows; so that his head is protected from wounds.

"He is wrapped up like a papyrus roll, and can hardly move his limbs in fight.

"Shall I tell you of his expeditions into Syria, his marches in far distant lands?

"He is obliged to carry water on his shoulder as an ass bears its burden;

"His back is bent like that of a beast of burden, his backbone is bowed.

"When he has quenched his thirst with a drink of bad water, he is obliged to mount guard for the night.

"If he meets the enemy he is like a bird in a net, his limbs have no strength left.

"When he returns to Egypt, he is like a piece of worm-eaten wood.

"If he is too ill to stand, they put him on the back of an ass;

"His baggage is plundered by robbers, and his servant deserts him."—*Lenormant, Id., Book III, chap. 5, sec. 6.*

But it may be said that these writings were all Egyptian, Assyrian, or Babylonian, while the ten commandments were written in Hebrew, and that this was the first written document in that kind of characters. Very well, of this kind of writing, Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward says:—

"It was not many years ago that it was stoutly asserted that Moses could not have written a book of the law, or the ten commandments, because writing was not then invented. . . . But within the past twenty years the history of Phoenician writing *used by the Hebrews* has been carefully studied; and it is now the general conclusion of the best scholars that it originated during the time of the conquest of Egypt by the Shepherd Kings four or five centuries before Moses. The last student of the subject, Mr. Isaac Taylor, thus sums up the result of long and careful investigation: 'The possible date of the origin of the alphabet . . . lies between the twenty-third and seventeenth centuries; and there seems to be no

reason why we should not provisionally accept the approximate date which has been proposed by De Rouge, and place it in or about the nineteenth century B.C."—*The Bible and the Monuments, in Sunday School Times, Volume 25, Number 42, pp. 659, 660.*

If, however, these evidences should be questioned or should not be considered sufficient to show that the decalogue was not the "first writing in alphabetical characters ever seen by man," we have the evidence of the Bible itself.

1. According to the best evidence and authorities, Job lived more than 500 years before the children of Israel left Egypt, and he exclaims, "Oh that my words were now *written!* oh that they were printed [graven, carved] in a *book!* That they were graven with an iron *pen* and lead in the rock forever." Here we have the plain words "written," "book," and "pen." We cannot conceive how Job could have talked about his words being written if writing was not known. And if there was no writing there could have been neither *book* nor *pen*. Under Dr. Clarke's supposition, the words of Job are not only utterly meaningless, but it is impossible to conceive how he could have so named things that had no existence. This is not the only instance of it. In Job 31:35, he says, "My desire is, that . . . mine adversary had *written* a *book*." The only reasonable conclusion is that in the days of Job *pens* and *writing* were familiar things and to such an extent that *books* were *written*.

2. In Ex. 17:14 we read: "And the Lord said unto Moses, *Write* this for a memorial *in a book*, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua; for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." This was after the battle with Amalek at Rephidim, and *before Israel came to Sinai*. Now if the decalogue was the first written document ever seen by man, Moses at this time could not have known what it was to *write*, much less could he have known what such a thing as a *book* was; and so the Lord had commanded him to do what was simply a physical, moral, and intellectual impossibility. But this is not all.

3. We know that Moses could write, and that he did write in a book, before either he or anybody else on earth ever saw the tables of stone. In Exodus 24:4, 7, we read: "And *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord*, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill." "And he took *the book of the covenant*, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Now it was not till *after that* that the Lord told Moses to come up and get the tables of the decalogue; for in verse 12 it is said: "And the Lord said unto Moses, 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." And Moses was there in the mount "forty days and forty nights," before he came down with the tables of stone. Therefore the word of God shows positively that here was a "regular production in alphabetical characters," a "written document" *written* and *seen* and *read* by men before ever the tables of stone were seen by Moses, and more than forty days before they were ever seen by any man besides Moses. The idea of the ten commandments being the first written document on earth is a myth.

Lest there should be any who may have so rested upon this statement of Dr. Clarke as being of authority that they might think its destruction would weaken the claims of the law of God, we would say that even though the statement were true it would not strengthen the claims of the law a particle. The ten commandments are the law of God. They were written with the finger of God, on the tables of stone, and whether they were the first writing, or the last, that man ever saw, neither adds to them, nor diminishes from them, a single element of force. And if the statement in question is *not* true, then it could not add any to the strength of the decalogue anyhow; for the truth can never be helped by that which is not the truth; its sole tendency would be to weaken the truth, and the sooner it was destroyed the better. There is, however, a principle involved here that justifies the question of our correspondent, and the exposure of this error. It is this: If it were true that writing was not then known on the earth, that of itself would be a sufficient reason why the Lord himself must write the law. For if man was to have the written law at all, the Lord would *have* to write it, because man *couldn't*; which we say would imply that that was the reason why the Lord did write it. But when we allow the truth to stand as it is, that writing, both on stone and in books, was a familiar thing to men and nations, then it shows that there was that about the giving and the writing of the law, which God regarded as of too much importance to be intrusted to the hand of man.

J.

**November 18, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Franks. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 44 , p. 692.**

### **THE FRANKS**

*(Continued.)*

THE defeat of the Burgundians followed in A.D. 499, and is thus told:—

"The kingdom of the Burgundians, which was defined by the course of two Gallic rivers, the Saone and the Rhone, extended from the forest of Vosges to the Alps and the sea of Marscilles. The scepter was in the hands of Gundobald. That valiant and ambitious prince had reduced the number of royal candidates by the death of two brothers, one of whom was the father of Clotilda; but his imperfect prudence still permitted Godegesil, the youngest of his brothers, to possess the dependent principality of Geneva. The Arian monarch was justly alarmed by the satisfaction, and the hopes, which seemed to animate his clergy and people after the conversion of Clovis; and Gundobald convened at Lyons an assembly of his bishops, to reconcile, if it were possible, their religious and political discontents.

"A vain conference was agitated between the two factions. The Arians upbraided the Catholics with the worship of three Gods; the Catholics defended their cause by theological distinctions; and the usual arguments, objections, and replies were reverberated with obstinate clamor; till the king revealed his secret apprehensions, by an abrupt but decisive question, which he addressed to the orthodox bishops. 'If you truly profess the Christian religion, why do you not restrain the king of the Franks? He has declared war against me, and forms alliances with my enemies for my destruction. A sanguinary and covetous mind is not the symptom of a sincere conversion: let him show his faith by his works.' The answer of Avitus, bishop of Vienna, who spoke in the name of his brethren, was delivered with the voice and countenance of an angel. 'We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by Scripture, that the kingdoms which abandon the divine law are frequently subverted; and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return, with thy people, to the law of God, and he will give peace and security to thy dominions.' The king of Burgundy, who was not prepared to accept the condition which the Catholics considered as essential to the treaty, delayed and dismissed the ecclesiastical conference; after reproaching his bishops, that Clovis, their friend and proselyte, had privately tempted the allegiance of his brother.

"The allegiance of his brother was already seduced; and the obedience of Godegesil, who joined the royal standard with the troops of Geneva, more effectually promoted the success of the conspiracy. While the Franks and Burgundians contended with equal valor, his seasonable desertion decided the event of the battle; and as Gundobald was faintly supported by the disaffected Gauls, he yielded to the arms of Clovis, and hastily retreated from the field, which appears to have been situate between Langres and Dijon. He distrusted the strength of Dijon, a quadrangular fortress, encompassed by two rivers, and by a wall thirty feet high, and fifteen thick, with four gates, and thirty-three towers; he abandoned to the pursuit of Clovis the important cities of Lyons and Vienna; and Gundobald still fled with precipitation, till he had reached Avignon, at the distance of two hundred and fifty miles from the field of battle. A long siege and an artful negotiation, admonished the king of the Franks of the danger and difficulty of his enterprise. He imposed a tribute on the Burgundian prince, compelled him to pardon and reward his brother's treachery, and proudly returned to his own dominions, with the spoils and captives of the southern provinces.

"This splendid triumph was soon clouded by the intelligence, that Gundobald had violated his recent obligations, and that the

unfortunate Godegesil, who was left at Vienna with a garrison of five thousand Franks, had been besieged, surprised, and massacred by his inhuman brother. Such an outrage might have exasperated the patience of the most peaceful sovereign; yet the conqueror of Gaul dissembled the injury, released the tribute, and accepted the alliance, and military service, of the king of Burgundy. Clovis no longer possessed those advantages which had assured the success of the preceding war; and his rival, instructed by adversity, had found new resources in the affections of his people. The Gauls or Romans applauded the mild and impartial laws of Gundobald, which almost raised them to the same level with their conquerors. The bishops were reconciled, and flattered, by the hopes, which he artfully suggested, of his approaching conversion; and though he eluded their accomplishment to the last moment of his life, his moderation secured the peace, and suspended the ruin, of the kingdom of Burgundy."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 38, par. 8, 9.*

When Clovis died, November 25, 511, his dominions were divided amongst his four sons, Theodoric, or Thierry I., his eldest son, had the northeastern portion, which lay on both sides of the Rhine, with his capital at Metz. Childebert, eldest son of Clothilda, held the central part, the country around Paris, with Paris as his capital. Clodomir, the third son, received western Gaul, along the Loire, and had his capital at Orleans. Clotaire, the youngest son, ruled in the northern part of Gaul, with his capital at Soissons. The Alemanni under the governorship of dukes, belonged with the eastern partition and were tributary to Theodoric. The Burgundians were still ruled by their own kings until 532, when the last Burgundian king was slain, and they, too, ruled by dukes, became subject to the sons of Clovis. This was accomplished under the reign of Sigismond, the son of Gundobald.

"The Catholic Sigismond has acquired the honors of a saint and martyr; but the hands of the royal saint were stained with the blood of his innocent son, whom he inhumanly sacrificed to the pride and resentment of a step-mother. He soon discovered his error, and bewailed the irreparable loss. While Sigismond embraced the corpse of the unfortunate youth, he received a severe admonition from one of his attendants: 'It is not his situation, O king! it is thine which deserves pity and lamentation.' The reproaches of a guilty conscience were alleviated, however, by his liberal donations to the monastery of Agaunum, or St. Maurice, in Vallais; which he himself had founded in honor of the imaginary martyrs of the Thebaean legion. A full chorus of perpetual psalmody was instituted by the pious king; he assiduously practiced the austere devotion of the monks; and it was his humble prayer, that Heaven would inflict in this world the punishment of his sins.

"His prayer was heard; the avengers were at hand; and the provinces of Burgundy were overwhelmed by an army of victorious Franks. After the event of an unsuccessful battle, Sigismond, who

wished to protract his life that he might prolong his penance, concealed himself in the desert in a religious habit, till he was discovered and betrayed by his subjects, who solicited the favor of their new masters. The captive monarch, with his wife and two children, was transported to Orleans, and buried alive in a deep well, by the stern command of the sons of Clovis; whose cruelty might derive some excuse from the maxims and examples of their barbarous age. Their ambition, which urged them to achieve the conquest of Burgundy, was inflamed, or disguised, by filial piety; and Clotilda, whose sanctity did not consist in the forgiveness of injuries, pressed them to revenge her father's death on the family of his assassin. The rebellious Burgundians, for they attempted to break their chains, *were still permitted to enjoy their national laws* under the obligation of tribute and military service; and the Merovingian princes peaceably reigned over a kingdom, whose glory and greatness had been first overthrown by the arms of Clovis."—*Id.*, par. 10.

The quadruple division of the dominions of Clovis ended in 558, by being merged in the sole rule of Clotaire I., who held the power till his death in 561, when it was again divided into four parts among *his* four sons—Charlbert, king of Paris, Goutran, of Orleans, Sigebert, of Metz, and Chilperic, of Soissons. The Burgundians fell to the portion of Goutran, who left Orleans and fixed his capital in their country.

"In 567 Charlbert, king of Paris, died, without children, and a new partition left only three kingdoms—Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy. Austrasia, in the east, extended over the two banks of the Rhine, and comprised, side by side with Roman towns and districts, populations that had remained Germanic. [The Alemanni—Suabians—belonged in this division.] Neustria, in the west, was essentially Gallo-Roman, though it comprised in the north the old territory of the Salian Franks, on the borders of the Scheldt. *Burgundy, as the old kingdom of the Burgundians*, enlarged in the north by some few counties."—*Guizot's History of France, chap. 8, par. 1.*

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Why Should Sunday Be Kept?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 44 , pp. 695, 696.**

WHAT reason does the Scripture present for the keeping of the first day of the week? Does the word of God present any reason at all for so doing? Does the Scripture say that anybody should keep it holy? Does the Scripture say that it ought to be so kept? Does the word of the Lord say of this thing, "Happy are ye if ye do it"? Does the Bible say any one of these things in regard to the first day of

the week? Is there in the word of God a command or any direction that anybody should keep the first day of the week for any cause whatever? If there is any such command, it ought to be easy enough to point it out. If there be any reason given, it ought to be readily referred to.

For keeping the seventh day, there is a plain, direct commandment from the Creator of all,—a commandment spoken with his own voice and written with his own finger. To that commandment the Lord attached a reason why the seventh day should be kept,—a reason that sanctions the obligation to keep the seventh day, and cannot be made to sanction the observance of any other day. The fourth commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." If any one should ask which day is the Sabbath, the commandment plainly answers the question: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The commandment also says, "In it [the seventh day] thou shalt not do any work." If any one should ask why, the commandment again, gives a complete answer: "*For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore [for this reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*" For the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord, therefore, the Lord has not only given a plain, direct commandment, but he has also given a reason why the seventh day is the Sabbath, how it became the Sabbath, and why it should be kept so. That is, the Lord has not only given a reason for keeping the commandment, but he has given a reason for the existence of the commandment.

Now can the first day of the week show any one of these things in behalf of the claim that it should be kept holy? Is there a commandment to keep it holy? Is it holy at all? If it is where is the record that God hallowed it? what reason has he given for hallowing it? Most assuredly, if the first day of the week lacks these things it lacks every element essential to its obligation, and there rests upon men no moral nor religious duty whatever to keep it. A proper question therefore is, What saith the Scripture about the first day of the week?

1. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." Matt. 28:1. Here all that is said is, that two women went to the sepulchre, on the first day of the week. Well, what reason for keeping the first day of the week lies in that fact? None at all.

2. "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Mark 16:1, 2. Can anybody tell what there is about this text that shows that the first day of the week is the Sabbath? How can the first day of the week be the Sabbath, and yet the Sabbath be past before the first day of the week begins? For it matters not how early the first day of the week may begin, even "very early," yet the Sabbath is past."

3. "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Luke 24:1.

4. "The first [day] of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre." John 20:1.

Notice that these four statements—one by each of the Gospel writers—are not four records of four distinct things, but four distinct records of *the same* thing, and of the same time, even the same hour. Each one tells what occurred in the morning of a certainly first day of the week, and the only fact stated in all four of the records, about the first day of the week, is that certain women came to the sepulchre very early in the morning. Then what is there in all this upon which to base any reason for keeping the first day of the week? Just nothing at all.

In the Gospels there is mention made of the first day of the week, only twice more. These are in Mark and John. And the record in John and the close of the record in Mark again speak of the same time precisely, only it is in the evening, whereas the other was in the morning of that same first day of the week.

5. Here is Mark's record: "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. After that he appeared in another form unto two of them [Luke 24:13-48], as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them. 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 16:9-14.

6. Of this same time John says: "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. And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord." John 20:19, 20.

Here, then, are all the instances in which the term "first day of the week" is used in the Gospels, and the manifest story is simply this: When the Sabbath was past, the women came to the sepulchre very early in the morning on the first day of the week, and found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre, and Jesus risen. Then Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene, and she went and told the disciples that Jesus was risen, and they "believed not." Then Jesus appeared to two of the disciples themselves as they went into the country, and they went and told it to the others, who yet believed not. Then Jesus appeared to all the company together and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart because they had not believed them which had seen him after he was risen, then showed them his hands and his side, and said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see. . . . Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them." Luke 24:39-43.

Now take this whole narrative from beginning to end and where is there a word in it that conveys any idea that anybody ever kept the first day of the week,

or that it ever should be kept as the Sabbath or for any other sacred or religious purpose whatever? Just nowhere at all. The Scriptures throughout show that the purpose of the repeated appearances of Jesus was not to institute a new Sabbath, for there is nothing at all said about it, but to convince his disciples that he really was risen, and was alive again, that they might be witnesses to the fact. The words above quoted show this, but Thomas was not there with the others, and he still did not believe, and so at another time, "after eight days," Thomas was with them, and Jesus came again for the express purpose of convincing him, for he simply said to the company, "Peace unto you," and then spoke directly to Thomas, saying: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing." John 20:24-27.

This is made positive by the words of Peter: "Him God raised up the third day, and *showed him openly*; not to all the people, but *unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.*" Acts 10:40, 41. "This Jesus hath God raised up, *whereof we all are witnesses.*" Acts 2:32. And that evening of the day of his resurrection, when he said to the eleven to handle him and see that it was he, and when he ate the piece of broiled fish and of an honeycomb, he said to them, "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and *to rise from the dead* the third day; . . . and *ye are witnesses* of these things." Luke 24:46-48. Once more, Peter said, Ye "killed the Prince of life, whom *God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.*" Acts 3:15.

They were witnesses that Christ was risen from the dead because a living Saviour, and faith in a living Saviour alone, could be practiced. How did they become such witnesses? Christ showed himself to them, and "did eat and drink with them after he

696

rose from the dead." Then what was the purpose of his appearances on this first day of the week mentioned in the four Gospels, and his appearance to Thomas afterward? To give them "*infallible proofs*" that he was "alive after his passion." Acts 1:3. Then where does the first-day-of-the-week Sabbath come in? Nowhere. In these texts, in the four Gospels, which speak of the first day of the week, where is there conveyed any idea that that day shall be kept as the Sabbath? Nowhere. The other two places where the first day of the week is mentioned, will be noticed next week.

J.

**"The Coming of the Lord Draweth Nigh" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 44 , p. 696.**

THE *elite* of San Francisco is just now deeply engaged in the enjoyment of a carnival, the "paper carnival" it is called. Webster's Unabridged gives us the definition of carnival, thus: "A festival celebrated with merriment and revelry in Roman Catholic countries during the week before Lent." As Lent is the forty days before Easter, this carnival is considerably before the time, but in all other points,

as best we can make out from the reports, the definition is quite fully met, for this is now virtually a Roman Catholic country, although this is not, in name at least, a Catholic carnival.

The tamest definition that we can find of revelry is "noisy festivity" and the reports show that this definition exactly describes the proceedings. We read of the "grand march," "dancing," yes even of a certain minuet being "beautifully danced by people from St. Paul's Church, *who have a reputation in this direction.*" We read of costumes "ranging from the primordial ape to the finest court costume of the queen of the English." We read that "next to the grand march" "the booths are the great feature of the carnival." One of these is "devoted to refreshments;" another is the "Mermaids' Grotto" and "the army of young ladies who take part in the tableaux of Neptune and the Mermaids, are attached to this booth." We read of "St. Luke's booth," devoted to ice-cream and cake and arranged with a "sole view for revenue." We read that "St. John's Church has an ice-cream booth" and does a "rushing business." We read that "many of the younger men found their way to the gypsy camp to have the dusky maidens reveal the future to them through the medium of the cards." All this and a great deal more we read, and that the revelers "generally gave themselves up to the full enjoyment of the occasion."

