

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 13 (1887)

January 6, 1887

"The Ten Kingdoms in the Dark Ages" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1 ,
pp. 3, 4.

WE have now shown not only the rise of the ten kingdoms foretold in the prophecy, but we have traced directly to the great States of modern Western Europe, the seven of the ten nations which remained after the uprooting of the three to establish the Papacy.

To form of these kingdoms an empire such as that of Rome, was the ambition of Charlemagne, and of others after him, "but the unity of the empire and the absolute power of the emperor were buried in his grave." In his grandsons design of the mighty Charles was dissipated into a dream. It was this same ambition that led Otto the Great to Rome, to his compact with the Pope, and to the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire. But "the Imperial Crown was the most fatal gift that could have been offered them all things, it deprived them of nearly everything. And in doing this, it inflicted on many generations incalculable and needless suffering." In theory, the Emperor was "the secular lord of the world," but in fact, he was but the servant and the tool of the Papacy. The Imperial office was the symbol of united power, but the nations which were connected with the empire were, in fact, the most divided of all the European nations. This was true of the empire as long as it existed, and when it was destroyed by Napoleon in 1806, it was only that he might establish, in reality, a great European Empire, with himself as Cesar, Augustus, Constantine, Charlemagne, and Otto all in one.

"He picture to himself the creation of feudal States, believing that he could make them acceptable, and preserve them from the criticism which was beginning to assail ancient institutions, by establishing them on a scale so grand that, as our pride would be enlisted, our reason might be silenced. He believed that once again he could exhibit what history has already witnessed—the world subject to a 'People-King;' but that royalty was to be represented in his own person. A combination of Eastern and Roman institutions, bearing, also, some resemblance to the times of Charlemagne, was to transform the sovereigns of Europe into great feudatories of the French Empire."—*Memoirs of Madame de Remusat, chap. 12.*

The English newspaper had said:—

"If Bonaparte succeeds in accomplishing his system of Federal Empire, France will become sovereign arbiter of almost the whole continent. He was delighted at this prediction, and resolutely strove to realize it."—*Id., chap. 20.*

"The European phalanxes were gradually giving way before him, and he began to believe that he was destined to regulate the

affairs of every continental kingdom. . . . He sometimes said: 'It is my intention to reach such a point that the kings of Europe shall be forced, each one of them, to have a palace in Paris, and at the time of the coronation of an emperor of the French, they shall take up their residence in it, to be present at the ceremony, and render it more imposing by their homage.'—*Id.*, chap. 16.

He had already, March 17, 1805, "laid the foundation-stone of this brain-built edifice," by uniting the iron crown of Italy with his own as emperor of France. It was to obtain, of his own blood, an heir to such an empire, that he divorced Josephine and married Maria Louisa, the Archduchess of Austria. And when she bore a son, March 20, 1811, the title of King of Rome was bestowed upon him as the first step in the succession to so grandly pictured an empire, which neither he nor his father ever saw, and which should never more be seen. For God had declared that although they should "mingle themselves with the seed of men," yet, "they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Dan. 2:43. And thus they will remain till the end of the world, for says the word of God by the prophet: "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.

In fulfillment of the vision of the great image, seen by Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, we have seen the rise, the glory, and the fall, of Babylon, the head of gold; of Medo-Persia, the breast and arms of silver; of Grecia, the sides of brass; and of Rome, the legs of iron. We have seen the division of the iron kingdom of Rome into ten parts according to the number of toes of the image in the vision; we have seen the history of these divisions for more than fourteen hundred years; and we now live in the last days, not only of their history, but of all history. For when they fall it is at the establishment of the everlasting kingdom of God. Said the prophet, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which

4

smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." Dan. 2:34, 35. The stone smiting the image upon his feet, is explained by the prophet to mean that "in the days of those kings [the kingdoms represented by the toes—the ten kingdoms] shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom." Verse 44.

Notice, the stone smites the image, not upon his head, nor his breast, nor his sides, nor his legs, but *upon his feet*. The kingdom of God was not therefore, and was not to be, set up in the days of Babylon, nor of Medo-Persia, nor of Grecia, nor of Rome, but in the days of the kingdoms which should arise upon the ruin of Rome. These kingdoms did not arise till in the fifth century, therefore it is this side of the fifth century that this kingdom of God is to be set up. And when this kingdom is set up, all the others are broken to pieces and carried away as is chaff by the wind, and *no place is found for them*. Not one of these kingdoms

remains when the kingdom of God comes, but it breaks in pieces and consumes them all, and then it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth, and stands forever.

The kingdom of God is to smite the nations that are now upon the earth. These are to be broken to pieces. In the days of these kingdoms it is that "the God of Heaven" shall set up this kingdom. Therefore in closing this sketch of the history foreshown in the prophecy by the great image, we can only use the words of the prophet of God as he stood before King Nebuchadnezzar in the pleasant palace of Babylon, two thousand four hundred and eighty-nine years ago; and we can use it with as much assurance as he, for it is the word of God. "Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; *the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter; and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.*" Dan. 2:45. J.

"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man.—No. 7" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 1 , p. 7.

ANOTHER question which we wish to notice is this: "What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" 1 Pet. 4:17. The Bible answer to this, its own question, is: "They are the enemies of the cross of Christ; *whose end is destruction.*" Phil. 3:18, 19. "Them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1:8, 9. Peter also tells of the "perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3:7. Perdition is defined to be "*utter* destruction." There would not be space in an article of reasonable length to quote the bare texts without note or comment, that destruction is the end of them that obey not the gospel of God. We can only give some indication of the evidence on this point by a summary. Nineteen times the word of God says they shall be "destroyed;" seven times it says they shall go to "perdition;" thirty-four times it says they shall "die," and this with reference alone to the second death; twenty times it says they shall "perish;" eight times it says they shall be "consumed;" four times it says they shall be "devoured;" seven times it says they shall come to an end; ten times it says they shall be burned up or "utterly burned;" three times it says they shall be as nothing; once it says "the wicked shall not be; yea thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Psalms [*sic.*] 37:10.

Now when the Scripture says so plainly and so repeatedly that the wicked shall be destroyed, and utterly destroyed; that they shall die, perish, be consumed, devoured, come to an end, be burned up, shall come to nothing, and shall not be, and that there will be no place for him if he should be; then how *can* the idea of eternal torment be true? If those words of the Scripture do not show that the wicked shall perish, that he shall come cease to exist, then what do they mean? If these Scriptures do not show that the wicked shall cease to exist, then how could God make known such a thing if he wanted to tell to men that the wicked should perish and should not be?

Then in the face of scores of passages of Scripture that show that the wicked shall be destroyed, etc., how can it be that, in the almost universal doctrine of Christians, eternal life is given to the wicked. True, by this doctrine they are to remain in misery eternally without dying; but if the wicked live eternally, that is eternal life, and the fact that they are in misery, does not in the least affect the duration of their existence. But against such doctrine there stands the word of God that "the wages of sin is death," and if the wicked live eternally even in torment, then there can be no such thing as death. Again the Scripture speaks of a time when there shall be no more pain (Rev. 21:4); but if the wicked are tormented eternally there never *can* be a time when there shall be no more pain.

Again we ask, How then can it be that in the beliefs of men eternal life is given to the wicked? How is it that, in spite of the plain Bible answer to the question as to what the end shall be of them that obey not the gospel of God, so many are perplexed upon the question? The perplexity on this question arises from the same source that it does on all the other questions which we have examined, that is, from the doctrine which we have examined, that is, from the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. As a Doctor of Divinity once said, "If we believe in the immortality of the soul we *must* believe in the eternal torment of the wicked."

Immortal means "exempt from death," "exempt from liability to die." It is the doctrine of the unconditional immortality of man, therefore, which gives eternal life to the wicked. But such a view cannot be held consistently with the Bible. This is plain from the few texts cited, and the Bible terms referred to above. And that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul may be still held, the language of the Bible has to be, and is, forced into channels where that of no other book would be allowed to go.

Words when found in the Bible are made to mean exactly contrary to what they mean when found in any other place in human language. And all to sustain the dogma of the immortality of the soul. But that is just where this method of interpretation belongs. It was the introduction of this doctrine into the Christian church, that created the necessity for this scheme of interpretation. The one man who, more than any other, is responsible for it was Origen, who lived from A.D. 185 to 253. Says Mosheim:—

"The Christian doctors who had applied themselves to the study of letters and philosophy, soon abandoned the frequented paths, and wandered in the devious wilds of fancy. The Egyptians [Alexandrians] distinguished themselves in this new method of explaining the truth. . . . Origen was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man, enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it. . . . He alleged that it was not in their literal force and import that the true meanings of the sacred writers were to be sought, but in a mysterious and hidden sense. . . . In this devious path he displays the most ingenious strokes of fancy, though generally *at the*

expense of truth, whose divine simplicity is rarely discernible through the cobweb of allegory. Origen expresses himself in the following manner. Origen expresses himself in the following manner: 'The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so shall not attain to the kingdom of God. The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.' But the philosophy which this great man embraced with such zeal was one of the sources of his delusion. He could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that sacred book according to its literal sense."—*Church History, century 2, part 2, chap. 3, paragraphs 1, 5.*

There is exposed the secret of the whole matter. "He could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted." What were those opinions? He was "enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy." And *that* was the immortality of the soul. Now in Plato's discussion of the nature of the soul, he maintains that it is imperishable, indestructible, immortal, deathless, etc., etc. But the Bible, speaking of wicked men, says they shall "die," "they shall utterly perish," their "end is destruction," that man is "mortal," etc. It is not at all strange, therefore, that Origen could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted, because those opinions, and the statements of the Bible, are as entirely opposites as it is possible for things to be. And so, not finding any support in the Scriptures for this doctrine, he invented a scheme by which he could find not only that, but whatever he wanted. That is, to give a meaning to the Bible language directly opposite to what it says. And Origen's method of interpretation is perpetuated to this day by those who attempt to maintain, by the Scriptures, the immortality of the soul, and the consequent eternal life of the wicked. However, this is not strange, because, as the doctrine was dependent wholly upon this scheme of interpretation for its birth into the Christian church, so, without that scheme, it could not live there for a day.

The Bible taken as it is, therefore, is clear on the question, "What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" The word of God says, their "end is destruction." That word says, they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;" and "neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away."

J.

**"The Financial Results of that Paper Carnival" *The Signs of the Times*
13, 1 , pp. 7, 8.**

THAT "Paper Carnival" venture of the Church of the Advent, San Francisco, which we mentioned in the SIGNS of November 18, and upon which we made some estimates, did not pan out as well in money as was expected. There were several items of expenses that were not in our count, because then the carnival was in its full tide of revelry, and the official statement of its receipts and expenditures had not been made, and of course could not be till the carnival was

over. So far as was then known, the estimates were that more than 800 persons had spent three months in preparation, and \$10,000 had been paid for "dresses, costumes, etc." For the 800 persons we allowed 25 cents a day for 75 working days, which amounts to \$15,000, which, with the \$10,000 for costumes, dresses, costumes, etc. make \$25,000. Now the official financial statement has been published, and to this \$25,000 we find there must be added a "dancing master's salary, \$152.75;" stage manager's salary, \$120; rent of pavilion, gas, music, calcium lights, erecting and papering booths, fitting up stage, and payment of stage hands—in all amounting to \$3,806.50. Thus the expense, "at a low estimate," was \$28,806.50.

The expectation was to raise \$15,000 by the carnival, but the gross receipts were only \$10,202.48. So there was \$28,806.50 spent to get a return of \$10,202.48. But as the \$3,806.50 had to come out of the \$10,202.48, there was left a net income of only \$6,305.98, while "it is thought that enough more will come from ladies who sold small quantities of tickets, to raise the sum to \$6,500." Allowing this full amount of \$6,500, it then appears that there was an investment of \$25,000 to get a return of \$6,500. In other words, \$18,500 was paid for sheer revelry to help the Church of the Advent. But the "good work" did not stop at that. The official report is that "several wealthy parishioners are so well pleased at the result of the carnival that they have promised contributions, which, added to the carnival proceeds, will reduce the debt to about \$5,000." We should think they ought to be "pleased" with a piece of fun that cost \$18,500. But we are at a loss to know how the Church of the Advent is ever going to pay the remaining \$5,000 of its debt. For now a carnival would be no novelty, and therefore another carnival would hardly prove such a grand success as this one proved. It is highly probable, however, that the inventive genius of the "Rev. John Gray of the Church of the Advent" is not yet exhausted, and that in the payment of this remaining \$5,000 we may look for him to make the greatest effort of his life. By getting up something in which the fun alone would cost about \$50,000, it is perhaps possible that he might get the

8

desired \$5,000; if not from the enterprise direct, he might by this means succeed in so pleasing his wealthy parishioners that they would promise contributions enough to pay it, especially if he could make sure of them while the revelry is at its height.

J.

January 13, 1887

"A Scrap of History" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2 , p. 23.

IN the *Congregationalist* of December 9, 1886, the Rev. Wolcott Calkins, D.D., says:—

"I came across a curious scrap of history one day last summer, when I was searching for something else, in a library at Paris. It was the record of a trial in the south of France, in 1794 or 1795, for

breaking the law of the Republic enforcing rest from work on the tenth day. A blacksmith was fined by the court for continuing his work on the day of rest. The revolution which had suppressed church, Sabbath, and 'all the rest of the superstitions,' had attempted to provide and enforce a substitute for the Christian sabbath."

Just now, when all over our land there is a loud and persistent cry for law to enforce a substitute for the Sabbath of the Lord, this is an interesting piece of history. The church of Rome had substituted the observance of Sunday for that of the Sabbath of the Lord. France in the revolution substituted the observance of every tenth day for that of Sunday. France had just as much right to enforce the observance of this tenth day as she or any other country, or the church of Rome or any other church, had to enforce the observance of Sunday. This tenth day was as much a Sabbath as Sunday was or is. And there was just as much right and justice in France's punishment of that blacksmith for working on the tenth day as there is in any of the States of the United States punishing people now for working on Sunday.

If that case in France had been one wherein the punishment fell upon a man who had already kept Sunday, we have not the least doubt that all those in our country who demand Sunday laws would count it injustice and oppression, if not persecution. And yet throughout the United States the demand is being made by which all who keep the Sabbath of the Lord shall be compelled to keep Sunday also; and in certain States which now have Sunday laws, those who keep the Sabbath of the Lord have been, and are being, fined and imprisoned and cruelly treated because they have by downright spies been detected in some trifling act that could be construed into a degree of work that could be touched by the law. The people of Arkansas and Tennessee can very properly stop their mouths at mention of the French Revolution.

J.

"Bible Answers to Bible Questions Concerning Man.—No. 7" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2 , pp. 23, 24.

THE last question which we shall notice in this connection is that one which was put by Peter to the Lord Jesus: "Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?" To this question the Lord gave two answers. The first one was to the twelve direct, and concerned them alone: "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The other answer is to all people: "And everyone that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold," "now in this time, . . . and in the world to come eternal life." Matt. 19:27-29; Mark 10:30.

Eternal life is that which they shall have who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever

believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "And 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.

With eternal life to those who believe on the Son of God, there is also given eternal glory. "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered awhile, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you." 1 Pet. 5:10. "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Rom. 8:18. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4:17.

They shall stand in the presence of the throne of God and of his glory. "I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." Rev. 7:9, 10. "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 for ever." Jude 24, 25.

Of some other of the glories of the reward which shall be to those who have left all and followed Christ, we will let another tell, in tones that charm as though attuned to the symphonies of the other world:—

"'The fire that consumes the wicked purifies the earth. Every trace of the curse is swept away.' No eternally burning hell will keep before the ransomed the fearful consequences of sin. One reminder alone remains: our Redeemer will ever bear the marks of his crucifixion. Upon his wounded head, upon his side, his hands and feet, are the only traces of the cruel work that sin has wrought.

"'O Tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion.' The kingdom forfeited by sin, Christ has regained, and the redeemed are to possess it with him. 'The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever.' A fear of making the saints' inheritance seem too material has led many to spiritualize away the very truths which lead us to look upon the new earth as our home. Christ assured his disciples that he went to prepare mansions for them. Those who accept the teachings of God's word will not be wholly ignorant concerning the heavenly abode. And yet the apostle Paul declares: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.' Human language is inadequate to describe the reward of the righteous. It will be known only to those who behold it. No finite mind can comprehend the glory of the Paradise of God.

"In the Bible the inheritance of the saved is called a country. There the great Shepherd leads his flock to fountains of living

waters. The tree of life yields its fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree are for the service of the nations. There are ever-flowing streams, clear as crystal, and beside them waving trees cast their shadows upon the paths prepared for the ransomed of the Lord. There the wide-spreading plains swell into hills of beauty, and the mountains of God rear their lofty summits. On those peaceful plains, beside those living streams, God's people, so long pilgrims and wanderers, shall find a home.

"There is the New Jerusalem, 'having the glory of God,' her light 'like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal.' Saith the Lord, 'I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people.' 'The tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.'

"In the city of God 'there shall be no night.' None will need or desire repose. There will be no weariness in doing the will of God and offering praise to his name. We shall ever feel the freshness of the morning, and shall ever be far from its close. 'And they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light.' The light of the sun will be superseded by a radiance which is not painfully dazzling, yet which immeasurably surpasses the brightness of our noontide. The glory of

24

God and the Lamb floods the holy city with unfading light. The redeemed walk in the sunless glory of perpetual day.

"I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.' The people of God are privileged to hold open communion with the Father and the Son. Now we 'see through a glass, darkly.' We behold the image of God reflected, as in a mirror, in the works of nature and in his dealings with men; but then we shall see him face to face, without a dimming veil between. We shall stand in his presence, and gaze upon the glory of his countenance.

"There, immortal minds will study with never-failing delight the wonders of creative power, the mysteries of redeeming love. There is no cruel, deceiving foe to tempt to forgetfulness of God. Every faculty will be developed, every capacity increased. The acquirement of knowledge will not weary the mind or exhaust the energies. There the grandest enterprises may be carried forward, the loftiest aspirations reached, the highest ambitions realized; and still there will arise new heights to surmount, new wonders to admire, new truths to comprehend, fresh objects to call forth the powers of mind and soul and body.

"And as the years of eternity roll, they will bring richer and more glorious revelations of God and of Christ. As knowledge is progressive, so will love, reverence, and happiness increase. The more men learn of God, the greater will be their admiration of his character. As Jesus opens before them the riches of redemption, and the amazing achievements in the great controversy with Satan, the hearts of the ransomed beat with a stronger devotion, and they sweep the harps of gold with a firmer hand; and ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of voices unite to swell the mighty chorus of praise.

"And every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever."—*Mrs. E. G. White, in Great Controversy, Vol. IV.*

J.

"The Call of Abram. Gen. 12:1-9" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 2 , pp. 26, 27.

The Commentary

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON

(January 30.—Gen. 12:1-9.)

"NOW the Lord had said unto Abram." Abram was a native of Ur of the Chaldees, not far from the mouth of the Euphrates; though, through the river deposits of ages, the ruins of Ur are now about 125 miles from the Persian Gulf and about six miles from the Euphrates. The oldest of its temples are certain ones whose bricks bear the name of Uruk, who calls himself "King of Ur and Accad." The signet cylinder of Uruk's son, Ilgi, has been found and is preserved in the British Museum. Uruk is supposed to have lived about a hundred years, or perhaps a little more, before Abram left Ur.

TERAH was Abram's father and an idolater, for he "served other gods." Josh. 24:2. These gods were mostly the sun, the moon, and the planets. Sin, or Hurki, was the moon-god; San, or Sansi, was the sun; Vul was the god of the atmosphere; Nin was Saturn; Merodach was Jupiter; Nergal was Mars; Ishtar was Venus; and Nebo was Mercury. With each of these and in his worship was associated a female divinity. Ana was the god of the lower world, the lord of darkness or death. The chief seat of his worship was Erech. Gen. 10:10. The principal temple at Erech was built by Uruk to Sin, the moon-god. He also built temples to the sun to Belus and his wife Beltis, as well as to many others, for he was a mighty builder and a devout worshiper of the gods.

IT was in such a place, and amidst such idolatry, that Abram was born and grew up, his own people and even his own father serving those gods. Yet Abram turned from it all and served Jehovah. When all about him had forsaken the true God and served idols and walked in their evil ways, Abram stood faithful to the Lord. Whilst all others did not like to retain God in their knowledge, Abram gave himself up to the sincere worship of the Lord. Therefore he became "the friend of God," and the father of all them which believe. "For if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

IT was from the midst of this idolatry that God called Abram to go out into a land which he would show him, and he obeyed, and "went out not knowing whither he went." For "the God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran [Haran], and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell." Acts 7:2-4.

COMING out of Ur, Abram was accompanied by Terah, his father, Lot, his nephew, and Sarai, his wife. Gen. 11:31. It seems that Nahor had preceded them to Haran, and had built that city, for Haran was "the city of Nahor." Compare Gen. 24:10 with 27:43. Haran was on a tributary of the Euphrates, the Belichus, about seventy-five miles northeast of Carchemish. "And they came to Haran and dwelt there." "And Terah died in Haran." And after his father died, Abram, in obedience to the call which the Lord had given him in Ur, went on to the land which should be shown him. "So Abram departed as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him; and Abram was seventh-five years old when he departed out of Haran."

"AND Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran; and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came." God had said to him while he was in Ur: "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." And now when Abram had passed through the land unto the plain of Moreh, the Lord again appeared to him, and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land."

"AND he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child." Acts 7:5. "Now to Abram and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:16, 29. "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

AND "by faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same

promise; for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; . . . and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims

27

on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. . . Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11:9-16.

IF we will be Christ's we must take his yoke upon us and learn of him, for he is "meek and lowly in heart," and it is meekness and lowliness in heart which we must learn of Christ, that we may be his. And if we be his, then are we Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. So says Christ: "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5:5.

J.

January 20, 1887

"That Sunday-Law Petition" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3 , p. 39.

AT the Sunday-law Convention held in San Francisco November 29, 1886, reported in the SIGNS of December 9, the Executive Committee that was elected, was directed "to prepare petitions as soon as possible and send throughout the State for signatures." Petitions have been prepared accordingly, and are being circulated. It seems that the work has been going on for some time, but so slyly that not many outside of the churches concerned had any knowledge of it until a reporter for the San Francisco *Chronicle* called on the Executive Committee and made inquiries and then published his report. The Executive Committee seems to be working strictly in harmony with the spirit of the convention by which it was appointed. There appears the same double dealing, the same effort to keep the Legislature and the public misinformed as to the real object of the movement.

The following is a copy of the petition, 2,500 of which have been sent out to the "pastors of the churches and others known to be interested:"—

"To the Legislature of the State of California: We, the undersigned legal voters of the State of California, believing that the best interests of the State, material and moral, will be promoted by a suspension of business and a rest from labor on one day in seven, would respectfully petition your honorable body to enact such law or laws as may be necessary to secure to the people of the State this important object."

It seems by the petition, that all they want is for the Legislature to secure to the people the privilege of suspending business and of resting on "one day in seven." But suppose the Legislature should pass a law by which it should be declared in solemn enactment, in the very words of this petition, that from and after the approval of this Act by the governor, there shall be throughout the State of California, "a suspension of business and a rest from labor on one day in seven;" would that satisfy this Executive Committee, and the ministers and people who are circulating the petition? Not by a long way. Suppose the

Legislature should by law declare that on and after a certain date it shall be unlawful in this State to conduct any manner of business, or to do any manner of work, except works of necessity and mercy, "on one day in seven;" would *that* satisfy the Executive Committee and its workers? Not by any manner of means.

This Executive Committee knows, and all its workers know, and everybody else knows that no such law as that is wanted. If the Legislature of California should enact a law in which were embodied the very words of this petition, everybody knows that this Executive Committee and its workers would be the ones who would more decidedly object to it than would anybody else in the State. If a law embodying the very words of their petition, is not what they want, and would not suit them, then why do they not petition for what they *do* want, and for what *would* suit them? Oh, that would never do, because, as stated in the convention, if they should ask the Legislature for what they really want they would get nothing at all. Besides, this, if they should circulate a petition for what they really want, they might not get so many signatures, and worse than all, it might alarm the enemy and provoke opposition and counter-petitions. As stated to the *Chronicle* reporter, in their own words, what they want is this:—

"The ministers see the importance of a law to protect the sabbath, which is their harvest-day for souls."

So then it is not a law that will cause a suspension of business, and a rest simply "on one day in seven," that is wanted. It is a law that will protect the ministers' "harvest-day for souls." Would it not be a good thing for this Executive Committee to petition the Legislature to pay the ministers for harvesting the souls? If not why not? If it be the duty of the State to furnish and protect a day for the harvesting of souls, why is it not equally the duty of the State to pay those who do the harvesting? And so, to get the Legislature to pass a law in the interest of the ministers, by protecting the sabbath because it is their harvest-day for souls, they circulate for signatures a petition asking the Legislature to pass a law or laws which shall "secure to the people of the State the important object of a suspension of business and a rest on one day in seven." And this they do "to avoid alarming the enemy and provoking opposition and counter-petitions." We do not wonder that they dread opposition when their real purpose is seen.

As they stated it to the reporter it was thus:—

"They [the ministers] are stirring up the churches and congregations to make a strong fight in its defense. But they wish to avoid alarming the enemy and provoking opposition and counter-petitions."

Oh yes; the ministers of California can make a strong fight in defense—when they are not attacked. They are valiant leaders—if they can only "avoid alarming the enemy." They, and in fact the ministers generally throughout the country, are vigorous advocates for Sunday—if they can avoid opposition. They are all strong petitioners for laws to protect the ministers' harvest-day for souls—if they can only frame the petition so as to avoid all danger of alarming the enemy, or provoking opposition, that might culminate in a counter-petition.

There is nothing the Sunday cause and its advocates dread so much as opposition. They dare not go before the people of California with a frank, fair,

open avowal of the cause in behalf of which they demand that the Legislature shall act. They dare not go to the Legislature itself with a fair statement of what they want; they said so in their convention. Any cause that cannot bear the light of day, and the test of open, full, and free examination and discussion is unworthy the attention of thinking men. And legislation in behalf of any such cause is unworthy of a free people. But such is the Sunday cause and legislation in behalf of it.