By close attention to the long report of the first night's revelry, we find that it is altogether a church affair. We find that "the authors" are "the Reverend and Mrs. John Gray;" that the carnival is given in the interest of the Rev. Mr. Gray's church, that of the Advent; that "the Rev. Mr. Gray appeared upon the stage and announced that the carnival pavilion was now open," and that after about a week's run the Rev. Gray "was overjoyed with the sustained interest."

The object of the carnival is said to be "to raise enough money to cancel a debt of \$15,000 on the property of the Church of the Advent." In the same paragraph we read that "at a low estimate" "the dresses, costumes, etc.," made specially for the carnival and good for nothing else, as they are made of paper and flowers, "represent a cost of about \$10,000;" that "the carnival has been three months in preparation;" and that "over 800 persons take part in it." These items are worthy of a little consideration. Let us make a brief calculation, and put everything at a low estimate. The *time* of the persons engaged we will count at *twenty-five cents* a day.

Eight hundred persons at 25 cents per day is \$200 a day. Counting but 75 working days in the three months engaged—75 days at \$200 a day, is \$15,000. To this add the \$10,000 for costumes, etc., which gives a low estimate \$25,000. That is to say, these people have made an investment of \$25,000 in order to get a return of \$15,000. In other words, \$10,000 is paid for revelry alone. Then what, but revelry, was the real object of the carnival? And all this no doubt is called helping the cause of God! Could anything better illustrate the scripture, "Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof"?

In such a connection the title "Church of the Advent" is exceedingly and fearfully suggestive, for it is just such practices as these that the Saviour declares will be the characteristic of the times which immediately precede his second

advent to this world. The word of God declares abundantly that thus it will be in the last days: that those who have a form of godliness will be "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away." 2 Tim. 3:4, 5. It is time to turn away, for "revelings and such like" God classes with adultery, idolatry, murder, drunkenness, and the like, and declares "that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21. "Babylon is fallen" indeed; "come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4. J.

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man.—No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 44 , pp. 696, 697.**

ANOTHER important question concerning man, one which has, no doubt, been asked by every person that ever lived long enough to think at all upon the subject, is, When a man dies, where does he go? what is his condition? etc., etc. This question the Bible asks: "Man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Job 14:10.

Of course there have been many answers given to this question; and there are yet many, even in this land where Bibles are scattered everywhere. Some say that if he die wicked he is in hell; if he die righteous he is in Heaven. Others say that he is in neither hell nor Heaven, but in purgatory; and yet others that he is in none of these but has passed to the "spheres," and still associates and communicates with those who still live. Of course all these answers cannot be the right ones; and as a matter of fact not one of them is the right one. The Bible alone is that which gives the right answer to this, its own question. And as it is alone the Bible answers to Bible questions that we are now studying, that alone shall be what we shall seek on this question of where is man when he has died.

"Man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Answer: "The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that *they go to the dead.*" Eccl. 9:3. To good king Josiah God said, "Thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace." 2 Kings 22:20. Of the wicked he also says, "Yet shall he be brought to the grave, and shall remain in the tomb." Job 21:32. Jacob said, "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." Gen. 37:35. We shall not multiply texts on this point, but simply show that this is confirmed by the word of Christ. When he comes to give reward to his people, and when he calls for them, they, all that are dead, are found in the grave: "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." John 5:28, 29. Therefore the Bible answer to this question is plainly that he is in the grave.

But what is his condition there? Let us read a verse from Job again: "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.

This shows that man, when he dieth, is asleep. Again Job says that if he had died when he was an infant, "now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have *slept*; then had I been at rest, with kings and counselors of the earth. . . . There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master." Job 3:13-19.

In the history of the kings of Israel and Judah, *twenty-five* times is the record made of their deaths, "He *slept* with his fathers."

Not to multiply texts we turn at once, again, to the word of Christ. Lazarus was sick. Jesus and his disciples were some distance away, and Lazarus died. Jesus said, "Our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said the disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit *Jesus spake of his death*; but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, *Lazarus is dead*." John 11:11-14. Here are the words of Christ: "Lazarus sleepeth;" "Lazarus is dead." Therefore the plain word of Christ is that when a man is dead he is asleep.

Paul says that, "David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on *sleep*, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption." Acts 13:36. And Peters says of him, "David is not ascended into the heavens." Acts 2:34. And the reason is, that "David *slept* with his fathers and was *buried*." 1 Kings 2:10.

Of Stephen it is recorded, "He kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he *fell asleep*." Acts 7:60. It is certain, therefore, that the Bible plainly teaches that when man dies he falls asleep. The word of God plainly teaches the sleep of the dead.

And it is wholly an unconscious sleep, as, in the very nature of the case, it must be when the place of sleep is in the grave. But here is the proof: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead *know not anything*, 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 forever in anything that is done under the sun." "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, 6, 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. When men's love, and hatred, and envy, and their very *thoughts*, have perished, and their memory is gone, there can be nothing else but unconsciousness. But that is precisely what death is, and that is the condition into which men go when they die—a long, silent, dreamless sleep.

But the Bible story on this subject does not stop here. For "now is Christ *risen from the dead*, and become the first-fruits of them that *slept*." 1 Cor. 15:20. "And many bodies of the graves after his resurrection." Matt. 27:52, 53. And as God "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus," so also "them which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him;" "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; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are

697

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. 4:15-17. "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."

Then it is that, "many of them that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake*." Dan. 12:2. Then is the time to which David looked when he fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers: "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I *awake*, with thy likeness." Ps. 17:15. This is the time to which Job looked when he said, "*Till the heavens be no more*, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." For it is at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead that the heavens roll away. "The heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places," and men cried "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; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Rev. 6:14, 16, 17.

The Bible answers to the Bible question, When man giveth up the ghost where is he? is this, therefore; He is asleep in the grave until the trump of God awakes the dead, and the voice of the glorious Son of God calls and all that are in the graves hear his voice. For it is God who gives victory over death, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Reader, this is profitable teaching, for it is the teaching of the word of God, and "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldst go." Isa. 48:17. This is the way that the Lord Jesus leads us, will you follow?

J.

**November 25, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Lombards. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 12, 45 , p. 708.**

**THE LOMBARDS**

*(Continued.)*

IN A.D. 493, the Herulian kingdom of Italy was uprooted, and replaced by the kingdom of the Ostrogoths; in A.D. 533, September, to 534, the kingdom of the Vandals in Africa was annihilated, by the army of Justinian under Belisarius; and in A.D. 538, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy was destroyed, also by Belisarius and the army of Justinian. But as these events are directly connected

with the establishment of the Papacy, we reserve the history of them until we come to that of the Papacy, in Dan. 7:24, 25.

We left the Lombards in possession of Noricum and Pannonia. "But the spirit of rapine soon tempted them beyond these ample limits; they wandered along the coast of the Hadriatic as far as Dyrrachium, and presumed, with familiar rudeness to enter the towns and houses of their Roman allies, and to seize the captives who had escaped from their audacious hands. These acts of hostility, the sallies, as it might be pretended, of some loose adventurers, were disowned by the nation, and excused by the emperor [Justinian]; but the arms of the Lombards were more seriously engaged by a contest of thirty years [A.D. 536-566], which was terminated only by the *extirpation of the Gepide*."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 42, par. 2.*

"The destruction of a mighty kingdom established the fame of Alboin. . . . But his ambition was yet unsatisfied; and the conqueror of the Gepide turned his eye [A.D. 567] from the Danube to the richer banks of the Po, and the Tyber. Fifteen years had not elapsed, since his subjects, the confederates of Narses, had visited the pleasant climate of Italy; the mountains, the rivers, the highways, were familiar to their memory; the report of their success, perhaps the view of their spoils, had kindled in the rising generation the flame of emulation and enterprise. Their hopes were encouraged by the spirit and eloquence of Alboin; and it is affirmed, that he spoke to their senses, by producing at the royal feast, the fairest and most exquisite fruits that grew spontaneously in the garden of the world.

"No sooner had he erected his standard, than the native strength of the Lombard was multiplied by the adventurous youth of Germany and Scythia. The robust peasantry of Noricum and Pannonia had resumed the manners of Barbarians; and the names of the Gepide, Bulgarians, Sarmatians, and Bavarians, may be distinctly traced in the provinces of Italy. Of the Saxons, the old allies of the Lombards, 20,000 warriors, with their wives and children, accepted the invitation of Alboin. Their bravery contributed to his success; but the accession or the absence of their numbers was not sensibly felt in the magnitude of his host. . . . The Lombards, and their confederates, were united by their common attachment to a chief, who excelled in all the virtues and vices of a savage hero; and the vigilance of Alboin provided an ample magazine of offensive and defensive arms for the use of the expedition. The portable wealth of the Lombards attended the march; their lands they cheerfully relinquished to the Avars, on the solemn promise, which was made and accepted without a smile, that if they failed in the conquest of Italy, these voluntary exiles should be reinstated in their former possessions.

"Whatever might be the grounds of his security, Alboin neither expected nor encountered a Roman army in the field. He ascended

the Julian Alps, and looked down with contempt and desire on the fruitful plains to which his victory [A.D. 568-570] communicated *the perpetual appellation of LOMBARDY*. A faithful chieftain, and a select band, were stationed at Forum Julii, the modern Friuli, to guard the passes of the mountains. The Lombards respected the strength of Pavia, and listened to the prayers of the Trevisans; their slow and heavy multitudes proceeded to occupy the palace and city of Verona; and Milan, now rising from her ashes, was invested by the powers of Alboin five months after his departure from Pannonia. Terror preceded his march; he found every where, or he left, a dreary solitude; and the pusillanimous Italians presumed, without a trial, that the stranger was invincible. Escaping to lakes, or rocks, or morasses, the affrighted crowds concealed some fragments of their wealth, and delayed the moment of their servitude. . . . Along the maritime coast, the courage of the inhabitants was supported by the facility of supply, the hopes of relief, and the power of escape; but from the Trentine hills to the gates of Ravenna and Rome *the inland regions of Italy became, without a battle or a siege, the lasting patrimony of the Lombards.*

"The submission of the people invited the barbarian to assume the character of a lawful sovereign, and the helpless exarch was confined to the office of announcing to the Emperor Justin the rapid and irretrievable loss of his provinces and cities. One city, which had been diligently fortified by the Goths, resisted the arms of a new invader; and while Italy was subdued by the flying detachments of the Lombards, the royal camp was fixed above three years before the western gate of Ticinum, or Pavia. The same courage which obtains the esteem of a civilized enemy provokes the fury of a savage, and the impatient besieger had bound himself by a tremendous oath, that age, and sex, and dignity, should be confounded in a general massacre. The aid of famine at length enabled him to execute his bloody vow; but, as Alboin entered the gate, his horse stumbled, fell, and could not be raised from the ground. One of his attendants was prompted by compassion, or piety, to interpret this miraculous sign of the wrath of Heaven; the conqueror paused and relented; he sheathed his sword, and peacefully reposing himself in the palace of Theodoric, proclaimed to the trembling multitude that they should live and obey. Delighted with the situation of a city which was endeared to his pride by the difficulty of the purchase, the prince of the Lombards disdained the ancient glories of Milan; and Pavia, during some ages, was respected as the capital of *the kingdom of Italy.*

"The victorious Autharis asserted his claim to the dominion of Italy. At the foot of the Rhetian Alps, he subdued the resistance, and rifled the hidden treasures, of a sequestered island in the Lake of Comum. At the extreme point of the Calabria, he touched with his

spear a column on the sea-shore of Rhegium, proclaiming that ancient landmark to stand the immovable boundary of his kingdom."

With the exception of the possessions of the Exarchate of Ravenna, and some cities on the coast, "the remainder of Italy was possessed by the Lombards; and from Pavia, the royal seat, their kingdom was extended to the east, the north, and the west, as far as the confines of the Avars, the Bavarians, and the Franks of Austrasia and Burgundy. In the language of modern geography, it is now represented by the Terra Firma of the Venetian republic, Tyrol, the Milanese, Piedmont, the coast of Genoa, Mantua, Parma, and Modena, the grand duchy of Tuscany, and a large portion of the ecclesiastical state from Perugia to the Adriatic. The dukes, and at length the princes, of Beneventum, survived the monarchy, and propagated the name of the Lombards. From Capua to Tarentum, they reigned near five hundred years over the greatest part of the present [1776] kingdom of Naples.—*Id.*, chap. 45, par. 5, 7, 14, 15.

So widespread was the Lombard rule that Lombardy "was indeed for a time the name for Italy itself," and from that time to this the history of the Lombards is but the history of Italy, and Lombardy is still "the name of the finest province" of that country, which, itself, might almost be called the key of history.

## THE FRANKS

We must now resume the narrative of the triple division of the dominions of Clovis—Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy. Before the end of the sixth century we may mark the rise of a new character, the Mayor of the Palace, which finally developed the glorious era of Charlemagne. The last of the line of Clovis—the Merovingians—who possessed or displayed any of the characteristics of a king, was Dagobert. After his death in A.D. 638, the kings dwindled into insignificance, if not idiocy, and the Mayors of the Palace assumed sole authority, yet always in the name of the "do-nothing" kings; and the struggle for supremacy was kept up between the Mayors, as it had been before by the kings. Finally, in A.D. 687, Pepin of Heristal, Mayor of the Palace, of Austrasia, defeated Berthar, Mayor of Neustria, at the battle of Testry, and so brought the contest virtually to an end. "From that time to the end of his life, in A.D. 714, Pepin of Heristal was unquestioned master of all Franks, the kings under him being utterly insignificant." Pepin of Heristal was succeeded by his son Charles, who in A.D. 732 won the name of Martel—the Hammer—by the crushing defeat which he gave the Saracens under Abdel-Rahman at the battle of Tours.

Charles Martel died October 22, 741, and left his dominions divided between his two sons, Pepin the Short, and Carloman, Pepin had Neustria, Burgundy, Provence and the suzerainty of Aquitaine, Carloman had Austrasia, Thuringia, and Allemannia. Each, however, with only the title of Mayor of the Palace. In 746 Carloman abdicated his power, left his dominions to Pepin, had Pope Zachary to make him a monk, and shut himself up in the monastery of Monte Cassino. In

747 Pepin the Short found himself sole master of all the heritage of Clovis, but still with the title of Mayor of the Palace. At last in 751 he decided to put an end to the fiction. He sent an embassy to the Pope to consult him "on the subject of the kings then existing amongst the Franks, and who bore only the name of king without enjoying a tittle [*sic.*] of royal authority." The Pope, who had been already posted on the matter, answered that "it was better to give the title of king to him who exercised the sovereign power." Accordingly the next year in March, 752, "in the presence and with the assent of the general assembly" at Soissons, Pepin was proclaimed king of the Franks, and received from the hand of St. Boniface the sacred anointment. "At the head of the Franks, as Mayor of the Palace from 741, and as king from 752, Pepin had completed in France and extended in Italy the work which his father Charles Martel had begun and carried on from 714 to 741 in State and church. He left France reunited in one and placed at the head of Christian Europe." He died at the monastery of St. Denis, September 18, 768.—*Guizot's France, chap. 9.*

Pepin, like his father, left his dominions to two sons, Charles and Carloman; but in 771 Carloman died, leaving Charles sole king, who, by his remarkable ability, became Charles the Great—CHARLEMAGNE.

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Why Should Sunday Be Kept?" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 45 , pp. 711, 712.**

HAVING examined all the places in the Gospels where the first day of the week is mentioned, and found no sign of a reason for the keeping of it with any kind or degree of sacredness, we now take up the only other instances in the New Testament where the day is named. The first of these is in Acts 20:7, and that we may discuss it with the best advantage to the reader we copy the whole connection:—

"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. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep; and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead. And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him. When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." Verse 7-11.

Upon the face of this whole narrative it is evident that this meeting was at night. Let us put together several of the statements: (1) "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples *came together* . . . there were *many lights* in the upper chamber, *where they were gathered together.*" (2) "Paul *preached* unto them . . . and continued his speech *until midnight.*" (3) At midnight Eutychus fell out of the

window, and Paul went down and brought him up, and *then* he broke the bread and ate, therefore we may read, "The disciples came together to break bread," and *after midnight* the bread was broken. (4) *After that* Paul "talked a long while, even *till break of day*, so he departed." Therefore we may read (5) Upon the first day of the week, the disciples came together, and there were many lights where they were gathered together. They came together to break bread, and after midnight the bread was broken. Paul preached unto them until midnight, and even till break of day. When the disciples came together, Paul was ready to depart on the morrow, and when he had talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed. There can be no room for any reasonable doubt that the meeting referred to in Acts 20:7 was wholly a night meeting, and not only that but that it was an *all-night* meeting.

This meeting being therefore in the night of the first day of the week, the question properly arises. Accordingly to the Bible, what part of the complete day does the night form? Is the night the first or the last part of the complete day? The Bible plainly shows that the night is the first part of the day. There was darkness on the earth before there was light. When God created the world, *darkness* was upon the face of the deep. Then "God said, Let there be light; and there was light." Then "God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." As the darkness was called night, and as it takes both the night and the day—the darkness and the light—to make the complete day, it follows that in the true count of days by the revolution of the earth, the night precedes the day. This is confirmed by the Scripture: "The evening [the darkness, the night] and the morning [the light, the day] were the first day."

This is order which God established in the beginning of the world; it is the order that is laid down in the beginning of the book of God; and it is the order that is followed throughout the book of God. In Leviticus 23:27-32, giving directions about the day of atonement, God said that it should be "the tenth day of the seventh month," and that that was from the ninth day of the month at even; "from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." Thus the tenth day of the month began in the evening of the ninth day of the month. And so according to Bible time every day begins in the evening, and evening is at the going down of the sun. Deut. 16:6. Therefore as the meeting mentioned in Acts 20:7-11 was in the night of the first day of the week, and as in the word and the order of God the night is the first part of the day, it follows that that meeting was on what is now called Saturday night. For if it had been on what is now called Sunday night it would have been on the second day of the week and not on the first. So Conybeare and Howson, in "Life and Epistles of Paul," says: "It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath." And that is now called Saturday night.

This meeting, then, being on what is now called Saturday night, as Paul preached till midnight, and after the breaking of bread talked till break of day and departed, it follows that at break of day on the first day of the week, at break of day on Sunday. Paul started afoot from Troas to Assos, a distance of twenty miles, with the intention of going on board a ship at Assos and continuing his journey, which he did. For says the record: "We [Paul's companions in travel, Acts 20:4] went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos, there intending to take in

Paul; for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot. And when he met with us at Assos, we took him in, and came to Mitylene." Verses 13, 14. Paul not only walked from Troas to Assos on Sunday, but he *appointed* that his companions should go before and sail to that place—about forty miles by water—and be there by the time he came so that he could go on without delay. And when he reached Assos he went at once aboard the ship and sailed away to Mitylene, which was nearly forty miles further. That is to say, on the first day of the week Paul walked twenty miles and then sailed nearly forty more, making nearly sixty miles that he traveled; and he *appointed* that his companions—Luke, Timothy, Tychicus, Trophimus, Gaius, Aristarchus, and Secundus—should sail forty miles and then take him aboard, and all sail nearly forty miles more, making nearly eighty miles travel for them, all on Sunday. And this is exactly how these Christians kept that first day of the week of which mention is made in Acts 20.

But nowadays men try to make it appear that it is an awful sin to travel on Sunday. Yes, some people now seem to think that if a ship should sail on Sunday, the sin would be so great that nothing but a perfect miracle of grace would be so great that nothing but a perfect miracle of grace would keep it from sinking. Paul neither taught nor acted any such thing, for says the record, "We went before to ship, and sailed; . . . for *so had he appointed*." Paul and his companions regarded Sunday in nowise different from the other common working days of the week. For, mark, the first day of the week they sailed from Troas to Mitylene, "the next day" they sailed from Mitylene to Chios, "the next day" from Chios to Samos and Trogyllium, and "the next day" to Miletus. Here are "the first day of the week," "the next day," "the next day," and "the next day," and Paul and his companions did the same things on one of these days that they did on another. They considered one of them no more sacred than another; they considered the first day of the week to be no more of a sabbath than the next day, or the next day, or the next day. True, Paul preached all night, before he started on the first day of the week; but on the fifth or sixth day of the week he preached also at Miletus, to the elders of the church of Ephesus.

The only remaining mention of the first day of the week is in 1 Cor. 16:21. "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." What this means is explained by Paul in 2 Cor. 9:1-5: "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."

All there is therefore in 1 Cor. 16:2, is that on the first day of the week every one was to "*lay by him*" what he chose to give for the help of the poor saints at Jerusalem. Rom. 15:26-28. And when the time came for Paul to take it to

Jerusalem, that it might be ready for him when he came he sent brethren before to Corinth to "make up" this bounty that each one had laid by him, according to Paul's directions.

We have no examined every one of the right instances in which the first day of the week is mentioned in the Bible, and we ask, Where can any person find in any of them any statement that that

712

day should be kept as the Sabbath, or for any other sacred purpose? Where is there in any of them any statement that anybody ever did keep it? Where is there in any of them any reason given for keeping the first day of the week? The only true answer that there can be is, Nowhere. We do not ask whether men can give any reason for it, because men can give a multitude of reasons for a thing, and which may seem to them very satisfactory reasons, but which at the same time do not rest upon any just basis whatever. Bible reasons—that is, reasons framed in Bible language—alone are the just basis of Bible duties. Do you ask us why we keep the seventh day? We answer, Because God said "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." So we might go on through a long list of duties. We do not ask men to do any duty toward God the reason for which we cannot give in the very words of God. But we do ask, Where is there a person who can give, in the words of the Bible, the Bible reason for keeping the first day of the week? Never yet have we seen any such person.

Again we say, Bible reasons alone are the just basis of Bible duties. If there is no Bible reason for keeping Sunday, then there is no duty resting upon anybody to keep it. And if there is no Bible reason for it, why in the world do you do it?  
J.

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man.—No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 45 , p. 712.**

ANOTHER question is, Do the dead praise the Lord? Nowadays it is held that if a person be righteous, or even professedly so, when he dies, it follows, as a matter of course, that he has gone to Heaven and has joined the angelic hosts in their holy songs of praise to the Creator of all. But in the Scriptures this question is asked in connection with certain others, in a manner and in a tone which of themselves admit only of no for an answer.

Says the psalmist, "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? 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. Here the grave, the place of the dead, is called "the land of forgetfulness." This is strictly in accord with that which we read last week, that "the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them *is forgotten*." They are in the land of "forgetfulness." "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished" (Eccl. 9:5); and "in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4); and "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. 9:10. In this respect therefore no single expression could better

describe the place of the dead than does this one, "The land of forgetfulness." The psalmist also speaks of it as "the dark." On this Job says, "I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 10:21, 22. Those that have been dead, David says, "dwell in darkness." Ps. 143:3.

Now it is of those who dwell in this place, the place of the dead, that the question is asked, Shall they praise the Lord? And here is the direct answer: "*The dead praise not the Lord*, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17. And again, "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. 6:5. These words are the words of God. They are the truth. Therefore the idea that people go to Heaven or anywhere else, but this place of the dead, when they die, cannot be the truth. The Lord who speaks to us in the Bible made man. He knows what was before us. He knows what will be after us. He knoweth our thoughts afar off. He it is who says, "The dead know not anything." He it is who says, "The dead praise not the Lord." He it is who says that the place of the dead is "the land of forgetfulness." We implicitly believe this word, for he alone knows. He teaches us to profit, and though we may have to pass through this land of darkness, this valley of the shadow of death, if our trust is in him, his rod and his staff will comfort us, for he has gone this way before us. He died and lives again. If our hope is in him, even though we may have to go to the place of the dead, yet we shall come again from it and live by him.

King Hezekiah was one of the few good kings that Judah ever had. He fell "sick unto death." The Lord, by the prophet, sent this message to him: "Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." Isa. 38:1. Yet, although this word of the Lord says positively, "Thou shalt die and *not* live," now it is believed by the great majority of people that when a man dies he *does* live, and that he lives more fully, more really, than ever before. It is now held that when a person dies he knows vastly more than he ever knew before, or than he ever could have known if he had not died; but from what we have set forth in these articles there can be nothing more certain than that such is not the teaching of the Bible.

In this theory of the consciousness of the dead, is the promise and potency, the whole sum and substance, of Spiritualism, purgatory, prayers for the dead, worship and invocation of saints, etc. But bring Spiritualism, with all these other things, to the test of these scriptures, and where will it appear? It will appear just where it rightly belongs, that is, in the train of "that old serpent which is the devil and Satan," who said to innocent Eve, "Thou shalt not surely die." People now think it very strange that Eve should have believed the word of Satan. Yet with the example of Eve before them, and its fearful fruits of these thousands of years, and the word of God with its line upon line and precept upon precept—with all this before them, multitudes of these same people instead of believing the word of God, will yet believe the same story that Satan told Eve.

When the prophet went to king Hezekiah with the message that he should die and not live, Hezekiah was very sorry, and turned his face to the wall and prayed, and said, "I shall go to the gates of the grave; I am deprived of the residue of my years. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living."

This, with much more, he said in his prayer, and the Lord sent Isaiah again to the king saying, "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years." Then Hezekiah praised the Lord and said: "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; . . . for the grave *cannot praise thee*, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. *The living, the living, he shall praise thee*, as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth." See Isa. 38 throughout.

Take this plain, express statement of the word of God: "They that go down into the pit *cannot hope for thy truth*," and by it test the New Theology, or probation after death, which is just now being discussed throughout the land, and the utter worthlessness of the New Theology will be seen at a glance. When a man dies, his opportunity to learn the truth is gone. He is dead. He is gone to the "land of forgetfulness," to the grave, and they that go there cannot hope for the truth of God. If they have not learned it, and loved it, before they go there, they will never learn it at all. "Now is the accepted time." "Now is the day of salvation." "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." The living, the living it is, not the dead, who praise the Lord.

Therefore the Bible answer to this Bible question, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." J.

**December 2, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Franks. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 46 , p. 724.**

### **THE FRANKS**

*(Continued.)*

"THE appellation of *great* has been often bestowed, and sometimes deserved; but Charlemagne is the only prince in whose favor the title has been indissolubly blended with the name. . . . The dignity of his person, the length of his reign, the prosperity of his arms, the vigor of his government, and the reverence of distant nations, distinguish him from the royal crowd; and Europe dates a new aera from his restoration of the Western Empire."—*Dec. and Fall. Chap. 49, par. 41.*

It seems almost certain that Charlemagne really aspired to the restoration of the Roman Empire. But one life was too short, and there was no second Charlemagne. Besides this, the prophetic word was written that when once Rome was divided into its ten parts they should not be made to cleave one to another no more than could iron and clay. Charlemagne reigned forty six years—forty-three from the death of Carloman—thirty-three of which were spent in almost ceaseless wars. He conducted, in all, fifty-three expeditions, thirty-one against

the Saxons, Frisons, Danes, Slavs, Bavarians, and the Avars; in upper Germany, Bohemia, Noricum, and Pannonia, give against the Lombards in Italy; twelve against the Saracens, in Spain, Corsica, and Sardinia; two against the Greeks; and three in Gaul itself against the Aguatanians and the Britons. Thus Saxony, bohemia, bavaris, Pannonia, Hungary, the Lombard kingdom of Italy as far as the duchy of Beneventum, that part of Spain between the Pyrenees and the river Ebro, Burgundy, Alemannia, and all of Gaul, was subject to the sway of Charlemagne. He already wore the iron crown of Lombardy in addition to the kingship of all the Frankish dominions, but when on Christmas day, 800, in the church of St. Peter, Pope Leo III. placed a precious crown upon the head of this mighty king while the great dome resounded with the acclamation of the people, "Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God the great and pacific emperor of the Romans," the honor seems well deserved. "For fourteen years, with less of fighting and more of organization, Charles the Great proved that he was worthy of his high title and revived office of Emperor of the West." "And when in 801 an embassy arrived with curious presents from Harun at Rashid, the great caliph who held in the East the same place as Charles in the West, men recognized it as a becoming testimony to the world-wide reputation of the Frankish monarchy." But this honor, this power, and this glory was short lived. Charlemagne died at Aix la Chapelle, January 28, 814, and the unity of the empire which he had formed was at an end.

"Like more than one great barbaric warrior, he admired the Roman Empire that had fallen,—its vastness all in one and its powerful organization under the hand of a single master. He thought he could resuscitate it, durably, through the victory of a new people and a new faith, by the hand of Franks and Christians. With this view he labored to conquer, convert, and govern. He tried to be, at one and the same time, Cesar, Augustus, and Constantine. And for a moment he appeared to have succeeded, but the appearance passed away with himself. The unity of the empire and the absolute power of the emperor were buried in his grave."—*Guizot's France, chap. 11, end.*

Charlemagne was succeeded by his only surviving son, Louis the Pious, upon whom he had fixed the succession in 843, about six months before his death. Louis passed his life in a struggle with an ambitious second wife, and three undutiful sons who by constant rebellions abused his natural gentleness and goodness. In the quarrels and jealousies of his sons he was twice deposed and twice restored, and perhaps only escaped a third deposition, by his death June 20, 840. This set the sons free to wrangle among themselves, which they did till the fearful battle of Fontanet, June 25, 841, and the treaty of Verdun, August, 843, put an end to their mutual struggles and "to the griefs of the age." Lothair, the eldest son, retained the title of emperor and received the Italian territory, with a long narrow strip stretching from the Gulf of Lyons to the North Sea, bounded on the east by the Alps and the Rhine, and on the west by the Rhone, the Saone, the Mense, and the Seheldt. Charles the Bald had all the rest of Gaul. Louis the German received Alemannia and all the rest of the German lands east of the

Rhine, with the towns of Mainz, Worms, and Spire, on the western bank of that river.

This division, though counted as marking the real beginning of the history of France and Germany as separate kingdoms, lasted but a short time. For the Emperor Lothair died in 855, and was succeeded in his possessions to the north of Italy by Lothair II., who died in 869, when Charles the Bald seized upon his territory. But Louis the German disputed his seizure of the whole prize, and in 870 they signed the treaty of Mersen by which Louis became possessed of most of Lotharingia, or, as it was now called, Lorraine; Charles the Bald the rest of it; and Lothair's brother, Louis II., was allowed to retain the possessions of his father in Italy. Louis II. died in 875, and Charles the Bald managed to secure the imperial crown and aimed at the possession of the whole empire with it. But Louis the German, at his death in 876, had divided Germany among his three sons, Carlman, Louis, and Charles—the second of whom, Louis, met Charles the Bald on the field of Andernach and gained such a victory over him as to not only put an effectual damper upon his imperial aspirations, but to force him to give up the portions of Lorraine that had been ceded to his father by the treaty of Mersen. Carlman and Louis both soon died, and the German kingdom passed to Charles surnamed "the Fat," the youngest of the three sons of Louis the German.

Charles the Fat, incompetent, indolent, and gluttonous, became, without any effort of his own, sovereign of all the dominions of Charlemagne, except Burgundy which now became again an independent state. Alemannia—Swabia—he inherited from his father in 876, by the death of his brother Carlman, he received Bavaria and became king of Italy, in 880; by the death of his brother Carlman, he received Bavaria and became king of Italy, in 880; he was crowned emperor in 881; the death of his brother Louis of Saxony gave him all the rest of the Germanic possessions; and as Charles the Bald had died in 877, and had no successor who could relieve France from the scourge of the Northmen, Charles the Fat was invited to become the king of France, at the death of Carlman in 885. But instead of boldly meeting the Northmen with an army, he adopted the policy of buying off these bold savages who had plundered Cologne and Treves, and had led their horses over the very grave and in the beautiful basilica of Charlemagne. And when they laid siege to Paris and he still pursued the same cowardly course, his disgusted subjects, under the leadership of his nephew Arnulf, deposed him in 887, and in a week or two afterwards he died. Charles the Fat was the last ruler who ever reigned over both France and Germany. After his deposition the history of these two countries is distinct. It will be seen that the boundaries of France under the treaty of Verdun are very nearly the same as at present with the exception of that part between the Rhone and Saone, and the Alps. And so having traced the kingdom of the Franks to its permanent bounds, there we have it.

## **THE ALEMANNI**

We must now resume the history of the Alemanni, and sketch their fortunes through the tumults of the Dark Ages. We have seen that the Alemanni and their

Suevic brethren that followed them in the invasion of the Roman Empire, took possession of all Rhetia as far south as the country about the lake of Constance and the northern border of Switzerland; and that part of Gaul which lay between the Rhine and Moselle, and the head waters of the Seine. Thus they occupied the country which now comprises Alsace, Lorraine, Baden, Wurtemberg, greater part of Bavaria, and the southern of the large divisions of Hesse Darmstadt. When they were defeated by Clovis, their Gallic possessions became the prize of the conqueror, but all the rest they were allowed to occupy, and were permitted by Clovis and his successors "to enjoy their peculiar manners and institutions, under the government of official, and at length of hereditary, dukes."—*Gibbon, chap. 36, par. 5; chap. 38, par. 5*. These, as well as the other German conquests of Clovis, "soon became virtually free. They continued to acknowledge Frankish supremacy; but the acknowledgment was only formal. At the head of each confederation was its own herzog or duke. These rulers were at first appointed by the Frankish kings, or received their sanction; but in course of time the office became hereditary in particular families."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Germany, p. 477*.

Of the Allemanni there were two dukedoms, Swabia and Bavaria, and it is under these two names that their future history is found. But as Swabia is the original, and as it has exerted a greater influence in the affairs of Germany than has any other confederation, it is the one about which most must be said; for the history of it is, in a measure, the history of Germany, especially after the treaty of Verdun. Thassilo, duke of Bavaria, had been on ill terms with Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, and when Charlemagne came to the throne, Thassilo repeated acts of treachery caused Charlemagne to remove him, and Bavaria was placed under the authority of the margrave of *Ostreich* (Austria). The "margraves" were "lords of the marches;" and the "marches" were formed of the border countries, by Charlemagne, over which he appointed "margrave" (*markgrafeu*) "whose duty was to administer justice in his name, to collect tribute, and extend his conquests." Bavaria was rule by margraves till about 900, when it again became a dukedom. The margraviate of *Ostreich* continued till 1156, when it, too, was made a duchy, and thus the march of *Ostreich*, formed by Charlemagne, was the origin of what is now the empire of *Austria*.

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"A Romish Reason for a Romish Custom" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 46 , p. 727.**

HAVING examined all the scriptures which speak of the first day of the week, and found that not one of them gives any reason for the keeping of that day in any sacred manner, we shall now for a little space look at some other of the "reasons" which are given for keeping Sunday.

Once of these "reasons" is framed something after this manner: Redemption is greater than creation, and as creation had a memorial day, redemption should also have a memorial day; and as redemption was completed at the resurrection

of Christ, and as that was on the first day of the week; therefore the first day of the week must now be kept in commemoration of completed redemption.

This might all be well enough if it were true. But there are several fatal defects about it.

1. The Scripture says not a word about it.

.2. This "reason" says that "redemption is greater than creation," a thing which, as the Scripture is silent about it, no person can prove. For mark what would have to be done before it could be shown that redemption is greater than creation. The whole creation would have to be spanned and measured; and then redemption likewise; then a comparison drawn before ever it could be known which is the greater. But no man can conceive of the creative power employed in the making of the smallest insect that lives, nor of the tiniest blade of grass that grows. In short no human mind can form any just conception of any creative act whatever. How much less then can it be formed of the *whole* creation, or of the depths of redemption. Therefore, until a person is found who has such a mighty grasp of intellect that he can span the creation; and who is so profoundly wise that he can enter into the counsels of eternity and comprehend the depths of redemption; and then against creation weigh redemption as in a balance—until then none can ever know which is the greater. And as God, who alone is able to do this, has not in all his revelation to men said a word about which is the greater, and as none else can, it follows that there is no just basis for the statement that redemption is greater than creation. Almighty power alone could accomplish either, and to talk of one act of Almighty power being greater than another is only nonsense.

.3. Another fatal defect in this is in saying that "redemption was completed at the resurrection of Christ." The truth is that redemption, so far from being finished at the resurrection of Christ, will not be finished till the end of the world. The disciples asked the Saviour what should be the sign of his coming and of the end of the world, and he answered, "There shall be *signs* in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And *then* shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things *begin* to come to pass, *then look up*, and lift up your heads; *for your redemption draweth nigh*." Luke 21:25-28. These things did not "begin to come to pass" till 1780 A.D.; for then it was that the sun was turned to darkness, and the moon also. Therefore it is plain from these words of Christ, that instead of redemption being completed at the resurrection of Christ, it was not even "nigh" for 1749 years after that event.

This is confirmed by Paul. He says: "Ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Rom. 8:23. Our bodies will be redeemed at the resurrection of the dead: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death" (Hos. 13:11); and the resurrection of the dead is accomplished at the second coming of the Lord. "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. Therefore Paul, in telling of our redemption, places its accomplishment exactly where Christ places it, that is, at the second coming of the Lord, and *not* at his resurrection.

Again Paul writes: "In whom 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." Eph. 1:13, 14. "That Holy Spirit of promise" was not given until the day of Pentecost, forty-nine days *after* the resurrection of Christ; and this, says Paul, is the earnest of our inheritance *until* (not because of) the *redemption* of the purchased possession. By this Holy Spirit, says Paul, "ye are sealed *unto* the day of redemption." Eph. 4:30. Now as the Holy Spirit was given to be with those who trust in Christ "until the day of redemption," and as that Spirit was not so given till forty-nine days after the resurrection of Christ, this proves most positively that the day of the resurrection of Christ could not possibly be made "the monument of a finished redemption." And when anybody, or the whole professed Christian church together, sets up the first day of the week as the monument of a finished redemption, it is simply to pervert the Scripture doctrine of redemption, and to put darkness for light.