If those ministers should obtain the law which they demand, a law that would secure the "suspension of business and a rest on one day in seven," that is, on Sunday; and if men in this State should suspend all business and should rest on one day in seven, other than Sunday, thus doing all that the petition asks for, then there is not one of those ministers who would not by the law compel these men to rest and suspend business on Sunday also, and would thus demand rest and the suspension of business on *two* days in seven, which is just twice as much as the petition asks for. But that is no difference to them; a Sunday law is what they want, a law to protect the ministers' harvest-day for souls; and if they can obtain it by petitioning the Legislature to pass a law securing rest and suspension of business "on one day in seven," or a "civil" Sunday law, it is all right. If they can get the thing they want, by asking for another and totally different thing, it is all the same to them, and so much the better if by this means they can "avoid alarming the enemy and provoking opposition." And so, having valiantly fought, and right valiantly won, the battle in which there is no opposition, 'twill be "a famous victory."

J.

"Infidelity in High Places" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 3 , pp. 39, 40.

IN answer to a question as to whether men can be saved except through faith in Christ, the *Christian Union* of December 16, 1886, page 26, says:—

"According to the Westminster Assembly's Catechism a knowledge of Christ is necessary to salvation, and those who have never possessed that knowledge are certainly lost. But this opinion is now entertained by very few divines."

So then it is "the Westminster Assembly's Catechism" is it, that declares that "a knowledge of Christ is necessary to salvation"? We thought we had read in the Bible, of Christ, these words: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. We thought that we had read in the Bible, that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," and that God hath set forth Christ "to be a propitiation *thought faith in his blood*, to declare *his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." We thought that we had read in the word of God, that it is the righteousness of Christ alone that avails for the sinner, and that this righteousness is received by faith "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." "To declare, I say, at this time His [Christ's] righteousness; that he [God] might be just, and the justifier of him which

believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:19-26. We have thought all these years that faith in Christ was necessary to salvation, and that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And now the *Christian Union* informs us that it is the "Westminster Assembly's Catechism" that says so. However, whether it be the Bible, or the catechism that says it, or whether both say it, the *Union* says that "this opinion is now entertained by very few divines." Again says the *Union*:—

"Some hold that an opportunity will be given for such knowledge in another life; others hold that no such knowledge is necessary, and instance the case of Cornelius (Acts 10), the Judgment as described in Matt. 25, and such promises as Isa. 55:7, and Rom. 3:7-10."

The case of Cornelius is not well taken in this connection, for to him such knowledge was most certainly necessary. So very necessary, indeed, that an angel was sent from Heaven on purpose to tell him how he could obtain the knowledge. The angel told him to send for Peter, and "he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." He sent for him. Peter came, and Cornelius said, "Now therefore are we all here present before God." Peter there preached to him and them "peace by Jesus Christ," and "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." And then they were baptized. Acts 10:6, 33, 36, 43, 44, 48. The other passages referred to are turned just as much awry as this. Rom. 3:7-10 reads: "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner? And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say), Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just. What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one." It seems that this is rather cold comfort to give to satisfy men

40

that a knowledge of Christ is not necessary to salvation.

But more yet, the *Union* says:—

"There seems to us abundant scriptural authority for the latter opinion [that a knowledge of Christ is not necessary to salvation], and none for the doctrine that a knowledge of Christ is *essential* to salvation."

No scriptural authority for the doctrine that a knowledge of Christ is essential to salvation! Then what in the world was ever the Scriptures given for? Why was the gospel ever preached to men? If this be so, then why did Christ die at all?

And the opinion that such knowledge *is* necessary, "is now entertained by very few divines." How much further can infidelity go, and still wear the name "Christian," and its advocates be called "divines"? "When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?"

J.

January 27, 1887

"Who Has Declared Independence?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4 , p. 55.

IN 1698 Ireland was subject to England. Although she had her own Parliament, yet she, Parliament and all, was governed by the mother country, and by the Parliament of the mother country. And in this, England was distinctly the mother country; because the governing class in Ireland was composed of colonists from England; and it was only by the power of England that these were enabled to govern either Ireland or themselves. So entirely was this true, that if the protecting power of England had been withdrawn, any and all government in Ireland, in which the English colonists could have had any part at all would have ceased to exist. Therefore, it was literally true that the very existence of the then Government of Ireland depended wholly upon the mother country. Yet for all this, the Irish Parliament took a step which, if allowed to stand, would have not only severed its connection with the home Government, but with that would have cost it its own existence. We will give this in the words of the historian himself. He says:—

"The Irish Lords and Commons had presumed, not only to re-enact an English Act passed *expressly* for the purpose of *binding them*, but to re-enact it with *alterations*. The alterations were indeed small; but the *alteration even* of a *letter* was tantamount to a *declaration of independence*."—*Macaulay's England, chap. 23, p. 63.* [The italics are mine.]

Now, according to this *true* principle of government, those people who claim that Christ re-enacted the ten commandments, and that, too with alterations, virtually assert that Christ declared independence of the Supreme Government. But against all such claims, we have the words of Christ, in strictest accordance with this true principle, which declare: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law," knowing full well that to alter a "jot or tittle," or, in the words of Macaulay, "even a letter," would be equal to a "declaration of independence." Therefore among the very first words that he uttered as a public teacher, "as one having authority," he lays down the fundamental principle of true allegiance. And every other word, and every other act of his life, is strictly consistent with it. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, *not as I will* but as thou wilt." Matt. 26:39. "I seek *not mine own will*, but the *will of the Father* which hath sent me." John 5:30. "I came down from Heaven, *not* to do mine own will, *but* the will of him that sent me." John 6:38. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to *finish his work*." John 4:34. Was the work of God not done until by the ministration of Christ he had "re-enacted with alterations" "his own law, and had thus declared himself *independent of himself*? That would *finish his work* indeed, and with a vengeance. But God forbid, "He *cannot deny himself*." 2 Tim. 2:13. On the contrary, his work can be, and will be, and was intended to be finished in righteousness (Rom. 9:28), and "in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. This "will" and this "work" Christ came to do, and in justice and in

righteousness he pledges himself and all his followers to the firmest allegiance to the government of the Most High. Matt. 7:21; 10:17; Rev. 22:14; 14:12.

On the other hand, how aptly this exploit of the Irish Lords and Commons with the English Government illustrates the arrogance of the Papacy with the God of Heaven! There was the Irish Parliament ruling Ireland, yet itself dependent on the English Parliament and power for its very existence. Here was the Papacy ruling the world in things temporal, and in things spiritual, yet itself dependent upon the mercy, the forbearance, and the long-suffering and power of the Most High. There the supreme power had passed an act for the express purpose of binding them. Here the Power Supreme above all had passed acts for the express purpose of binding, not only the Papacy, but all upon the earth. There, they presumed to re-enact, with *slight* alterations, the act which bound them. Here, he has presumed to re-enact, with the *most material* alterations, those acts which God had passed to bind the human race. That, the historian says, was "tantamount to a declaration of independence." This was nothing less than an out and out declaration of independence. He has assumed all the titles of the King of kings and Lord of lords. But it is not enough that he should make himself *equal* to God, but he must exalt "himself *above* all that is called God or that is worshiped." And in the matter of subordinate Government acting with Supreme Government, and subordinate with Supreme Ruler, I cannot conceive of a more decided and effectual means that could be employed for asserting independence than just the very means which he has employed, and which is so perfectly illustrated in the historical point under notice; that is, "to re-enact with alterations" the law of God, the *ten commandments*.

J.

"As It Was in the Days of Noah" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 4 , pp. 55, 56.

IN speaking of the times which should immediately precede his coming, the Saviour said, "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." And in reading the Scripture we find that "violence" was one of the principal evils that characterized the days of Noah. "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." As therefore violence specially characterized the days of Noah; and as, so shall it be at the coming of the Lord, we are, upon the authority of the Scriptures to expect the growth and prevalence of violence as time draws on toward the coming of Christ.

This is clearly shown by the words of the Lord by Paul in 2 Tim. 3. He says 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, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."

This is a fearful picture as it is, but in the same connection the word says, "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." When men are

possessed with such dispositions as are here named, it would seem that that time would be about as bad as it could be; but when it is clearly and positively stated that these same characters and dispositions shall grow worse and worse, it is plain that the days of Noah will be repeated, and the earth will be filled with violence.

Ezekiel, speaking of the time of the end, says: "Violence is risen up into a rod of wickedness; none of them shall remain, nor of their multitude, nor of any of theirs; neither shall there be wailing for them. . . . They shall cast their silver in the streets, and their gold shall be removed; their silver and their gold shall not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the Lord. . . . Make a chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence." Eze. 7:11, 19, 23. And Habakkuk (2:17) cries out, "Because of men's blood, and for the violence of the land, of the city, and of all that dwell therein."

There are abundance of signs, and plenty of evidence, other than this, to show when the coming of the Lord is at the doors; but even if there were no other than this, it seems to us that from the pernicious course of current events we might justly conclude that the world is fast nearing the day of the coming of the Son of man. In view of the present condition of society we can only wonder how much further things can go as they are and have lately been going, before the earth shall be filled with violence. In a whole year there is scarcely a week passes but that some part of the country is disturbed by a strike, and afflicted by the rioting and violence that are its inseparable attendants.

In San Francisco, there has not been a strike on hand for more than a month. Certain cable-car hands have struck, and all this time, on two of the principal thoroughfares of that city, people's lives have been in constant danger. Running cars have been assailed with showers of stones, obstructions have been placed so as to destroy the cars, and some have been blown up with death-dealing explosives. Many innocent people have been injured—perhaps crippled for life—and some have been almost killed. And yet the city seems to be helpless. A few arrests have been made, a reward of \$500 has at last been offered for the detection of the criminals who were concerned in blowing up the cars; but even if some of the very criminals themselves should be caught, the chances are altogether against any successful prosecution, of any just punishment overtaking them. In the first place it is almost impossible to get a jury of twelve men who are not so far in sympathy with the crimes committed by strikers as at least to prevent justice overtaking the criminal. And even though a jury should be found which would convict, then the criminals are almost sure to escape, through the tricks and technicalities employed by equally criminal lawyers. This is proved in the case of the Chicago Anarchists, and almost numberless other cases.

There is another feature developed in this San Francisco violence, to which we designed specially to call attention, as betraying a most dangerous and deplorable condition of society. We refer to the prominent part taken in it by the school-boys and other boys not beyond school-boy age if not actually school-boys.

Shortly after the strike occurred, the striking workmen held a parade, and marched a considerable distance along the line of road from which they had

struck. On this occasion the striking workmen themselves behaved very well. But preceding the men in their march, there was a great crowd of small boys who riddled with stones the windows of every car that passed them; and this was kept up along the whole line of march, with hooting and insulting those in charge of the cars. And when police protection was given to the roads, the *Chronicle* of January 11 reports that:—

"The heaviest police protection given the roads during daylight is placed in the vicinity of the school-houses along the lines, as the school-boys, who have shown a keen interest in the strike since its inception, are given to annoying the new train hands, calling them "scabs" and throwing sand and mud at them whenever an opportunity to do so safely presents itself."

In the case of men who have a grievance, in the excitement and bitterness of opposition, it is not to be wondered at that some excesses should be committed; but in such a case as this of those school-boys, it can spring from nothing but sheer wantonness and love of violence. When parental authority has grown so slack that mere boys are at liberty to omit such things, and when the discipline of the public schools has grown so grossly slack that children at the very doors of the school-house can commit such outrages that the strongest police protection of the city is required there, it is evident that this spirit cannot go on much longer before the earth shall be filled with violence. When the public

56

schools of a city are so conducted that in times of unrest the strongest police protection is required in the vicinity of the school-houses, then such schools become dangerous to society—a nuisance that ought to be abated, and the sooner the better.

Nor yet are we prepared to say that San Francisco is the worst city in the United States. It may be, and it may not. We have seen no such record concerning any other city, but this may be only because the like has *not been recorded*. But even admitting that San Francisco is the worst, it only occupies the place of the superlatives in a degree of comparison whose tendency is only downward. All are bad, some are worse, and some one must be the worst; and if to San Francisco belongs that bad pre-eminence, it only shows that she is a little further along than are some others in a course of evil and violence upon which all are rapidly moving.

When the world has reached that place that, from children to men, from the public schools to the city mob, the same spirit of lawlessness and riot prevails, how much longer shall it have to wait before the earth shall be filled with violence? What remedy can be applied? The church has lost *its* power, and has to appeal to this same lawless element for help to preserve its "essential" though illegitimate dogma. It is plainly confessed that if the Sunday is to be preserved, "the religious element must be re-enforced by the non-religious;" and Sunday is the ground essential to the existence of the church, the "harvest-day for souls." The preservation of Sunday is now the great and leading question. And when to preserve its own dogmas the church is compelled to court the alliance of the

"assemblies of violent men," this is positive evidence that the power of godliness is gone from it, and that the spirit of force and violence is taking its place.

In the days of Noah, "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." And "as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." "Make a chain, for the land *is* full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence." J.

February 3, 1887

"Yet a Little While" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5 , pp. 71, 72.

THE prophet Isaiah exclaims, "Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." 59:14. We are not left in doubt as to when this is, for in immediate connection with these words is the statement that the Lord "put on the garments of vengeance for clothing," and this time is shown by Paul to be at his second coming: "To you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. And Isaiah continues: "According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies; to the islands he will repay recompense." "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." Verses 18, 20. There can be no doubt therefore that the time to which Isaiah refers is the same to which Paul refers, and that the time is that which immediately precedes the second coming of the Lord.

Hosea speaks of the same time, saying, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel; for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." 4:1, 2. That the prophet in this perfectly describes the condition of things at the present time, can be proved by anyone who looks at any of the leading daily or weekly papers anywhere in all the land, or who to any extent moves about among men. Whole columns are filled with the reports of deeds of violence; with thievings and adulteries in high places and in low, and especially in the high places. Columns of iniquitous reports of adulterous proceedings are telegraphed at immense expense across the ocean and then across the continent in all directions, and the paper that bears the fullest account sells the best. Society is honeycombed with the canker of iniquity.

Now are we left in doubt as to whether these words of the prophet were meant to describe the times which now are. The next verse says, "Therefore shall the land mourn, and everyone that dwelleth therein shall languish, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven; yea, the fishes of the sea also shall be taken away." This time when the beasts of the field languish is definitely shown by Joel 1:15-20; 2:1. "Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand,

and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come. . . . The seed is rotten under their clods, the garners are laid desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. . . . The beasts of the field cry also unto thee; for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness. Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Said Hosea also, "The fishes of the sea also shall be taken away." The time when the fishes of the sea are taken away is in the time of the second of the seven last plagues. "The second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea." Rev. 16:3. When the seventh plague is poured out the voice of God declares the end of the world, and then comes the end of the world. Therefore by these evidences it is plain that the word of the Lord by Hosea, which we have quoted, describes the state of society at the time when the great day of the Lord and the end of the world are impending.

Micah also says: "The good man is perished out of the earth; and there is non upright among men; they all lie in wait for blood; they hunt every man his brother with a net. That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward; and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire; so they wrap it up. The best of them is as a brier; the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge." And that this is in the last days is shown by the next clause, "The day of thy watchmen and thy visitation cometh; now shall be their perplexity." This is made positive by another verse in the same connection: "Therefore I will look unto the Lord; I will wait for the God of my salvation; my God will hear me. . . . He will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold his righteousness." Micah 7:2-9.

Habakkuk too in vision, saw all this evil going on, and he cried out unto the Lord about it. He wanted to know how the Lord could stand it to see so much iniquity, when he hates iniquity; how he could bear to behold so much injustice when he is altogether just. He says, "O Lord, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear! even cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save! Why dost thou show me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance? for spoiling and violence are before me; and there are that raise up strife and contention. Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth; for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth." "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity; wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?" 1:2-4, 13.

After thus making his inquiries he waited for an answer, saying, "I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me. . . . And the Lord answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith." Chap. 2:1-4. Now the

Lord has made his own application of this text, and by reading that application there can be no mistake about the time to which the prophet refers when he speaks of this violence and failure of justice prevailing. Paul, in speaking of the coming of the Lord, quotes these words of Habakkuk, saying, "For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For *yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry*. Now the just shall live by faith: but if [any man] draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Heb. 10:36-38.

The vision, therefore, which Habakkuk saw was the concerning the coming of the Lord, when his coming would be so near that whatever delay there should seem to be would be but a tarrying and that for but a little while, when he should surely come and would not tarry. But the vision for an appointed time. It was to be written out and made plain upon tables, that he might run who should read it. The visions concerning the appointed time

72

of the coming of the Lord have been written out; they have been, and are still being, made plain on tables, and many who read are running with the word to show to men that the appointed time is almost expired and that the coming of the Lord is at the doors. And he himself said, "Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved." Matt. 24:12, 13. Now the just shall live by faith, and there is no room for drawing back. For, says, the Scripture, to draw back is to draw back unto perdition, and we must not be of such but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

All the evidences of the Bible are in perfect accord with words of the prophets which we have here presented. All show that the last days—the days in which we live—will be times of fearful iniquity and outbreking sin; of violence and bloodshed; of blasphemy and impurity; of injustice and oppression. As quoted at the beginning of this article, they will be times when "judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey [is accounted mad, *margin*]."

But to those who do depart from evil the Lord promises that the Redeemer shall come. Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die, O house of Israel. To "them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28.

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Abraham Pleading for Sodom.
Gen. 18:23-33" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 5 , pp. 74, 75.**

(February 20.—Gen. 18:23-33.)

THE time had come when Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim, had filled up the measure of their iniquity, and like the inhabitants of Canaan

afterward, and the antediluvians before, the earth could bear them, and the justice of God could spare them, no longer. Yet they, as all others, were called, and were given an opportunity to escape the impending ruin. The Lord kept it not a secret from Abraham, and sent Lot to call whoever he could induce to escape. The responsibility for every wicked man's destruction is upon himself; God calls all, and will save all who will give him the opportunity.

"SHALL I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Amos 3:7. And Abraham was a prophet. Gen. 20:7. He was God's trusted servant, and the Lord would not destroy that city, so fearfully wicked as it was, without telling Abraham; he would not bring the flood without telling Noah; he would not give up Israel without sending them prophets in abundance; he did not at the last destroy Judah till, in addition to all the prophets, he had sent them his own Son, who, as he beheld the city in her stubbornness of spiritual pride, burst into weeping, exclaiming, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under [her] wings, and ye would not!" "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Matt. 23:37; Luke 19:42-44.

THAT has been and is the trouble with all, they know not the time of their visitation. The people upon whom the flood came knew not the time of their visitation; the cities of the plain knew not the time of their visitation; nor Jerusalem. Felix knew not the time of his visitation, although he trembled at the message of God. Agrippa knew not the time of his visitation, although, by the earnest words of Paul, he was almost persuaded to be a Christian. Nero knew not the time of his visitation, though God called him twice. It is a fearful thing to be so dulled by the influences of sin that we cannot perceive the gracious visitation of the love of God. "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart." "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." We beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.

TEN righteous people would have saved Sodom and the cities of the plain! No community knows, no city knows, no nation knows, the world itself does not know, what it owes to the few humble, pious people of God. They who fear God and walk in the steps of Christ are the salt of the earth. It is they who preserve from destruction the vast multitude of the wicked; *they* are the light of the world, and God still bears with the wicked in patient waiting that they may in that light see his goodness and glorify him in the day of visitation. The long-suffering of God is salvation. It is the history of the human race illustrated over and over, that as long as there is any possibility of getting any good out of a nation or a people, so long God suffers them to remain, though there be iniquity in them. But when all hope of good is gone, then that people is given over, as were those in the

lesson to-day. Sodom and Gomorrah are made an example to all who live ungodly. 2 Peter 2:6.

BUT in this lesson on Sodom, there is a special lesson for all who live to-day. It is a lesson of the greatest importance. Jesus said, "As it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. *Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.*" Luke 17:28-30. The announcement is now being made throughout the land and to the ends of the earth, that the time is at hand when the Son of man will be revealed in a glory that will cover the heavens. Accompanying the announcement is a message of God which will make ready a people prepared for the Lord. If the message is heeded by you, you may be amongst that people.

THAT message is the Third Angel's Message (Rev. 14:9-12): "If any man worship the beast

75

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." And that which follows closely upon the message is the coming of the Lord. God, "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."

THOUSANDS of people will study the lesson of Sodom to-day, and will wonder why they and those others listened not to the call of God, and knew not the time of their visitation; and yet will reject the message of God to-day, and will not now know the time of *their* visitation. It is easy enough now to believe that the flood, or this destruction of Sodom, came and destroyed all but those who believed and escaped. It is easy enough now to express surprise at the people there for not believing the message of God. It is easy enough now to do all this, and at the same time do exactly as they did in rejecting the message of God in our day, as they did in theirs. God has now in the earth a message of warning, of entreaty, and of salvation, as really as he had in the days of Noah or of Lot. It must be believed and heeded as really if we would escape a destruction as real as was then. While the world stands, Paul's words to the men of Antioch are ever apt: "Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Acts 13:40, 41.

J.

February 10, 1887

"Justice Standeth Afar Off" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6 , pp. 86, 87.

LAST week we presented some scriptures showing that the prophets in contemplating the times of the last days saw a great prevalence of injustice and oppression through the slackness and the wrong course of the law. If this were to be the one leading characteristic that would specially distinguish the last days, and if there were no other means of telling when we had reached the times of the last days, we verily believe that we might safely fix upon the present times as the ones referred to by the prophets. For now of a surety the law is deplorably slacked, and justice standeth literally afar off.

This subject of the defeat of justice is one that is now, and has been for some time, exciting the attention of the leading periodicals and journals in the land. Very lately the New York *Independent* has given the public a series of able and interesting articles on this subject, from some of our leading jurists and authorities on law. Some time ago the *North American Review* devoted considerable space to a discussion of the same subject; the principal daily journals of the country have more or less to say upon it all the time; and it is a subject that cannot well escape the serious attention of every thinking person. Law is liberty. The integrity of just laws is the strongest safeguard of the rights and liberties of men in the civil compact.

When through systematic perversion, evasion, or delay, the Law becomes slacked, there is lost to the citizen the sense of security which is his due under government, and which it is the duty and the province of government to provide. And such is fast becoming the normal condition in the field of jurisprudence throughout the whole country. Justice awarded, is almost the exception rather than the rule, and even then comes after so long delay that the element of justice is a matter of doubt. In the Scriptures there is a parable given, called the parable of the *unjust* judge. And it seems that the point in the parable where his injustice appears, is in the fact of his delay. He seemed disposed to put off the case just as long as possible, and when at last he was brought to a decision, it was not with the primary idea of doing justice in the case, but to get rid of the petitioner who persisted in pressing her case for a decision. Luke 18:2-5.

Having this inspired statement of the injustice of delay it is perfectly clear that now injustice is the rule in all our courts of law. Says Judge Learned in an article in the *North American Review*, June, 1885: "One cannot begin a lawsuit that involves a considerable amount, with any hope of a reasonably speedy decision. A year's time would be short for its termination; and the plaintiff may not reach the end in three, four, or five years." At present in the Supreme Court of the United States, on any case that takes its regular order on the docket, a decision is not expected inside of three years. Some of the State Supreme Courts are in about the same condition. In California, for instance, a decision is not expected now in much less than three years. And instances are well known wherein cases have been appealed to these courts for the express purpose of delaying the final decision for that length of time.

But even when the case is at last reached and passed upon, there are so many precedents to follow, and so many technicalities raised that the chances

are greatly in the majority that the case will be remanded for a new trial, and then the whole course has to be gone over again, perhaps with the same result, and the process be again repeated, until, as we personally know, there are cases which have passed

87

through the Supreme Court three times; and then, in one case of which we know, only to be remanded to the lower court for a fourth trial. In April, 1885, the United States Supreme Court rendered a third decision in a case, and remanded it for a fourth trial. It was the case of a murderer in Utah. He had been three times tried for the same murder, three times found guilty, and three times sentenced to death. And upon some mere informality in the judge's charge to the jury, the case was sent back for trial the fourth time. Since that we have not heard from it. It may be pending in the Supreme Court again, or the man may have died and put an end to the tedious process of law and failure of justice.

This trick of repeated appeal and return is now almost always employed by the extremely wealthy—especially corporations, against a weaker contestant. Says a writer in the *Independent*, Jan. 6, 1887: "Rich suitors—especially powerful corporations—make use of their opportunities of appeal to tire out their weaker antagonists and force them to an unjust compromise of a just claim." And again says the same writer: "Few persons in this democratic country will wish to see the time come when the highest courts in the land are closed to all but the rich." That is certainly true, yet it is just as certainly true that the direct effect of such procedure is to virtually close the courts to all but the rich, and to place the poor at the mercy of the rich. And so the courts have almost ceased to be courts of justice, for justice standeth afar off, and equity cannot enter. Wealth is taking the place of justice, and trickery the place of equity. And when this is so, law ceases to be regarded, and violence takes its place. This is the way the matter is going now and it cannot continue long, they will break out, and blood touch blood, and violence fill the land. This is so in only civil affairs, and much more so is it in criminal; while the direct result of this lack in civil cases can only be to increase the criminal. And what shall the end be?

J.

"Where Are the Protestants?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6 , pp. 88, 89.

ONE of the most noticeable, most humiliating, and at the same time, from the interests and destinies involved, most important movements of the present day, is the fast-growing alliance between Catholicism and so-called Protestantism. It is hardly correct though to call it an *alliance*, for in fact it is scarcely more than an out-an-out surrender of the "Protestants" to the Catholic Church, for the advances are all on the part of the "Protestants." Protestantism, which in *name* does, and in *fact* ought to, represent open and direct antagonism to Catholicism now in doctrine, in work, and in methods of work, represents close relationship with Catholicism. In short, that which is called Protestantism is now such only in

name, and has actually ceased to be Protestant in anything where Catholicism is concerned.

We have mentioned this before, in these columns, but as the evil work goes on we shall have to mention it more and more. Because such movement, or any movement that tends to increase the power of Catholicism, can be fraught with evil only. The Papacy knows no change of heart. Its outward form it may and often does change, so that it may the better accomplish its evil and oppressive designs upon men and nations. It is true that now there is a close resemblance between Catholicism and Protestantism, but it is not because Protestantism has grown worse. "As the Protestant churches have been seeking the favor of the world, false charity has blinded their eyes. They do not see but that it is right to believe good of all evil; and as the inevitable result, they will finally believe evil of all good. Instead of standing in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, they are now, as it were, apologizing to Rome for their uncharitable opinion of her, begging pardon for their bigotry."