But some may ask, As the ideas of redemption being greater than creation, and of redemption being finished at the resurrection, are not according to Scripture at all, where did they come from, and how did they become so widely prevalent in the church? The answer is, they belong with the Sunday institution itself; they are an essential part of the foundation upon which that institution rests; and they originated where the Sunday-Sabbath institution originated, they came from the same place that it did; that is, from that grand hot-bed of errors and corruptions of Scripture, the Romish Church, the mystery of iniquity, the lawless one. Of that power which opposes and exalts itself above God, it is just what we might expect that it would take upon itself to declare that redemption is greater than creation, which God has *not* declared, and to declare that redemption was completed at the resurrection of Christ, the *contrary* of which God *has* declared. This is only in keeping with the character which the Bible shows of Rome, that of exalting itself above God.

But the mere statement of this, by us, without proof, would not be sufficient. Therefore we here give the proof that this so-called reason for keeping Sunday is only a Romish reason, and is of Romish origin. In the Roman Catholic Catechism, entitled "The Catholic Christian Instructed," chapter XXIII. Question 6, is found the following:—

"Q.—Why was the weekly Sabbath changed from Saturday to Sunday?

"Ans.—Because our Lord *fully accomplished the work of redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday*, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday; *as therefore the work of redemption was greater than that of creation*, so the primitive church thought the day on which this work was *completely finished*

was more worthy her religious observation than that on which God rested from creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."

There, reader, is the true authority upon which rests this "reason" for keeping Sunday. So whenever you hear anybody present as a reason for keeping Sunday (and you will never hear it for any other cause), the idea that redemption is greater than creation, or that redemption was completed at the resurrection of Christ, you may know that both the idea and the institution come from Rome. And you may know that the person who preaches it, in that thing preaches the doctrine of Rome and not the doctrine of Christ. instead of giving a Bible reason for a Bible duty, he only gives a Romish reason for a Romish custom.

J.

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions.—No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 46 , pp. 728, 729.**

ANOTHER important question is, "If a man die, shall he live again?" This question is not one that is asked now so much as it ought to be. The question that is now asked a good deal more than it ought to be, is whether man really dies—whether there is really any such thing as death. And as it is in the great majority of cases decided that man does not die, that "there is no death, what seems so is transition," in the view that man never ceases to live, it would not be an appropriate question at all to ask, Shall he live *again*?

But as we have abundantly shown, the Bible considers this subject from the standpoint of the fact that man does die; that when he is dead he is wholly unconscious, and that all prospect of future existence depends upon an affirmative answer, from the word of God, to the question as to whether he shall live again. In Job 14:14 is written the question to which we have here referred: "If a man die, shall he live again?" And in Isaiah 26:19 we have the direct answer to the question: "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."

The only hope of future life which the word of God presents is in the resurrection of the dead. This is the hope of the righteous, it is the Christian's hope. Paul, in discussing this subject of the resurrection of the dead, proves first that Christ is risen, and then says: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." 1 Cor. 15:12-14. It is evident that there were some at Corinth, even as there are some now, who professed to believe in Christ and at the same time believe *not* in the resurrection of the dead. But Paul settles that at once by saying, "If there be no resurrection of the dead," your faith in Christ is vain. This proves plainly that our hope and faith in Christ meets its fruition only at and by the resurrection of the dead.

This is so important that the Spirit of God, by the apostle, repeats it. Again he says: "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." Here it is declared that to deny the resurrection of the dead, is to deny the resurrection of Christ, is to leave the professed believer yet in his sins, and so is to subvert the gospel and the salvation of Christ. This is followed by another most important conclusion, and that is, If the dead rise not, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished*." It would be impossible to more forcibly show that all hope of future life depends upon the resurrection of the dead. If there be no resurrection of the dead, then the dead are perished. And this is stated, not of the wicked dead, but of the righteous dead, "they also which are fallen asleep *in Christ*," even these have perished if there be no resurrection of the dead. In verse 32, this is repeated in another form: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to morrow we die."

Such argument as that is very seldom heard in these our days. Now the argument is, What advantageth it us to practice the life of Christian self-denial, if the soul be not immortal? What advantageth it us to do these things if we do not go to Heaven when we die? And so it is sung,—

"Oh, you must be a lover of the Lord,  
Or you can't go to Heaven when you die."

The truth is, that though you *be* a lover of the Lord, you can't go to Heaven *when you die*, but you

729

*can go at the resurrection* of the dead. And that is at the coming of the Lord. For so it is written: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first-fruits; *afterward* they that are Christ's *at his coming*." Verses 22, 23. "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. "So," means "in this manner." In this manner it is that we go to Heaven. In this manner we meet the Lord.

The hope of life by Christ, at the resurrection of the dead, is the hope in which Paul lived, the hope in which he exercised himself, the hope which he preached. When he stood before the council, he said: "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Acts 23:6. And afterward, when he answered his accusers before Felix, he said: "I have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. . . . Let these same here say, if they have found any evil doing in me, while I stood before the council, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." Acts 24:15-21. Again, when he stood before Agrippa, he said: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" Acts 26:6-8.

Now put these things together: (a) He stood and was judged for the hope of the promise made of God. (b) This was the promise made unto the fathers. (c) Unto this promise the twelve tribes—all Israel—hope to come. (d) For this hope he was accused of the Jews. (e) But he was accused—called in question—of the Jews, "touching the resurrection of the dead." (f) Therefore the hope of the promise of God, made unto the fathers, *is the hope of the promise of the resurrection of the dead.* (g) This is made emphatic by his question to Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, *that God should raise the dead?*" When Paul was at Athens "he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." Acts 17:18.

Therefore it is plainly proven that the hope which God has set before us in Christ and his blessed gospel, is the hope of a resurrection from the dead unto everlasting life and eternal glory. And as this resurrection all depends upon the glorious appearing of our Saviour, therefore the second coming of our Saviour is inseparably connected with this the Christian's "blessed hope." Thus saith the Lord: "For 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." Titus 2:11-13.

This is that for which Job looked. He says: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Job 14:14. This change is at the resurrection, for says Paul, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52. Again says Job: "If I wait, the grave is mine house; I have made my bed in the darkness. . . . And where is now my hope?" Chap. 17:14-15. Here it is: "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 a stranger. My reins within me are consumed with earnest desire for that day." Chap. 19:25-27, margin.

Time and space would fail us to quote the words of this hope, expressed by David, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, and Hosea, and Micah, and all the prophets and apostles. We can only cite again the words that this is the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, unto which promise we instantly serving God day and night hope to come. Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead? The righteous dead shall live again, at the coming of the Lord, and therefore we look and anxiously wait for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the Lord Jesus. Like faithful Job, our reins within us are consumed with earnest desire for that glorious day. And as He assures us, "Surely I come quickly," our hearts reply, "Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

J.

**December 9, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Alemanni. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 12, 47 , p. 740.**

**THE ALEMANNI**

*(Continued.)*

IN the treaty of Verdun, 843, it will be remembered Louis the German received the whole of Germany east of the Rhine. And as he was the first sovereign who ruled over the Germans, and over *no other western people*, he is considered in history as the founder of the *kingdom* of Germany. At his death his son Charles the Fat received from him, Swabia–Alemannia–and, as before shown, by the death of his two brothers Charles inherited all Germany, was made emperor, and by invitation assumed the sovereignty of France, but was deposed, and Arnulf, his nephew, chosen king of Germany in his place. Arnulf, like Charles the Fat, went to Rome and was crowned emperor. He returned and in 890 inflicted such a defeat upon the Northmen that "they never again returned in such numbers as to be a national peril." Arnulf died in 899 and was succeeded by his son Louis the Child, six years old, who nominally reigned till 911. His reign was one of the darkest periods of German history. For as soon as the Magyars–Hungarians–heard that Arnulf had been succeeded by a child, "they swept into Germany in vast numbers, and fearful was the havoc they caused in every part of the kingdom." "Where the Northmen had whipped with cords, these barbarians lased with scorpions." And there was no leader around whom the nation could rally. At this time and for about three hundred years Germany consisted of five duchies,—Swabia, Bavaria, Franconia, Saxony, and Lorraine.

Louis the Child died in 911. Even while he lived, the dukes were virtually kings in their duchies; and when he died they could have been altogether kings, but the dangers threatened by the Magyars, the Slavs, and the Northmen, obliged them to form a central government for the common defense. Accordingly, the nobles assembled at Foreheim, and by the advice of Otto, the duke of Saxony, Conrad, duke of Franconia, was made king. But his election displeased the dukes of Bavaria, Swabia, and Lorraine. The duke of Lorraine rebelled outright. Those of Bavaria and Swabia yielded, but the bishops, jealous of their power, induced Conrad to force a quarrel with these as also with Henry, duke of Saxony. This fairly created an anarchy all his days, but on his death-bed, 918, he recommended that Henry of Saxony be chosen king in his stead.

With Henry began the rule of the House of Saxony which continued one hundred and six years, 918-1024, through Henry I., Otto I., Otto II., Otto III., and Henry II. Henry I. delivered Germany from the scourge of the Magyars and so thoroughly restored peace and order throughout the dominion that when he died, 936, "every land inhabited by a German population formed part of the kingdom, and none of the duchies were at war with each other nor among themselves." Before his death the nobles had, in national assembly, promised Henry that his son Otto should be recognized as his successor, and the promise was kept. Otto

I. the Great reigned from 936-973. His half-brother, however, raised a rebellion and was joined by the dukes of Franconia and Bavaria. But by the help of the duke of Swabia the rising was put down. A second rebellion was led by Otto's brother, helped by the dukes of Franconia and Lorraine. This, too, was quelled to the immense advantage of Otto.

Having secured peace in Germany, and made himself master of the kingdom, as none of his immediate predecessors had been, Otto was by far the greatest sovereign in Europe. But not content with this, he decided to take a step that caused Germany ages of trouble—he put himself into the hands of the Pope and became the "protector of the church." The way it was brought about was this: Adelaide, the young widow of Lothair, the son of King Hugh of Provence—Burgundy—had refused to marry the son of Berengar, king of Lombardy. For this she was cast into prison and cruelly treated. She appealed to Otto. Her appeal not only touched his sympathies, but aroused a strong ambition, for he saw the way thus opened to imperial authority. At the head of a strong force he crossed the Alps in 951. He displaced Berengar and assumed, himself, the title of King of Italy. Besides this, he was so fascinated by young Queen Adelaide that in a few weeks he married her. His son Ludolf thought his rights threatened by this marriage, returned sullenly to Germany, and with the archbishop of Mainz formed a conspiracy against his father. Otto, hearing of their plot, hastened home, leaving Duke Conrad of Lorraine to attend to affairs in Italy. But Conrad restored the crown to Berengar, and returned to Germany and joined the conspiracy of Ludolf and the archbishop. War broke out. The majority of the kingdom were indeed opposed to Otto, being displeased with his ambitious designs in Italy. But Conrad and Ludolf basely invited in the terrible Magyars, which so disgusted the Germans that the whole nation with one consent rallied to the support of Otto. At the battle of Lechfeld, 955, Conrad was slain and the Magyars received such an overwhelming defeat that the deliverance of Germany was complete. From that time the Magyars began to settle, and "adapt themselves to the conditions of civilized life in the country which they now occupy," and so arose the kingdom of Hungary.

Meantime Berengar and his son Adelbert had laid such exorbitant taxes, and had made themselves so tyrannical in Italy, that an embassy was sent by the most of the bishops and princes, as well as the Pope, imploring Otto to come again and deliver them. The Pope at this time was John XII., to whom as such we shall pay our respects in another place. The legates of the Pope "were enjoined to offer the imperial crown to the king of Germany, provided he drove out the tyrants, and delivered the most of all churches from the miseries she groaned under and could no longer bear."—*Bower's Popes, John XII.* At this Otto went a second time into Italy, in 962, and was crowned emperor by the Pope.

"The emperor, at the request of the Pope, promised upon oath to defend the Roman Church against all her enemies; to maintain her in the quiet possession of all the privileges she had enjoyed to that time; to restore to the Holy See the lands and possessions that belonged to St. Peter, as soon as he recovered them; to assist the Pope to the utmost of his power when assistance was wanted; and

lastly to make no alteration in the government of Rome without his knowledge or approbation. At the same time the emperor confirmed all the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne; but obliged in his turn the Pope and the Romans to swear obedience to him, and promise upon oath to lend no kind of assistance to Berengar or to his son Adelbert, from whose tyranny he was come to deliver."—*Id.*

Thus was finally developed the Holy Roman Empire, that mightiest political weapon of the Papacy. After Otto, the sovereign crowned in Germany always claimed it as his right to be afterwards crowned in Milan with the iron crown of Lombardy, and in Rome with the golden crown of the empire.

In 964 Otto returned to Germany, increased the number of the duchies, and nobles, and as he was now the protector of the church, and was set for the promotion of her interests, he immensely increased the importance of the prelates. "They received great gifts of land, were endowed with jurisdiction in criminal as well as civil cases, and obtained several other valuable sovereign rights." Thus he sowed the seed that bore bitter fruit for Germany in the humiliation of Henry by Hildebrand. In 966 he went once more to Italy, where he remained till his death, May 7, 973. Nothing of particular note occurred in the reigns of the three following emperors of the House of Saxony, except that the last one, Henry II., made a treaty with Rudolf III. king of Burgundy, by which at the death of Rudolf his kingdom was to be united to the empire, and showed himself so dutiful a son to the Papacy that both he and his wife were made saints.

At Henry's death, in 1024, the great nobles met at Oppenheim and elected Conrad II., a count of Franconia, king. With him began the rule of the House of Franconia, which continued one hundred years, through Conrad II., Henry III., Henry IV., and Henry V. Through all there were plottings and counter-plottings, and wars, civil as well as foreign, which kept the nation in a constant turmoil. In accordance with the above-mentioned treaty, Conrad, in 1032, received the kingdom of Burgundy into the empire, and in 1034 he received in Geneva the homage of its leading nobles. Conrad died in 1039 and was succeeded by his son Henry III., whom, as early as 1026, he had caused to be elected king of Germany, and whom he had made duke of Bavaria in 1027, duke of Swabia and king of Burgundy in 1038. At this time the vices of the clergy all over Europe had become most scandalous, the Popes setting the infamous example. There were three vial claimants for the tiara. Henry entered Rome with an army in 1046, and summoned a council, and had all three of the rival Popes deposed, and raised to the Papal See, Clement II., who crowned him emperor. In the succeeding ten years of his reign it devolved upon Henry to appoint three more Popes in the succession, and as all of them were energetic administrators, and exerted themselves to carry out the policy of Henry, they did much to purify the ecclesiastical system of Europe. But the empire paid dearly for this effort to purify the Papacy. Hildebrand was chaplain to one of the Popes, Gregory VI., whom Henry had caused to be deposed, and went with him into exile. He afterwards became cardinal, sub-deacon, and confidential adviser to each of the last two Popes whom Henry appointed, as well as to all the others till his own accession,

in 1073, and during all the time he was forging the weapons by which he would revenge upon the empire the insulted dignity of the Papacy.

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"That Sunday Law Convention" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 47 , pp. 743, 744.**

ACCORDING to the call of the Sacramento preachers, noticed in our issue of two weeks ago, a meeting of pastors and church-members favorable to the passage of a Sunday law was held at the Young Men's Christian Association Hall, San Francisco, November 29. There were about sixty or seventy gentlemen present, the majority being ministers of various denominations, and about a half-dozen women. Among the clergymen were Rev. Dr. F. A. Horton of Oakland, Mr. Warren of San Leandro, Mr. Dobbins of West Berkeley, Dr. E. S. Chapman of East Oakland, J. A. Wheeler of Sacramento, Samuel Slocum of Cayucos, and J. C. Eastman of San Francisco, Presbyterians; John Kimball, editor of the *Pacific*, Congregationalist; M. C. Briggs, Dr. Heacock, Dr. F. F. Jewell, Mr. Rich, and Thomas Filben, Sacramento, Methodists; Dr. Abbott and Mr. Bateman, Baptists; N. R. Johnsten, Reformed Presbyterian; and Elders McHatton of Sacramento, and Sweeney of Oakland, Disciples.

A week before the day of the convention, the Congregational Club of San Francisco had discussed the subject in their regular Monday meeting. In that meeting Rev. Mr. Hamlin said that the Sabbath was about as well observed here without a Sunday law as it was at the East with one. The Sunday law was not enforced there, nor was it enforced here when we had one. If ministers stepped out of their sphere and meddled with politics they generally ran things into the ground. The almost unanimous opinion was that it would be useless to try to do anything while the present Legislature existed, and when the question was put whether the club should adjourn over two weeks or hold its next meeting at the same time with the convention, it was voted to hold their regular meeting at the same time that the convention was held.

As those who issued the call were slow in putting in an appearance a good deal of doubt seemed to exist as to who was authorized to call the meeting to order. After waiting about a quarter of an hour, Dr. Horton arose and called for some one to state the object of the meeting so that they could get to work as all could not wait all the afternoon. It was then moved that Dr. Horton take the chair and call the house to order. Mr. Filben of Sacramento, though yet absent, was elected secretary. After prayer, the chairman called for some of the Sacramento ministers, as they had issued the call, to state the object of it.

Dr. Wheeler responded, and said that the pastors of Sacramento had proposed attending the meeting in a body, but for a variety of reasons they had been prevented. The Christian people of Sacramento had not only been disturbed in their worship, but their religious feelings had been outraged by systematic and flagrant disregard of the Sabbath. So serious had the matter

become that it had been brought before the pastors' conference, and a correspondence had been opened with divines throughout the State on the subject of a Sunday law, in accordance with which the present convention had been called. He believed that it would not be difficult to secure such legislation as would insure a proper observance of the "Lord's day, or Sunday, or Sabbath, or whatever you are pleased to call it."

Mr. Johnson, a National Reformer by the way, moved that the calling the convention be approved. This opened the way for discussion, and then the thing became really amusing. We were there, and we verily believe that there were not three persons in the hall who were really agreed upon the reasons why a Sunday law should be made, nor upon what kind of a law it should be when it was made. Yet they were all perfectly assured that there should be a Sunday law.

Upon the motion to approve the calling of the convention, Rev. John Kimball was the first speaker. He said he could not vote for the motion as it stood. He believed in the objects of the convention, but it should have been held before the election. It was useless to hope that any church influence could be brought to bear on the next Legislature. The members were pledged, especially those belonging to the Democratic party, against any legislation of this character. A movement at this stage would only be inviting a Waterloo. It might, however, be a good time to begin to agitate for the next election. The Democratic party was now in control, and it was notoriously against any such legislation. The Republican party attributed their defeat to the fact that they had not taken the same ground as their opponents. The speaker believed in agitating the subject and disseminating literature.

Rev. Mr. Briggs said he hoped that those who called the convention would present some plan,—a clear definition of what was wanted. If it is to be a civil Sabbath law, the discussion and advocacy of it must not be allowed to run wild. It must be a law that will protect the citizens. Intelligent instruction on this point would prevent the purblindness that characterized the work of the previous Sunday law campaign, of urging its enforcement as a religious law. He said that information is greatly lacking on this point of the intelligent distinction between the civil and the religious aspects of the question. What he favored was distinctively a civil law.

Mr. Sweeney said that he came in simply as a citizen to work for a civil Sunday, not as a preacher to work for a law to enforce a religious institution. "If we can come in here this year as preachers and call on the State to enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, next year we may come in as preachers and ask the State to compel everybody to be baptized; and the next year ask the State to compel everybody to celebrate the Lord's supper, and so we shall have church and State." But none of these things are wanted. Therefore he said he indorsed the remarks of Dr. Briggs. Simply a civil law is all that is wanted. The question was one of political economy and State ethics, and not of religion at all. The preacher should be entirely separated from the question, and the law should be demanded by them as citizens.

Mr. McHatton said that this was the idea of his people. They were working for a civil Sunday.

Dr. Chapman did not think that the minister ought to be left out of the question. The movement was a religious one, and he was decidedly against divorcing it from a Christian standpoint. The ministers of the State were decidedly to blame for their long delay in taking action on the subject, but it was now necessary to do something. Should no attempt be made on the present Legislature, could they expect to succeed with other ones? He said he would not entertain the question as to whether it would be a "Waterloo" or not. He had been in politics long enough to know that legislators keep their finger on the public pulse, and that they generally give what the people want. Besides, if the Legislature is asked and it refuses, then there is something to go into the work with next time. "If the legislators are not on the side of the toiling multitudes, then we shall know how to go to work." It is failure not to try. This speech was much applauded.

Dr. Jewell said, "If parties in their platforms have challenged us, it is cowardly not to accept the challenge. If they have opposed the Sunday law, it is time for us to speak out. I indorse Dr. Chapman's idea. I don't want to eliminate the minister from the subject. If any people are the friends of the workingman they are the ministers. The workingmen have a right to the Christian Sabbath. I am the friend of the workingman. I am traveling in the footsteps of their friend, the Carpenter of Nazareth. I do not propose to drive all the gospel out of the question."

Mr. Sweeney said, "I too am in favor of the workingman. I am too in favor of all this religion. But Jesus of Nazareth never asked the Roman Empire to unsheathe the sword in favor of his religion? Nor do we want to invoke the sword of California in favor of his religion."

Dr. Carver stated that he was surprised that Mr. Sweeney should make such an assertion. He would advocate no Sunday law that excluded the Man of Nazareth. If Democratic or Republican parties would not give them what they required, then let them support some party that would. And that a religious Sabbath and not a civil Sunday is what is wanted.

Then Mr. Rich offered an amendment to the motion of approval, reading as follows:—

"WHEREAS, The purpose of the Sacramento ministers in calling this convention is to secure by agitation a civil Sabbath for California, therefore,

*"Resolved,* That we approve the object proposed."

*Mr. Johnson.*—"I don't like the word "civil" in that."

*Dr. Chapman.*—"Insert the words, 'to secure a better observance of the Sabbath.' Isn't that what the Sacramento brethren want?"

Several answers, "No."

Dr. Abbott obtained the floor and said, "I like the term 'Sunday,' not Sabbath. I would like some one to show me in the words of Jesus any Christian Sabbath. There is no such thing as a Christian Sabbath. And if any one here has fixed upon the idea of a Christian Sabbath, he had better revise his scholarship. The term Sabbath has no place in Christianity, it is a Judaistic expression. The term Christian Sabbath, the Lord never used, not his disciples. I want a Sunday law. I believe in having a Sunday law, but I believe that agitation in favor of one at this

time is neither timely nor practical. We have been defeated. We must yield all religious ideas in connection with the question. Sweeney is right."

Then in hopes of getting an agreement, the proposed amendment was changed so as to leave out the words civil Sabbath and have it read, "To secure by agitation a *Christian Sunday* for California."

*Dr. Briggs.*—"When you leave out the word 'civil' my interest in the question is gone. If you strike out the word 'civil' you cannot reach the Legislature. To urge the Legislature to pass upon anything Christian is fruitless."

Then the proposed amendment was changed again so as to read "civil Sunday."

Then Mr. Morris asked, "Is agitation the proper word to use there, or is it *legislation*? It is by legislation that we are to get the Sunday law."

Another said, "We have in our churches the Christian Sabbath, it is the civil Sunday that we want."

*Mr. Ware.*—"It is not a civil Sunday that we want, it is a civil Sunday *law*."

So then the word "law" was inserted. Then a motion was made to strike out the word "civil." This motion was fortunate enough to get to a vote, and was lost. Then the chair shut off debate, and

744

put the question of the proposed amendment and it was lost. Then the original motion for approval was put and carried, four voting against it.

A motion was then carried for the appointment of a committee to draft resolutions and an order of business. While the committee was out, the way was opened by the chair for short speeches.

Mr. Johnston advocated stringent Sabbath laws, based on the fourth commandment, and cited the action of the late convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Minneapolis,—that they were not ashamed to base their claim for law, upon the religious aspect of the question, nor should these. He considered the publication of newspapers, the running of excursion trains, and even funerals, a desecration of God's holy Sabbath and would support a law to prevent them. He would stop excursions and excursion trains on Sundays, if Senator Stanford himself stood on the track.

Another clergyman suggested that a law should be made preventing people from dying or becoming sick on Sunday.

Professor Knowlton said as Sunday newspapers would bear no inconsiderable place in relation to the Sunday law, they should consider the fact that virtually all of the work on a Sunday paper was done on Saturday, while the work on a Monday paper was done on Sunday. They should consider which paper would be affected by the law.

Then a gentleman arose and said, "That is a question that concerns me. I am a newspaper man, and my paper is printed on Mondays, and the work has to be done on Sunday to get it ready. Now will you prohibit that, and stop my Monday paper?"

The answer was, "Yes."

Then said he, "The *work* on the Sunday paper is done on Saturday, but will you let us sell it on Sunday?"

The answer was, "No."

Then said he, "What then are we newspaper men to do? You will not let us print a Monday paper, and you will not let us sell a Sunday paper, what is to become of the newspaper business in California?"

By this time the Committee on Resolutions had returned, and their report was received. They recommended "the formation of a Sabbath Union for California, on a permanent basis, and the election of officers and an Executive Committee."

Dr. Abbott moved that the word Sunday be substituted for Sabbath.

Another said as Sabbath means rest, he could not see why Sabbath could not be used.

Dr. Abbott replied, "This is for the Legislature to act upon, and we can never get the word Sabbath in the law. If we ever get any law we shall have to get it as a Sunday law not as Sabbath."

Another said, "The old law read, 'The first day of the week commonly called Sunday,' that is what we want."

Another said, "There is already in the civil code of California a recognition of Sunday as a civil day. What more is wanted? Is it not something religious?"

Then a reverend gentleman said that there are some people in the State who keep the seventh day, and are opposed to the Sunday law. But that on this question the majority must rule.

Another said that on that principle, if those who keep Saturday were in the majority, then they would have an equal right to pass a law to compel all to keep Saturday. He said, "You are in the majority and propose to make a law compelling them to keep Sunday. You claim this as your right. Now if they were in the majority, would you recognize it, would you allow it, as their right, to compel you to keep Saturday?"

At this there was a murmur all over the house and the answer, "No."

Then said he, "What becomes of the Golden Rule? It is gone. And then where is your Christianity? for Christ said, on this hangs all the law and the prophets. If those who keep the seventh day were trying to get a law to compel all to keep Saturday, I would oppose it. And when you try to make a law to compel them to keep Sunday, I oppose that."

The nominations for officers was next made: Gen. O O. Howard for President, Dr. Briggs for Vice-President, Mr. Filben for Secretary, and an executive committee of seven. It was recommended that petitions be prepared as soon as possible and sent throughout the State for signatures, and returned as soon as possible to be presented to the Legislature, which begins its session January 1, 1887. A representative of the Good Templars stated that already that body had 20,000 signatures to a petition for the Sunday law.

A resolution recommending that in all places where there are two or more churches, union services be held for the good of the cause, failed to pass. And then the explanation was made that "as this is a civil, and not a religious movement, it is not supposed that the services would be held on Sunday, but on a week day."

Then it was voted to adjourn and so closed the Sunday Law Convention. Lack of space demands that our comments upon it, and our impressions of it, be reserved till next week. We may add, however, that the papers show that General Howard resigned immediately, and as yet nobody has been chosen in his place.  
J.

**December 16, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Alemanni. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 12, 48 , p. 756.**

### **THE ALEMANNI**

*(Continued.)*

IN 1056 Henry III. died and was succeeded by his son Henry, six years old, but who had already, at the age of four years, been crowned King Henry IV. of Germany. He was under guardianship till he was fifteen years old, 1065, when he assumed the duties of government, and from that time till his death, forty-one years, between the fierce arrogance of the Papacy and the ambitious jealousies of his own subject nobles, he never knew peace. He it was who waged the memorable contest with Hildebrand; during his reign was the first crusade, 1095; and he made Welf (or Guelf, or Guelph) of Altdorf in Suabia, duke of Bavaria.

Henry IV. died in 1106 and was succeeded by his son Henry V. War with the Papacy was renewed, in which Henry's chief friends were two Swabian princes of the Hohenstaufen family, Frederick and Conrad. Frederick had been made duke of Swabia by Henry IV., and now by Henry V. Conrad was made duke of Franconia, which had been directly attached to the crown since the time of Otto I. Henry V. was succeeded in 1125 by Lothair, duke of Saxony, and when he received the imperial crown, Innocent II. claimed that he did so as the vassal of the Pope. Lothair was succeeded in 1137 by the above Conrad, the Swabian duke of Franconia, who became Conrad III.

With Conrad III. began the reign of the House of Swabia or Hohenstaufen which continued one hundred and seventeen years, and was the most glorious age of the medieval history of Germany. In 1116 went forth the second crusade headed by the Emperor Conrad, and Louis VII. of France. Conrad died in 1152, when Germany passed under the rule of one of the greatest sovereigns she ever had—Frederick Barbarossa, duke of Swabia—who reigned thirty-eight years.

Here we must notice the rise of another Swabian family which has had a notable course in history, and which is inseparably connected with the reign of Frederick Barbarossa. Henry IV. made Welf, or Guelf, of Swabia, duke of Bavaria. He was succeeded in the duchy of Bavaria by his son Henry the Proud, who was also invested with the duchy of Saxony. Henry the Proud rebelled against Conrad III. whereupon both his duchies were declared forfeited; Saxony was granted to Albert the Bear, a Saxon noble, and Bavaria fell to Leopold,

margrave of Austria. Henry the Proud suddenly died, and his brother, duke Welf, continued the contest for his duchies. Welf, hoping to succeed Leopold in the margraviate, consented to a compromise by which Saxony, with the assent of Albert the Bear, was granted to Henry the Lion, the son of Henry the Proud. Instead, however, of the margraviate of Austria being given to Welf, it passed, in the end, to Henry Jasomirgott. Welf for years contended with his rival, but without avail, for Henry the Lion finally, at the head of an army, laid claim to Bavaria as his, by right of inheritance from his father, Henry the Proud. Frederick Barbarossa was, through his mother, allied to the Welfs, and he, having a personal regard for Henry the Lion, began his reign by promising to secure for Henry the duchy of Bavaria. The margrave Jasonirgott however persistently refused to give it up, till at last in 1156 Frederick detached the march of Austria from Bavaria, made it a duchy with special privileges, and bestowed it on the stubborn margrave. This honor contented Jasonirgott, and left Frederick free to fulfill his promise to Henry the Lion, and so Henry received his paternal duchy of Bavaria, in addition to the duchy of Saxony which he already held. And from this Swabian–Alemannian–House of Welf, or Guelph, is descended in direct line through Henry the Proud and Henry the Lion, the House of Hanover which has ruled England from George I.–August 1, 1714–to the present Victoria "*Regina Dei gracia*."

Frederick Barbarossa received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, March 9, 1152. In October, 1154, he descended to Italy and assumed the iron crown of Lombardy. Then "after apprehending Arnold of Brescia, as an earnest of his purpose to support the Papal cause" he was crowned Emperor, by Pope Adrian VI., June 18, 1155. From this time onward till 1186 the reign of Frederick was little else than a long contest with the Lombard cities and with the Popes. By his marriage with Beatrice, daughter of the Count of Upper Burgundy, he added that province to the kingdom of Burgundy and to the empire. He thus reasserted the imperial authority in Burgundy and received the homage of the Burgundian nobles.

Having at last, brought these struggles to an honorable close, he started in 1187 for Palestine at the head of the third crusade, but was drowned while crossing a small river in Pisidia, June 10, 1190.

Frederick was succeeded by his son Henry VI., and was crowned emperor by Celestine III., March 31, 1191. Richard I., of England–Cúur de Lion—as he was on his way home from the third crusade, had been arrested by the duke of Austria, December 21, 1192, and in the following March was surrendered to the Emperor Henry who imprisoned him. To regain his liberty Richard was compelled to resign his crown to the emperor as overlord of Christendom, and receive it back as a vassal of the emperor, and to pay a ransom of 150,000 marks. But with all this humiliation he was not released till about the first of March, 1191. With the money that was paid for Richard's ransom, the emperor was enabled to fit out a fine army, with which he succeeded in conquering the Saracen kingdom of Sicily. So great was the authority which he acquired that it is supposed to be almost certain that had he lived a little longer he would have achieved his great ambition of having the crown declared hereditary in his family. But this aspiration was quenched by his death in 1197. In his reign about 1195 began the fourth crusade.

Upon Henry's death there was a double election. Philip, Henry's son, was favored by a large majority of the princes; while his opponents pitched upon Otto, son of Henry the Lion. There was no show for Otto, however, had not Innocent III. cast all the influence of the Papacy, which at this time was absolute, into the scale in his favor. Even with the help of the Pope, Otto's success was exceedingly doubtful until Philip was murdered, in 1208. This of course put a stop to the war, and Otto IV. was crowned Emperor. As soon as Otto had been made emperor, he violated all the pledges he had made to the Pope for the Pontiff's favor, and began to act as an independent sovereign. This was what no sovereign could be suffered to do while Innocent III. was Pope. He accordingly played off against Otto, Frederick the son of Henry VI. Otto, thinking to injure Frederick's chances by striking at the Pope, went to the support of John of England against Philip Augustus of France, but at the battle of Bouvines, July 27, 1214, he met a crushing defeat, and fled, a ruined man. He retired to his hereditary possession, the principality of Brunswick, and apart from that had no more place in history, while Frederick II. "ascended the marble throne of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, and received the silver crown" of Germany, July 1215, and November 22, 1220, received at Rome, from the hands of Pope Honorius IV., the golden crown of the empire.

In the estimation of his contemporaries, Frederick II. was "the wonder of the world." Though perhaps not the strongest in all respects, he was the most brilliant, of the German kings. In the beginning of his public career, in 1208, at the age of fifteen, he possessed but the crown of Sicily, and at his death, December 13, 1250, the splendor of his position was such that it has never been surpassed in addition to his original and inherited crown of Sicily, the crown of Sardinia, the crown of Burgundy, the iron crown of Lombardy, the silver crown of Germany, the golden crown of the empire, and last, but in that age the most glorious of all, the crown of Jerusalem, with which he with his own hands had crowned himself at his recovery of the holy city from the Saracens and its restoration to the church. In 1245, July 17, he was excommunicated by Pope Innocent IV. When he heard of it he laughed, and said:—

"Has the Pope deposed me? Bring me my crowns that I may see of what I am deprived.' Then seven crowns were brought him—the royal crown of Germany, the imperial diadem of Rome, the iron circlet of Lombardy, the crowns of Sicily, Burgundy, Sardinia, and Jerusalem. He put them on his head one after another, and said, 'I have them still, and none shall rob me of them without hard battle.'"—*The Story of the Nations, Germany, chap. 21, par. 8.*

But though Frederick feared not the excommunication of the Pope, the effect of such a thing was always to turn loose the elements of violence among men, and especially in Germany. Of that time, an old historian says: "After the Emperor Frederick was put under the ban, the robbers rejoiced over their spoils. Then were the plowshares beaten into swords, and the reaping hooks into lances. No one went anywhere without steel and stone, to set in blaze whatever he could fire."—*Id., par. 9.*

During the reign of Frederick II. the conquest of Prussia was begun, A.D. 1230, under the leadership of the Knights of the Teutonic Order, who "after half a century of hard fighting, found themselves masters of the entire country." Also, in the beginning of his reign the fifth crusade was proclaimed by Innocent III., 1198, and went forth in 1201.

Frederick II. died February 13, 1250, and was succeeded by his son, Conrad IV., who reigned only four years, and such was the condition of the empire through the contending factions of Germany and the intrigues of the Pope that he was never actually crowned Emperor. He died in 1254 and with him ended the line of Hohenstaufen emperors, whose rule formed the age "most interesting in the medieval history of Germany." "Women never held a higher place, nor, on the whole, did they ever respond more nobly to the honors freely lavished upon them." "The problems of government were seen in new lights, partly from the study of Roman law which passed from Italy to Germany, partly from the summaries of native custom in the 'Sachsenspiegel' [Saxon law] and 'Schwabenspiegel' [Swabian–Alemannian–law]. Altogether, Germany has seen no more fascinating epoch, none more full of life, movement, and color."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Germany.*

J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"The International Sunday-School Lessons for 1887" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 48 , pp. 758, 759.**

THE International Sunday-school Lessons for the first six months of 1887 are in Genesis and Exodus, ending with the ten commandments—Exodus 20. We are glad to see so much of the year given to the study of this portion of the Scripture. And yet we feel well assured that if the lessons are studied according to the guidance of the official "Select Notes" put forth by the Messrs. Peloubet, they will be studied to very little purpose, if indeed to any purpose at all except that of infidelity.

These "Select Notes" are a kind of commentary gotten up by the "Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., and M. A. Peloubet." The Scripture that contains the lesson is printed in both the Old and the Revised Version, and then accompanying this are notes of their own with many others selected from all sources which they approve; and are intended to be made the guide especially to the teachers of the International Lessons in the Sunday-schools. These notes perhaps more largely than any other helps, are used in the Sunday-schools throughout the country. And than these notes, no better evidence is needed to show how thoroughly the modern "scientific theories" pervade the theology of all the Protestant churches.

All the so-called scientific theories, even to evolution itself, of the creation, and of man, of the flood and of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, are here freely admitted if not directly taught. Everything must be made to conform to what "science" says. All must agree with the decisions of "science." "Science" is the standard by which all must be tested, and if it agrees with "science" that is

evidence conclusive that the word is inspired. All this, however, is just the reverse of the true position. The true position is that the word of the Bible is true; that it is given by inspiration of God. That is the sole unerring standard. If scientific deductions agree with the Bible upon matters of which it speaks, it is well; if these deductions do not so agree then the deductions are wrong, that is all, and they, not the Bible, must be revised; they, and not the words of the Bible, must yield, or be re-stated.

In these "Select Notes" on the creation, we read:—

"God may have made use of second causes, as, 'Let the waters bring forth.' 'Let the earth bring forth.' This does not decide the question of the truth of the development theory or of evolution, but shows that God had a plan of development in his own mind, or made creation so that, under his control, it unfolds as an acorn unfolds into an oak. God states the *fact* that *he* created all things; he does not state *how* he created them. God makes a tree as really when it grows in the field as if he had sent it ready made from Heaven. Let scientists discover *how*."

Very well but has science discovered how? Can science tell *how* a tree grows in the field? If God should send a tree ready made from Heaven, and should set it right alongside of one that had grown in the field, we should very much like to see the scientist who could tell *how* the one came any more than the other. There is not a scientist in all the world who can tell that thing, and there never can be one. For the simple truth is that he would have to be equal to God to do it. All this technicality, this shifting of changes, upon the point that God states that he *created* all, but does not tell *how* is a sheer contrivance to save appearances. Those who use it are so far advanced in the "advanced science," and the "advanced theology" of the day, that even the appearance of believing the Scriptures can be kept up in no other way.