"A day of great intellectual darkness has been shown to be favorable to the success of Popery. It will yet be demonstrated that a day of great intellectual light is equally favorable for its success. In the movements now in progress in the United States to secure for the institutions and usages of the church the support of the State, Protestants are following in the steps of Papists. Nay, more, they are opening the door for popery to regain in Protestant America the supremacy which she has lost in the Old World. And that which gives greater significance to this movement is the fact that the principal object contemplated is the enforcement of Sunday observance."

An important item on this subject we find in the *Christian Statesman*, Jan. 13, 1887, copied from an article by the late Dr. A. A. Hodge, in the *Princeton Review*. Dr. Hodge was one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, and was zealously devoted to the objects sought by that Association. Dr. Hodge was writing on the subject of teaching religion in the public schools, really insisting that the State shall teach religion, and said:—

"It is great to be regretted that this tremendous question has been obscured and belittled by being

89

identified with the entirely subordinate matter of reading short portions of the King James's version of the Bible in the public schools. Another principal occasion of confusion on this subject, is the unavoidable mutual prejudice and misunderstanding that prevails between the two great divisions of our Christian population, the Romanist and the Protestant. The protest against the reading of the Protestant version of Scripture came in the first instance from the Romanists. Hence, in the triangular conflict which ensued, between Protestants, Romanists, and infidels, many intelligent Christians, on both sides, mistook the stress of battle. Every intelligent Catholic ought to know by this time that all the

evangelical churches are fundamentally at one with him in essential Christian doctrine. And every intelligent Protestant ought to know by this time, in the light of the terrible socialistic revolutions which are threatened, that the danger to our country in this age is infinitely more from skepticism than from superstition. We have, Protestant and Romanist alike, a common essential Christianity, abundantly sufficient for the purposes of the public schools, and all that remains for specific indoctrinization may easily be left to the Sabbath-schools and the churches respectively. We are in the same sense Christian theists. We believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in his fatherly providence and love. We believe in the same divine human Saviour, and place alike all our hope of salvation on his office and work as Mediator. We believe in the infallibility and authority of the inspired word of God, and we nearly approximate agreement on all questions touching the Sabbath, the oath, the rights of property, marriage, and divorce, etc., and with regard to the religious elements of science, physical and moral, and on all questions in which the State, or the schools of the State, have jurisdiction. Let us mutually agree, as citizens, not as ecclesiastics, upon a large, fair, common basis of religious faith, for the common needs of the State and her schools, leaving all differences to the churches, and, thus united, we will carry the country before us."

Think of it: "Every intelligent Catholic ought to know by this time that all evangelical churches are fundamentally at one with him in essential Christian doctrine"! So then to be "at one" with the Catholic Church is an evidence that you are "evangelical." And thus "evangelical" Protestantism is one with Catholicism. And Rev. A. A. Hodge, D.D., was one of the foremost men in the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

The *Statesman* remarked upon this extract:—

"We have yet to hear, however, the first utterance from any recognize Roman Catholic authority, of like spirit with the above."

So have we. Nor do we expect to see any such utterance. What need is there of it? As the Protestants are all going to Rome, all that Roman Catholic authorities need to do is to wait. Not so, however, with the Protestants. They don't propose to stand on ceremony. They want help, and they don't hesitate to go to Rome to get it. The country is in danger from these "terrible socialistic revolutions," and so to save themselves and the country from the dangers of Socialism, they propose to give all into the cruel hands of Rome. We have not the least doubt that they will really unite and that before long, and when "thus united" they "will indeed carry the country before" them. But, farewell liberty when that time comes. If there be any people in this country who think themselves Protestants, it is high time for them to examine themselves and see whether they really are such or not. J.

"Notes on the International Lesson. The Destruction of Sodom. Gen. 19:15-26" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 6 , p. 91.

(February 27.–Gen. 19:15-26.)

WHEN Abraham had reduced to ten the number in whose behalf he would plead with the Lord to spare Sodom, and the Lord had said he would not destroy it for ten's sake, Abraham ceased to plead any further. It has been supposed that ten was just the number of Lot's family and connections. And this seems probable from close attention to the narrative. We find Lot and his wife, and his two daughters that escaped, making four. Then we read of "his *sons-in-law* which married his *daughters*," and that these daughters were *two*, which seems to be implied in the words of the angels to Lot, "Arise, take thy wife, and thy *two* daughters, *which are here*." This would seem to imply that there were two daughters who were *not* there. Then besides these we read of his "sons," which would require at least two. Thus we have Lot and his wife, and his two daughters unmarried, two sons, and his two daughters and their husbands, his sons-in-law, making just ten. It is, therefore, most probable that when Abraham ceased pleading at the number ten, he had in view Lot and his whole family. And when the Lord agreed that if these were righteous, the city should stand, it seems that Abraham considered that sufficient, for if these should not be found righteous, it would be unreasonable to ask anything more. "And the Lord went his way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham; and Abraham returned unto his place."

THE two angels that had departed from Abraham and the Lord went on toward Sodom, and came to Sodom at evening. Lot, sitting at the gate of the city, arose to meet them and invited them into his house to stay overnight. The angels proposed to stay in the street all night, but Lot, not knowing but that they were only men, and knowing the dreadful wickedness of the place, "pressed upon them greatly," and they turned and entered into his house. "And he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat."

THE men of Sodom, however, knew of their coming, and before very long a great crowd gathered from every quarter and surrounded the house, demanding that the angels whom they thought men, should be delivered up to them. Lot attempted to remonstrate with them, but it only made them worse and they attempted to break the door. Then the angels drew Lot into the house and shut the door, and smote the mob with blindness, "both small and great; so that they wearied themselves to find the door." Then the angels made known to Lot who they were, and said to him: "Hast thou here any besides? son-in-law, and thy sons and thy daughters, and whatsoever thou hast in the city, bring them out of this place; for we will destroy this place, because the cry of them is waxen great before the face of the Lord; and the Lord hath sent us to destroy it."

"AND Lot went out, and spake unto his sons-in-law, which married his daughters, and said, Up, get you out of this place; for the Lord will destroy this city. But he seemed as one that mocked unto his sons-in-law. And when the

morning arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying, Arise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are here; lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city. And while he lingered, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters; the Lord being merciful unto him; and they brought him forth, and set him without the city. And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed."

HERE the personal pronoun changes from "they" to "he," and from "we" to "I," showing that the Lord, with whom Abraham had talked, had come to Sodom, and that he was the One in whose power the destruction lay. Lot pleaded to be allowed to stop in the little city—Zoar—and the Lord granted that, and "the sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground."

"As IT was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." The people of those cities arose that bright, beautiful morning, as they had arisen morning by morning, year after year, always. One went about this business, another that; one to his merchandise, another to his building; one to his eating and drinking, another to his planting. To them all things were as they always had been. They knew of nothing unusual that was about to occur; and, worse than that, they would not be convinced that there was. When Lot spake to them of the destruction that hung over the place, to them it was only foolish mockery. And when they saw Lot and his two daughters—and his wife as far as she went—running swiftly across the plain, we have no doubt but they sent after them many a ribald shout. They knew nothing, they believed nothing, they feared nothing, of any destruction coming. But it came. Their unbelief did not delay it a moment, nor did it temper the terror when it came.

"EVEN thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." The Lord sends a message to the world that he is coming again. He gives line upon line, precept upon precept, prophecy upon prophecy, and sign upon sign, that his coming is at the doors, and that men must be ready to meet him in peace without spot and blameless. But his messengers are despised, his word is slighted, and all his tokens are set at naught. Men will not believe that he is coming. To them all things go on as usual, and as they always have gone. But one of these days will be the last, as it was with Sodom. Christ has declared that the end of the world shall be. He points to a certain generation and says that that generation shall not pass away before he himself appears. And in that generation he will appear as surely as destruction came upon Sodom. Men may not believe it, as those of Sodom did not; these may treat the message as mockery, as did those; these may scoff at the messengers, as did those; but none of these things will

nullify the promise of Christ, nor delay his coming, nor deliver those who are not prepared to meet him when he does come.

WHEN now in preparing to meet the Lord, men separate themselves from the world and from everything in the world, they will be counted as foolish as was Lot when he left Sodom and hurried across the plain. But there those who left all were the ones who escaped, while those who remained to scoff remained to perish. "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." "Arise ye, and depart; for this is not your rest; because it is polluted, it shall destroy you, even with a sore destruction." And as ye depart, "remember Lot's wife."

J.

February 17, 1887

"The Defeat of Justice" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 7 , pp. 104, 105.

A MOST important factor in the almost continuous defeat of justice which is so widely prevalent, is the present jury system. Trial by jury has been called the palladium of our liberties; and against the legal system of trial by jury, we shall never have a word to say. It is not trial by jury of which we complain and against which we lay the charge of the defeat of justice; but it is trial by *such* juries. It is not the jury system of legal procedure with which we find fault, but it is the *present* jury system.

First, in cases of the most importance and of the most widespread interests, it is next to impossible to obtain a jury that is capable of forming an opinion of any value upon the subject. Because if a man has formed any kind of an opinion of the case he cannot be a juror. Whereas if he be a man of intelligence, one who reads the papers and takes notice of the events of the day, one who associates with his fellowmen to any fair extent, and especially *if he thinks*, it is hardly possible to prevent forming some sort of an opinion. And so the primary effect of this rule is only to shut off the intelligence of the community from the very cases in which the community has the most vital interest.

The secondary effect of the rule is consequently to create a jury of less than the average intelligence of the people; a jury of men who either do not read or converse or associate with their fellow-men at all, or else do not think enough to be impressed with what they would naturally learn by all the means of intelligence that nowadays are mere matters of course to everybody but an ignoramus or a recluse. Such a jury is incapable of reaching a decision of any value in any case that requires close attention or thought; any weighing of evidence or sifting of testimony. And, practically, juries are not expected to reach a decision in any such way. Under this rule every case becomes neither more nor less than a contest between the lawyers as to which shall make the strongest impression upon the jury, and so to carry, or at least hang it. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, as by the rule a jury has been chosen of men who are not capable of forming an opinion in the case, it becomes the duty of the opposing lawyers, each to form the opinion which he wants adopted and then project that opinion

into the minds of the men composing the jury. The lawyer who does that with the most force, gets the jury; or if the impression of opposing counsel be about equal, the jury being incapable of forming an opinion must disagree.

That this is practically the theory upon which the majority of cases are conducted before a jury, must be patent to every disinterested person who studies the argument and conduct of the one who is pleading. One of the best proofs of this is the fact, which any one may notice on occasion, that no lawyer ever talks to a judge as he does to a jury,—unless perchance it be an instance of some country justice of the peace who knows as little as the average juror; we have known instances of that kind were the lawyer fairly threw the judge out of his wits. But to the intelligent judge an advocate speaks with a calmness and a consideration that spring from a consciousness that there is one upon whose mind his argument will rest with only the weight that its real merit deserves. But when he begins to address the jury he is fairly turned into another man, especially if he be a criminal lawyer pleading in a criminal case. Then he flatters and cajoles, pleads for sympathy, and sheds crocodile tears; in one sentence asserts the absolute innocence of the prisoner, and in the next appeals to the jury for mercy; in short he exerts every conceivable influence that he can bring to bear, except a calm and considerate presentation of facts and law, and an appeal to that, to win the jury. This is precisely why and how it is that so many cases are gained directly against law and evidence.

This would not be so if our juries in the most important cases were composed, as they ought to be, of the best and most intelligent men in the community. Let a lawyer understand that he is talking to twelve men who will bring to the rigid test of the law and evidence, everything that he says, and it will soon be found that he will appeal more to the law and the evidence, and depend upon that more than upon the impression that he can make upon them by personal exertion and appeals to their sympathies. It would be as it was with the famous Tom Marshall, of Kentucky, when once he found three staid, sober, intelligent Presbyterians on a jury when he was in doubt about the rightfulness of his side of the case. As he said himself, "They listened attentively to what I said, and appreciated it, but in their faces I could see written plainly, 'Good, good, Mr. Marshall, but to the law and to the testimony.' I redoubled my effort, and if ever I was eloquent I was in addressing those three men, but I could make no impression upon them. 'To the law and to the testimony' was written all over their faces." In the argument Mr. Marshall did succeed in gaining the other nine, but in the jury room the three drew back the nine to the law and to the testimony,—and to the right side. Give the jury-box twelve such men, whether they be Presbyterians or what not, and we should soon have different arguments to our juries, and what is much more we would have different verdicts from the many unjust ones which are now rendered, justice would come near and iniquity would begin to hide itself instead of stalking abroad as now.

But with juries chosen as the system is at present, which shuts out the intelligence of the community, we cannot fairly expect just verdicts. How can an intelligent verdict be rendered by an *un*-intelligent jury. If the verdict be just it is only so by chance. A case is actually reported from New York wherein two men

on a jury voted in direct opposition to the real sentiments because they did not know the meaning of the words "plaintiff" and "defendant," nor the difference between them. Yet those were duly qualified jurors. They had not formed an opinion in the case, neither before nor after the trial, and the reason is obvious—they were incapable of forming a just opinion.

Another illustration from the same State, in fact from New York City. A case was on trial in which a certain firm sued an insurance company for the amount of insurance laid on a cargo that the firm said had been lost at sea. The insurance company claimed that the merchandise in question had never been put on the vessel; and presented evidence to this effect so conclusive that in an informal conversation between the opposing lawyers, after the jury had retired for deliberation, the counsel for the firm admitted that they had clearly lost their case; that the insurance company was right, and the cargo

105

really had never been shipped. Then the weighty remark was made, "Well, is not this an extraordinary situation? Here we are, the opposing counsel, fully agreed about the case, and prepared to settle it without further parley, yet we must sit here and wait for twelve men to guess upon it." And the upshot of it was that after two hours' deliberation (?) their guess amounted to a unanimous verdict against *the insurance company!*—that is, directly against the evidence, and against the perfect agreement of the opposing counsel.

Now a very proper question is, Why is it that a jury cannot be chosen, sufficiently intelligent to render a verdict that will not be a "guess"? Why is it that States will continue to follow a system of legal procedure whose proper and effective working can never in an important case result in anything more than a guess? It is but just to say, however, that there are places in the Union where intelligent juries can be chosen. We know of one instance, in Washington Territory, where the judge gave instruction in selecting juries, that the formation of an opinion should not be a disqualification unless the opinion was so fixed that it could not be changed nor affected by evidence. Such a state of mind as that, would of course be sheer prejudice, and ought to disqualify anyone who held it. But an opinion formed and held upon what evidence has been contemplated, and subject to alteration or reversal by fuller evidence or more explicit testimony, is evidence of a clear intelligence and a fair judgment, and ought never to be a disqualification, but rather a qualification in the selection of a jury.

Again, Vermont has a law which provides that in cases of unusual importance or great complexity, whether civil or criminal, there shall be a picked jury,—a jury selected especially with a view to their intelligence, and their ability to decide intelligently upon the questions at issue. The first case that was tried under the new law was one in which suit was brought by a railroad company against its former president, to recover \$200,000, which the company claimed that he had embezzled. The trial lasted nine weeks, and the testimony included 725,000 words. At the conclusion of the case, it was in 1885, the *Oregonian* gave expression to some views upon it, which are so eminently sound and practical, that we quote them:—

"The jury was composed of prominent farmers and business men, selected under the new law with a view to their ability to comprehend intelligently this mass of evidence which dealt with the complicated matters of railroad accounting. The result was a verdict in favor of Governor Page, and this was followed by the spontaneous movement of the people of Rutland with a great demonstration of popular approval.

"Although this was a picked jury, selected under a special law, it probably exemplified the original and true idea of a jury of one's peers, or a jury of the country, more truly than the average haphazard panel that would have been utterly unable to understand the complicated evidence in the case. It is absurd to speak of the lazy, listless loafers who hang around courts in many country places, as well as in many of the cities, for the purpose of being called to the jury-box, as the peers of a man who had been the able financial and executive officer of a State and the successful manager of a railroad for many years. Neither is such a jury a fair representation of the country, such as could be called the jury of the country in which such a man had occupied a leading position. Under the old system, men who could barely draw the simplest note of hand might have been chosen to sift this mass of evidence. Any person of sound intelligence can see how unfair to both sides the trial of this Vermont case would have been before an ignorant jury. The trial of the star route cases in Washington was a simple mockery because of the incapacity of the jurors.

"The recent acquittal of Richard Short in a New York court through the cowardice and ignorance of the jury was not an exceptional instance of the scandalous failure of justice for the same cause. Here were twelve jurymen who, the judge says, were guilty of 'cowardice and ignorance,' and whom the district attorney styles 'cowards,' who brought in a verdict contrary to all justice, reason, and evidence." It is but a little more than a year since the Cincinnati riots, in which scores of men were shot down and the heart of the city was devastated with fire, because the people had become exasperated by failures in criminal administration through a system of selecting jurors which enabled criminals or their attorneys to exclude from the box men who would render honest verdicts. The experience of courts in all parts of the country will show that ignorant or depraved jurors, even when free from bias, in particular cases are less likely to reach sound conclusions on evidence which they can comprehend than intelligent and moral men. If trial by jury is to be prevented from becoming more than a mockery of justice—a positive menace to the social order—greater care must be taken to provide honest and capable jurors, and prevent lazy, listless loafers, the 'professional jurors,' from finding their way into court.

The following, also, from a late number of the *Interior*, is to the point, and illustrates the deplorable defeat of justice under the working of the present jury system:—

"The shrewd criminal lawyer who gets rich by helping rascals to escape the punishment they deserve, so that they may continue to prey upon the community, don't want a good jury. He prefers ignoramuses and scalawags—fellows whom he can cajole with his sophistry or who are naturally in sympathy with his client. If a bad man is drawn on a panel, he, of course, will swear that he has formed no opinion. He wants to get on the jury, for he knows that he will have inducements offered to him to hang it, and thus save the prisoner. For we have in our jury system a strange and absurd anomaly. In the Supreme Court of the United States a majority of the judges decide. But a jury must be unanimous or there can be no verdict. A single cranky, mulish, or corrupt man can stand out against the other eleven, and prevent conviction in the clearest case—against both law and testimony. This has occurred again and again, and will continue to occur, and more frequently in the future, since there has sprung up in all our large cities a class of men known as professional jurors—known so at least to the criminal lawyers. They try to get on juries for the very purpose of defeating the ends of justice; and in too many cases they succeed. Let the jury system be modified so that ignorance shall not be the one special qualification, and that two-thirds can bring in a verdict."

There can be no question, therefore, that the workings of the present jury system are more for the defeat of justice than for the proper administration of justice. There must be a thorough reform, a reform indeed so thorough as to be a reversal of the present system, before Justice can have the seat of honor that is hers of right. But will there be any such reform? We fear not. The great and crying need of it is known and recognized in the highest courts and the best circles in all the land. But of the thing itself we see no sign, but rather the working of elements which can only make against a reform, and for the increase of injustice and the growth of violence. And what *can* the end be?

J.

February 24, 1887

"The Course of 'Justice'" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 8 , pp. 119, 120.

ONE of the worst elements in the defeat of justice in the courts nowadays, is the bad practice of continuances, which has grown to such an extent that it may almost be considered as an established system. Cases are continued over and over and again and again, until the chances are altogether against justice ever being done in them. One case in San Francisco has now been continued *eighty* times, and yet awaits trial. Another has been continued *fifty* times, and still waits.

These are perhaps extreme cases, but they illustrate a practice that is followed in the courts everywhere to such an extent that in a multitude of cases the trial as well as the result at last is only a travesty upon justice.

By these continuances, so much time is consumed that in the natural order of events the witnesses may die, or move from the place, and even if they remain and are called to the trial, the facts are no longer fresh and clear to their minds, while many important points and circumstances are wholly forgotten. And when testimony, which at the best must be uncertain, falls into the hands of a sharp lawyer, and especially of the criminal lawyer, it is the easiest thing in the world for him to present it to the average jury in such a way that they shall see no real evidence in it, much less such evidence as would place the matter "beyond reasonable doubt."

The Constitution of the United States provides that in criminal cases the party accused shall have the right to a speedy trial, which of necessity implies that the accuser, that is "the people," shall have the right speedily to try him. But this provision of the Constitution, eminently wise and just as it is, is almost a dead letter; and this almost wholly owing to this baneful practice of repeated continuances and postponements. Both the fault and its remedy, lie with the courts. The matter of granting a continuance lies entirely in the option of the judge. There are, to be sure, times when a postponement ought to be made, and when it will serve the ends of justice, but such are the exception. Whereas it is safe to say that nine times out of ten, to grant the continuance asked for is only to play into the hands of the lawyers, and they in most cases directly into the hands of the criminals. Says the *San Francisco Chronicle*:—

"Too many judges have to kindly a feeling for the pockets of their brethren at the bar, and will not force a case to trial for fear that the attorney for the defendant should be compelled to sacrifice some other business in attending to the case in hand. They accept the plea of another professional engagement as a good and sufficient excuse for delay, instead of compelling the attorney for defendant to try the case or give it up to someone else. This is all wrong. There is no divinity doth so hedge about any particular member of the bar that the wheels of justice should stop because he cannot superintend their revolutions. An attorney violates the spirit if not the letter of his oath when he accepts an employment with full knowledge that he cannot give his services to his client at the time when they will be required, and it is the clear duty of the court to frown upon such unprofessional conduct by compelling the attorney to conform to the orders of the court or to relinquish the case."

And the *New York Observer*:—

"In many cases the pleas seem to be nothing more than a legal device for wearying out an opponent or making a trial so expensive to him that he cannot follow it up. The strangest part of the matter is that magistrates seemingly countenance such devices by granting adjournments on the most flimsy pretexts. So great are these

abuses in the administration of justice that a court of law is about the last place in which a man seeks for a redress of wrongs or a restitution of rights."

But in this delay of the law and defeat of justice, the largest part, by long odds, is played by the lawyers. We know full well that there are honest lawyers—men who are faithful to the public good, and who would do nothing to defend the ends of justice. But at the same time, it is undeniable that there are lawyers, and the number is increasing every day, who are unprincipled men, and have no scruples at all in regard to their conduct of a case—men with whom the question of justice has no place, but the sole question is whether the criminal can be cleared. They are men who, in behalf of the criminal, will enter and maintain any plea or any number of pleas that they think will give them the smallest chance of success—yes; and even pleas that are directly contradictory, each of which destroys the others. Other pleas are entered that it is impossible for a disinterested person to believe that the lawyer himself believes to be true. Yet the pleas, and perhaps contradictory ones, are solemnly entered, and the trial conducted upon them, before a jury perhaps itself in sympathy with crime, and the criminal is cleared. It not so fortunate as to obtain such a decided result, at least a disagreement of the jury is secured, and this repeated two or three times, and then almost certainly an acquittal. But if anywhere in all this procedure the verdict is that the accused is guilty, then a long series of exceptions and technicalities are brought up as the basis of a motion for a new trial. If the motion is denied, then an appeal is taken, and of that the result is almost sure to be that a new trial will be ordered, and then the same long, tedious process is gone through with again unless an acquittal shall have been obtained by the privileges of the new trial.

The preparation for this course is diligently and steadily made and kept up from the very first. From the very first step that is ever taken in the case, the criminal lawyer keeps up a volley of irrelevant questions of his own, or of objections to the questions of the prosecution, upon all of which the court must decide, and if the decision is not in his favor, then an exception is marked. This thing continues unabated throughout the trial, which of itself is greatly lengthened by it, so that when the trial is ended he has a volume of exceptions upon which to base his motion for a new trial or his appeal to a higher court. It sometimes appears as though the principal office of the trial judge were only to decide upon objections so that the lawyers can take exception to his decision. So emphatically is this so that there is actually a practice known in the courts as "trying a case for the exceptions," that is as defined by Judge Learned of the New York Supreme Court, "contriving as many ingenious pitfalls as possible, by offers of evidence and by exceptions to evidence and the like, in the hope, often well fulfilled, that the trial court will fall into some of these dangers, and that thus a client *with no real defense* might weary out his adversary by the delay consequent on an appeal."

Then, when by such trickery the appeal is gained, the appellate court pays more attention and gives more weight to the technicalities involved in the

exceptions than it does to the question whether justice has been done. Again says Judge Learned, of this practice: "Instead of being guided by the rules of codes of law, or by a sound judgment as to the merits of the case, appellate courts are constantly searching for precedents in other cases, and are anxiously making a precedent out of the case in hand. When a case is argued, the question is not whether

120

justice was done in the court below; but it may be whether some witness said something which might be considered irrelevant—perhaps no more important to the merits than *whether he stood at right angles to the jury when he testified.*"

We do not say that the accused should have no lawyer to plead for him, even though the case be one known to all as deliberate and unmitigated murder. We care not how confirmed a criminal he may be, nor how manifestly guilty, he has a right to a fair trial. He has a right to counsel. This the States assures to everyone. If the accused is unable to hire counsel, the State appoints counsel, and it is only just and right that it should be so. But whether the counsel be hired or appointed, he has no right to try to delay or to defeat justice in the case. Let him fairly present the prisoner's plea, let him bring into notice all the extenuating circumstances that can be fairly and honestly set up; to all this the accused has a perfect right. But no lawyer has a right to work by tricks and quibbles and technicalities to compass the escape of a criminal from the just penalty that he deserves.

There are indeed times when a lawyer will not allow his client to plead guilty, or having already plead guilty will try to persuade him to withdraw it and plead not guilty. Such a case which we recall particularly occurred not long ago in New York City. A prisoner had plead guilty, and a lawyer tried to induce him to withdraw it, and allow him to defend him as not guilty. The prisoner persisted that he was guilty. Then the lawyer addressed the court, saying, "He is undoubtedly guilty, *but the people can't prove it.*" The rebuke that the judge administered to this man was as richly deserved as it was stern. Not all such lawyers have the frankness to so openly reveal their real sentiments and purposes, but there is an immense number of them who act strictly upon the principle here avowed. The following from the *Interior* gives the true *status* of all such men:—

"The lawyer who helps him to secure an acquittal by unfair and dishonorable means, under the color of law, is as guilty as if he went to the jail at night and helped the prisoner to escape. The practice in our criminal courts has fallen into the hands of smart but unscrupulous men. There were great criminal lawyers in the former generations who were also honorable men. But there has been a great change in this respect. And the men who make it their business to defend thieves and murderers have more sympathy with their clients than with honest and law-abiding citizens. They are really partners in the crimes which those clients are encouraged to commit, because they depend on these unscrupulous practitioners to get them free through loop-holes in the law."