Suppose the Creator, beside telling us that he did create the oak, had also chosen to tell us *how* he did it. Suppose he had told us that he placed an acorn in the earth, that the earth was wet, that then he caused the sun to shine upon it, that the acorn sprouted and took root and grew and became an oak. Would that help the matter a particle? Would not the question still be, How? Still the scientific doubter would say: "God states the *fact* that he did thus and so, but he does not state *how* he did it. He states the *fact* that he placed the acorn in the earth, but he does not state *how* he did it; he states the *fact* that he caused the sun to shine upon it, but he does not state *how*; he states the *fact* that the acorn sprouted, but he does not tell *how*; he states the *fact* that the acorn took root and grew, but he does not state *how*. Let scientists discover *how*." But for scientists to discover *how* the oak came from the acorn is not enough. They must then discover *how came the acorn*. If God should state the fact that he created it, still the advanced science doubter would say, "True, God states the *fact* that he created it, he does not state *how* he created it. Let scientists discover *how*." But can scientists discover how? We have never yet seen or heard of the scientist who had discovered which was first, the acorn or the oak. We wish Mr. Peloubet or some one else would give us "the latest assured verdict of science" on this point. *Then*

we shall ask them *how* it was first, and *how* it was at all. *Then*, too, it will be time enough for them to tell *how*.

The truth is that the Creator, in stating the fact that he created all things, has told all that can be told on the subject. At the point of creation we touch the infinite, and the finite cannot fathom it. There is one way and *only* one in which the finite can get beyond that word "how." That only way is *by faith*. For thus saith the Lord: "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. It is by faith alone that we can understand the creation of God. Faith alone can connect the finite with the infinite. Mark it, "The things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." "The worlds were framed by the word of God." "He spake and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." And "through faith we understand" it.

Again says the Select Notes:—

"If it should be proved that the theory of evolution is true to a large extent (not evolution instead of God, but evolution under God's control with God as Creator and Guide of all), the story of creation as told in Genesis would not be inharmonious with such evolution."

759

But "the latest assured verdict of science" is that "the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation." Now if Mr. Peloubet or any of the teachers of the International Lessons can explain just *how* the story of creation in Genesis would not be inharmonious with such evolution; that is, if he can tell just *how* that story can be in harmony with a theory that is directly antagonistic to it, we should like very much to see *how* it can be done. Have scientists yet discovered how this can be?

Again we read:—

"That the DAYS are not days of twenty-four hours, is clearly seen by the use of the word in these chapters. It is used of three days before there could have been any such days, as the sun did not appear till the fourth day."

Is it one of "the latest assured verdicts of science" that the earth did not rotate on its axis till the fourth day? If the earth did rotate, did it not do so once in twenty-four hours, as it still does; or did it then go so slow that it took it ages upon ages to make one rotation? The latter cannot be so, as we believe that it is "the latest assured verdict of science" that it is entirely to its rotary motion that the earth owes its oblate-spheroidal form. If that motion had been so slow as to consume ages in turning once then the earth would not be the shape that it is. But instead of the rotation being then so slow, it is the "assured verdict of science" that "one hundred million years ago" the rotary motion of the earth was actually nearly three-quarters of an hour *faster* than is now is. Therefore "the latest assured verdicts of science" prove that the days of creation were not *more* than twenty-four hours long.

As to there being any difference in the days before and after the sun shone on the earth, there was none. The first day, "God said, Let there be light. And

there was light." "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." And so it was the first day, and the second day, and so it has been every other day, and so it is now. Causing the sun to shine did not make the day. God made the day—the light—the first day. Thus day was upon the earth before the sun shone on the earth, and then when God made the greater light, it was to *rule*—not make—the day. Gen. 1:16. It is singular that the advanced theology has not found out that there was light on the first day and that God called that light Day.

Again says Mr. Peloubet, of the creation of man:—

"If the theory of evolution, believed by so many scientific men, should prove to be true so far as relates to man's body, and it should be shown (though it has not been proved as yet) that the physical man was developed from monkeys and the lower order of animal life, yet that would not contradict the statement that man was made from the dust of the earth. It would only explain *how* he was made of the dust—an explanation which the Bible nowhere gives, but leaves men to discover."

But the extreme height of this theologico-scientific nonsense and absurdity, is reached when he comes in his select notes to the creation of woman. He says:—

"Woman was created from man by taking a rib (not merely the bone, but a piece of the side), and forming it into a woman. This is strictly in accordance with the processes of life as revealed by modern scientific research. . . . God chose the only method in existence among his creatures which the nature of the case rendered possible."

So then this "method" was already "in existence among his creatures" was it? It is a great comfort, however, to know that science has kindly left us the privilege of thinking that the Creator was wise enough to choose "the only method" "which the nature of the case rendered possible."

Again:—

"So from a portion of Adam made He a woman. A miracle, indeed (as all creations are miracles), but a miracle conforming, as far as the conditions admitted, to methods already in use."

"Methods already in use"! By whom, we should like to know. Was that the "method already in use" in the making of women, before ever there was a woman made? Was that "the method already in use" in the making of women, before God made the woman? If so who made them? and if so, then where was the miracle?

And this is the stuff that the children are to be taught in the Sunday-schools throughout the land! This is the way that faith in God and respect for his word are to be implanted in the minds and hearts of the young! And this is to be called Christianity! Parents, is it so that such senseless jargon as this shall be taught to your children as the word of God? Is this the way that they are to be taught to remember their Creator in the days of their youth?

That such things as these should be put forth to be taught, yea, as part and parcel of the essential teaching, in the Sunday-schools throughout the English

speaking world, is, to him who respects the Bible as the word of God, a most startling thing. For it shows how all-pervading this scientific infidelity has become. For infidelity it is and nothing else. If it is not, then there is no such thing as infidelity. If these things can be held consistently with sound belief in Christianity and the Bible as the word of God, then there is no such things as *unbelief*. If this be faith there can be no such thing as doubt.

"Keep that which is committed to thy truth, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." 1 Tim. 6:20, 21. "When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" For "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."

J.

### **"Impressions of the Sunday Law Convention" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 48 , pp. 759, 760.**

THE first and perhaps the most notable thing about the Convention, that would be noticed by a looker-on, was the perfect confusion of ideas as to what was really wanted. This will be plainly seen by the report which we have already given our readers. It is true that there was perfect unanimity on the point that there should be a *law* demanded of the Legislature, but that was the only single thing upon which there was any real agreement.

With some, nothing but a *Sunday* law would do; with others, nothing but a *Sabbath* law would answer. With some, it must be a *civil* Sabbath law; with others, a *religious* Sabbath law. With some, it must be a *civil Sunday* law; with others, a *religious* Sunday law. With some, it was a Christian *Sunday* that was wanted; with others, a Christian *Sabbath*. With some, it was a *religious* Sabbath law that was *wanted*, and a religious Sabbath law that must be had, and they were ready to go to the Legislature upon that basis; but these were very few. While with others, and these the great majority, it was a *religious* Sunday law or a religious Sabbath law that was *wanted*, but at the same time it was *naively* argued that to go to the Legislature with such a request would be all in vain, for the Legislature would not act upon any question of a *religious* nature; therefore, to get what they wanted, they must ask only for a *civil* Sunday law.

It was upon this last point that the discussion and the action of the Convention culminated. And by this action, there was irresistibly forced upon the mind of an observer a strong impression of the insincerity of the great majority of the members of the Sunday-law Convention. The course of the discussion and this culminating action show that the majority of the members of that Convention are willing to cover up the real purpose which they have in view, and to deliberately go to the Legislature of California under a false pretense. They show that while a religious law, and nothing else, is what they want, yet, as to openly ask the Legislature for that would be fruitless, they propose to obtain what they want—a *religious* Sunday law—by getting the Legislature to pass a civil Sunday law. That is, they will have the Legislature to pass a civil Sunday law and then they will

enforce it as a religious Sunday law. In other words, they propose to hoodwind the Legislature of California. We hardly think they will succeed.

Another evidence of this insincerity was the ringing of the now familiar changes upon the "workingman." One had very great sympathy for the "toiling multitudes." Another was the "friend of the workingman," and "if any people are the friends of the workingman, they are the ministers." And yet not one of them was there as the representative of the workingman, nor was it the needs of the workingman upon which the call of the Convention was based. When that which gave rise to the calling of the Convention was officially stated, it was that "the *Christian* people of Sacramento had been disturbed in their *worship*, and their religious feelings had been outraged by the disregard of the Sabbath; the matter had come before the Pastors' Conference; a correspondence opened with divines throughout the State on the subject of a Sunday law; and accordingly the presence Convention had been called."

It was that "the Christian people" had been disturbed in their "worship," and not that the workingmen had been deprived of their rest; it was that the "religious feelings" of "the Christian people" had been outraged, and not that the workingman had been oppressed, nor that his feelings had been outraged; it was with the "divines," and not with the workingmen throughout the State that a correspondence had been opened; it was these considerations and not the needs of the workingman that formed the basis of the call for the Convention. And yet in the face of these definite statements, some of these "divines" would get up in the Convention, and fish for the favor and try to catch the ear of the workingman, by trying to make it appear that they came there as "the friends of the workingman."

And, too, just thing of a lot of "divines" called in general convention to secure the enactment of a Sunday law to protect the "worship" and the "religious feelings" of "Christian people;" and then to fulfill the purpose, and to attain to the object of that call, they, in convention assembled, unanimously decide to go up to the Legislature and demurely ask for a law *entirely civil!* And why is this? Why could they not go to the Legislature in the name of that purpose for which they were called? Oh, that would never do! For if the word "civil" be stricken out, "you cannot reach the Legislature." Therefore just put in the word "civil" and the purpose of the Convention will be accomplished, for we will get all we want and the Legislature will not know it. If those worthy "divines" think the Legislature of California is so exceedingly verdant as not to be able to see through that piece of wire-work, we rather think they will find themselves mistaken.

The demand of these "Christian people" for a Sunday law, because their worship was disturbed, is just as hollow a pretense as is any other part of their scheme. For if their worship was really disturbed, they have already a sufficient resource. For the protection of religious worship from disturbance, the statutes of California make provision that ought to satisfy any ordinary mortal. Section 302 of the Penal Code of California reads as follows:—

"Every person who willfully *disturbs* or disquiets any assemblage of people met for *religious worship* by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behav-

ior, or *by any unnecessary noise* either within the place where such meeting is held, or *so near as to disturb* the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

And such misdemeanor is punishable by "imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or both."—*Id.*, sec. 19.

Are not six months in jail and a fine of five hundred collars a sufficient punishment for the disturbance of worship? Or is this penalty so insignificant that these "divines" and "Christian people" disdain to inflict so light a punishment and therefore demand a Sunday law to make the punishment heavier? But if the present penalty is insufficient to properly punish those who disturb their worship, then what *will* satisfy these "divines"? Where the State chastises with ships, do they want to chastise with scorpions? Do they want to imprison a man for *life* and mulct him of *all* his property for disturbing (?) their worship by working on Sunday on his farm, in his shop or garden, far away from any place of worship? We firmly believe that if the truth were told it would appear that it is not their *worship* at all, but their *doctrine* that has been disturbed.

Just a word more on their pretended friendship for the workingman. We freely hazard the opinion that if they should obtain the "civil" Sunday law which they seek, then the poor workingman, who, to support his needy family, should work on Sunday, will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. We venture this opinion because of facts of which we know. In Tennessee there are lying in prison to-day, honest, hard-working men, whose families are dependent upon their daily labor, and these men are in that prison for working on Sunday to obtain the necessary means to support their families, and while they are in prison their families are in want, and have to be supported by the charity of Christian friends. *That* is the kind of friendship for the workingman that is shown in the enactment of these "civil" Sunday laws. And if the people of California want to see the same thing repeated in this State, then just let them allow these "divines" to secure the enactment of the "civil" Sunday law that they want. Then may be seen exemplified here this solicitous friendship for the workingmen.

One of the leading members of the Convention remarked that he had "been in politics long enough to know that legislators keep their finger on the public pulse, and that they generally give what the people want." From our observations in the Convention, of the speeches, and of its workings, we are prepared to give it as our private opinion, publicly expressed, that the most of the members of the Convention have been in politics long enough to know a good deal about the ways and means by which politicians too often compass their ends.

J.

**"Justice is Gone Away Backward" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 48 , p. 760.**

AFTER a long, careful, and fair trial, those murderous Anarchists and Socialists of Chicago were found guilty of murder and justly condemned to be

hanged December 3. Since their condemnation, as well as before, every trick that is known to the tricky lawyers has been employed to deliver them from the consequences of their crime. Not only this, but Labor Unions in different parts of the country have sent petitions in favor of the criminals, and appeals have come all the way from France, in their behalf. Politicians interested themselves in the case, and an appeal to the Illinois Supreme Court has finally been secured, and that the Supreme Court may hear and pass upon that arguments, a respite has been granted until March. It is now seriously doubted whether the murderers will receive any punishment at all or not. The Chicago correspondent of the *Christian Union* says:—

"It now becomes a matter of grave doubt whether the Anarchists will receive any further punishment at all. The stay of proceedings granted by Justice Scott does not necessarily set aside permanently the decision of the lower court, but it increases the probability that some way will be found, for political purposes, if for no other, to mitigate the sentences pronounced against Spics, Parsons, and their associates. It is commonly thought that our Mayor and our city officials generally are in favor of the respite, and would not be sorry to have the proceedings of the lower court permanently set aside."

When such a terrible crime as that committed by these men finds such ready sympathy by so many Orders throughout the country, and in foreign lands, by lawyers, by politicians, and by the officials, even to the mayor, of a great city like Chicago, it shows a fearful condition of society. When the protection of criminals and the promotion of crime become essential to political preference, then Government is on the verge of ruin. And when the most influentially religious portion of society forms an alliance with this non-religious portions, as it actually proposes to do, and as it inevitably will do, then the fearful climax is reached and society itself is ready for disintegration. This know also that these are now the last days and perilous times *have* come. 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

J.

**"The Latest Sunday Alliance" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 48 , p. 760.**

THE Sunday law question is springing up almost everywhere. We have reported the movement in California, and in the South. But like movements are going on in both the East and the middle West, only that there the question is on enforcing the laws already on the statute books, while in California it is to get a strict penal statute that may be enforced. In Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and other cities in the East, in La Crosse, Wisconsin, and other cities in the West, the laws are being enforced. In Boston and some places in the West it is by the liquor dealers. In Philadelphia, it is by the "Law and Order League" and the "Sabbath Association;" in Reading, Pa., and Worcester, Mass., it is by the barbers' association of the Knights of Labor. In La Crosse, Wis., it is by the Norwegian population. In New York City it is by the Central Labor Union, "a radically Socialistic organization."

The *Christian Union* reports a like movement going on in Great Britain; this also represented by the Labor Unions. Likewise in Germany and in France. Says the *Union*: "A strong and apparently hopeful attempt is being made to secure the enforcement by law" of Sunday observance, "not on religious but on Socialistic grounds." And then the *Union* most meaningfully says:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath [Sunday, of course] 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 re-inforce the religious demand* for Sabbath [Sunday] rest, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o' nights in fear and trembling. One of the Sabbath Committee in Philadelphia is, indeed, represented as relying 'upon the law of the Sabbath as promulgated by the Creator.' But the majority of Americans, including a large proportion of those who are most desirous of preserving the Sabbath, will never consent to see a purely religious obligation enforced by civil penalties. On the other hand, pure individualism affords an entirely adequate legal basis for anything like adequate Sabbath legislation. . . . Modern, and, if our readers please so to regard it, Socialistic political economy . . . holds that the community has a right to act as a unit; . . . it has a right to fix upon a legal holiday or an eight-hour standard for the normal labor day—if it judge this best. In short, no eight-hour man can consistently deny the right of society to maintain a Sabbath by legal provisions; and . . . no advocate of Sabbath laws, unless he maintains the right of the State to establish a purely religious observance, can consistently deny the right of the community to fix a normal labor day. . . . And Christian Socialism finds a place for both."

In this extract is clearly marked out the course which the Sunday cause will pursue. The religious sentiment and demand will be re-enforced by the non-religious. So-called Christianity will ally itself with Socialism to get the support of the Socialists in preserving the so-called Christian Sabbath. And by such shameful alliances as these the wicked scheme of a National Sunday law will surely succeed and persecution under it will surely follow. For when a religious element to compass its ends has to ally itself with the non-religious element, then the whole body becomes most basely corrupt and pure religion is persecuted to the death. How much more surely will this be so when, as in this impending evil, the alliance is formed with the very basest element of human society—the Socialistic. And to make the thing the more attractive to this element, the shamefully abused term "Christian" is blended with the terrible title "Socialism," and so there is introduced to the world the new phrase, "Christian Socialism," which is just as congruous as is the phrase "Holy Inquisition," and no more so. And we are very sure that the outcome will yet demonstrate that the real meanings that underlie the two incongruous phrases are very nearly identical. When a religious element to preserve its religion is forced to ally itself with the

non-religious, then such religion is not worth preserving. And when a professed Christianity becomes so lost to all the vital power of real Christianity that it becomes essential to its preservation that it shall ally itself with Socialism, this of itself is proof that such Christianity is no better than such Socialism, and the sooner it should perish the better would it be for the world. As Christianity is the greatest blessing the world has ever known, so such perversion of Christianity becomes the worst bane the human race can know. Thus has it ever been. Thus only can it ever be.

J.

**December 23, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Alemanni. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 12, 49 , p. 772.**

### **THE ALEMANNI**

*(Continued.)*

THIS age of glory was followed by one of misery, called the Great Interregnum, which lasted twenty years.

"This was the saddest time that ever was in Germany. Every one did what he liked. The fist and the sword decided between right and wrong. The princes and the cities were in constant feud. The knights made themselves strong castles and lived in them on plunder and murder. From their fortresses they swooped down on the merchants traveling from town to town and robbed them, or levied on them heavy tolls. They went plundering over the level land; they robbed the farmers of their cattle, devastated their fields, and burned their houses. Moreover, the neighboring nobles and knights quarreled with each other and fought, so that the country was one battle-field."—*The Story of the Nations, Germany, chap. 22.*

This period of anarchy was turned to account by the Papacy through Pope Urban IV. Up to this time the election of the emperor was always virtually by the leading princes, although each election needed the sanction of the whole class of immediate nobles. Now, however, mainly by the influence of the Pope, the electorate of Mainz, the archbishop of Cologne, the archbishop of Treves, the margrave of Brandenburg, the king of Bohemia, and the princes of the House of Wittelsbach (Bavaria), and of the House of Saxony. Thus the electorate stood till 1356, when Charles IV. issued the Golden Bull, by which the office of electors was fixed to the three archbishops, the king of Bohemia, the margrave of Brandenburg, and only the *duke* of Saxony, and the *palsgrave* or *count palatine* of the Rhine, of the House of Wittelsbach. Thus the electorate was confined to seven personages—three archbishops, three lay princes, and one king—and ever afterward the emperor was chosen by these officials who are the ones so often

referred to in the history of the Reformation, by the term "electors." Luther's protector, Frederick, was the "elector of Saxony" in his day.