Then such is the gauntlet which Justice has to run, how can she come out clear and untarnished? But this is the condition of legal procedure that is most prevalent in this nation to-day, and again we ask, What *can* the end be?

J.

March 3, 1887

"The Papacy and Peace" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9 , p. 134.

IN the midst of the alarms of a great European war, the Papacy, as might be expected, is constantly strengthening itself, increasing its prestige, and enlarging its power. The relations established last year between Bismarck and the Pope were only the prelude to more important movements on the part of both Germany and the Papacy, and each one has been a stepping-stone to the steady aggrandizement of the Papacy. And now that the German Parliament refuses to vote the assurance of war supplies and forces for seven years, the Papacy throws all its influence into the scale in favor of Bismarck and the emperor and all their demands for war materials, and for the establishment of the forces upon the strongest possible war footing. Official letters have been sent by the Pope instructing the Catholics in Germany and the Parliament to support the Government demands, and thus he makes complete his alliance with Germany, and his position secure so far as Germany is concerned.

For about two years, or perhaps more, the relations between France and the Papacy have been at a pretty high tension; but now on account of the threatening aspect of affairs, France is making advances which the Papacy receives very cordially and graciously, as a matter of course, and at the same time very condescendingly grants favors that amount to nothing, and concessions that cost her nothing.

The Papacy has also made overtures to Russia. But as her proffers were rather too extravagant, the Czar would not entertain them at all. We have no doubt, however, that there will be such modifications that, in some way, the connection will be secured. As for Austria and Spain, the Pope owns them bodily, almost.

All these negotiations, too, are entirely in the interests of peace! That is, if Germany cannot be placed upon the strongest possible war footing for seven years, there will be war before seven years pass. Therefore, as a "distinguished prelate" stated is, Prince Bismarck "quite unofficially" dropped the merely casual remark that "if the Pope will speak the word now in favor of the Septenate, he will be helping to keep the peace." And "so with purely peaceful views, the holy father thought it right to speak."

Yet as "purely peaceful" as his views may be, there is one thing that the Pope has in view in it all, and that is the re-establishment of the power of the Papacy, especially in Italy. Said the aforesaid "distinguished prelate," "The Vatican had serious reasons to believe its intervention would improve the position of the Holy See, especially in its relation with Italy." That is the one grand view that underlies

and pervades all the Pope's "peaceful views;" it is to make firm his alliance with all these other powers, and then by their united power bring such a pressure upon Italy that she shall be compelled, in one way or another, to recognize the sovereignty of the Papacy, and consent to the restoration of its power. And if such a result can only be accomplished in the end by a general European war, then into such a war all Europe will be plunged without a moment's hesitation. And such is the purity of the peaceful views with which "the holy father thought it right to speak," and with which he labors everywhere and in all things in the interests of "peace." The movements and the workings of the Papacy just now are an important study.

J.

"The Lord Saw It, and It Displeased Him" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 9 , pp. 136, 137.

IN the three preceding numbers of the SIGNS we have referred to the fact and to the means of the defeat of justice that now prevails so extensively throughout the land. It is the estimate of one of the leading criminal lawyers of the country, that not over one-fifth of the criminals at the present day are ever punished. The other four-fifths either escape arrest, or else escape conviction through the devious course by which Justice is now compelled to thread her way, and which we have in a measure pointed out. But whether it be through the complaisance of judges, the incompetence of jurors, or the chicanery of criminal lawyers, that the criminals are allowed to escape the penalties justly due their crimes, not the least of the fault for it all lies with society itself.

There is pervading the whole body of society an undercurrent of sympathy with crime and for criminals, and this undercurrent is constantly coming nearer the surface, and is fast becoming so much more than an undercurrent that it may fairly be counted as a part of the main current itself of human affairs. Crime is looked upon rather as a disease than as turpitude, as a misfortune rather than a fault; and the criminal unfortunate rather than guilty, and so "ought to be pitied rather than punished." The greater and more horrible the crime, so much the more sympathy is aroused for the criminal. A cold-blooded and deliberate murder may be committed, yet instead of showing horror at the dreadful crime, women will pet and pamper the bloody villain, fill his cell with flowers, and decorate it with costly bouquets; reporters will fill columns of the papers with the full report of his life, and the smallest details of his crime. If by chance he is at last convicted, all these attractions are increased; petitions are industriously circulated imploring executive clemency, and perhaps pardon, and if all this proves unavailing, he is sent out of the world in a halo of glory.

If it happens to be a crime against the very existence of society itself—as that of the Chicago Anarchists—then the sickly sentimentalism culminates in the marriage of the marriageable criminal, and the effort at conviction is successfully opposed by throwing the whole subject into politics, and making the legislative machinery work the perversion of the judicial. These are facts, and they are worth the serious consideration of all who have any regard for the pure principles of

justice and social order; for society and such things as these cannot long exist together. Ere these things continue long, violence and anarchy will inevitably usurp full sway.

Another, and most palpable proof of the prevailing sympathy with crime is the fact, and the necessity too, of the organization of "Law and Order Leagues" in many of the States and large cities. Not that these leagues are themselves in sympathy with crime—far from it—but the very fact that their existence is necessary proves that in the body of society sympathy or condolence with crime does prevail; for the regularly and legally established machinery of the State is the power of society. And when this power has become so impotent that extra-legal and irresponsible bodies are made necessary to the proper administration of the law, this of itself demonstrates that in the great body of society sympathy and tacit agreement with crime prevail more than does opposition to it. Says the Providence (R.I.) *Journal*:—

"There is something rotten in the State of Denmark when an ultra-legal, self-constituted, irresponsible body of men is necessary to the enforcement of law, which, being the voice of the State, is theoretically upheld, sustained, and maintained by the machinery of the State. The State is sovereign. It declares the law; it provides courts, police, jails. It undertakes to carry out its own proclaimed will. It can, in the last resort, summon every one of its citizens to enforce its law. Is not this enough? Theoretically, yes. But not enough in regard to certain laws, because the officers of the law will not enforce the law; and because the apathy, or the opposition of the people to the law, permits this infidelity to authority to be open and efficient. The fact of the existence of a Law and Order League is a reproach either to the legislators or to the people. No law should be passed which is not sensible and just. No law should be violated with impunity. And here again we strike deeper than law or league. It all comes back at last, as in the matter of education, to the judgment and conscience of the community. Unless these are sound, nothing will much avail."

The *Journal* is right; it does indeed all come back at last to the judgment and conscience of the community. And when we reach this point we strike the tap-root, in more senses of the word than one, of the whole difficulty which we in these articles have been discussing. Upon what basis, by what standard, and by what means are the judgment and conscience of the community formed or regulated? There can be but one answer to the question as to the basis, and the standard upon which, and by which, the judgment and the conscience of the community *ought* to be formed. That answer is, *The law of God*. That is the basis of all judgment, and the standard of every conscience. Every judgment that does not conform to the law of God is a wrong judgment, and any conscience that will not yield to the dictates of that law is an evil conscience.

But although there is but this one answer to the question as to the basis upon which the judgment and conscience of the community *ought to be* formed, it is certain that the law of God is not the basis upon which they *are* formed. While

murder, and theft, and adultery, and lying, are rife on every hand, an assembly of Methodist ministers gravely discuss the exceedingly grave and important question as to where Cain got his wife! The Congregationalists discuss the question as to whether there is or is not a probation after death for those who in this life "have not had a fair chance;" and those of other denominations discuss questions of equally living and instant importance with these. But take the whole year of 1886—undoubtedly a year of more violence and iniquity than any other in the history of the country, except perhaps in time of war—and in all that year, in all the leading pulpits of all the leading denominations in the land, how many sermons were heard from the text, "Thou shalt not kill"? how many from the text, "Thou shalt not commit adultery"? or from the text, "Thou shalt not steal"? or "Thou shalt not bear false witness"? In short, from all these pulpits, how many sermons were delivered in which the law of God in its majesty and integrity was pressed upon the judgment, and urged upon the conscience of the community? We are satisfied that each of our readers can readily tell how much such he heard in that year, and by his own experience he can judge of the experience of other people in this direction.

The truth is that the law of God is not dealt with in any such way in those places. But when by others there is an endeavor to bring up the judgment and conscience of the community strictly to the standard of that law, the popular pulpit most generally makes use of its conspicuous position to oppose the law of God, and to satisfy the judgment, and ease the conscience of the community, with the idea that the law is abolished. And as "they that forsake the law praise the wicked" (Prov. 28:4), the inevitable result is that wickedness is increased, the conscience is dulled, the truth is forsaken, and crime walks abroad.

And yet there is a pretense of preaching the gospel. But when the law of God is forsaken, or opposed in the preaching, the gospel is robbed of its power. The gospel is God's effort to save sinners, but it is only by the law that sin is made known. "By the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20); the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation." Rom. 1:16. Said Adam Clarke, "They that preach only the gospel to sinners, heal 'the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly.'" John Wesley said that those who leave out the law, and preach only the gospel; those who leave out the condemnation that is upon men because of the transgression of the law of God, and preach only the love of Jesus, will find that soon even that will lose its effect upon men. That is the truth, and if John Wesley could travel through our land in this year of the nineteenth

137

century, he would see the very result which he described.

Men will stand in opposition to the law of God, and preach directly that it is abolished, and then go about to get up a revival of religion! And many of the most successful revivalists are the most decidedly opposed to the law of God. Of course they have revivals, but what do the revivals amount to? Some of these revivalists may, like the most popular one just now, succeed in getting the people ashamed of their meanness. But to be ashamed of a piece of meanness is not that godly sorrow for sin, which leads to repentance. In all the revivals of the present day, where is that deep contrition and sorrow before God, because of sin

against *him*, that attended the preaching of Wesley and Whitfield and Edwards and Asbury and Finney? It is not found there, and it never will be found there, till the law of God is given the place that belongs to it in all such work; till by it men are shown their utterly ruined and lost condition, with no hope but the cross of Christ. Then men will delight in the law of God, as well as to rejoice in the love of Christ; and they will glory in the cross of Christ because that by the sacrifice of the cross they are redeemed from the *curse of the law*.

But instead of this, the gospel that is most prevalently preached nowadays, is fast becoming, if it has not already become, hardly anything more or less than a gospel of religious sentimentalism. It creates a Christianity of sentimentalism, instead of building up a Christianity of vigorous, stalwart righteousness before God and men. The great standard of justice and righteousness is not held before men as a mirror that they may see themselves as they really are. It is all love and mercy, without the justice of God, that is preached. We would not that the love and mercy of God should be preached less, but his law and justice more. The gospel of Christ was given to the world that God might be *just*, and justify the transgressor of his law, who will believe in Jesus. God's *justice* is guarded as well as manifested in the gospel of Christ, and whenever a gospel is preached which does not contemplate the justice of God, then is it not the gospel of Christ.

Thus by forsaking the law of God, and accepting the gospel of sentimentalism, the judgment and conscience of society are lowered to that degree that of a truth "judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. . . . And he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey; and the Lord saw it, and it displeased him." But although the Lord is displeased at it, where are the chances or the prospects of a reform?

J.

March 10, 1887

"What Shall the End Be?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 10 , pp. 152, 153.

IN several numbers of the SIGNS immediately preceding this we have called attention to the failure of justice, and the sympathy with crime and criminals, which now characterizes the proceedings at law, and pervades society everywhere. In view of these things, we have asked how long can these things continue before the earth shall be filled with violence? If these things furnished the only source whence an increase of violence were justly to be feared, this of itself would be a most important question. But when, in whatever direction we may look, there are only tendencies of a like nature to be seen, then the question becomes one which must be, and is indeed, of the most absorbing interest to all thinking people.

Notwithstanding the national organization of the Knights of Labor for the purpose, as stated, of preventing strikes, there were more than 3,000 strikes in the United States in the year 1886, all of them accompanied with violence to a

greater or less degree. In some instances the violence was so great that it would be difficult to tell how much greater it could be short of open war or complete anarchy. All this in 1886, and here we are only two months on the way in 1887, and how stands the record? Is the prospect for this year any brighter in this direction than it was for 1886 at the same time, or in fact at any time in that year? To say nothing of others of less note, Boston, New York, and Paterson, New Jersey, lead off with strikes in quick succession, and of such magnitude as to easily surpass any, except, perhaps, the very largest of the year 1886, and that year surpassed all others. Now let any person soberly ask himself the question, How long can this thing continue before outbreaking violence shall be the rule, and law and order be set at defiance? How long? And when there is added to this the *fact* that the so-called labor organizations are falling more and more under the direct and active domination of Socialistic principles, and Socialistic agitations, whose sole purpose is the utter breaking down of the present order of civil society, the question of how long is so much the more emphasized.

In 1857 Lord Macaulay, writing of the American Republic, used these words:—

"The day will come when in the State of New York, a multitude of people, not one of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a Legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a Legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith; on the other is a demagogue, canting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in carriages, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessaries. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by the workingman who hears his children crying for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such seasons of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning. Either some Cesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of Government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country and by your own institutions.'

With that please read the following editorial note from the *Argonaut* (S.F.), of November 6, 1886:—

"Mr. Henry George has not carried New York, and has not become its mayor, but this is what has been done: An impecunious adventurer, who has no property, pays no taxes, has no residence or citizenship anywhere—so far as we know—takes his gripsack in his hand and moves to the great American metropolis, and, gathering around him all there is of poverty, ignorance, discontent, and crime, proclaims himself a candidate for mayor; without party, or press, or money, he organizes discontent, and, becoming its leader, he marshals a band of men who have little to lose and much

to gain, and marches them to the ballot-box to obtain control of the government of a city containing more than a million of people and more than a thousand millions of aggregated wealth. That he does not succeed may be a matter of congratulation; that he came within a few thousand votes of his successful opponent, seems to us an incident of great significance, that carries with it the suggestion of danger. In saying this, it is not necessary to deny to Mr. Henry George great ability and thorough integrity of purpose. We may not call him crank or impracticable theorist, but the danger lies in the fact that the class of discontents is so numerous, and that it can be brought together for a political purpose, and become subordinate to party discipline, and wielded for political use. When one reflects in this direction, he can but question whether the unlimited exercise of the elective franchise ought not to be taken from an alien immigrating class, in order that the ranks of this dangerous and restless element may be prevented from further enlargement."

Then in connection with these two extracts the following from an editorial in the November *Century* is interesting and strongly suggestive. Under the heading of "The Congressional Balance-sheet" is given a striking illustration of the incapability, if not the failure, of Congress as a legislative body. The editor says:—

"The reader may perhaps desire an explanation of this failure of our national Legislative. Let him then go to Washington while the two Houses are in session. Let him sit in the gallery of the Senate, provided an 'executive session' does not turn him out; let him scan the faces of the Senators, reflect upon their previous records, and consider how many of them came to occupy their present positions.

"Let him then go and sit for a time in the gallery of the House of Representatives, and watch that national bear-garden. Let him enjoy the usual scene—one purple-faced Representative sawing the air in the progress of what is technically called an 'oration;' a dozen or more highly-amused colleagues surrounding him; the rest of the members talking at the top of their voices, clapping their hands for pages, writing, reading, telling funny stories and laughing uproariously at them, making social calls from desk to desk, doing anything and everything except the business for which they are paid.

"Let him try to estimate the rapidity with which a plain business man, finding his clerks engaged in such a scene during business hours, would make a 'clean sweep' of them. He will no longer ask an explanation of the congressional balance-sheet. What better result could be expected from the two Houses, each in its own way controlled by influences antagonistic to intelligent legislation? Congress is no longer a legislative body. Its degeneration is now admitted. It consists now of a plutocracy at one end, and a mobocracy at the other. The two chronic perils of a democracy have a firm grip on the Congress of the United States.

"Here is no question of comparative guilt or responsibility. Each House is as bad in its way as the other. Nor is there any partisan question involved. The course of Congress has for years been downhill. Able and sincere men are still to be found in both Houses, yet each successive Congress is, on the whole, worse than its predecessors; not because Democrats or Republicans control it, but because it is two years further on the road. . .

"The Congress of the United States has become the most incapable legislative body of the constitutional world. So far as the Senate is concerned, its case is hopeless; the only remedy is outside of it, in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. The case of the House is somewhat different; its failure may be redeemed by reform within itself."

But the prospect of a cure by this prescription is as hopeless as is the case for which it is given. "The

153

only remedy for the Senate" is said to be in the regeneration of the constituencies which elect the Senators. But the constituencies are as corrupt as is the Senate. Else how is it that the Senate is so bad? The House it is said "may be redeemed by reform within itself." It *might* be it is true. But will it be? Is there hope of reform from such a source? To think so is like expecting a man to lift therefore we see only that the whole case, as the editor says of that of the Senate is hopeless.

In view of these things stated by the *Argonaut* and the *Century*, Lord Macaulay's words are remarkable. And when we view the destructive violence of the participants in the almost perpetual strikes, their secret and sometimes open sympathy with Anarchists, and their always open advocacy of Socialism, which can only end in anarchy, it appears as though the American "Huns and Vandals" mentioned by Macaulay are almost ready to burst upon the nation. And though Macaulay places the time of plunder in "the twentieth century;" and though there remain less than thirteen years before the twentieth century comes; yet we very much doubt whether the nineteenth century instead of the twentieth will not see this time of ruin so clearly pictured by this justly eminent writer and thinker. For when the Hung and the Vandal came upon Rome there was no Cesar, and the time of the American Huns and Vandals seems too near to hope for a Cesar here.

Yet there is no one more step that may be taken before ruin is reached. That is, let the whole body—representatives and constituencies—become permeated with the vileness of an apostate church; let religious hypocrisy be added to political chicanery and legislative incompetency; then will be reached the condition in which Rome stood at the time to which Macaulay refers, and having reached it, a dreadful fall awaits this nation, as surely as red-handed ruin fell upon Rome. And that there may not be a single color lacking in the lurid picture, National Reform presents itself, and in it's the embodiment of the last element of corruption needed to fill up the cup of iniquity, as Rome's was filled when ruin overtook her. History *does* repeat itself. And if any just lesson may be drawn from history, it seems that this one must be that ruin stands at the doors of our nation

to-day; and the National Reform party has its hand upon the latch ready to open the door and let her in.

This in our own land. But turn to Europe and what is the condition there. The spirit of discontent and violence among the laboring classes is as rife there as it is here. And as for Socialism and Anarchism, Europe is the land of its nativity, and it is from there that these destructive theories have come to our country. But there, in addition to all this, every one of the leading nations is preparing for war on the most gigantic scale. Each one of these strong nations is placing itself upon the strongest possible war footing. Each one so bitterly jealous of the others, and so almost desperately angry, that the safety of each can only lie in the manifestation of such strength for war as to make success extremely doubtful upon the part of the attacking power. But how long can such a condition of affairs continue. When the strongest possible preparation for war is the only assurance of peace that a government can give, then what is the value of such an assurance of peace? And again the question comes, How long can such a state of things continue? In the very nature of things there is a limit beyond which such a fearful tension cannot be sustained. There is bound to be a break, and when the dreadful train is once started, what shall be the result? The first result must be war—the most dreadful the world has ever known. And then, of that, what can the end be?

Now in view of all these things in every place and on every hand, how far does the prospect favor the so-much-preached millennium? In all these things where is there any promise of a time of universal peace, and perfect safety? Well, the promise of it is just as far from the fact as the preaching of it is from the truth of the Bible. That the expectation of such a time on this earth, is utterly foreign to the truth of the Bible, we shall show next week.

J.

March 17, 1887

"Is It Peace and Safety?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 11 , p. 167.

IN spite of the rapid increase of crime and violence on every hand; in spite of the most gigantic preparations for war that the world has ever seen; in spite of the increasing worldliness of the church, the pulpit and the religious press continue to talk of peace and safety, of a millennium in which there shall be no war, and in which the world will be converted. In the midst of violence and crime, it seems a strange proceeding to talk of peace and safety. In the presence of the greatest possible preparations for war, it seems rather incongruous to announce the speedy approach of a time when there shall be no war. In the face of the increasing worldliness of the church, and the loss of her power of godliness, the prospect does not appear very flattering for the conversion of the world to Christ. Yet under these very circumstances, in these very times, these very things are preached.

But is such preaching, the preaching of the truth? Is it so that through the practice of violence and crime there is to be developed an era of peace and safety for those who commit these things as well as for those who do not? Is it true that by these immense preparations for war, by this constant readiness for war, and this increasing jealousy and warlike spirit amongst nations, there is to be brought about a time when all nations shall voluntarily lay down their arms and make no more preparation for war, and when there shall nevermore be either jealousy or warlike spirit? Is it a fact that through a world-loving church seeking for worldly power and worldly favor, there shall flow such a flood of divine grace that it shall irresistibly overwhelm the world? Such results from such causes or by such means, are moral impossibilities. Then why is it that from one end of Christendom to the other the pulpits ring with it? Is it because the Scriptures say that this shall be? Let us see.

There are certain scriptures quoted to prove that these things are so. Let us read them.

Psalm 2:7, 8. "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." There, does not that say that the world shall be converted? Well does it? Plainly it does not. It says that the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth shall be given to the Son of God. But it does not say that this shall be by conversion nor for conversion. Before the conversion of the heathen or the uttermost parts of the earth can be found in that scripture it has to be put into it by the one who wants to find it there. And that is not the best way to interpret Scripture. It is not the best way to read into Scripture what we want there, rather than to read the Scripture to find what really is there. But it may be asked, Is not conversion the necessary conclusion from the text? It is not, because the next verse shows the contrary: "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." That is certainly anything else then their conversion. This is shown further by the remaining verses: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little."

This shows that the time is coming when the Son will be angry, and his wrath will be kindled; and that now men must make their peace with him, that they be not broken and dashed in pieces when his wrath shall be kindled, for that is to be done with the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth when they are given to him. This is confirmed by another scripture in which this wrath is spoken of. Revelation 6:16 speaks of "the wrath of the Lamb." And when that wrath is revealed, "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?" It is certain therefore that the second

psalm does not teach the conversion of the world; nor will it allow any such teaching to be read into it.

Another scripture quoted in proof of the conversion of the world is,

Revelation 11:15: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." But this text is much the same as the other. It does not say that these kingdoms become his by conversion nor for conversion. It is evident that this text bears the same meaning as that in the second psalm. Read the two together: "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." These two texts certainly speak of the same time and the same event, and we have seen that these heathen are given him to be dashed in pieces. And that this is the same with "the kingdoms of the world," is evident from the context. The whole verse reads, "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 for ever and ever."

"The seventh angel" here spoken of, is the seventh of the seven trumpet angels of the eighth to the eleventh chapters of this book. And each of the last three trumpets is accompanied by woe, for Rev. 8:13 says, "Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!" There were three trumpets yet to sound and there were to be three woes because of the three trumpets. This is further shown by Rev. 11:14: "The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." Then follows the sounding of the seventh trumpet and the announcement that the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ. Now as the seventh trumpet is accompanied by the third woe, and as it is under the seventh trumpet that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, it is certain therefore that it is in the midst of a time of woe that the kingdoms of this world do become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

This is further shown by verse 18: "And the nations were angry [precisely the attitude of the nations at this moment], 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 corrupt [margin] the earth." The time of reward of the saints, etc., is at the coming of the Lord, for he says, "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. Then it is that his wrath is kindled and the angry nations are given him, and in the midst of a time of woe they are dashed in pieces, and destroyed because they corrupt left to other people, but it shall *break in pieces and consume* all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."

It is evident that in none of these texts is the conversion of the world, nor a millennium of peace, spoken of at all nor even suggested. Instead of the nations being at peace, they are "angry;" instead of there being safety on the earth there is "woe;" instead of the conversion of the world there is to be destruction that shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. And yet in the face of these

plain declarations of the word of God, and of the events that mark their fulfillment, men will preach directly the opposite. But even this is shown by the word of God as that which will be at this time. In the last verse of 1 Thessalonians 4, the coming of the Lord is spoken of. Then in the first verses of the fifth chapter it is said: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; *then sudden destruction cometh upon them*, as travail upon a woman with child; *and they shall not escape.*"

This shows that at the time when destruction is impending there will be men saying, "Peace and safety," and *then* sudden destruction comes upon them. Therefore if there is any one thing that men should disbelieve, it is the preaching of peace and safety, the preaching of a millennium of peace and the conversion of the world. The very preaching of it is evidence of its falsity, because the word of God says that *then* "destruction cometh."

There are other texts upon this subject, the examination of which we defer till next week.

J.

March 24, 1887

"In the Last Days" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 12 , pp. 183, 184.

UNDOUBTEDLY the one text of Scripture that is oftenest referred to as proof of the millennium and the conversion of the world, is that one which speaks of the nations' beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. There are two places in the Bible where these words are used—Isaiah 2:2-4, and Micah 4:1-5. These are almost precisely alike, except that where one uses the word "nations" the other uses "people," and the statement in Micah is a little longer than that in Isaiah. That the reader may have the full benefit of the text and this discussion of it, we here print it in full.

"But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it. For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

Now let us examine this closely and see what it teaches. When is this scripture to apply?—"In the last days." Who is it that shall say these things?—"Many nations [Isa. "Many *people*"] shall come and say;" etc. Exactly! In the last days then *many people* shall say that "the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." In the last days many people shall say, The nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks." In the last days many people shall say that "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." In the last days many people shall say, "Peace and safety," because "they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid." And, too, they will say that "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." All these things *many people* will say in the last days.

But what saith the Lord? "In that day, *saith the Lord*, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even forever." Verses 6, 7. This shows that at the very time—in *that day*—when "many people" are saying all those things, there will be some who will be "driven out," "afflicted," and "cast off," and that these will be a "remnant." And it is this "remnant" which the Lord says he will gather and over whom he will reign in Mount Zion forever.

This is clearly against the idea of the conversion and gathering of all the world, for if that were true then there would be no "remnant" at all, nor would there be any that were "cast off" or "driven out" or "afflicted." How could there be any afflicted or driven out when every man could sit under his vine and under his fig-tree, with none to make afraid, and when none should ever learn war any more? Plainly there could not be. Therefore the text does not at all teach that there shall be a millennium of peace and safety and the conversion of the world. It only teaches that in the last days many nations or people will say so, and *will say* that the Lord has said it; while the Lord himself says that "in that day" there will be a remnant, who will be cast off, driven out, and afflicted, and that this remnant he will gather, and will reign over them in Mount Zion forever.

That this is the true explanation of the text we have the whole Bible on this subject in proof.

.1. Let us follow this "remnant" and see what further is said about it. In Joel 2:30, 31, the Lord says: "I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come." And in verse 32 he says that "there shall be deliverance" "in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." And in Zeph. 3:8 we read: "Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy." Can it be possible that the Lord is going to assemble a converted world to pour upon such a people all his fierce anger? Not at all. The word of God knows no such thing as the conversion of the world, that is all. The prophet proceeds, verse 12: "I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor

people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord." This is precisely what *the Lord* says in Micah 4, while many people are saying "Peace and safety," and that the world shall be converted. This is further shown by the next verse. It speaks of this afflicted and poor people as the "remnant of Israel," saying, "The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth; for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid." This whole connection shows that the time here spoken of is the same as that in Micah 4, and that the remnant here referred to is the same as the remnant there referred to, and that this remnant will be poor and afflicted, cast off and driven out.

This is confirmed by another reference to this remnant. Rev. 12:17, says: "The dragon was

184

was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." The dragon is said, in verse 9, to be "the devil," "Satan." The "woman" is the church of God. The devil is wroth with the church of God, and goes to make war with the remnant of her seed. The devil works through earthly powers and agencies. In stirring up kings, and people, and nations to oppress the church he has ever endeavored to destroy her. This is continued even to the end, in a war with the remnant of Israel, the last of the church of God. Says the Lord by Daniel, speaking of that great power that so long wore out the saints of the Most High. "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." Dan. 7:21, 22.

Here then is the story of the remnant. It is the last of the church. The people who compose it keep "the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." The devil, through the powers of earth, makes war upon them. By this they are "cast off" "driven out," and become an afflicted, and poor people. But there is deliverance in the remnant who the Lord calls, for, "In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even forever." "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. Those who got this victory are they who kept "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus;" and these are the remnant, who are driven out and afflicted, but whom the Lord gather, and over whom he reigns in Mount Zion forever.

Yet at the very time when the devil is thus making war upon the poor, afflicted, but loyal remnant of the church of Christ, the popular pulpit, and the worldly church, will sing of peace and safety and the conversion of the world, and will think that because the world finds it to its interest to ally itself with the already too willing church, therefore the world is becoming converted, and a millennium of

peace will reign on the earth! Yes, says the prophet, "From the uttermost part of the earth have we heard songs, even glory to the righteous. But I said, My leanness, my leanness, woe unto me! the treacherous dealers have dealt treacherously; yea, the treacherous dealers have dealt very treacherously. Fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth." Isa. 24:16, 17. Right here the reader may with profit read carefully the whole of the second chapter of Isaiah. It is too long to quote here.

There is another line of scriptures that also prove positively that this promise of peace and safety, and of beating swords into plowshares, and spears into pruning-hooks, is only the saying of "many people" and not of the Lord at all. Notice, the time at which the prophet says that many people will say these things, is "in the last days." Now what does the Lord say shall be the condition of things in the last days? This:—

"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." 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

This is what God says there will be, in the last days; and this is exactly what now is, as any one can see who will look. Nor is there promise of these bad men growing better and better, until all shall be converted and there be left none wicked on the earth. On the contrary, this word says "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:13. And in the face of these plain positive declarations of the word of God, pulpit and platform, priests and people, will declare that the world is growing better, that everything prospers and is on the highway to the millennium. It is too, but not such a millennium as they are looking for and preaching, but one of destruction and devastation.

Again, Says the Lord by the prophet Joel, "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come, get you down; for the press is full, the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great." Joel 3:13. When is the harvest? "The harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39. Who holds the sickle to reap withal? "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." Rev. 14:14-16.

This is the time, and the event, that is spoken of by Joel, "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe"—the end of the world is come. And when that time comes, the word of God says, "*Their wickedness is great.*" Therefore any preaching that promises a reign of righteousness on this earth before the end of the world, is contrary to the word of God. What further says the Lord, of this time? This:—

"Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles [nations]; Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up; beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears; let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about; thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord." Joel 3:9-11. Then he continues in verse 13, "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe," etc.

Therefore the word of God is plain that the promises of peace and of the increase of righteousness, that will be heard in the last days, are only the words of many people, and not the word of God; of a people too, who are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," and who have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof; and from whom it is the duty of all who fear God, to turn away.

When this people say, Peace and safety, God says there shall be "fear, and the pit, and the snare," and "sudden destruction" upon the inhabitants of the earth. When they say, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," the Lord says, "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near, let them come up." When they say that "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks," the word of God says, "Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears." When they shall say that the world is growing better and better, know of a surety that God says, "Evil men and seducers shall wax *worse and worse*." When they speak of the time when the world shall be converted, God says that at that time, "their wickedness is great."

We are now living in the last days, in the very time when many people are saying all these things that are directly contrary to the word of God; and not only that, but are said contrary to that word, in the very presence of the evil times and events that the word of God shows shall be. From such turn away, for whoever trusts in such promises of peace and safety, and follows in the way of such words shall not know peace. For the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come. "Therefore also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning; and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness." Joel 2:12, 13. J.

March 31, 1887

"The World Will Not Be Converted" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13 , pp. 198, 199.

BY those who believe in a millennium of peace and safety and the conversion of the world, it is argued somewhat as follows: The Bible says that the devil is to be bound a thousand years and shall deceive the nations no more till the thousand years are finished. Therefore, Satan being bound, and unable to deceive anybody, the gospel having no opposition, and having a thousand years

to work untrammelled, in the very nature of the case all will accept the blessedness of the gospel, and the world must become converted.

That appears very plausible, but is it true? We think not, and that for many reason which the Scriptures show, some of which we shall give.

1. It is true that the devil is to be bound a thousand years. It is true that he is to have no power to deceive till the thousand years shall be fulfilled. And it is just as certainly true that when the thousand years are expired he does have power to deceive the nations; and that *he does deceive them*, to that extent that he gathers them to battle against the City of God, and fire comes down out of Heaven and devours them. Let us read the scripture on this. It is in the twentieth chapter of Revelation:—

"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." Rev. 20:1-3; 7-9.

That is a straightforward story. It needs no addition. It says plainly that Satan does not deceive the nations for a thousand years, and then that when the thousand years are expired he *does* deceive them, even the nations that are in the four quarters of the earth, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea, and fire devours them. Now it seems rather incongruous to claim that the world will all be converted during the thousand years, only to be deceived by the devil and devoured by fire as soon as the thousand years are over. It seems hardly reasonable that the Lord would give over to the devil and destruction, the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, when they had all become converted. If it should be claimed that these who are destroyed are only the ones who would not yield to the gospel, and would not be converted, then what becomes of the doctrine of the world's conversion? For the number of the deceived and destroyed is made up of *the nations* that are in the *four quarters of the earth*, and the number is as *the sand of the sea*. At that rate the number of the converted could hardly embrace the world. No; neither this text that speaks directly of the millennium—*m,le-annum*, a thousand years—nor any other in all the Bible gives any hint of the conversion of the world. A thousand years, a millennium of peace and safety and the destruction of all evil, is a myth. The doctrine of the conversion of the world is a fraud, and the preaching of it a deception and a snare.

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; they make you vain; they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me,

The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you." Jer. 23:16, 17.

Could this time be better described than it is in these words? Those that despise the Lord are increasing on every hand; those who walk after the imagination of their own heart are multiplying in the church as well as in the world; evil men and seducers are growing worse and more abundant; and when anyone proclaims the word of God, that the Lord cometh to judge them for their evil ways, then a chorus of voices can be heard all around, saying to them that despise the Lord, "The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace." "Don't be troubled, the Lord is not coming yet. The world is only in its infancy. The gospel has only got a fair start. The world must be converted before the Lord comes," etc., etc. And when the word of the Lord is preached that "destruction cometh," and "fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth," then the same deceptive song is heard, "No evil shall come upon you. For who hath stood in the counsel of the Lord, and hath perceived and heard his word? Who hath marked his word and heard it?" "Don't be disturbed. Nobody can tell whether the coming of the Lord is nigh or not. It may be a thousand years, may be ten thousand years yet. Nobody can tell anything about it." "No evil shall come upon you." This say they, but what saith the Lord?

"Behold, a whirlwind of the Lord is gone forth in fury, even a grievous whirlwind; it shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. The anger of the Lord shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the thoughts of his heart; *in the latter days* ye shall consider it perfectly. I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings." Jer. 23:19-22.

The wicked, and those that despise the Lord and walk in their own evil way, they will comfort with the hope of the soon-coming millennium of peace the hope of the soon-coming millennium of peace and safety, and the conversion of the world; and then as the wickedness increases, those who promise and preach such things will invoke the power of the State to compel the wicked to act as though they were righteous, and so to help bring in the millennium and convert the world. They will comfort the wicked with the promise of a time when they can all be converted and become servants of God, without forsaking the world, or denying themselves, or taking up the cross,—a time in short in which the way to life will be so broad that none can get out of it, and the way to destruction so narrow that no one can get into it.

199

But such a time will never be in this world. Christ said, "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14. And he never gave any intimation that the order would ever be reversed, and the way become so broad that the world would find it. But he did say, "Strive to enter in at

the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." They will *seek*, but will not *strive*. They will go in the way to destruction because the way to life is so strait. And, "When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are. . . Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." Luke 13:25-27.

When the door of salvation closes there will be "many" working iniquity. Yea, says the Saviour, "And because iniquity shall *abound*, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matt. 24:12, 13. And, "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith [not all flock to the faith], giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." 1 Tim. 4:1. "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18:8.

All these scriptures and all others that we might quote, show that the word of God contemplates no such thing as a millennium of peace and safety, nor the conversion of the world. And they who preach, or promise, or prophesy these things "speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord." "I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." Jer. 23:16, 32. As we said before, so say we now again, if there is any one thing about the preaching of the present day that should be disbelieved, it is the preaching of peace and safety, and the conversion of the world.

J.

"'A Complaint' Indeed" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 13 , p. 200.

UNDER the heading of "A Complaint," a Presbyterian elder writes to the *Interior* of March 17, 1887, as follows:—

"I listened to the argument of a Baptist clergyman a short time ago, who, as usual, claimed that there was but one mode of baptism—that by immersion. Returning home, I took down Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, an abridged edition prepared by him alone, for universal use among Sabbath-school teachers, and Bible students. I expected to find a statement of the different views held by Christian denominations of the world on baptism, briefly and concisely stated, such as can be usually found in Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias for general use. I was much surprised in not finding any reference to the mode by sprinkling, as practiced by the great majority of Christians; but on the contrary, Dr. Smith says, 'Baptism properly and literally means immersion.' As to the mode, he says, 'The language of the New Testament, and of the primitive fathers, sufficiently points to immersion, as the common mode of baptism.' He says further, that 'the ancient church mostly adopted immersion.' His larger edition prepared by him and seventy others, may treat the subject exhaustively, but this one prepared by

him alone for universal use, does not, to my mind, deal fairly with the subject. I picked up 'Watson's Dictionary of the Bible,' and there I found the strongest arguments of those who favor, and those who oppose immersion, candidly set forth and the subject fairly treated. The 'Smith's Dictionary' that I have is an American reprint published by Jansen McClurg & Co., 1875. I cannot understand (unless Dr. Smith is a Baptist), why all reference to sprinkling, as a mode of baptism—practiced by such a large body of Christians—is omitted by him. Can you enlighten me?"

That is "a complaint" with which a great many people are afflicted nowadays. They find themselves believing and preaching something that is practiced "by a large body of Christians," but which is totally at variance with the teachings of Christ, and then when their error is shown them they look for something that will confirm them in their error, and if they do not find it they enter their complaint. If their error be, as in this instance, in practicing sprinkling for baptism; and the Scriptures are set before them, and their error pointed out and the truth shown them, then instead of accepting the truth and obeying the word of God, they will go to some commentary or dictionary to find arguments to confirm them in their disobedience. And then if the dictionary is against them and in harmony with the Bible, they "cannot understand" it unless the writer, as in this case, Dr. Smith, "is a Baptist"! Unless the writer of the book is a Baptist they cannot understand why all reference to sprinkling as a mode of baptism is omitted by him, when it is "practiced by such a large body of Christians." They cannot understand how the Scriptures can be right and the people wrong. They cannot understand how a writer can "deal fairly with the subject" when he gives the plain meaning of the Scriptures, instead of the corrupt practice of a large body of Christians, and so they enter "a complaint." That is to say they cannot understand how it is that the practice of the people should be regulated and tested by the Bible, instead of the Bible being interpreted by the practice of the people.

It is the same way in regard to Sunday-keeping. The Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and commands all men to "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." "A large body of Christians," make the Sabbath a working day, and keep Sunday instead. When the word of God is set before them and their sin in working on the Sabbath is shown them, then too many are just like this Presbyterian elder with baptism; instead of going to the word of God to see indeed their duty, they will go to commentaries or dictionaries to find something to confirm them in their wrong doing. We actually knew a minister to warn his congregation against "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible" (Barnum's edition, Appleton, etc.) as being published in the interests of Seventh-day Adventists; and now here comes this Presbyterian elder and suspects Dr. Smith of being a Baptist! And in both instances they will refuse to obey the word of God, because it is contrary to their practice.

This is a very sad "complaint," and afflicts a very "large body of Christians."

J.

April 7, 1887

"When Does the Millennium Begin?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 14 , pp. 215, 216.

HAVING conclusively shown what the millennium is *not*—that it is not a time in which the world will be converted—we now propose to show by the Scriptures what it *is*. The word *millennium* means *a thousand years*. Properly speaking, any period of a thousand years is a millennium, it matters not where, nor in what connection, the period may occur. But as there is in the Bible a period of a thousand years definitely measured off, which by perversion has been made to promise great things to the earth, to this period has been appropriated exclusively the phrase, *the millennium*; so that when this expression is used with no qualification, it is always understood to mean the thousand years referred to in the twentieth chapter of Revelation, during which Satan is deprived of power to deceive the nations.

When, then, does the millennium begin? At the resurrection of the righteous dead. The Scriptures is perfectly plain on this subject; and the only question that can be, is, What saith the Scripture? Rev. 20:4-6: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Here it is said that certain ones lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years; that they are the blessed and holy; that on them the second death hath no power; that this is the first resurrection; and that the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. It is certain therefore that the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked are a thousand years apart. It is certain that the resurrection of those upon whom the second death hath no power, is a thousand years before the resurrection of those upon whom the second death hath power. As this is definitely named the first resurrection; and as the rest of the dead—those who have no part in the first resurrection—live not till the thousand years are finished, it assuredly follows that the second resurrection is a thousand years after the first. And as only the righteous—the blessed and holy—have part in the first resurrection; and as those who live not again till the thousand years are finished are consumed in the lake of fire, there can be no shadow of doubt that there are to be two resurrections—the resurrection of the righteous only, and of the wicked only—and that the two resurrections are a thousand years apart.

The Saviour said: "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. Here is shown "the resurrection of life," and "the resurrection of damnation;" clearly two resurrections, though this text does not of itself show how far apart they are. The text in Revelation tells that they are a thousand years apart. True, this is the only text that does tell it, but that makes nothing against the truth of it. What the Lord says once is just as true as though it were said fifty times. We know that the common idea of the resurrection of the dead is that when the end of the world comes, all the dead will be called up together, both righteous and wicked, and then judgment passed upon each case; but these texts, and many others that might be given, show that such a view is a mistaken one. The truth is that the righteous are raised first, and they are made immortal "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump;" and before they are raised to immortality, they are "accounted worthy" of such a resurrection. Luke 20:35, 36.

The evidence of the Scripture is positive therefore that the millennium begins at the time of the resurrection of the righteous dead. Now when is it that this resurrection takes place? At the last trump. For, "we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52. But when is it that this trumpet sounds, that awakes the righteous dead? At the coming of the Lord 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. Thus the millennium begins at the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the resurrection of the righteous dead is at the coming of the Lord. Therefore the millennium begins at the coming of the Lord Jesus in his glory.

This is confirmed by Rev. 20:4, which we notice again: "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them." What is the antecedent of the pronouns "they" and "them" in this sentence? The antecedent is not in the twentieth chapter, for the first three verses refer to the binding of Satan. From verse eleven to the end of the nineteenth chapter, the coming of the Lord and the destruction of the nations are described, so we are compelled to go yet further back. We read the first verse of the nineteenth chapter, and there we find it: "And after these things [after the judgment of great Babylon] I heard a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God." Now we may read on, chap. 20:4: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

Now when is it that judgment is given to these? At the coming of the Lord. For, says the Scripture, "Judge nothing before the time, *until the Lord come.*" 1

Cor. 4:5. And in Dan. 7:21, 22, of the Papacy it is said: "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." This shows that judgment is given to the saints of God, at the coming of the Lord in his glorious kingdom; and we have found that this is at, and by, their resurrection from the dead. Again says the Saviour, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14. "And, behold, I come quickly; and may reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. Therefore, as judgment is given to the saints at their resurrection, and that at the coming of the Lord; and as their resurrection is the first resurrection, and that is the beginning of the millennium, it is proven as plainly as anything can be proven that the millennium begins at the second coming of the Lord Jesus.

Then where do the righteous spend the millennium? Let us follow them from their resurrection, and see where they go. First we have read in 1 Thess. 4:16, 17, that when the Lord comes and the trump of God is sounded, the dead in Christ arise, and then those who are alive are caught up together with him to meet the Lord *in the air*. Here at the first step we find them taken away from the earth, and caught up to the Lord Jesus "in the air." Secondly, we have read in Rev. 19:1 of a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, "Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God." Thirdly, we read in Rev. 7:9, 10, "I be-

216

held, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." And this throne was set in Heaven. Rev. 4:2. Therefore it is certain that the multitude of the righteous, who are raised in the first resurrection of the millennium, who are caught up to meet him in the air, to whom judgment is given, and who reign with Christ a thousand years,—it is certain that these are taken to Heaven, to the presence of the throne of God, and that there they worship him and the Lamb; it is certain that they spend the millennium in Heaven, and that there is where they are priests of God and of Christ, and where they reign with Christ the thousand years.

This is confirmed by another view. In Rev. 20:4 it is said that in this great company there are those who had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark in their foreheads, nor in their hands, and that they with the others reigned with Christ a thousand years. Now in Rev. 15:2 we read of these same ones, thus: "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." And this sea of glass is before the throne of God in Heaven, for says the Scripture, "I was in the Spirit; and, behold, a throne was set *in Heaven*, and one sat on the throne." "And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal." Rev. 4:2, 6. Again, these are said to have "the harps of

God," as they stand on that crystal sea. And in Rev. 14:1, 2 we read of the same company: "I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder; and I heard *the voice of harpers harping with their harps.*" This shows that those who did not worship the beast, nor his image, nor receive his mark, but got a victory over all, were taken to Heaven; and these were only a part of that "much people" whose voices were heard there, to whom judgment was given, who were raised at the beginning of the millennium, and who reigned with Christ during the millennium—the thousand years.

From all these texts, the conclusion is clear and positive that all the righteous people from this world are taken to Heaven by the Lord Jesus, at the beginning of the millennium, and that they spend the millennium in Heaven itself in the presence of God and the Lamb. Therefore any preaching that promises a millennium before the coming of Christ in his glory, is contrary to Scripture. And any preaching that promises a millennium of peace and joy *on this earth*, even after the coming of Christ, is also contrary to the Scripture. This last statement we shall make plain next week by showing what the millennium will be on the earth.
J.

April 14, 1887

"Who Shall Stand When He Appeareth?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 15 , pp. 231, 232.

LAST week we showed by the plain reading and evidence of Scripture that the millennium begins at the second coming of Christ and the consequent resurrection of the righteous dead. We showed that when the righteous are raised by the Lord Jesus at his coming, they are then taken to Heaven, where judgment is given unto them, and where they reign with Christ a thousand years, that is, during the millennium; while the rest of the dead—the wicked—live not again till the thousand years—the millennium—are finished. We then stated the legitimate conclusion, that any preaching that promises a millennium before the second coming of Christ, is contrary to Scripture. We further stated that any preaching that promises a millennium of peace and joy *on this earth* even *after* the second coming of Christ, is likewise contrary to Scripture. This we shall now prove by scriptures so abundant that to doubt it will be but to doubt the truth of the Bible.

Let us read again 1 Thess. 4:16, 17: "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." This shows as clearly as language can that all the righteous, both dead and living, are taken away from the earth when the Lord comes, that is, at the beginning of the millennium. They are "caught up together,"

"*in the clouds*," "to meet the Lord *in the air*;" and they are not found upon earth again till after the thousand years are finished. As therefore the righteous, whether dead or living, are all taken away from the earth when the Lord comes, the question fairly presents itself, *What becomes of the wicked on the earth when the Lord comes?*

The answer is not far to seek, and it is clear and explicit. 2 Thess. 1:7, 8, says, "To you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The vengeance of the Lord on the wicked is destruction. For says Christ, "As it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and *destroyed them all*." Luke 17:26, 27. As the flood destroyed all who in the days of Noah obeyed not the Lord; and as the days of Noah were so shall the days of the Son of man be; it is certain that when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, it will be the destruction of every soul of man that stands in wickedness. Again: "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and *destroyed them all*. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:28-30.

But were they not warned in the days of Noah? Oh yes! they all had ample warning. Noah preached to them all about it. The trouble was not that they *could* not know about it, but that they *would* not know. They would not believe what was told them. It was thus also in Sodom, they would receive nothing, and believe nothing, about the destruction that hung over their guilty city. They could have escaped, had they believed and obeyed; but they would not believe, nor obey, and the fire and brimstone from heaven destroyed them all; and even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. Christ sends a message to the world, that his coming is at the doors, and that this generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. This message will make ready a people prepared for the Lord; but it will be believed by but a few, compared to earth's millions. For instead of believing it and acting accordingly, "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." 2 Pet. 3:3-6. There is where lies the difficulty, not that they are ignorant of these things, but that they are *willingly* ignorant. It is told them but they will not know nor believe.

Again we read of the coming of the Lord, and the destruction of the wicked on the earth at his coming, "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 that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. 19:11-21.

The beast here spoken of is the same as the "little horn" of Dan. 7; it is the "man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," named by Paul in 2 Thess. 2:3-8, of which he says, "That Wicked shall be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." And the "army" here referred to as following the King of kings and Lord of lords is the same as that mentioned in Joel 2:2-11. "A great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations. . . . The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble; the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining; and the Lord shall utter his voice before his army; for his camp is very great; for he is strong that executeth his word; for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" And all these refer to the same time and people, that Paul mentions in the text before quoted, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with his mighty angels*, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Speaking of this same time, Rev. 6:14-17 says: "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?" This corresponds exactly to the pouring out of the last of the seven last plagues when the voice of God announces the end of the world: "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." Joel speaks of the same time, saying, "The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall

shake; but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Joel 3:16.

Jeremiah also, tells of this time and what shall be to the wicked when the day of the Lord comes. "The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout, as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." Jer. 25:30-33. They shall not be lamented, for there are none left to lament them. They shall not be gathered nor buried, because there are none left to gather nor buried, because there are none left to gather or bury them. All are destroyed as at the flood, and as at the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.

These scriptures certainly show as plainly as the scriptures can, that at the coming of the Lord, that is to say, at the beginning of the thousand years, all the living wicked upon the earth are slain. And right here is where the views set forth in the Prophetic Conference, lately held at Chicago, are utterly at fault and terribly misleading. There is was preached, according to the Scripture, that the coming of the Lord will be before the millennium. It was likewise preached according to the Scripture, that wickedness will increase, that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse," until the coming of the Lord. And then, contrary to all Scripture, it was preached that when the Lord comes, the conversion of the world will begin in reality, and will be accomplished during the thousand years! That is to say, Men will mock at the law of God, and despise the gospel of Christ, and grow worse and worse at it, till the Lord Jesus comes in the glory of his Father and all the holy angels with him, and then they all become willing to be converted; even then they are so slow about it that it takes a thousand years to accomplish it.

Such doctrine will never do. The Scripture is wholly against it, not only when speaking directly upon the subject, but also when showing the very consciousness of men when they realize the presence of the divine. The most righteous of men have always been smitten with fear at the appearance of an angel of God, and needed to be reassured by the words of the angel, "Fear not." How much more terrible then to the wicked would such an appearance be. The wicked Belshazzar in the midst of his lascivious feast, was filled with dread and alarm at the sight of only the fingers of a man's hand writing on the wall. And what will be done by the wicked of this world when the heaven is torn asunder and there is revealed the face of Him that sitteth on the

throne, is shown by a text already quoted, but we will repeat it. "And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together. . . . 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." Rev. 6:14-16.

The fact is, that the wicked would rather have a mountain on them than to be obliged to stand in the presence of Christ when he appears in his glory. To the wicked in that day a falling mountain will be counted a refuge if it will only hide them from the penetrating gaze of the righteous Son of God. "Our God is a consuming fire," and such will he be in that day to ever soul of man who does not have grace whereby they may serve him with reverence and godly fear. (Heb. 12:28, 29). Nothing can live in the presence of God, except it be imbued with life from God, and made like unto him in his glory. In that great day when Christ shall appear in his glory, every one who is righteous will be imbued with immortality, in the twinkling of an eye, and made like him (Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 John 3:2); and every one who is wicked, will be destroyed with the brightness of his glory, from one end of the earth to the other end of the earth, and shall not be lamented neither gathered nor buried. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye." Eze. 18:32.

As therefore the righteous, both living and dead, are all taken away from the earth, and the wicked are all slain upon the earth, when the Lord comes, and as the wicked live not again till the thousand years are finished, it would reasonably follow that the earth would then be left without inhabitants. That is exactly what the Scripture declares, but the proof of it we must defer until next week. J.

April 21, 1887

"What Is the Millennium" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 16 , pp. 247, 248.

WE have seen by the Scriptures that at the second coming of Christ, and the consequent resurrection of the righteous dead, the thousand years—the millennium—begins (1 Thess. 4:16, 17; Rev. 20:4-6); that then likewise all the living wicked on the earth are slain (2 Thess. 1:7, 8; Rev. 19:11-21; 16:14-17; Jer. 25:30-33); that none of the wicked live any more until the thousand years are finished (Rev. 20:5, 7-9); and that therefore the conclusion certainly follows that the earth is left utterly desolate, and without a human inhabitant during the whole millennium. That this is not only the certain conclusion from correct premises, but is also the positive showing of all the Scripture on the subject, it is the purpose of this article to show.