At the beginning of the Great Interregnum, William of Holland received a nominal allegiance for two years, when he died; then, about 1257, there was a double election, of Alphonso of Castile in Spain, and Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III. of England. Richard was crowned, but he only visited Germany three times in the seventeen years; while Alphonso never visited it at all, although claiming all the time to be its sovereign. The influence of none of these tended in the least degree to check the disorder of the times. When Richard died the princes showed no disposition to choose an emperor, for a condition of affairs that allowed every one to do as he pleased was exactly to their liking. But the northern revenues of the Pope were seriously falling off, and this with troubles at home caused a Papal longing for an emperor again who would be "the protector of the church." The Pope, therefore, informed the electors that if they did not choose an emperor he himself would appoint one.

Accordingly the electors met in 1273 and raised to the throne Rudolf, count of Hapsburg, of Swabia. During the interregnum Ottocar, king of Bohemia, had acquired by marriage and conquest, a great territory beyond his native possessions, and his acquisitions included the duchy of Austria and its dependencies, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. This made Ottocar the most powerful prince in Germany, and he expected to receive the German crown at the election. When it was bestowed upon Rudolf, Ottocar refused to acknowledge him as sovereign. War followed, and in the battle of Marchfeld, near Vienna, A.D. 1278, Ottocar was defeated and slain. Austria, Styria, and Carniola were then granted in fief to Rudolf's son Albert. Thus Rudolf made himself memorable as the founder of the House of Hapsburg, which has ruled Austria from that time to this; which from his time has formed one of the most influential forces in the national life of Germany, and which gave sovereigns to Spain in the days of her greatest glory.

Rudolf of Swabia died in 1291, and was succeeded by Adolf of Nassau who ruled till 1298, when he was succeeded by Duke Albert of Austria, Rudolf's son. Albert reigned till 1308, and was succeeded by Count Henry of Luxembourg who reigned, as Henry VII., till 1313. Upon the death of Henry VII. the electors could not agree, and the result was a double election—Frederick the Fair, duke of Austria, son of Albert, and Louis, duke of Bavaria. War broke out and continued for nine years, when, at the battle of Muhlberg, A.D. 1322, Frederick's army was entirely routed, and in 1325 the two rivals agreed to rule in common. Frederick died in 1330, and Louis IV. reigned till 1347. At the death of Louis, Gunther, count of Schwarzburg was elected, but Charles, king of Bohemia, by liberal bribes, bought off his supporters, and Gunther resigned his claim, and Charles IV. reigned. It was he who issued the Golden Bull. He added the margraviate of Brandenburg, Silesia, and Lower Lusatia to the possession of his House—the House of Luxembourg. He died at Prague in 1378, and was succeeded by his son Wenceslaus. Wenceslaus was deposed and the crown was given to Rupert, elector of the palatinate, A.D. 1400, who reigned till 1410, when he died and Sigismund, brother of Wenceslaus, and king of Hungary, reigned. This was the

Emperor Sigismund who gave up John Huss and Jerome of Prague, to be burned by the Council of Constance, which brought on the Hussite wars. Sigismund was a spendthrift and never had enough money for his wants; and for 400,000 gulden he granted to Frederick, count of Hohenzollern, of Swabia, first as a pledge but afterwards as a permanent fief, the march of Brandenburg. With the death of Sigismund ended the Luxembourg dynasty, and the House of Hapsburg was restored.

Sigismund was succeeded by Albert II. duke of Austria, in 1438. Albert II. was succeeded in 1440 by Frederick IV. and he, in 1493, by Maximilian I., and he, in 1519, by Charles V., before whom Luther stood for the faith of Christ; and before whom the German princes read the famous PROTEST.

Although the German crown remained elective from the time of Albert II. forward, it was "always conferred on a member of the House of Hapsburg until the extinction of the male line;" and then it was taken up by the female in Maria Theresa, whose husband was elected emperor in 1745. He was emperor only in name, however; Maria Theresa's was the rule in fact. Maria Theresa's husband was succeeded in 1765 by her son, Joseph II. And in her line of the House of Hapsburg the imperial office remained till the Empire and the German Kingdom came to an end in 1806; and in her line the Imperial office of the empire of Austria-Hungry remains to the present day.

We referred above to the grant of the march of Brandenburg, by the Emperor Sigismund, to Frederick of Hohenzollern, of Swabia. Frederick thus became one of the electors of the empire. It will be remembered, too, that it was the Knights of the Teutonic Order who made the conquest of Prussia. At the time of the Reformation, Albert of Brandenburg happened to be Grand Master of the Teutonic Order. He became a Protestant, dissolved the Order, and received in fief, 1525, from the King of Poland, the duchy of Prussia. Albert left two granddaughters, Joachim Frederick, Elector of Brandenburg, married Eleanor, the younger, and his son, John Sigismund, married Anna, the elder, and thus the duchy of Prussia was secured to the family of the Elector of Brandenburg. Frederick William, called the Great Elector, was the grandson of John Sigismund and Anna. By the treaty of Wehlau, in 1657, the duchy of Prussia was declared independent of Poland. The Great Elector added largely to his territories, and in 1701 his son Frederick, who had succeeded him in 1688, having obtained the consent of the emperor, crowned himself king of Prussia. And thus, under the Alemannian House of Hohenzollern, arose the kingdom of Prussia, which, through Frederick I. 1701-1713, Frederick William I. 1713-1740, Frederick II. the Great 1740-1786, Frederick William II. 1786-1797, Frederick William III. 1797-1840, Frederick William IV. 1840-1861, has come down in direct descent to William I. king of Prussia 1861-1871 and Emperor of Germany from January 18, 1871, to the present day.

It is true that in tracing at such length the history of the Alemanni, we have had a double purpose, the full value of which will be appreciated when we come to consider the rise and growth of the Papacy, but even without that, we believe, and we think it must be admitted, that when it is realized that from the Alemanni sprang what is still the German nation; that under the rule of the Alemannian

House of Hohenstaufen was the most glorious and prosperous period of medieval German history, that, with but a short interval since the end of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, the Alemannian House of Hapsburg held the imperial office as long as the empire existed, and when it ceased to exist, still rule in Austria and does yet rule the Austria-Hungarian Empire; that the Alemannian House of Hohenzollern made of Prussia one of the strongest States of Europe, and accomplished what had been the wish of ages,—the vital union of all the little States into which the German people had been separated,—and now rules the German Empire; that the Alemannian House of Guelf furnished to England the House of Hanover and by it her present and most illustrious Queen Victoria, and that Spain in her glory was ruled by princes of the Alemanni;—we say when this is realized, we think it must be admitted that Gibbon made no mistake when he described the rise of the Alemanni as the origin of "a *great and permanent* nation;" that the French, who have lived side by side with them since the time when together they were all savages in the German forests, likewise make no mistake when even to this day they call the Germans *Allemands* and Germany *Allemagne*; and we believe that we make no mistake when we number them as one of the ten kingdoms that arose upon the ruin of the Western Empire of Rome.

J.

**"Prophecy and the Sunday Movement" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 49 , pp. 775, 776.**

LAST week we noticed the special efforts at the enforcement of Sunday laws, now being made simultaneously in different places all over the country; and not only in our own country but also in England and France. We have at different times lately called attention to the tendency in this direction, in both Europe and America. The tendency has now become the fact. The enforcement of Sunday laws and prosecutions for Sunday work, becoming so general, and being engaged in by so many different classes from the highest to the lowest,—from preachers to saloon-keepers, from religionists to Socialists,—is forcing the attention of all to the truth that this is fast becoming the leading question not only in the Nation but in the world. The papers, secular as well as religious, but more especially the religious, are discussing it.

It is especially remarkable how everything is bent to the recognition of Sunday. The whole tide of human events seems to be set in that direction, and every elements is going with the current. Even the Jews who, as a people, have stood for ages the bitterest persecution for their religion's sake, are in this readily yielding, and, now willing to go with the multitude to do evil, are deserting the truth of God as to the Sabbath of the Lord, and are going over to the Sunday. The *New York Observer* says that "it is proposed to form a World's Day of Rest League, and a convention of representative Jews is advocated, which will endeavor to secure the transfer of the Jewish Sabbath to the first day of the week. It is urged that this uniformity would add greatly to the influence of the principle of resting one day in seven." We have no doubt that it will.

We wish some influence could be brought to bear that would greatly revive the old-fashioned principle of obedience to God. God gave a commandment that men shall rest on the Sabbath of the Lord. He gave this commandment that there might be uniformity. In the commandment he plainly declared that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God—not the "Jewish Sabbath"—and that in it—the seventh day—thou shalt not do any work. Yet in spite of that commandment, the world sets about to form a World's Day of Rest League, to secure the world's worldly observance of the first day of the week, and to get the Jews to transfer the Jewish Sabbath to the first day of the week. Before these men of the world get their World's League formed, and have by it secured the world's uniformity in the observance of the first day of the week, it would be well for them to remember the word of God that says: "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."

It is one of the clearest possible proofs of the lack of real godliness in the professed church of Christ, that all this ready favor of the world it mistakes as the manifest favor of God, while the word of God declares that it is enmity with God. There could be no better evidence that Sunday is not of God, than is furnished in this, that Spiritualists, Socialists, Labor Unions, Catholics, and all such, so heartily unite in favor of it. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness! and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? . . . Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord." No interest that makes for righteousness can be promoted by the favor of such elements as are now swiftly rallying to the support of the Sunday institution. This consideration alone demonstrates the unrighteousness of the Sunday cause.

And yet we are not the least surprised that these things are so. We are not surprised that even the professed church of Christ should stoop to an alliance with the world to maintain by civil power the influence which she deems her right, but which through her own worldliness and lack of self-respect she has lost. We are not at all surprised that the church should endeavor to maintain by civil power the position before the world which she has but by her own lack of the power of godliness. And that she has so lost her position, no stronger proof is needed than is shown in her willingness and even anxiety to ally herself with the world, that she, re-enforced by the non-religious elements of the world, may wield the power of the world.

We say we are not surprised at any of these things for we have for years expected to see the very things that are now soon throughout the so-called Christian world. For years we have not only expected to see an alliance between the church and the world by which the civil power would be wielded by the church in her own behalf, but we have expected to see the Sunday and its compulsory observance made the basis of the alliance. For years we have expected to see the Sunday, and controversy concerning it, become the leading question in this Nation. We have talked it and preached it, we have written it and printed it, when as yet the most strenuous advocates of the Sunday only accounted it as among

the very least of the questions that pertained to Christianity. Yet now these very men concede all that we have taught, and they themselves claim that upon the preservation of Sunday hangs the destiny of Christianity in this Nation, and that if it is to be preserved the religious element must be re-enforced by the non-religious, and even the Socialistic.

For more than forty years, in public and in private, by speech and by print, Seventh-day Adventists have constantly taught that there would be the very condition of things which now is and is impending. And this upon the authority of the word of God. In fact from no other authority could such teaching have been derived, when it was as confidently urged so long before as it is now; when as yet there was apparently no probability of its coming to pass; and when even the supporters of Sunday themselves steadily refused to admit that there was any possibility, much less any probability, that it should come to pass.

The word of God contains a solemn warning that must be given to the world. It is the Third Angel's Message of Revelation 14. That message says: "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

776

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." Rev. 14:9, 10. In years past it was known among Protestants that the beast is the Papacy, "the man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity." Nowadays Protestants are not so ready to let it be known, yet it is the truth now as it has ever been.

The "beast" represents the Papacy. The Sunday is the one grand institution which the Papacy sets forth as the sign of its authority. It is by the establishment of Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the Lord that the Papacy has thought to change the law of God. In thus changing the law of God, the Papacy has virtually declared independence of the Most High. In thus presuming to put away an institution—the Sabbath—which rests upon the authority of Jehovah, and putting in place of it an institution—the Sunday—which rests solely on its own authority, the Papacy has exalted itself above God. In demanding the observance of the Sunday, which rests upon its own authority, instead of the Sabbath, which rests upon the authority of God, the Papacy has usurped the place of God. In thus demanding obedience to its own authority instead of obedience to the authority of God, the Papacy has usurped the obedience, and in that the worship which is due to God. The commandment to keep Sunday holy is the first commandment of the church of Rome. To keep Sunday is to keep the commandment of Rome, for there is no other commandment for it.

But there is mentioned the image to the beast. That which formed the beast of the prophecy was the union of Church and State—the union of Catholicism and the State. An image to the beast must be likewise a union of Church and State, but in this case a union of Protestantism and the State. This image to the beast is to be formed by the union of Protestantism and the State in the United States. But it is to enforce the worship of the beast, and the receiving of his mark—see Rev. 13:11-17. As the keeping of Sunday is to keep the commandment of Rome

and to recognize her authority, so to compel people to keep Sunday is to compel them to keep the commandment and to recognize the authority of Rome. To compel men to keep Sunday, is exactly that for which the Protestant churches in the United States are now grasping for civil power and working up the Sunday laws and their enforcement. It is to compel men to observe Sunday that the Protestant churches in the United States invoke the re-enforcement of the non-religious and Socialistic elements of society.

But to compel men to keep Sunday is to compel them to do homage to the Papacy, and the Papacy is the beast. To compel men to keep Sunday is to compel them to worship the beast. Therefore the Protestant churches in the United States are at present engaged in a movement to compel men to do what the word of God by the Third Angel's Message solemnly warns them not to do. The present movement of Protestantism in behalf of the Sunday is in the course of fulfillment of Rev. 13:11-17, and the Third Angel's Message (Rev. 14:9-12) is God's solemn warning to all men against it, and his call to come out from among them and be separate, and to "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." It is for this cause that all these years Seventh-day Adventists have been preaching and publishing that there would be in the United States exactly what now is here, and this is only the beginning.

The fourth commandment of God says, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work." The first commandment of the man of sin says: "Remember that thou keep holy the Sunday." Whose commandment are you going to keep? Whom will you worship?

The Third Angel's Message is now the one thing of the greatest importance to the people of the United States and of the whole world, for the enforced worship of the beast is to be made universal. J.

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man.—No. 5" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 49 , pp. 776, 777.**

OUR last question under this heading was, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Job 14:14. And we presented the direct Bible answer by Isaiah: "Thy dead men shall live" (Isa. 26:19); and by the Lord Jesus, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." John 5:25. We presented abundant Scripture proof that it is at the second coming of the Lord that the dead hear his voice, that the trumpet of God sounds, and that the dead are raised. We presented proofs of Holy Writ that the hope of the gospel is the resurrection of the dead; that this is the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers; that in this hope they all lived; that in this hope they died; and that in this hope they still sleep in the dust, awaiting the glorious sound of the voice of the Son of God to call them from the dead to life and immortality. We proved by Paul's repeated argument in 1 Cor. 15 and other places that in assurance of the resurrection of the dead alone, lies the assurance of a future life; and that if there be no resurrection of the dead there is no future life for either righteous or wicked.

In connection with this, there now comes in a question that has perplexed men for ages, and does yet perplex many; and although the Bible both asks and answers the question, there is yet much perplexity about it even among those who profess to believe the Bible. That question is, "How are the dead raised up?" 1 Cor. 15:35. The answer is, in substance, The dead are raised up by "the power of God." Matt. 22:29.

This is shown by the Saviour's words to the Sadducees. The Sadducees, who "say that there is no resurrection," once came to Jesus and in favor of their unbelief presented what they deemed an insuperable objection to the idea of there being such a thing as a resurrection of the dead. They said: "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."

All the difficulty that has ever arisen in men's minds upon this question, "How are the dead raised up?" has been from these causes. At the foundation of all the difficulty lies the lack of knowledge of the Scriptures, and the accompanying, if not the consequent, lack of knowledge of the power of God. Without the Scriptures we can know nothing about the resurrection of the dead; and without the power of God there can be no resurrection of the dead; and so to leave out either consideration, is only to be at sea on the question before us—not only at sea, but at sea with neither rudder nor compass nor pole-star. It was only giving expression to this same thought of the Saviour's when Paul, speaking of this hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, appealed to Agrippa in these earnest and thrilling words: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" Acts 26:8.

Sure enough! Why should it be thought a thing incredible with any one that God should raise the dead? God made a man once from the dust of the ground; he states in his word that many have arisen from the dead, and he has given us the most abundant testimony that he raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead, and that he was seen of witnesses chosen before—witnesses, too, to the number of above five hundred at once. Most, if not all of these witnesses were acquainted with him both before his death and after his resurrection. Some of them at with him, talked with him, and handled him, after they had seen him dead and buried and risen again. And yet if men leave out the Scriptures and the power of God, to them it still remains incredible that God should raise the dead.

Even in this our duty, and amongst those who profess to firmly believe the Scriptures and the power of God, there are those to whom it is incredible that God should raise the dead. Now is this confined to what are sometimes called the "ignorant multitudes." It is found, and in fact is prevalent, amongst the "divines," the "great scholars," and the "leaders of thought." But yet in all this the difficulty lies in the fact shown by the Saviour that they "do err, not knowing the Scriptures." For the one thing which logically and reasonably leads these eminent

scholars, as well as others, to doubt the resurrection of the dead, is their fixed belief in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Than the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, there is nothing more destructive of belief in the resurrection of the dead, and nothing more subversive of the Bible doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. In fact the two doctrines cannot possibly be consistently held in the same mind. Now for the proof.

The Scripture says: "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." 1 Cor. 15:36. This is spoken in answer to the question that is the subject of this article, and is therefore spoken with direct reference to the subject of how the dead are raised up. To quicken is "to make alive." What Paul says therefore is, "That which thou sowest is not made alive except it die." That this is spoken directly of man and his resurrection, is plain by verses 42-44. "It is sown a natural body," etc. Now the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is, that the body properly has no life, that it is not the real man; but that the soul is the real, living sentient man; that it is that about man which alone possesses real life. In other words, the body is only the house in which the real man lives; *i.e.*, the real "I" dwells within the "me;" and death is simply the separation of the soul from the body. Death breaks down the house, and lets the real occupant free.

According to this doctrine, there is no such thing as real death; because the body properly has no life, consequently it does not die; and the soul—the real man—is immortal and it cannot die; therefore there is in reality no such thing as death. If this be true, there is not only no such thing as death but there is, likewise, no such thing as a resurrection of the dead. For, upon the apostle's premise that "That which thou sowest is not quickened [made alive] *except it die,*" it follows that, as the body, having no life, does not die, it cannot be quickened (raised from the dead); and as the soul does not die, it cannot be raised from the dead; consequently there is no such thing as a resurrection of the dead.

Therefore it stands proved to a demonstration that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is utterly subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. But the resurrection of the dead is a Bible doctrine; it is the very truth of God. And it is because of the wide-spread belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul that there is so much doubt and misunderstanding of the Scripture on the subject of the resurrection of the dead.

777

As we have already shown in these articles that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is contrary to the Scriptures throughout; and as it is now shown that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul leads to disbelief in the resurrection of the dead, the Saviour's words are distinctly applicable to all who now doubt the resurrection. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

To all with whom there is any difficulty in understand the question, "How are the dead raised up?" we say, Get an understanding of the Scriptures as to the nature of man, and his condition in death, and all connected subjects, then allow the power of God a place, and all your doubts will be removed, and the subject will be all plain and easily understood.