In Isaiah 14:22, 23 God said of Babylon, "For I will rise up against them, saith the Lord of hosts, and cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew, saith the Lord. I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts." This word everybody knows has been fulfilled to perfection. Babylon has lain for ages a ruin, a desolation, and an astonishment—it *has been swept* "with the besom of destruction."

And thus saith the Lord, "This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth; and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Verses 26, 27. The ruin and desolation of ancient Babylon lie to-day as a mighty object lesson teaching the inhabitants of the world what this earth is yet to be, and that during the millennium.

Again we read: "Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. And it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him. The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word." "The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage; and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it; and it shall fall, and not rise again. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as]prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison,

248

and after many days shall they be visited." Isa. 24:1-3, 19-22.

The Revised Version reads, "after many days they shall be *punished*," which is really the correct idea, for the Hebrew word is the same one just before translated "punish." Thus Isaiah 24:19-22 is identical with Rev. 16:17-21 and 20:5, 7-9, and shows the desolation of the earth, and the punishment of the living wicked when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven, with his mighty angels taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. The prisoners shall be gathered together in the pit (of death) for they live not till the thousand years are finished; "and after many days, shall they be punished," after the thousand years, for "when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. . . . And fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them." Rev. 20:7-9. It is certain therefore that this earth is to be utterly empty and utterly spoiled of all human inhabitants during the millennium.

This time of ruin, of wasteness, and of desolation is "the great day of the Lord," so often spoken of in the Bible. Although the great day of the Lord is somewhat more than exactly a thousand years in length, yet the millennium is the greater part of that great day. The great day of the Lord begins about a year before the coming of Christ, that is, about a year before the one thousand years proper begin. It begins with the outpouring out of the first vial of the wrath of God, that is, the first of the seven last plagues, for the wine of the wrath of God is the seven last plagues (Rev. 14:9, 10; 15:1; 16:1-21); and at the last of the seven last plagues the great voice of God is heard saying, "It is done;" then Christ comes, the earth is made desolate, and is left empty for the thousand years; then follows

the resurrection and destruction of the wicked upon the burning earth. So that the great day of the Lord begins a short season before, and continues a short season after, the exact period of the one thousand years. Therefore as the millennium is the greater part of the great day of the Lord, whatever is said of the condition of the earth in the great day of the Lord, describes the condition of the earth during the millennium.

Of this time Joel exclaims, "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Then he speaks of "a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. . . And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army; for his camp is very great; for he is strong that executeth his word; for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" Joel 2:1-11. This is identical with Rev. 19:11-21, and this army is the same as "the armies which were in Heaven," and which "the armies which were in Heaven," and which "upon white horses" follow the King of kings and Lord of lords when he comes in his glory taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is certain, then, that the second coming of the Lord introduces a time of darkness and gloominess, and of clouds and thick darkness upon the earth.

This is further shown by Zephaniah: "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord; the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord; and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their flesh as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath; but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy; for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land." "I will utterly consume all things from off the land, saith the Lord. I will consume man and beast; I will consume the fowls of the heaven, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked; and I will cut off man from off the land, saith the Lord." Zeph. 1:14-18, 2, 3.

As the result of all this, the condition of the earth is as seen and described by Jeremiah:—

"I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down *at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce*

anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end. For this shall the earth mourn, and the heavens above be black; because I have spoken it, I have purposed it, and will not repent, neither will I turn back from it. The whole city shall flee for the noise of the horsemen and bowmen; they shall go into thickets, and climb up upon the rocks; every city shall be forsaken, and *not a man dwell therein.*" Jer. 4:23-29.

These scriptures certainly show that at the second coming of Christ, the earth will be swept with the besom of destruction, made empty, and left utterly desolate with not a man to dwell therein. More passages might be quoted to the same effect, but assuredly it is not necessary. If these passages do not make that point clear, what could make it so? If the Lord wanted to declare to men that at his second coming to this world, he would make the earth waste, and desolate, and empty, and leave it utterly without a man to dwell in it, how would it be possible for him to tell it more plainly or more strongly than he has told it in the texts cited? Compare Jer. 4:23:—"I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light,"—with Gen. 1:2,—"The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep,"—and it is seen that at the end of the world, that is, at the second coming of Christ, the earth is to be brought back to the waste, formless, and void condition in which it stood at the beginning, ere ever light shone on it. And so it will remain for a thousand years, and *such is the millennium upon the earth.*

Such *in reality* is the "millennium" to which the pulpit of these last days is looking as a time of peace and safety, as the time of its triumph in the conversion of the world; and with the hope of which it is deluding both itself and the world, for such a hope is like a spider's web.

J.

May 5, 1887

"Healdsburg College Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 17 , p. 266.

PURSUANT to the call of the trustees, the fifth annual session of the stockholders of Healdsburg College Corporation convened at the South Hall of Healdsburg College, Monday, April 18, 1887, at 10 A. M., to elect trustees for the ensuing year, and for the transaction of other College business.

FIRST MEETING

The president and secretary being absent the meeting was called to order by the acting president, Elder J. N. Loughborough. Elder A. T. Jones was chosen secretary *pro tem*. Upon a call for representatives of stock it was found that there were 540 shares represented personally and 859 by proxy, making 1,402 shares present out of the whole number of 2,222 shares issued.

Minutes of last meeting read and approved. Remarks were made by the chair upon the prosperity that has attended the College and its work during the year. Committees were appointed as follows:—

On Resolutions, E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, W. C. Grainger.

On Nominations, N. C. McClure, E. P. Daniels, W. S. Swayze. Adjourned till 3 o'clock P. M.

SECOND MEETING

Prayer by Elder McClure. Minutes of last meeting were read and approved. Additional stock was represented, amounting to 133 shares, making a total of 1,532. Reports of committees were called for. The Committee on Nominations reported, presenting for directors the ensuing year, the names of S. N. Haskell, J. N. Loughborough, W. C. White, John Morrison, S. Brownsberger, Joseph Leininger, and N. C. McClure. Ballots were distributed and 1,414 votes cast for the nominees. They were declared elected.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF HEALDSBURG COLLEGE FOR YEAR ENDING, APRIL 1, 1887

RESOURCES

Real estate,	\$31,175.00	
Personal property,	13,935.19	
Bills receivable,	2,270.83	
Accounts receivable,	3,738.90	\$51,129.92

LIABILITIES

Bills payable,	\$27,947.50	
Accounts payable,	4,173.47	
Present worth,	19,008.95	\$51,129.92
Worth April 5, 1886,	\$14,944.45	
Received on donations,	45.60	
Received on stock,	3,063.00	\$18,053.05
Net worth April 1, 1887,	19,008.95	
Net gain for the year,		\$965.90

The Committee on Resolutions presented the following:—

Resolved, That our

Resolved, That we very much regret that the ill health of Sister Sisley, who came to give instruction in missionary work, would not suffer her to . . . that we renew our request to the General Conference to send us a missionary teacher for our school next winter.

The resolutions were all quite fully discussed. It was remarked by the librarian of the Healdsburg Tract and Missionary Society that the good of the instruction that Sister Sisley was able to give what little time she was at the school, was plainly apparent in the work of the society, and that the loss that the cause on this coast has sustained by her sickness could not be overestimated.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted. After their adoption, a motion was made that the second resolution be submitted to the congregation. The motion was carried, and the resolution was adopted by a rising vote of the whole house. The meeting then adjourned.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH, *Acting Pres.*

A. T. JONES, *Sec. pro tem.*

May 19, 1887

"Persecution or Nothing" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 19 , pp. 295, 296.

THE National Reform party has by resolution affirmed, and even re-affirmed, that their work does not tend in the least degree to a union of Church and State; that it does not threaten the liberty of any people, but that, on the contrary, it will furnish the strongest safeguard to the liberties, both civil and religious, of all citizens; but their actions contradict their words. And not only so, their words contradict themselves. This can be clearly seen by anyone who will read the publications of the National Reform Association. The fact of the matter is, that under their National Reform Constitution, there would be no real liberty at all, either civil or religious. The *Christian Statesman* says:—

"Enforce upon all that come among us, the laws of Christian morality."

To *enforce* is *to force*; to constrain; *to compel*; this, then, being interpreted, means, force all, compel all,—infidels, atheists, Jews, heathen,—to keep the laws of "Christian morality." Says Rev. W. J. Coleman, one of the secretaries of the Association:—

"The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logical consistent infidel."

They propose first to force all to keep the laws which they shall establish as being those of Christian morality; then those who will not be forced, will be disfranchised. And then what? Oh, the gradation is easy. Rev. E. B. Graham says:—

"If the opponents of the Bible [that is, the National Reform views of the Bible] do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own, on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

That is pretty heavy, but there is one more step that could be taken, and it *is* taken. Rev. Jonathan Edwards says:—

"Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

The "true inwardness" of this last can be the more

296

readily appreciated when it is understood that this reverend gentleman defines atheism to be whatever opposes National Reform.

The liberty, then, which the National Reformers propose to guarantee to every man is the liberty to do as *they* say, and the liberty to conform to what *they* shall establish as Christianity and morality. And *that* is a kind of liberty that is strictly compatible with absolute tyranny. Such liberty as that the Papacy at the height of its power was willing and anxious to grant. Indeed, of that kind of liberty the Inquisition was the best conservator that the world has ever seen.

And when we read these things, and many others of like import, in the National Reform literature, and, in view of them, express our fears that religious intolerance and persecution will be the inevitable consequence of the success of the National Reform movement, they seem to think is passing strange. To them it seems only "folly and fanaticism" that anybody should harbor any such fears. Then they come cooing like a dove: "Why you need have no fears at all; we would not hurt a hair of your heads." But the sentiments expressed in the above quotations are spoken with too much earnestness, and are received with too much favor in the National Reform Conventions, for us to allow any weight whatever to such honeyed phrases as that we need have no fears, and, they would not hurt a hair of our heads. But even if we had all pleasant words and fair speeches on their part, and had none of these plain and forcible expressions of their real sentiments and feelings, we should be none the less assured that intolerance and persecution would be the result of the success of the National Reform party. First, because all history proves that such a thing is to be dreaded; and, secondly, because such a result is inseparable from the success of such a movement.

We repeat: *Intolerance and persecution are inseparable from the success of such a movement as is represented in the National Reform Association.* Their purpose is to place what they decide to be Christian laws, institutions, and usages, upon an undeniable *legal* basis in the fundamental law of the land. Such Christianity thereby becomes the law of the land; and the only point upon which turns the question of persecution or no persecution is, Will the law be enforced? If the law shall not be enforced, then their movement will be a failure; for, so far as any real, practical results are concerned, the whole matter would stand just as it does at present, and the present order of things is the cause of their sorest lamentations. But if the law shall be enforced, then there is persecution, for compulsory conformity to religious opinions is persecution. So the sum of the matter is this: If the laws which they shall establish shall not be enforced, their movement will be a failure. If those laws shall be enforced, then there will be persecution. And that the principles which they advocate will be enforced, if they obtain the power, is just as certain as that human nature is what it is, or that two and two make four.

A. T. J.

May 26, 1887

"An Image of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 20 , pp. 311, 312.

IN the Pittsburg National Reform Convention of 1885, President Brunot said:—

"The first amendment of the Constitution, which provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' was never intended to *de-Christianize* the nation, as some now hold, but, on the contrary, was meant to keep it Christian and free. First, by guarding against the establishment of a church or sect; and second, against the restrictive legislation in case the power to enact laws should fall into the hands of the enemies of all religion.—*Christian Statesman, April 20, 1885.*

Very good. It is plain therefore that any interference or change in that amendment would tend to *de-Christianize* the nation, and to prevent its being free. As that amendment guards against the establishment of a church, to change the amendment would open the way for the establishment of a church. As that amendment guards against restrictive legislation by the enemies of all religion, should they have the power to legislate so, to change the amendment would open the way for the enemies of all religion to restrict or abolish the practice of the Christian religion in this nation.

But to change that amendment and so to open the way for these evils, is precisely what that association, of which Mr. Brunot is president, proposes to do. Thus says "Secretary" W. J. Coleman:—

"The first sentence of Article I of Amendments reads: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This would be made consistent with the proposed [National Reform] amendment by substituting the words 'a church' for 'religion,' making it read, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a church.' This is what the Reform Association believes should be the rule in a rightly constituted State. There should be religion, but no church.—*Statesman, November 1, 1883.*

By their own words, then, it is clearly the purpose of the National Reform Association to reverse the first amendment of the United States Constitution so as to allow Congress to make laws respecting an establishment of religion, and prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Therefore it stands proved that the work of the National Reform Association is to open the way for "the establishment of a church or sect," and for the destruction of the freedom of this nation.

For (1), The State recognition of Christianity in law—both constitutional and statutory—and the making of laws respecting and enforcing the principles of that religion, is that which the National Reform Association proposes to accomplish. But that is precisely what Constantine did in the fourth century, and *out of it grew*

the Papacy. And just as surely as the National Reformers succeed in doing with Christianity in this nation, what Constantine did with it in the Roman State, so surely will it follow that out of their action will grow the living image of the Papacy. Nothing can prevent it, because—

(2) In the day when, by their proposed change in the first amendment of the Constitution, the National Reformers put it into the power and make it the province of Congress to make laws respecting religion, or prohibiting its free exercise, that very day they open wide the gates and give free course to the enemies of all religion, and to the enemies of Christianity in particular, just as soon as they can secure the power to make laws restricting or even prohibiting the free exercise of the Christian religion.

And when the way is thus opened for the enemies of the Christian religion to oppress it, as soon as they can secure the power, everybody knows that they will secure the power, at the earliest possible moment. Everybody also knows that the enemies of Christianity have no compunctions of conscience in the matter, and that they will leave no means unemployed, that they will stop at nothing, to secure the coveted power. Therefore, if the National Reformers will maintain their cause in the conflict which they shall thus have opened, they will have to do it upon the field which they themselves have chosen—the field of politics—and with the weapons which *their enemies* shall choose. They will have to meet political power with political power; they will have to meet force with force; bribery with bribery; intrigue with intrigue; chicanery with chicanery; hypocrisy with hypocrisy. This they will be compelled to do or else lose all they shall have gained, as soon as they shall have gained it.

This is precisely the course through which the Papacy was developed. And the long and constant practice of these bad methods, which the bishop of Rome was compelled to employ if the Christianity which he represented was to hold its position against its enemies and the ambitious rivals of its power—the practice of these bad methods it was which made the Papacy what it is, "the very masterpiece of human wisdom," and the most complete of all contrivances that have ever been "devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind." And if the National Reformers succeed in securing the changes in our Constitution which they propose, then by the practice of these bad methods which *they* will be compelled to employ to successfully cope with the enemies of the Christian religion, there will be developed in free America a perfect likeness of the Papacy.

On the other hand, having secured those changes in the Constitution; having empowered Congress to make laws respecting religion; and having entered upon this political contest to determine what kind of a Congress it shall be which shall make the laws respecting religion; then if the National Reformers do *not* employ the like methods with their political opponents, they will be defeated, the seats in Congress will be filled with the enemies of religion, and so the Christian religion in free America, its happiest home on earth, will be sold into the hands of its bitterest enemies, waiting to destroy.

In the one case, free Christianity will be enslaved; in the other her beautiful form will be marred and her fair name dishonored; and in either case the unkindest thrust of all will be by the traitorous hand of National Reform. For a

traitorous hand it is, because, under the first amendment of the Constitution, *as it is*, Christianity is forever safe from all her enemies, and forever free in free America. With the first amendment of the United States Constitution as it is, the presidential chair and every seat in Congress might be filled with the worst infidels and the most bitter enemies of Christianity that are in the land, and Christianity could not be molested or disturbed in the least degree. But with that amendment changed as the National Reformers propose to change it, then in the filling of the presidential chair and of each seat in Congress, Christianity would have just cause for fear, because there would be no means of knowing whether those who gain the seats were really her friends or her enemies; and with a bare majority of the enemies of Christian-

312

ity in congressional seats, every Christian in the land would be in danger of losing the dearest rights known to man. Traitorous, therefore, would be the hand of any but an avowed enemy of Christianity, that would attempt to break down this safeguard of Christianity in the United States; but to sweep away this safeguard is what the National Reform Association, under the guise of the Christian name, declares that it is its purpose to do, and therefore most traitorous is the hand of National Reforms.

One or the other of these evils will inevitably follow the success of National Reform in its designs upon the United States Constitution. The certain consequence will be either that Christianity will be delivered into the hands of open infidelity and atheism, or else there will be developed a new form of the Papacy to meet, and successfully contend with, the open enemies of Christianity. As to which of these forms of evil would be the worst we can form no opinion. Of the former we have an illustration in the French Revolution; of the latter we have an illustration in the Inquisition, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, and the Crusade against the Albigenses.

Yet, although we can form no opinion as to which would be the worst, we *can* form an opinion as to which form would rule—and ruin. We are fully persuaded that it would be the image of the Papacy. We are assured of this because we are satisfied that the National Reform Association, on its own part, would prove itself fully equal to the task of outdoing the open enemies of Christianity in all the political methods they might employ; and this assurance is made doubly sure, by the confessed fact that National Reform will be in close alliance with the Papacy itself. Read this:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."—*Christian Statesman*, December 11, 1884.

And this:—

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for 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."—Rev. S. F. Scovel, *Christian Statesman*, August 31, 1881.

And the National Reform Association, inspired and supported by the Papacy, can outdo political atheism in all the politically atheistic methods that they can employ. The Roman Church has had sixteen hundred years' practice "in resisting the progress of political atheism," and there is not a political method known to the human race, of which she is not the consummate mistress. In her presence all the political atheists in Christendom must hide their diminished heads. This is why we are certain that the success of National Reform will be to develop a new form of the Papacy. For with this alliance with Rome which the National Reformers are so anxious to complete—so anxious, indeed, that they will make repeated advances and suffer repeated rebuffs—when, under their reformed Constitution, the political conflict comes on between National Reform and the enemies of all religion, the "Reformers" will be thoroughly furnished unto all bad works. If bribery is demanded, Rome can furnish scores of eminent examples among the Popes, and ages of practice among all classes from kings and emperors to peasants and beggars. If mob violence or military force becomes necessary to the success of a candidate for office, Rome is likewise an adept in this, as the election of Pope Damasus and of many of his successors abundantly proves. If intrigue, treachery, fraud, and the most secret and deceptive wire-working are required, there are the Jesuits, whom Leo XIII. has lately restored to all their rights and privileges, and has thus prepared this strong support to National Reform.

We might follow these lines and extend these illustrations to almost any required length, but these points are sufficient to show to all thinking men that out of the success of National Reform there can come no good thing, but only evil, and that continually and continually increasing. If any of the National Reformers object to the points which we have here made, let them not blame us, let them call to account the president of their association, and their district secretary, W. J. Coleman, whose statements, fairly quoted, we have only traced to their logical and inevitable consequences. If either President Brunot's or Secretary Coleman's statement in regard to the first amendment is not correct, let the National Reformers call *him* to account and correct *him*, not us. We have only reasoned upon the premises laid down by these leading officials of the National Reform Association; if the premises are not true, that is their fault, not ours—let them correct the premises and we will revise our conclusions. But if the premises *are* true, and we believe they *are*, then the demonstration is complete that the success of National Reform will assure in this nation the development of *a living image of the Papacy*.

J.

June 2, 1887

"Human Nature and Its Restraints" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 21 , pp. 326, 327.

LET anyone compare the two pictures drawn by Paul, the one in Rom. 1:28-31, of the iniquity of ancient heathenism, the other in 2 Tim. 3:1-8, of the iniquity of the last days, even among those who have "a form of godliness," and he will see that they are exactly alike. Human nature, unrestrained, is the same in all ages. Whether in the days of Christ, or two thousand years before, or two thousand years after; whether manifested in the habitants of Canaan, or in the inhabitants of the United States, it is always the same. It is for this very reason that the Bible fits men, wherever on the earth it may find them. It is a book not for one tribe only, nor for one class, nor for one nation, but for the human race. *And it is the only book in the world that is.* The reason for that is, that the book was given by One who knows human nature in its very essence.

God made man upright. But he turned from the bright course which God set before him; he sinned, and so sold himself to do evil; and not the sublime powers which the Lord bestowed upon him, to be exerted in the way of righteousness, are prostituted to evil; his "course is evil," and his "force is not right." If ever, then, man shall be raised from his fallen state, if ever his lapsed powers shall be restored, it is indispensable that the tendency of every faculty be restrained, turned into the right course, and trained to follow it. The Bible meets this necessity; it meets it in every part, and satisfies it to the full. Therefore, this of itself is proof that *the Creator of man is the author of the Bible.*

Human nature being the same everywhere, the only thing that makes one person to differ from another *is the degree of restraint* each one recognizes in his own case. If, in a person, all the restraints of the law of God are recognized, he will be a man fitted for the society and fellowship of the angels. If, on the contrary, none of these are recognized, he will be a man fit only for the society and fellowship of demons. Upon many persons, and in many ways, these restraints exert themselves unconsciously, as in the case of the infidel, who denies the authority or the existence of God, and despises his word. Yet the principles of that word are so imbedded in the society of which he is a member that he yields obedience to them, while he thinks he is defying them; but transplant him to the state of society which he advocates, where none of these principles are recognized, and none exerted, and he will run as readily in the way of iniquity as the veriest heathen that ever dwelt in the land of Canaan. And that other class of persons who call themselves "Christians", or even "Christian ministers," who, in their opposition to the obligations of the ten commandments, can hardly frame sentences that will sufficiently express the bitterness of their contempt for the law of God, only let the time come when such seed shall have borne its fruit, when society in following such teaching shall have reached that condition which would be defined in the very opposite of the ten commandments, and they will go as greedily in that evil way as did Balaam of old.

Again, many will restrain themselves from *doing* evil through fear of punishment; but take away the prospect of punishment, or satisfy them that there will be none, and they will go to any length that circumstances may allow. Henry

VIII., although he regarded not God, as long as he feared the Pope did not dare to divorce his wife, but when he had broken through that restraint, he *cut off the heads of*

327

three wives, and only a witty speech saved the head of the fourth.

There is another course by which men reach the same state of cruelty. That is, not by denying the existence of God, but by making themselves the depositaries of what they choose to define as his will, and then holding themselves as the sole expositors and executors of that will. As in every single instance it is only *their own will* which is thus exalted to the supremacy, and therefore is of only human authority, the only way in which it can be enforced is by human enactment; and then instead of being simply executors, they make themselves *executioners* in carrying into effect their arbitrary will. Making their own will supreme, and themselves the sole interpreters of that will, even though they claim it to be the will of God, they just as veritably put themselves beyond restraint as do the men who deny God outright. Both classes reach the same point, and both commit the same enormous crimes, the one illustrated in the fearful orgies of the Reign of Terror, the other illustrated in the terrible torments of the Inquisition.

And now at this hour of the nineteenth century, and in our own country, under the profession of National Reform, the harlot daughters of the Papacy are preparing to revive the spirit and times of the mother. For when, by constitutional authority, they, after the *similitude* of the Papacy, shall have acquired a *power* similar to the Papal, they will be in position to commit *excesses* similar to those of the Papacy. Human nature without restraint, in these, is as ruinous as in those. True, they would comfort us with the assurance that they will not hurt a "hair of" our "heads." But as we know that it is a giant's power which they want, so we know, by human nature as portrayed in human history, that when they get it, they will use it like a giant.

The Scriptures confirm all that this investigation suggests. In the beginning of this article we cited Rom. 1:28-31 as the description of the ancient heathendom, and 2 Tim. 3:1-8 as the description of the last days of modern Christendom, and we find them exactly alike. It is by resistance to the truth of God that men loosen its restraints upon them, and deliver themselves up to the sway of Satan. In the last days it is only those who "received not the *love of the truth* that they might be saved," in whom Satan works "with all power and signs and lying wonders." It is only those "who believe not the truth" but have "pleasure in unrighteousness," who become so deluded that they "believe a lie."

From the beginning of the world God has left no nation without witness. Acts 14:16, 17. By a *then* "present truth" he has witnessed to different ages. In obedience to that truth, and in the love of it, lay the salvation of the people in each respective age. In the last days God sends a message which reaches to the end of the world, and is therefore his last message to the world. It is the Third Angel's Message, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-16. The commandments of God are truth. Ps. 119:151. The faith of Jesus is the faith of him who is the truth. John 14:6. Both together

embrace the whole word of God, which is truth (John 17:17), and restrain men. "*Thou shalt not*" is the key-note of the commandments of God; "and if any man will come after me, *let him deny himself*," exclaims Jesus. Therefore the Third Angel's Message in holding forth the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" presents the summary of all those restraints which are demanded in checking and transforming the tendencies of human nature, and in leading them by the "right course," to goodness and to God. And when the world shall deliberately reject the Third Angel's Message, it thereby places itself beyond those restraints, and is then ready to be led captive by Satan *at his will*; and then it is that he works with all power in them that perish, "*because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.*" By the Third Angel's Message, the harvest of the earth will be ripened for good or for ill; for glory or for shame; to be gathered into the garner of God, or to be bound in bundles to be burned.

J.

June 9, 1887

"The Kansas Camp-meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 22 , pp. 343, 344.

THE Kansas State camp-meeting was held in Garfield Park, Topeka, May 18-24. The park is a beautiful place quite thickly covered with a natural growth of trees. The irregularity of the tents in the best of order, but the lack in this respect was amply made up by the pleasant shade. About five hundred people were encamped on the grounds. Elders I. D. Van Horn of Michigan, and R. M. Kilgore of Illinois and Brother C. Eldridge of Battle Creek, Michigan, were sent by the General Conference committee. There was a measure of disappointment that the meeting was deprived of the services of Elder Geo. I. Butler, president of the General Conference, but as it was known that sickness prevented his coming, there was tender sympathy expressed, and earnest prayer offered for him as he labors under the burden of the many cares of his office.

With the exception of one sermon, the preaching was done by Elders Van Horn and Kilgore and the writers. The preaching in the day-time was particularly designed toward the wants of our own people, in the endeavor to impress them with a sense of the time in which we live, the dangers which threaten us, and the preparation in heart and life that is essential in the case of everyone who will stand before the Saviour when he comes. Sabbath, or course, was a day of special effort in this direction, and God came very near and gave victory. The day was made one of partial fasting—nothing being eaten after breakfast—and was faithfully observed as such by the entire camp. At 11 o'clock A.M. Elder Kilgore gave a most searching discourse from Mal 3:1-5, on the Investigative Judgment, and the importance of being ever ready, or in such an hour as we think not our cases will be passed, and we found wanting, our probation forever closed, and the awful word be pronounced, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still."

After the sermon a call was made for "them that were turned back from the Lord, and those that had not sought the Lord nor inquired for him." All the seats prepared were soon filled, and as there seemed to be such an earnest desire to draw near to God, the call was extended to all who would to come. Almost the whole congregation was moved. The main aisle of seats was soon filled, and the overflow filled the front seats of the side aisles. Then after some instruction on the subject of confession, and putting away of sin, the time was given to those who had confession to make. The response was general and free. There was not the least urging of excite-

344

ment, but there was a deep sorrow for sins committed, and an earnest longing for forgiveness, and for the application of the cleansing power of the precious blood of the Redeemer. It has seldom been our lot to see deeper conviction, or greater searching of heart, or more honest confessions. There seemed to be a disposition to care for nothing but to do right and be right with God, and that nothing should stand in the way, but that every sin should be searched out and put away forever. With a short intermission, this good work continued till the close of the day, and it was felt by all that an immense gain for godliness had been made.

The evening sermons and those of Sunday were devoted to subjects more adapted to the outside interest, which was good throughout the meeting. A heavy shower interfered with the attendance Sunday forenoon, but in the afternoon and evening there was a great crowd of people present, who gave the closest attention to the word spoken, and good impressions were made in favor of the truth. Monday afternoon a discourse was given by Elder Van Horn on the subject of baptism, after which the audience adjourned to the stream that flowed by the grounds, and twenty-two willing souls were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Brother Eldridge conducted a class in canvassing, throughout the meeting. Instructions were given on the subject every day, sometimes to the whole congregation, at others to the canvassers themselves and whoever chose to attend. These "talks" and instructions were among the best sermons of the meeting, and nearly a hundred canvassers now go forth in Kansas alone, to carry the truth to every house in the State. We pray that God may hasten the day when it shall be that not only a hundred but *hundreds* shall so go forth not only in Kansas but in every State and Territory in the Union.

Elder Kilgore was called by telegram to the capital of Illinois, on account of the Sunday law, which was to be made the special order in both the House and Senate of the Illinois Legislature, on Tuesday, May 24, and had to leave the camp-meeting at 2:30 A.M. Monday. The Illinois Sunday law, as proposed by the preachers of Chicago, is a terrible statute, and it was important that all be done that could be to obtain a recognition of the rights of conscience of those who observe the Sabbath.

Monday night a discourse was given by the writer, pointing out the dangers that now threaten the liberties of American citizens in the coming union of Church and State. The attendance was large, the attention was excellent, and we believe

that impressions were made that will tell for the truth in the coming conflict which is fast approaching.

Tuesday morning Brother Page was ordained to the work of the gospel ministry. Prayer by Elder J. H. Cook, charge by Elder I. D. Van Horn. And so closed the Kansas camp-meeting of 1887, which will be held long in grateful remembrance to God for the rich blessings there bestowed by him in his mercy. It was a precious occasion. We are sure that both ministers and people will go to their homes and to their work with increased faith and courage, and that the work of God in that State will prosper accordingly. The Kansas Conference has a large force of young men, who can be a power for good if only they will study hard, and work hard, build upon the Foundation broad and strong, consecrating all their powers to God and to the work in which they are engaged; and we believe there is in all an earnest purpose to do this.

As Elder J. H. Cook, who has been president of this Conference for several years, had been called by the General Conference to labor in Kentucky, his official connection with the Kansas Conference closed at this meeting. Elder Cook's labors in Kansas have been greatly blessed of God, and a strong Conference has been built up there, consisting now of about 2,000 members. He has become greatly endeared to the hearts of the brethren in Kansas, and it was hard for them to give him up, but they did it cheerfully, and many prayers will go with him to his work in Kentucky.

There were nearly a hundred Germans present, for whose benefit separate meetings were held under the charge of Elder H. Shultz, of Nebraska. Brother Shultz's report will be found in another column.

J.

**"The Huguenots and St. Bartholomew's Day" *The Signs of the Times*
13, 22 , pp. 344-346.**

WE have received a request to give in our columns an account of—

"1. The Edict of Nantes—when and by whom made, when and by whom revoked, and what the consequences of the revocation?

"2. The Huguenots—why so called?

"3. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's."

These questions all refer to the same people—the Huguenots—and to view them in their proper connection we shall have to take up the second point first, then the third, and the first one last. First,

THE HUGUENOTS—WHY SO CALLED

The Huguenots were the *French* Protestants of the Reformation period. The term *Huguenots* was a nickname first applied to them by the enemies of Protestantism, but which became their acknowledged title, even as the term Christian with the early disciples of the Lord, and the term Methodist with Wesley and his companions. As for the term itself, it is of uncertain origin, and has been the subject of much controversy. The best account of its origin seems to be this:—

In the city of Tours there was a popular superstition that a hobgoblin, called in French *le roy Huguon*, roamed the streets of that city. And, of course, it was with him as with all other hobgoblins, ghosts, and spooks, he was seen only in the night, and did all his exploits in the night. Now as the first Protestants in France, as well as in other countries, dared not, at the peril of their lives, meet together except under the friendly cover of the darkness, it was an easy transition that attached to them the name of the great hobgoblin—*Huguon*—who moved about only in the dark. And so they were nicknamed *Huguenots*, and that title distinguished a people who bore the wrath of the Papacy for more than two hundred and seventy years, yet who at times became so numerous and powerful as to endanger the supremacy of the Catholic religion in France. In fact, the means by which France was held under the sway of the Catholic religion, was that of which the fullest illustration is furnished in that dreadful scenes of

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY

August 24, 1572. Charles IX. Was nominally king of France. He was scarcely more than an imbecile, and his mother, the terrible Catherine de Medici, ruled the kingdom in the spirit of a second Jezebel. Philip II. was king of Spain, and, through the Duke of Alva, was carrying on a perpetual St. Bartholomew's in the Netherlands. Gregory XIII. was Pope at the time of the massacred, but it had been plotted under the instructions of his immediate predecessor, Pius V. Catherine and the Duke of Guise were the leaders of the Catholics; Henry of Navarre, afterward King Henry IV. of France, and Admiral Coligny were the leaders of the Huguenots. As Catherine, by years of open war, had failed to destroy, or even to very much weaken, the Protestant cause, she determined to compass the destruction of the Huguenots by treachery and massacre. It was a deeply laid scheme. It had to be, for the object was the total extirpation of Protestantism in France. The first thing was to disarm the suspicion of the Huguenots. A very plausible means presented itself.

The year before, a war of three years had closed so favorably to the Huguenots that it was in their power to indicate the terms of peace, and the treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye was made August 8, 1570, by which they were guaranteed liberty of worship outside of Paris. Catherine now proposed a close alliance of the two parties, and they united to make an armed intervention in the Netherlands in aid of the Prince of Orange, and to relieve the Netherlands from the scourge of Philip of Spain. To seal the alliance, she proposed that Henry of Navarre should marry Margaret of Valois, Catherine's own daughter, sister to Charles IX.; and that Admiral Coligny should head the united expedition to the rescue of the Netherlands. This scheme was the most taking to the Huguenots because the marriage had been actually talked of while as yet Henry and Margaret were but children; and if by this they could secure peace in France, they would gladly help to bring deliverance to their Protestant brethren in Holland.

The Huguenots were thoroughly deceived. The marriage was accomplished August 18, 1572. "The four following days all Paris was occupied with *fêtes*,

ballets, and other public rejoicings. It was during these festivities that the final arrangements were made for striking the great meditated blow." The massacre was to begin Sunday morning, August 24, at daybreak. Friday afternoon an attempt was made to assassinate Admiral Coligny, but he was only wounded, though severely, in the right hand and the left arm. Friday night and Saturday were spent in more perfect preparation. Troops were brought into the city, and all the gates were closed, except two, which were left open for the introduction of provisions. As the dreadful hour drew near, the king faltered, but Catherine was prepared for that. She told him it was now too late to retreat, that their plans were known to the Protestants, and that now to hesitate was to be lost. She succeeded in rallying him, and he exclaimed with an oath: "Then let Coligny be killed, and let not one Huguenot in all France be left to reproach me with the deed." What followed, we shall tell in the words of Dr. Wylie, "History of Protestantism," book 17, chap. 16.

"It was now 11 o'clock of Saturday night, and the massacre was to begin at daybreak. Tavannes was sent to bid the Mayor of Paris assemble the citizens, who for some days before had been provided with arms, which they had stored in their houses. To exasperate them, and put them in a mood for this unlimited butchery of their countrymen, in which at first they were somewhat reluctant to engage, they were told that a horrible conspiracy had been discovered, on the part of the Huguenots, to cut off the king and the royal family, and destroy the monarchy and the Roman Catholic religion. The signal for the massacre was to be the tolling of the great bell of the Palace of Justice. As soon as the tocsin should have flung its ominous peal upon the city, they were to hasten to draw chains across the streets, place pickets in the open spaces, and sentinels on the bridges. Orders were also given that at the first sound of the bell torches should be placed in all the windows, and that the Roman Catholics, for distinction, should wear a white scarf on the left arm, and affix a white cross on their hats.

"All was now arranged,' says Maimbourg, 'for the carnage;' and they waited with impatience for the break of day, when the tocsin was to sound. In the royal chamber sat Charles IX., the Queen-mother, and the Duke of Anjou. Catherine's fears lest the king should change his mind at the last minute would not permit her to leave him for one moment. Few words, we may well believe, would pass between the royal personages. The great event that impended could not but weigh heavily upon them. A deep stillness reigned in the apartment; the hours wore wearily away; and the Queen-mother feeling the suspense unbearable, or else afraid, as Maimbourg suggests, that Charles, 'greatly disturbed by the idea of the horrible butchery, would revoke the order he had given for it,' anticipated the signal by sending one at two o'clock of the morning to ring the bell of St. Germain l'Auxerois, which was nearer than that of the Palace of Justice. Scarcely had its first peal startled the silence of the night

when a pistol shot was heard. The king started to his feet, and summoning an attendant he bade him go and stop the massacre. It was too late; the bloody work had begun. The great bell of the Palace had now begun to toll; another moment and every steeple in Paris was sending forth its peal; a hundred tocsins sounded at once; and with the tempest of their clamor there mingled the shouts, oaths, and howlings of the assassins. 'I was awakened,' says Sully, 'three hours after midnight with the ringing of all the bells, and the continued cries of the populace.' Above all were heard the terrible words, 'Kill, kill!'

"The massacre was to begin with the assassination of Coligny, and that part of the dreadful work had been assigned to the Duke of Guise. The moment

345

he heard the signal, the duke mounted his horse and, accompanied by his brother and three hundred gentlemen and soldiers, galloped off for the admiral's lodging. He found Anjou's guards with their red cloaks, and their lighted matches, posted round it; they gave the duke with his armed retinue instant admission into the court-yard. To slaughter the halberdiers of Navarre, and force open the inner entrance of the admiral's lodgings, was the work of but a few minutes. They next mounted the stairs, while the duke and his gentlemen remained below. Awakened by the noise, the admiral got out of bed, and wrapping his dressing-gown round him and leaning against the wall, he bade Merlin, his minister, join with him in prayer. One of his gentlemen at that moment rushed into the room. 'My lord,' said he, 'God calls us to himself!' 'I am prepared to die,' replied the admiral; 'I need no more the help of men; therefore, farewell, my friends; save yourselves, if it is still possible.' They all left him and escaped by the roof of the house. Coligny, his son-in-law, fleeing in this way was shot, and rolled into the street. A German servant alone remained behind with his master. The door of the chamber was now forced open, and seven of the murderers entered, headed by Behme of Lorraine, and Achille Petrucci of Sienna, creatures of the Duke of Guise. 'Art thou Coligny?' said Behme, presenting himself before his victim, and awed by the perfect composure and venerable aspect of the admiral. 'I am,' replied Coligny; 'young man, you ought to respect my grey hairs; but do what you will, you can shorten my life only by a few days.' The villain replied by plunging his weapon into the admiral's breast; the rest closing round struck their daggers into him. 'Behme,' shouted the duke from below, 'hast done?' 'Tis all over,' cried the assassin from the window. 'But M. d'Angoulême,' replied the duke, 'will not believe it till he see him at his feet.' Taking up the corpse, Behme threw it over the window, and as it fell on the pavement, the blood spurted on the faces and clothes of the two lords. The duke,

taking out his handkerchief and wiping the face of the murdered man, said, 'Tis he sure enough,' and kicked the corpse in its face. A servant of the Duke of Nevers cut off the head, and carried it to Catherine de Medici and the king. The trunk was exposed for some days to disgusting indignities; the head was embalmed, to be sent to Rome; the bloody trophy was carried as far as Lyons, but there all trace of it disappears.

"The authors of the plot having respect to the maxim attributed to Alaric, that 'thick grass is more easily mown than thin,' had gathered the leading Protestants that night, as we have already narrated, into the same quarter where Coligny lodged. The Duke of Guise had kept this quarter as his special preserve; and now, the admiral being dispatched, the guards of Anjou, with a creature of the duke's for their captain, were let loose upon this *battu* of ensnared Huguenots. Their work was done with a summary vengeance, to which the flooded state of the kennels, and the piles of corpses, growing ever larger, bore terrible witness. Over all Paris did the work of massacre by this time extend. Furious bands, armed with guns, pistols, swords, pikes, knives, and all kinds of cruel weapons, rushed through the streets, murdering all they met. They began to thunder at the doors of Protestants, and the terrified inmates, stunned by the uproar, came forth in their night-clothes, and were murdered on their own thresholds. Those who were too affrighted to come abroad, were slaughtered in their bed-rooms and closets, the assassins bursting open all places of concealment, and massacring all who opposed their entrance, and throwing their mangled bodies into the street. The darkness would have been a cover to some, but the lights that blazed in the windows denied even this poor chance of escape to the miserable victims. The Huguenot as he fled through the street, with agonized features, and lacking the protection of the white scarf, was easily recognized, and dispatched without mercy.

"The Louvre was that night the scene of a great butchery. Some 200 Protestant noblemen and gentlemen from the provinces had been accommodated with beds in the palace; and although the guests of the king, they had no exemption, but were doomed that night to die with others. They were aroused after midnight, taken out one by one, and made to pass between two rows of halberdiers, who were stationed in the underground galleries. They were hacked in pieces or poniarded on their way, and their corpses being carried forth were horrible to relate, piled in heaps at the gates of the Louvre. Among those who thus perished were the Count de la Rochefoucault, the Marquis de Renel, the brave Piles—who had so gallantly defended St. Jean D'Angely—Francourt, chancellor to the King of Navarre, and others of nearly equal

distinction. An appeal to the God of Justice was their only protest against their fate.

"By-and-by the sun rose; but, alas! who can describe the horrors which the broad light of day disclosed to view? The entire population of the French capital was seen maddened with rage, or aghast with terror. On its wretched streets what tragedies of horror and crime were being enacted! Some were fleeing, others were pursuing; some were supplicating for life, others were responding by the murderous blow, which, if it silenced the cry for mercy, awoke the cry for justice. Old men, and infants in their swaddling clothes, were alike butchered on that awful night. Our very page would weep, were we to record all the atrocities now enacted. Corpses were being precipitated from the roofs and windows, others were being dragged through the streets by the feet, or were piled up in carts, and driven away to be shot into the river. The kennels were running with blood. Guise, Tavannes, and d'Angoulême—traversing the streets on horseback, and raising their voices to their highest pitch, to be audible above the tolling of the bells, the yells of the murderers, and the cries and moanings of the wounded and the dying—were inciting to yet greater fury those whom hate and blood had already transformed into demons. 'It is the king's orders!' cried Guise. 'Blood, blood!' shouted out Tavannes. Blood! every kennel was full; the Seine as it rolled through Paris seemed but a river of blood; and the corpses which it was bearing to the ocean were so numerous that the bridges had difficulty in giving them passage, and were in some danger of becoming choked and turning back the stream, and drowning Paris in the blood of its own shedding. Such was the gigantic horror on which the sun of that Sunday morning, the 24th of August, 1572 — St. Bartholomew's Day—looked down.

"We have seen how Charles IX. stood shuddering for some moments on the brink of his great crime, and that, had it not been for the stronger will and more daring wickedness of his mother, he might after all have turned back. But when the massacre had commenced, and he had tasted of blood, Charles shuddered no longer he became as ravenous for slaughter as the lowest of the mob. He and his mother, when it was day, went out on the palace balcony to feast their eyes upon the scene. Some Huguenots were seen struggling in the river, in their efforts to swim across, the boats having been removed. Seizing an arquebus, the king fired on them. 'Kill, kill!' he shouted; and making a page sit beside him and load his piece, . . .

"For seven days the massacres were continued in Paris, and the first three especially with unabating fury. Nor were they confined within the walls of the city. In pursuance of orders sent from the court, they were extended to all provinces and cities where

Protestants were found. Even villages and châteaux became scenes of carnage. For two months these butcheries were continued throughout the kingdom. Every day during that fearful time the poniard reaped a fresh harvest of victims, and the rivers bore to the sea a new and ghastly burden of corpses. In Rouen above 6,000 perished; at Toulouse some hundreds were hewn to pieces with axes; at Orleans the Papists themselves confessed that they had destroyed 12,000; some said 18,000; and at Lyons not a Protestant escaped. After the gates were closed they fell upon them without mercy; 150 of them were shut up in the archbishop's house, and were cut to pieces in the space of one hour and a half. Some Roman Catholic, more humane than the rest, when he saw the heaps of corpses, exclaimed, 'They surely were not men, but devils in the shape of men, who had done this.'

"The whole number that perished in the massacre cannot be precisely ascertained. According to De Thou there were 2,000 victims in Paris the first day; Agrippa d'Aubigne says 3,000. Brantome speaks of 4,000 bodies that Charles IX might have seen floating down the Seine. La Popeliniere reduces them to 1,000. 'There is to be found, in the account-books of the city of Paris, a payment to the grave-diggers of the Cemetery of the Innocents, for having inferred 1,100 dead bodies stranded at the turns of the Seine near Chaillot, Antenil, and St. Cloud; it is probable that many corpses were carried still further, and the corpses were not all thrown into the river.' There is a still greater uncertainty touching the number of victims throughout the whole of France. Mezeray computes it at 25,000; De Thou at 30,000; Sully at 70,000; and Perefixe, Archbishop of Paris in the seventeenth century, raises it to 100,000; Davila reduces it to 10,000. Sully, from his access to official documents, and his unimpeachable honor, has been commonly reckoned the highest authority. Not a few municipalities and governors, to their honor, refused to execute the orders of the king. The reply of the Vicompte d'Orte has become famous. 'Sire,' wrote he to Charles IX., 'among the citizens and garrison of Bayonne, you have many brave soldiers, and loyal subjects, but not one hangman.' . . .

"At Rome, when the news arrived, the joy was boundless. The messenger who carried the dispatch was rewarded like one who brings tidings of some great victory.' On the following day the Pontiff went in procession to the Church of Minerva, where, after mass, a jubilee was published to all Christendom, 'that they might thank God for the slaughter of the enemies of the Church, lately executed in France.' A third time did the Pope go in procession, with his cardinals and all the foreign ambassador then resident at his court, and after mass in the Church of St. Louis, he accepted homage from the Cardinal of Lorraine, and thanks in the name of

the King of France, 'for the counsel and help he had given him by his prayers, of which he had found the most wonderful effects.'

"But as if all this had not been enough, the Pope caused certain more enduring monuments of the St. Bartholomew to be set up, that not only might the event be held in everlasting remembrance, but his own approval of it be proclaimed to the ages to come. The Pope, says Bonanni, 'gave orders for a painting, descriptive of the slaughter of the admiral and his companions, to be made in the hall of the Vatican by Georgio Vasari, as a monument of vindicated religion, and a trophy of exterminated heresy.' These representations form three different frescoes.—'The king approves Coligny's slaughter!

"The better to perpetuate the memory of the massacre, Gregory caused a medal to be struck, the device on which, as Bonanni interprets it, inculcates that the St. Bartholomew was the joint result of the Papal counsel and God's instrumentality. On the one side is a profile of the Pope, surrounded by the words—*Gregorius XIII., Pont. Max., an. 1*. On the obverse is seen an angel bearing in the one hand a cross, in the other a drawn sword, with which he is smiting a prostrate host of Protestants; and to make all clear, above is the motto: *Ugoniottorum strages, 1572*—'The slaughter of the Huguenots, 1572.'"

Bishop Foss of the M. E. Church, now possess one of these medals. The account of the Edict of Nantes, we defer will next week. J.

June 16, 1887

"The Edict of Nantes" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23 , pp. 359, 360.

WHEN the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day was over it was expected by its authors that Protestantism in France was forever a thing of the past. In many of the cities and villages in the open country there was not a Huguenot left to breathe; but in the mountains the destruction was not so thorough, and before the first anniversary of the massacre came round, the Huguenot cause was almost as strong as it had been before that terrible day. When the anniversary came—August 24, 1573—the Huguenots met and drew up new demands, which they at once presented to the king. They sent delegates who "boldly demanded, in the name of the whole body of Protestants, to be replaced in the position they occupied before St. Bartholomew's Day, and to have back all the privileges of the pacification of 1570. The king was so taken aback that he did not know what to say. Catherine, pale with anger, burst out with: "What! although the Prince of Condé had been still alive, and in the field with 20,000 horse and 50,000 foot, he would not have dared to ask half of what you now demand."

Charles IX. died May 30, 1574, and his brother, the Duke of Anjou, became king of France, under the title of Henry III. He began his reign by issuing an edict

commanding all his subjects to conform to the religion of Rome or leave the kingdom. But the Government had not the power to enforce the decree, and its principal effect was to give the Huguenots full warning that the sword of St. Bartholomew's Day still hung over their heads. Henry of Navarre now became the great leader of the Huguenots. There also arose what was called the State party, who, although they were Romanists, revolted at the policy of extermination pursued by the court, which was bringing the State nearer and nearer to the brink of ruin. These case their influence on the side of the Huguenots, and thus re-enforced, the Protestants renewed their demands and the court had to grant all that they asked.

Besides certain matters of a political nature, it was granted that "the public exercise of the Reformed religion should be authorized throughout the kingdom; that the provincial Parliaments should consist of an equal member of Roman Catholics and Protestants; that all sentences passed against the Huguenots should be annulled; that eight towns should be placed in their hands as a material guarantee; that they should have a right to open schools, and to hold synods; and that the States-General should meet within six months to ratify this agreement. This treaty was signed May 6, 1576. Thus within four years after the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, the Protestants, whom it was supposed that that massacre had exterminated, had all their former rights conceded to them, and in ampler measure."

At this the extreme Catholics took new alarm and formed "The League," whose immediate aim was to prevent the execution of the terms of the treaty just signed, and in the end to accomplish the purpose designed by the massacre—the extirpation of the Huguenots. The king after some hesitation, went over to the side of the League, and to make himself secure with that party, swept away the treaty, by revoking all the privileges of the Protestants and once more commanding them to give up their religion or leave the kingdom. War followed, and the Huguenots, under the brilliant leadership of Henry of Navarre, held their own against the armies of the League and the king. It was soon seen, however, that the principal step in the accomplishment of the grand and ultimate purpose of the League was the establishment of the Duke of Guise upon the throne of the kingdom. This at once set the duke and the king at swords' points, each seeking to entrap and kill the other. The king succeeded and the Duke of Guise was slain. This turned all the Catholics into bitter enemies of the king; the Pope excommunicated him, and he went over to Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots. He was soon afterward assassinated by a monk, Jacques Clement by name. The death of King Henry III. was the extinction of his royal race, and the throne of France fell by right of succession to *King Henry of Navarre, the leader of the Huguenots.*

But, although the throne of right belonged to Henry, all the extreme Catholics, from the Pope downward, were opposed to his occupying it unless he would declare himself of the communion of Rome. At first he nobly answered: "Would it be more agreeable to you to have a godless king? Could you confide in the fait of an atheist? and in the day of battle would it add to your courage to think that you followed the banner of a perjured apostate?" But the Catholics were determined

and Henry was not; they hedged him about with difficulties, he thought he saw the throne slipping from under him, and he began to temporize. He tried to be both Romanist and Huguenot at once. He concluded an arrangement with the Catholics in which it was agreed that he should have six months' instruction in both creeds, and at the end of that time he would make his choice.

The period of six months was drawn out to four years, and Henry's throne was no more secure than it was at the first. He however had had four years of practice in duplicity. In fact it is extremely doubtful whether he ever had any real godliness. His mother was a Huguenot and a sincere Christian. He had grown up under Huguenot influence, and his sympathies were with them of course, but when the subject came to the test and he had to choose between principle, the genuine spirit of the gospel of truth, was not in him. And so Sunday morning, July 25, 1593, he went to the Church of St. Denis and knocked at the cathedral door. "The Bishop of Bourges, at the head of a train of prelate and priests, met him and demanded to know the errand on which the king had come. Henry made answer, "To be admitted into the Church of Rome." He was straightway led to the altar, and kneeling on its steps, he swore to live and die in the Romish faith." He also had to swear that he would endeavor to the utmost of his power, and in good faith, to drive out of his jurisdiction, and from the lands under his sway, all heretics denounced by the church.

360

Of course he never did it; he never intended to do it. His pretended conversion to Rome was nothing in the world but a piece of policy to gain the Catholics. And although the Huguenots suffered many hardships, Henry always secretly favored them and encouraged their organization.