For a view of the actual process of bringing the dead from the graves to real living existence again, Ezekiel 37:1-14 may be read with profit. It is too long to copy here; we ask the reader to turn to that scripture at once and read it carefully, and as you read do so in view of the "power of God."

J.

**December 30, 1886**

**"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages. The Burgundians. (*Continued.*)"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 12, 50 , p. 788.**

### **THE BURGUNDIANS**

*(Continued.)*

THERE remains yet one more to be noticed,—the Burgundians. It will be remembered that when the Burgundians, with the Vandals and Suevi, ravaged Gaul in 407, they took for their possessions the country that lay on the Saone and the Rhone. Their kingdom occupied "the whole valley of the Saone and Lower Rhone from Dijon to the Mediterranean, and included also the western half of Switzerland."—*Hallam's Middle Ages, chapter 1, part 1, sec. 9, note 8.* In A.D. 493 it included all of Switzerland that lies west of that part of the Rhine that flows from the south into the lake of Constance."—*Labberton's New Historical Atlas, map 22.*

It will also be remembered that the conquest of this kingdom was begun by Clovis, and was completed by his sons in 532; and that in the quadruple division of the Frankish dominion in 561 Burgundy with some additional counties in the north fell to Gontran, who fixed his capital there. When the Frankish dominions, having been united under Charles Martel, were again divided between Pepin the Short and Carloman, Burgundy fell to the share of Pepin. And when Carloman became a monk, and Pepin became king by the grace of Pope Zachary, of course Burgundy was but a province of his kingdom, as it was also of the empire of Charlemagne, the son of Pepin. In the division of the empire of Charlemagne, by the treaty of Verdun, 813, Burgundy was included in the portion of the Emperor Lothair, which, it will be remembered, reached from the Mediterranean to the North Sea, and included the Italian territory.

In the time of Charles the Fat, 877, Burgundy became again independent, under Boso, or Boson, husband of Ermangarde, the daughter of Emperor Louis II. This kingdom was called Provence as well as Burgundy, and sometimes Cir Jurane Burgundy, or as the real title ran, *regnum Provincie sea Burgundie*. It "included Provence, Dauphine, the southern part of Savoy, and the country between the Saone and the Jura" Mountains. There was formed another kingdom of Burgundy on the other side of the Jura Mountains. This was called the kingdom of trans Jurane Burgundy, or by title, *regnum Iurense, Burgundia Trans-inrensis*, and was founded by Count Rudolph in A.D. 888, and was

recognized by the Emperor Arnulf the same year. It included the northern part of Savoy and all Switzerland between the Jura Mountains and the River Reuss. In 937, Rudolph's son, Rudolph, traded his rights to the Italian crown for the Cis-Jurane Burgundy, and thus the two Burgundies—the Trans-Jurane and the Cis-Jurane—were united in the one kingdom of Burgundy or Arles, by title, *regnum Burgundia, regnum Arelatense*. This kingdom continued independent till A.D. 1032, when, in accordance with a treaty which had been made between the Emperor Henry II. and Rudolph III., its last king, the kingdom of Burgundy was received into the empire by the Emperor Conrad II.; Rudolph III. confirming it by will, as his niece Gisela was Conrad's wife. The emperor thus assumed the Burgundian crown, and this "beautiful kingdom," "full of prosperous cities," became a part of the empire.

Of this kingdom and country, at this time, Hallam says:—

"The kingdom of Burgundy, or Arles, comprehended the whole mountainous region which we now call Switzerland. It was accordingly reunited to the Germanic Empire by the bequest of Rudolph along with the rest of his dominions. A numerous and ancient nobility, vassals one to another, or to the empire, divided the possession with ecclesiastical lords hardly less powerful than themselves. Of the former we find the counts of Zähringen, Kyburg, Hapsburg, and Topkenburg, most conspicuous; of the latter the Bishop of Coire, the Abbot of St. Gall, and Abbess of Seekingen. Every variety of feudal rights was early found and long preserved in Helvetia; nor is there any country whose history better illustrates that ambiguous relation—half property and half dominion—in which the territorial aristocracy under the feudal system stood with respect to their dependents. In the twelfth century the Swiss towns rise into some degree of importance. Zurich was eminent for commercial activity, and seems to have had no lord but the emperor. Basel, though subject to its bishop, possessed the usual privileges of municipal government. Berne and Friburg, founded only in that century, made a rapid progress, and the latter was raised, along with Zurich, by Frederick II., in 1218, to the rank of a free imperial city."—*Middle Ages, chap. 5, sec. 20.*

In the northern part of what is now Switzerland, between Lake Constance and Lake Luzerne, and along the left bank of the Rhine, the Alemanni had settled when they first took the country from the Romans. The Castle of Hapsburg was possessed by Rudolf, the Alemannian nobleman who was made emperor in 1273. His ambitious descendants, the dukes of Austria, endeavored to enlarge their authority and possessions at the expense of the cantons.

"Several changes in the principal Helvetian families took place in the thirteenth century, before the end of which the House of Hapsburg, under the politic and enterprising Rudolph and his son Albert, became possessed, through various titles, of a great ascendancy in Switzerland. Of these titles none was more tempting to an ambitious chief than that of advocate to a convent. That

specious name conveyed with it a kind of indefinite guardianship, and right of interference, which frequently ended in reversing the conditions of the ecclesiastical sovereign and its vassal. . . . Among other advocacies, Albert obtained that of some convents which had estates in the valleys of Schweitz and Underwald. . . . The people of Schweitz had made Rudolph their advocate. They distrusted Albert, whose succession to his father's inheritance spread alarm through Helvetia. It soon appeared that their suspicions were well founded. Besides the local rights which his ecclesiastical advocacies gave him over part of the forest cantons, he pretended, after his election to the empire, to send imperial bailiffs into their valleys as administrators of criminal justice."—*Id.*

Some authorities make Frederick III. the one who sent these bailiffs, but whether it was Frederick or Albert the facts are the same. One of these bailiffs was Gesler, whom William Tell resisted.

"Their oppression of a people unused to control, whom it was plainly the design of Albert to reduce into servitude, excited those generous emotions of resentment which a brave and simple race have seldom the discretion to repress. Three men, Stauffacher of Schweitz, Furst of Uri, Melchthal of Underwald, each with ten chosen associates, met by night in a sequestered field, and swore to assert the common cause of their liberties, without bloodshed or injury to the rights of others. Their success was answerable to the justice of their undertaking; the three cantons unanimously took up arms, and expelled their oppressors without a contest. Albert's assassination by his nephew which followed soon afterwards fortunately gave them leisure to consolidate their union (A.D. 1308). . . . But Leopold, duke of Austria, resolved to humble the peasants who had rebelled against his father, led a considerable force into their country. The Swiss, commending themselves to Heaven, and determined rather to perish than undergo that yoke a second time, though ignorant of regular discipline, and unprovided with defensive armor, utterly discomfited the assailants at Morgarten (A.D. 1315).

"This great victory, the Marathon of Switzerland, confirmed the independence of the three original cantons. After some years, Lucerne, contiguous in situation and alike in interests, was incorporated into their confederacy. It was far more materially enlarged about the middle of the fourteenth century by the accession of Zurich, Glaris, Zug, and Berne, all of which took place within two years. The first and last of these cities had already been engaged in frequent wars with the Helvetia nobility, and their internal polity was altogether republican. . . . The eight already enumerated are called the ancient cantons, and continued, till the late reformation of the Helvetic system, to possess several distinctive privileges and even rights of sovereignty over subject territories, in which the five cantons of Friburg, Soleure, Basel, Schaffhausen, and Apenzell did not participate. From this time the united cantons, but especially those of Berne and Zurich, began to

extend their territories at the expense of the rural nobility. . . . Many feudal superiorities they obtained from the owners in a more peaceable manner, through purchase or mortgage. Thus the house of Austria, to which the extensive domains of the counts of Kyburg had developed, abandoning, after repeated defeats, its hopes of subduing the forest cantons, alienated a great part of its possessions to Zurich and Berne. And the last remnant of their ancient Helvetic territories in Argovia was wrested, in 1417, from Frederick, count of Tyrol, who, imprudently supporting Pope John XXIII. Against the Council of Constance, had been put to the ban of the empire. These conquests Berne could not be induced to restore, and thus completed the independence of the confederate republics. The other free cities, though not yet incorporated, and the few remaining nobles, whether lay or spiritual, of whom the Abbot of St. Gall was the principal, entered into separate leagues with different cantons. *Switzerland became, therefore, in the first part of the fifteenth century, a free country, acknowledged as such by neighboring States, and subject to no external control*, though still comprehended within the nominal sovereignty of the empire. . . .

"Though the House of Austria had ceased to menace the liberties of Helvetia, and had even been for many years its ally, the Emperor Maximilian . . . endeavored to revive the unextinguished supremacy of the empire. That supremacy had just been restored in Germany by the establishment of the Imperial Chamber, and of a regular pecuniary contribution for its support, as well as for other purposes, in the Diet of Worms [1495]. The Helvetic cantons were summoned to yield obedience to these imperial laws. . . . Their refusal to comply brought on a war, wherein the Tyrolese subjects of Maximilian, and the Suabian league, a confederacy of cities in that province lately formed under the emperor's auspices, were principally engaged against the Swiss. But the success of the latter was decisive; and after a terrible devastation of the frontiers of Germany, peace was concluded [1499] upon terms very honorable for Switzerland. The cantons were declared free from the jurisdiction of the Imperial Chamber, and from all contributions imposed by the Diet. . . . Though, perhaps, in the strictest letter of public law, the Swiss cantons were not absolutely released from their subjection to the empire until the treaty of Westphalia, their real sovereignty must be dated by an historian from the year when every prerogative which a Government can exercise was finally abandoned."—*Id.*

And thus the kingdom of the Burgundians of A.D. 407 is represented in the independent confederacy of Switzerland to-day. J.

**"Bible Answers to Bible Questions.—No. 6" *The Signs of the Times* 12,  
50 , pp. 790, 791.**

LAST week the Bible question which we noticed was, "How are the dead raised up?" To that question we gave the Bible answer. In immediate connection with that question is this one, "With what body do they come?" The whole verse reads: "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" 1 Cor. 15:35.

This is an important question or the Bible would not ask it. It is one which we have a right to study or it would not be presented thus in the Bible. And the Bible having asked the question, we believe that the Bible answers it, because God does not trifle with men. The Bible is his revelation to man, and in it God has laid before us that which it is important and for our good to know. We have yet found no question asked in the Bible which is not answered by the Bible, unless it be of those questions which carry the answers in themselves. This question is not an exception. The Bible answers the question as to with what body the dead come when they are raised up. And, like all the other questions which we have examined, the Bible is the

791

only place where the correct answer to this question can be found. And what the Bible says on the subject must settle the matter at once, for that is the truth, and nothing contrary to it can be.

Remember that the subject of the whole chapter in which this question is found is the resurrection of the dead. In verse 20, we read, "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." The first-fruits was the sample, and of the best of the great harvest that was to follow. There is to be a harvest of the earth. Of those who shall be gathered from the earth into the everlasting garner of God, Christ is the same. His glorious resurrection body is the sample, the pattern of all that shall be received by him from the earth. For says the Scripture, he "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." Phil. 3:21. And "we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 John 3:2.

But Christ says, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell, the grave, and of death." Rev. 1:18. And that same body that died on the cross; that same body that was pierced with the Roman spear; and that was laid in Joseph's new tomb; that same body came forth from the tomb and lived again. That same body that died came forth from the dead. And so really was it so that he could say to them who had been with him before his death. "Handle me and see that it is I myself." "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side." And when he came forth from the dead, the napkins which had enwrapped his sacred head, and the linen clothes that had been about his holy form, were laid in laces by themselves, while every vestige of the body was gone from the sepulcher. Thus the Saviour rose from the dead with the same body that died. He, says the Scripture, is "the first-fruits," the sample, of those who shall come from the dead. Therefore, the dead come from the dead with the body that died,

only that in the case of those who are Christ's, the body will be immortal as his glorious body instead of the mortal body that was laid in the grave.

This is clearly stated by the scripture in Isaiah 26:19: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Now, how could it be possible for the "Dead body" of any person to arise unless it be the body that died? Yet bear in mind that when the dead body—the body that died—arises, if it be the body of a righteous person, it arises immortal instead of mortal as it died. For says the Scripture, "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.

Next the Scripture uses a simile to illustrate this. Death and burial are likened to the sowing of grain. And so we read, "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Verses 36-38. As, therefore, death and burial are likened to the sowing of seed, and as God giveth to every seed his own body, it is plain by this word that when the one who has died is quickened, is made to live again,—to every one is given *his own body*; not the body of some one else nor some other body, but "his own body." When Christ was brought again from the dead he came with "his own body." As he was the sample of all the harvest, so every one who shall be brought from the dead will come as he did, and as the Scripture declares, with "his own body."

But the Scripture carries the subject yet farther, "All flesh is not the same flesh; but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds." Verse 39. And as God gives to every seed—every person—his own body, it follows that when men's flesh is sown, it will be men's flesh and not beasts', nor birds', nor fishes' flesh, that will be raised at the resurrection of the dead.

Again says the Scripture: "There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another." Verse 40. Every person will have his own body, but it will be immortalized and glorified so that its nature and capabilities will as far transcend our bodies at present as the glory of Heaven transcends the earth. For "there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory. *So also is the resurrection of the dead*. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Notice in all this that it is the same thing that is sown that is raised. "*It is sown,*" "*it is raised.*" The man who died is raised from the

dead. The body that is sown, that body is raised, for God giveth to every seed "his own body." Yet it is a changed body; changed from mortal to immortal, from corruptible to incorruptible, from weakness to power, from natural to spiritual, from dishonor to glory, for Christ "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."

We know that many attempt to apply scientific tests to the resurrection of the dead, as nowadays they do to every phase of revelation, and in the application of these scientific tests they cannot see how the dead can be raised, they cannot see how the body can be brought again from the dust. But it is not a scientific question at all. It is not susceptible of scientific tests. It is solely a question of the power of God, and science cannot touch it.

Yet it is said that though it be not itself a question of science, it must be according to science, for God cannot violate his own laws. It is not becoming for any one to say that what God says he will do, would be contrary to science. It may be indeed that it would be contrary to what *man knows* of science; it might be against man's ideas of philosophy. But does it follow that therefore it must be contrary to the science or the philosophy of the universe as known to God? We think not, for of a truth there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy. We do not believe that God is obliged to raise the dead according to men's ideas of science or philosophy. Jevons justly says:—

"We perpetually find ourselves in the position of finite minds attempting infinite problems, and can we be sure that where we see contradiction an Infinite Intelligence might not discover perfect logical harmony?"

As for the idea that "God cannot violate his own laws," we put the thing just the other way, that as God is the source of all law, it is impossible that anything which he should do *could* be a violation of law.

We know that a piece of lead, or any other metal except gold or silver, can be transformed by heat in contact with air, into a powder or species of ashes or lime. Those ashes can then be taken and heated in a crucible *with some grains of wheat*, and the metal will be seen rising from its ashes and re-assuming its original form and properties. And if chemistry can do this, *faith* says that though the human body be reduced to ashes or to the dust of earth, the power of God can cause the body to arise from its ashes, and to re-assume its original form; and that this renewed form will be immortal, spiritual, and glorious, according to the working whereby the ChristpGod is able to subdue all things unto himself. The Bible question is, "With what body do they come?" The Bible answer is, God giveth it a body as pleaseth him, and to every seed (every person) "*his own body*."

J.

**"A Pagan Paradise" *The Signs of the Times* 12, 50 , pp. 791, 792.**

IN its notes on the Sunday-school lesson the *Advance* of November 18 says:—

"Hades is the place of departed souls, without reference to their character or condition. Paradise and Gehenna, or hell, are both in hades."

Can it really be that hell and paradise are both in the same place? If that be so, it either cannot be a very bad thing to be in hell, or else it cannot be a very nice thing after all to be in paradise. Or is hades such a large country that it can contain both paradise and the lake of fire, for gehenna *is* the lake of fire, and yet they be so far apart that the misery of the one cannot detract from the happiness of the other? The *Advance* says that "paradise and gehenna, or hell, are both in hades." But where is hades? The *Advance* leaves us totally in the dark on this point. True we are told *what* it is,—"the place of departed souls,"—but we should like to know *where* it is.

Does the *Advance* agree with Josephus that

"Hades is a place *in the world* not regularly finished; a subterraneous [under-ground] region, where the light of this world does not shine; from which circumstance, that in this place the light does not shine, it cannot be but there must be in it perpetual darkness"?—*Discourse on Hades*.

As Josephus, like the *Advance*, says that "in this region there is a certain place set apart, as *a lake of unquenchable fire*," and that is gehenna or hell; and as Josephus speaks of another part of this under-ground region, this hades, and describes it in such a way as to correspond to the *Advance's* suggestion of paradise, we think perhaps the *Advance* has in view the very place that Josephus describes. If so, will the *Advance* tell its readers just what place "in the world" it is.

By the way, the thought just occurs to us that as Mr. Peloubet in his "Select Notes" on the international lessons, gravely informs the Sunday-schools of the land, on the lesson for January 9, 1887, that "A most able argument has been presented by President Warren of Boston University, in his late book, 'Paradise Found,' in favor of the *north pole* as the site of Eden;" and as the *Advance* oracularly declares that paradise and gehenna or hell are both in hades; it must be that hades is at the north pole. That being the case it would necessarily follow that gehenna is at the north pole, which would hardly correspond with the idea of the temperature that is generally supposed to be the special characteristic of hell. It does, however, exactly correspond to what we were taught in Sunday-school in our youth. For, when a child, the writer of this article was actually taught in an "orthodox" "evangelical" Sunday-school that the gnashing of teeth of the lost was really the chattering of the teeth of the lost was really the chattering of the teeth from shivering in the excessive cold of the place of departed souls. When such stuff as this, and that of the *Advance*, is seriously taught in the Sunday-schools, then how far removed is the Christian world

792

from downright paganism on the subject of the place and state of the dead?

The Bible deals in no such nonsense. Neither paradise nor gehenna is in hades. Hades, in the New Testament, as well as *sheol* in the Old, is the place of the dead. But that place is in the grave, in the dust of the earth. For at the

resurrection that is where they are found. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. 12:2. "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." Isa. 26:19. "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after His resurrection." Matt. 27:52, 53. "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth." John 5:28, 29. According to the word of God, the grave, the dust of the earth, is the place of the dead.

The tree of life is in the midst of paradise. Rev. 2:7. But the tree of life is on either side of the river of life, and the river of life proceeds "out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." Therefore, according to the word of God, paradise is in the presence of the throne of God.

Gehenna or hell,—the lake of fire,—is not found until the judgment of the great day. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him." Matt. 25:31, 41. And when gehenna is kindled, it is when, at the end of the millennium, the devil and the wicked of all the earth go up on the breadth of the earth, and compass the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire comes down from God out of Heaven and devours them. Rev. 20:7-9. There it is, and then it is, and not till then, that gehenna is found.

It is most devoutly to be wished that the word of God, instead of pagan superstition, could be taught in the Sunday-schools. J.