The Huguenot council applied to Henry's government for the redress of their wrongs, and the restoration of Protestant rights and privileges. Four years passed away in these negotiations, disputes, and contentions more or less bitter, which descended in one instance to actual violence, when at last the whole matter came to a happy issue in

THE EDICT OF NANTES, APRIL 13, 1598

By this edict those who professed the so-called "Reformed religion" were to enjoy henceforth "full and complete" liberty of conscience, but with restricted liberty of worship. Lord's high-justiciary, of whom there were 3,500, were allowed to assemble with their families, their tenants, and those whom they chose to invite. Those of lower grade would not worship in assemblies of more than thirty persons. Huguenots were to be freely admitted to all colleges, schools, and hospitals; they might establish and maintain educational and charitable institutions of their own; and their religious books might be published in all places where their worship was authorized. They were made eligible to all public employments on equal terms with Catholics, and on taking office were not bound to take any oaths, or attend ceremonies that would offend their consciences. Special courts were established, which should have jurisdiction in all cases arising between Catholics and Huguenots. Beside the worship of the land

owners, named above, the Huguenot worship was legalized in one town or village in each bailage. But at the court of the sovereign, at Paris and within a radius of fifteen miles all round it, and in all military camps, except in the personal quarters of a Protestant general, the Reformed worship was absolutely prohibited. It was also directly prohibited, by special arrangement, in many cities and towns. The Huguenots were enjoined to show outward respect to the Catholic religion; to observe all the Catholic holy days; and to pay tithes to the clergy. Their provincial assemblies were to be at once dissolved, but the king was to license the holding of a representative synod once in three years, with the privilege of addressing the crown on their condition, and petitioning for redress of grievances. They were confirmed in the possession, for eight years, of all the cautionary towns that had been granted in the treaty of 1577; and the expense of the Huguenot garrisons was met by a grant of 80,000 crowns—about 2,000,000 francs of the present day—a year from the royal treasury.

Such was the "full and complete liberty of conscience" granted by the Edict of Nantes. But yet it was a precious boon to the hunted Huguenots. They now had a *legal existence*. At this time there were in France seven hundred and sixty Huguenot churches, and under the edict they soon began to fill France with flourishing manufactures and a valuable trade. They were excellent farmers; they manufactured silk, velvet, paper, and a great number of other articles. But it was not manufactures and trade alone that they spread over France. Much better than all this was the moral vigor which they instilled into the people, and by which society was renewed. "Honesty, purity, and mental culture supplanted the barren dreams of chivalry and the corruption and indolence of the Catholic rule." "To be as 'honest as a Huguenot,'" became a proverb.

Under this edict the Huguenots prospered till 1660, when Louis XIV. abolished the representative synods. In 1669 he abolished the special courts. In 1679 the doors of all public employments were closed to Huguenots. Children of seven years were empowered to change their religion against their parents' will, and "a word, a gesture, or a look," was sufficient evidence that a child intended to abjure "the religion," and to facilitate such abjuration a system of purchasing conversions was established. The dragoons were quartered upon the Huguenots, "ruining the well-to-do, maltreating old men, women, and children, striking them with their sticks or the flat of their swords, hauling off Protestants in the churches by the hair of their heads, harnessing laborers to their own plows, and goading them like oxen." "Those who could fly left France, at the risk of being hanged if the attempt happened to fail." These persecutions went on for six years, growing worse and worse till

THE EDICT OF NANTES WAS TOTALLY REVOKED

October 15, 1685. The edict of revocation ordered that all chapels that remained standing should be demolished; interdicted all Protestant assemblies or worship; all disobedient ministers were ordered to leave the kingdom within fifteen days; all new-born babies were to be sprinkled by the parish priest; and all Huguenots were forbidden to leave the kingdom, under penalty of sentence to

the galleys for men, and confiscation of person and property for women. The superintendent of Rouen declared: "The will of the king is that there be no more than one religion in this kingdom; it is for the glory of God and the well-being of the State." And two hours were allowed for the Reformers of Rouen in which to make their abjuration and become Catholics. Of course the effect of the revocation was only to let loose the full tide of persecution once more.

"A wide scene of horror spread over the flourishing realm. Every Huguenot dwelling was invaded by fierce dragoons, the wealth of the industrious Reformers was snatched from them by the indolent and envious Catholics; the manufactories were deserted; flourishing cities sunk into ruin; and such crimes were perpetrated by the savage soldiers of Louis as can only be paralleled in the various persecutions instigated by the Popes of Rome. Yet the king and his courtiers found only a cruel joy in the sufferings of the people. Even literature the faded product of the corrupt age, celebrated Louis as the destroyer of heresy; and the infamous band of gifted preachers who adorn and disgrace this period of human woe, united in adoring the wisdom of their master, and the piety of the Jesuits. Bossuet, with rare eloquence and singular inhumanity, triumphed in the horrors of persecution; Massillon repeated the praises of the pitiless Louis; FIÈchier, the pride of the Romish pulpit, exulted in the dreadful massacres; Bourdaloue was sent to preach in the bleeding and desolate provinces, and obeyed without remonstrance; and the whole Catholic priesthood were implicated in the fearful crimes of that fatal period. The wise, the good, the gentle Huguenots became the prey of the vile, the cruel, and the proud."

"Hundreds of factories were destroyed, many villages were deserted, many large towns half depopulated, and great districts of the richest land in France became once more a wilderness. At Tours, of forty thousand persons employed in the silk manufacture, scarcely four thousand remained, the population of Nantes was reduced one-half; it is estimated that one hundred thousand persons perished in Languedoc alone, one-tenth of them by fire, strangulation, or the rack! Such was the victory of the faith over which Massillon, Bossuet, and Bourdaloue broke forth into loud applause; for which they celebrated the miserable king, with whose vices they were perfectly familiar, as the restorer of the church. 'Let our acclamations ascend to Heaven,' said Bossuet, 'let us greet this new Constantine, this exterminator of the heretics, and say, "King of Heaven, preserve the king of earth."' 'At the first blow dealt by the great Louis,' cried Massillon over the general massacre, 'heresy falls, disappears, and bears its malice and its bitterness to foreign lands.'

"Rome and the Pope, too, were eloquent in congratulation over the ruin of the working-classes of France. *Te Deums* were sung;

processions moved from shrine to shrine; the Pope addressed a letter to Louis filled with his praises. The whole Romish Church rejoiced in the slaughter of the heretics. Public thanksgivings were offered at Paris; medals were struck to commemorate the fortunate event; a brazen statue was erected to Louis on the Hùtel de Ville, with a brief Latin inscription, 'To the asserter of the dignity of kings and of the church.' During the Revolution it was converted into cannon, to be aimed against the throne and the priesthood.

"There now occurred in the course of their annals that wonderful spectacle of heroism and devotion, the flight of the Huguenots from France. The pure, the wise, the good, the noble, the wealthy, or the poor, animated by a common resolution to preserve their faith at the cost of all they held dear, resolved to abandon their native land and throw themselves upon the charity of strangers. From every part of France, in mournful processions, in secret, by night, in strange disguises, and in fearful sufferings and dangers, great companies of men, women, children, made their way to the frontiers. No severity could restrain them; no offers of emolument or favors could induce them to accept the Romish creed. Louis and his priestly advisers dispatched the fierce dragoons in pursuit of the fugitives, and filled the galleys and the prisons with their helpless captives. The unparalleled enormities inflicted upon the flying Huguenots can scarcely be described in history."

J.

"What Absurd Thing Shall Come Next?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 23 , pp. 360, 361.

WE had often head of the mind-cure theory, but now we see it. We always thought it was a mess of nonsense, but now we know that such only it is. We have before us the "formula" by which prescriptions are to be compounded for the cure of all diseases that humanity is heir to. What? "humanity" did we say? Oh, no, there is no humanity! It is all divinity. And "diseases" did we say? It is all a mistake. There is no such thing as disease, nor ache, nor pain—all this is a hoax. You get your finger caught as in a vice; it is not pinched, it does not hurt—it can't hurt, for don't you know that "matter has no life, and is insensible to pain or pleasure?" You only believe it hurts, and that is all. In fact matter "has no real existence" anyhow, and how can anything be really affected that has no real existence? "Matter is only an appearance like an image in a mirror;" and do you suppose that your reflection in a mirror could have its hand cut with a buzz-saw, or its finger mashed with a hammer? Do you suppose its tooth or head ever aches? Does it ever have the dyspepsia or neuralgia? Why, of course not. Well, then, are you so lost to all true ideas of sense or perception as not to know that "you are not material," and that that about you which appears to be matter "is only an appearance like an image in a mirror"? And are you so dull as to suppose that an appearance can ache, or swell, or be inflamed, or be sick? If you are, you

must get bravely over all that, for "pain and sickness exist only as beliefs, and come from consulting the appearance instead of clinging to the reality?"

Gentle reader, do you wonder whether we are not just "making this up"? Do you wonder whether there is anybody in this wide world who would put forth in sober earnest, and apparently with the expectation of being believed, such utter senselessness? If you do then you may safely lay aside all wonderment, for such is the case, and it is all sober fact. Let us proceed:—

"The belief you have entertained of neuralgia, constipation, hoarseness, etc., is a profound error from beginning to end."

We know better, for we have had them all—not all at once, but one or two at a time—and instead of it being only a belief that we had them, it was a painful reality.

"You are a spirit. . . you cannot commit sin, be sick, or die."

Wrong altogether. We are not spirit, we are flesh, subject to all the laws of flesh. We *can* commit sin, and are afraid we shall (especially if we read much more of this stuff), and we often have, and are sorry for it. We *can* be sick, and must be very careful that we be not, as thousands of people are. We *can* die, as everybody, except two persons, has died that ever has lived in this world, and multitudes are dying daily, and as multitudes shall die.

"You are perfectly well [yes, we are], ever have been [no, we have not], ever will be." Thank you

361

for the conclusion; hope we may be, yet we doubt it much.

"Jesus conquered all these beliefs in false seemings [that is, false, for he died], and was lifted up into a perfect person of the spiritual truth of being, and he said that if he was lifted up, he would draw all men unto him. Therefore, because he did reveal this Christ-life of spiritual truth to man, you have only to follow that thought of his in your thoughts to come, yourself realizing that you are perfectly well and cannot suffer from any inflamed nerves, or irritated vocal organs or bronchial tubes, which you call neuralgia and hoarseness; it is an illusion."

There, that is all we need to quote; there is much more to the same purpose, but this is enough. We can only say that if anything could possibly be more of "an illusion" than this theory of the mind-cure, we should like to know how any conception of it could be conveyed to the human mind. And when we realize that there are men and women who actually believe in such unmitigated nonsense as is set forth in this "formula," we confess that our confidence in human nature is just about in the last stages of dissolution, for after that what is there, or what can there be, that men may not believe. J.

June 23, 1887

"The Need of Evangelists" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24 , pp. 375, 376.

ONE of the associations of Congregationalist Churches in New England lately passed a resolution "objecting to the licensing as evangelists for home missionary service, of men who have not taken a full theological course." The *Christian Union* decidedly objects to this objection, saying that the colleges and theological seminaries cannot do more than supply the demand for pastors and teachers over established churches, because the graduates from these schools are barely more than enough to fill the vacancies caused by death and departure to non-clerical professions. But the strongest objection made by the *Union* is stated in the following words:—

"The education which culminates in a theological course does not prepare men for this evangelistic work. A young man who has spent three or four years in an academic course, four in college, and three in a theological seminary, is by the very process of such an education unfitted for the work of an evangelist. He is trained away from the people whom the evangelist wishes to reach. He is prepared to teach cultured Christian populations. The great evangelist of our times, Dwight L. Moody, not only did not have a college education, but it is safe to say would have been spoiled for his particular work if he had received such an education. We want in our great cities men of the people, educated with the people, accustomed not only to use the language but to think in the thought of the people. Scholastic training which is admirably adapted to prepare the teacher of an up-town church is equally admirably adapted to unfit a preacher to a street or a hall audience."

We do not doubt in the least that this is the exact truth of the matter. But what a deplorable condition of things it reveals? The highest effort to train men for the work of the gospel, only ends in unfitting them for that work! Ten or eleven years' study by a young man in a theological course undoes him! That is to say that the most thorough educational course furnished by the theological schools of the country, unfits a young man for the very work which, above all others, demands the most thorough and fully rounded education. And for the very good reason that "he is trained away from the people whom the evangelist wishes to reach." Now the evangelist wishes to reach all people, for so the Lord commanded, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Therefore no stronger indictment need ever be brought against the theological training of to-day to condemn it utterly, than that it trains men away from the people whom the evangelist wishes to reach. Such education is mis-education, and is worse than no education; such training is worse than no training. Any system of education or training that educates or trains men away from the common people is only a curse, for its only tendency is to develop pride, self-righteousness, and bigotry; its sole tendency is to Pharisaism.

"He is prepared to teach cultured Christian households," says the *Union*. That is to say that he is prepared to teach persons who are trained away from the people just as far as he is himself. But whoever cannot receive the kingdom of Heaven except as a graduate, will never receive the kingdom of Heaven at all. For, said Jesus: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom

of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." And whoever is trained to such a pitch that he is disqualified to present the kingdom of God so that it may be received thus, is trained away from the gospel of Christ. And if it be true that the "scholastic training which is admirably adapted to prepared the teacher of an up-town church is equally adapted to unfit a preacher to a street or hall audience," then the fact of the matter is that the "up-town church" is just as far estranged from the real gospel of Christ as is the street or hall audience.

The *Union* thinks that Dwight L. Moody "would have been spoiled for his particular work" if he had received a college education. We very much doubt it. We have an idea that Dwight L. Moody has common sense enough to have kept him from becoming so puffed up by the little knowledge that is imparted in a theological course, as to unfit him for helping common people to a knowledge of the gospel of Christ. Yet if the inevitable result of a college education be to unfit men for such work, then of course even Mr. Moody would have been unfitted by it. We venture the assertion, however, that nobody ever heard Dwight L. Moody say that a college education would have spoiled him for his particular work.

Is it then in truth better not to have a college education? Is it true that an uneducated man is better fitted for the work of the gospel? Not by any means. It is not one of the offices of the Spirit of God either to sanction or to sanctify ignorance. Nor does a lack of education commend a man even to uneducated people. There is nothing more interesting nor more attractive to uneducated people than to listen to an educated person speaking in a language that they can understand, and—not condescendingly nor patronizingly but, as it were—unconsciously adapting himself to their capacity. While on the other hand there is nothing that will repel the common people more quickly than to find a man talking to them in language entirely beyond the comprehension of anybody but a lexicographer, and with a manner that seems to be constantly saying, "I am a graduate in theology. I have been trained to teach cultured Christian households in 'up-town churches,' and it is a great condescension on my part to preach to 'a street or a hall audience.'" This last is precisely what makes so objectionable the college education of which the *Christian Union* speaks. The fault lies not at all against a college education, but against *such a system* of education.

There never was a more highly educated person on this earth than was Jesus of Nazareth, yet "the common people heard him gladly." True, his teach-

376

ing was not adapted to "cultured" Jewish households in "up-town" synagogues, but this was not the fault of either the matter or manner of his teaching. The fault lay in the proud hearts of the cultured up-town class. And everybody knows that if he had drunk in the spirit of the theological schools of his day, he too "would have been spoiled for his particular work," and he never would have been the Saviour of the world. The education of those schools was precisely such as the *Christian Union* says it is in these. It unfitted for evangelistic work every man that was taught there. Their students all "trained away from the people." There was a way, however, by which they could be brought back to the people, and taught "not only to use the language but to think in the thought of the people." That way was by *conversion*.

There is on record a notable instance of this, written, no doubt, as an example to be followed by these very theological schools that are now so admirably successful in unfitting men to preach the gospel. Saul of Tarsus was educated in the chief theological school, and by the chief theologian of his day. In that school he was trained so far away from the people whom the evangelists reached, that he thought he was doing God service by breathing out threatenings and slaughter against them and persecuting them unto strange cities. But he was converted after a while; then he became all things to all men, that he "might by all means save some." Though he was free from all, yet he made himself a servant to all that he might gain the most. He could preach in the street, or in a hall, just as well as in an "up-town" synagogue. He could preach to "pagan populations" just as easily as to "cultured" Jewish households. But whether he preached in the one place or in the other, he preached "Jesus Christ and him crucified." He preached "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." And although he was learned in all the wisdom of the schools, his speech and his preaching was not to make a display of his eloquence, it was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. He spake too in the language of the people, that he might be understood. To the church at Corinth he said: "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air." "I speak with tongues more than ye all; yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

If the instructors in these theological schools should become converted to Christ, and should lead to Jesus those committed to their charge, and have them learn of Christ, the young men would not then be trained away from the people; they would not then be unfitted for the work of an evangelist; then an education instead of spoiling them for the work of Christ, would only the better fit them to obey the Scripture injunction, to "do the work of an evangelist," and "make full proof of their ministry," as it did for Paul, and Luther, and Wesley, and Finley, and Asbury, and Finney, and Simpson; as, in short, it ever has done for those who have made Christ and his salvation supreme, and have subordinated to his will themselves and their education. J.

"The Reformation Repudiated" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 24 , pp. 376, 377.

IN the SIGNS of the past two weeks we have given an account of the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, and of the Edict of Nantes and its revocation. We have recalled to the minds of our readers the disposition of Rome wherever she can reach her relentless arm. We know that to the minds of many of the Protestant leaders of theological thought of the present day, this is a thankless task. To them it is a very uncharitable proceeding to hold up these things to the gaze of the people of our day, because they say Rome has changed and progressed with the change and progress of the age. But it is not so. She has not changed, she only bides her time, till Protestants by following Romish doctrines, and practicing

Romish principles, bring themselves to that place where they can see no difference between Protstantism and Romanism, and will restore to her the power of which she has been deprived so long. Romanism is not becoming enlightened, Protestantism is becoming more and more darkened.

In 1569 Pope Pius V. wrote to Charles IX. against the Huguenots, saying:—

"Our zeal gives us the right of earnestly exhorting and exciting you to use all your influence for procuring a definite and serious adoption of the measure most proper for bringing about the destruction of the implacable enemies of God and the king."

After a victory over the Huguenot forces, Charles sent to the Pope some flags that had been captured, as an acknowledgment of the help the Pope had rendered. At that Pius wrote to him in these words:—

"The more the Lord has treated you and me with kindness, the more you ought to take advantage of the opportunity this victory offers to you, for pursuing and destroying all the enemies that still remain; for tearing up entirely all the roots, and even the smallest fibers of the roots, of so terrible and confirmed an evil. For unless they are radically extirpated, they will be found to shoot up again; and, as it has already happened several times, the mischief will reappear when your majesty least expects it. You will bring this about if no consideration for persons or worldly things induces you to spare the enemies of God—who have never spared yourself. For you will not succeed in turning away the wrath of God, except by avenging him rigorously on the wretches who have offended him, by inflicting on them the punishment they have deserved.

"Let your majesty take for example, and never lose sight of, what happened to Saul, king of Israel. He had received the orders of God, by the mouth of the prophet Samuel, to fight and to exterminate the infidel Amalekites, in such a way that he should not spare one in any case, or under any pretext. But he did not obey the will and the voice of God. . . . therefore he was deprived of his throne and his life. By this example, God wished to teach all kings that to neglect the vengeance of outrages done to him is to provoke his wrath and indignation against themselves.—*History of Protestantism, book 17, chap. 13.*

To Catherine de Medici, he wrote, promising her the assistance of Heaven if she would pursue the enemies of the Roman Catholic religion "till they are all massacred, for it is only by the entire extermination of heretics that the Roman Catholic worship can be restored."—*Id.*

And that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day followed, was but the natural consequence. But

Pius V. was no worse than Pius IX., and neither of them was any worse than Leo XIII. We related last week how that Massillon, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, and Fléchier, exulted over the horrors brought upon the Huguenots by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Yet to-day there are so-called Protestant divines who sound the praises and exalt the Christian [*sic.*] virtues of those wicked men. "Oh, but they were eloquent," it is said. Of course they were eloquent, and as cruel as they

were eloquent. When eloquence is employed in exultation over the afflictions and miseries of men, it is an accomplishment that may well be abhorred rather than admired. And when those who are masters of the accomplishment are so cruel at heart as to so employ it, it is difficult to understand how they can be admired by any but such as partake of the same spirit.

Yet in the face of Rome's history and fixed character of bitter persecution and perpetual tyranny, there are scores of men of extensive influence professing to be Protestants, who are lending their names and influence to hand over this Government to be ruled in accordance with the principles of the Papacy "the most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny." The National Reform Association has rallied to its support all the "evangelical churches" and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and proposes to join hands with the Catholic Church in amending the National Constitution, so as to oblige Congress to make laws concerning religion.

In his little book, "Our Country," Dr. Strong well says:—

"There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our Government with those of the Catholic Church.

"The Constitution of the United States guarantees *liberty of conscience*. Nothing is dearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX., in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: 'The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State.' The same Pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematized 'those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,' also 'all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.'"

"The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O'Connor: 'Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.' . . . The archbishop of St. Louis once said: 'Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.' . . .

"Every cardinal, archbishops, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the Pope, in which occur the following words: 'Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the Pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.'"

"Cardinal Manning advises Romanists throughout the world to enter politics *as Romanists*, and to do this especially in England

and the United States. In our large cities the priests are already in politics, and to some purpose. . . . We are told that the native Catholics of Arizona and New Mexico are not as energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these Territories. True, but they are *energetic enough to be counted*. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often *much more*."

It is true that the Constitution of the United States guarantees liberty of conscience, but it is equally true that the evangelical churches and the W.C.T.U., through the mediumship of the National Reform Association, and its proposed amendment to the Constitution, are pledged to put into the hands of Rome, the power to employ force in this Government and so to rid it of this "pestilential error" of liberty of conscience, which is so much "to be dreaded in a State."

The Papacy is to-day the most influential power in the world. The *Christian at Work* admits that "There can be no question that under the new policy of Pope Leo XIII. the Roman Church is coming to the front again in the matter of dealing with political governments." And further it says that "in doctrine and in the completeness and compactness of her ecclesiastical system, and the far-reaching adaptability of that system to all exigencies the church of Leo I. and of Leo XIII.—though fourteen centuries intervene between them—are substantially one." And yet in the very same article with these last quoted words it says that if Dr. McGlynn does not obey the command of the Pope, "He will cease to speak with the influence of a priest of *the largest Christian denomination*."

A "Christian denomination" indeed! And "the church of Leo I. and of Leo XIII. are substantially one." It therefore follows that she always has been a Christian denomination; the Reformation was sheer heresy and schism, a sanctioning of "rebellion by undermining the principle of authority;" it was "the offspring of rebellion," and "originated with priests impatient of the yoke of the gospel, fond of novelty and ambitions of notoriety"! and Luther was excommunicated and cursed by a Christian Pope! Huss and Jerome were condemned and burnt by a Christian council! the command to massacre the Huguenots was issued by a Christian! the Inquisition was a Christian organization, and all its murders, and assassinations, its torments, and its persecutions, were but acts of Christian kindness, and Christian charity! The minions of the Pope and the Inquisition when thus employed were only Christians at work!

May Heaven help the Christians who are represented by the editorial utterances of the *Christian at Work*. And may all people who love liberty of conscience awake to the danger that lies in the strong Papacy and the weak, degenerate, and apostate Protestantism of to-day.

J.

June 30, 1887

"How God Has Spoken" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25 , pp. 391, 392.

"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." Notice, God is the speaker, whether unto the fathers or unto us; whether by the prophets or by his Son. In time past God spoke by the prophets; in these latter times God has spoken by his Son.

"At sundry times and in divers manners," that is, at different times and in different ways, he spake by the prophets. But at whatever time or in whatever way, the prophecy came not by the will of man, "but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." None of the prophets of God ever spake of their own will, or out of their own hearts, but the Spirit of God spake by them. "The sweet psalmist of Israel said, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." 2 Sam. 23:1, 2. When the prophet had spoken, his task was done; it was the word of God, and whether men would hear or whether they would forbear, rested with themselves. "Moreover he said unto me, Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go, get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." Eze. 3:10, 11.

A good illustration of the "sundry times" at which God spake unto the fathers by the prophets is found in the book of Haggai. There are only two short chapters in the book, but yet the word in it came at four different times. Chapter 1, verse 1, says, "In the second year of Darius the king, in the sixth month, in the first day of the month, came the word of the Lord by Haggai." Again, "In the seventh month, in the one and twentieth day of the month, came the word of the Lord by the prophet Haggai." Chap. 2:1. Again, "In the four and twentieth day

392

of the ninth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord by Haggai the prophet." Chap. 2:10. "And again the word of the Lord came unto Haggai in the four and twentieth day of the month." Chap. 2:20. Here we have the fact stated that the word of the Lord came to him the *first* day of the *sixth* month, the *twenty-first* day of the *seventh* month, and the *twenty-fourth* day of the *ninth* month, *twice* in the same day, all in the same year. And that is all the prophesying that Haggai did. In other words, four times this holy man of God spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

The "divers manners" in which the Lord spake by the prophets, was by visions and dreams. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream." Num 12:6. There was yet another way, which was by Urim and high priest, but after the early days of Israel in Palestine it seems to have been used only occasionally, as the only mention of it after the time of Saul (1 Sam. 28:6) is in Ezra 2:63 and Neh. 7:65, when Israel first went up from captivity.

Of course a dream from God was in a certain sense a vision, but visions were not always seen through dreams. Yet like things were revealed whether shown through a dream or by a vision when wide-awake. The prophecy of the seventh chapter of Daniel was revealed to him in a dream. "Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed; then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of

the matters." Dan. 7:1. It was in the same way that the prophecy of the second chapter was made known. "Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision." Dan. 2:19. But the prophecy of the eleventh chapter was revealed to him in the day-time, while he was out by the side of the river Tigris (chap. 10:4). The vision of the ninth chapter also was given him while he was wide-awake and praying. The vision of the eighth chapter was also given him while he was awake and in the palace at Susa, on business for the king of Babylon.

Ezekiel's visions seem to have all been given him when awake. That of the first chapter was given while he was "among the captives by the river of Chebar." The heavens opened and he saw visions of God. The vision of chapter eight to eleven was given as he was sitting in his house and the elders of Judah sitting before him. This was a most remarkable vision. Ezekiel was one of those who had been carried captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar. These captives were placed in a colony on the river Chebar, in Chaldea. Ezekiel, as has been stated, sat in his house in Chaldea, with the elders of Judah before him. Suddenly a vision from God fell upon him. He saw an appearance of a glorious personage glowing as fire. This personage put forth the form of a hand and took him by a lock of his hair, and seemed to lift him up between heaven and earth, and carried him in vision to Jerusalem. Although it was a vision, it was just as real to the prophet as though he had been carried literally and bodily from Babylon to Jerusalem. He was taken in vision to Jerusalem, and was shown the idolatrous practices of those who yet remained there. He was shown a hole in a wall, and was commanded to dig there. He dugged a little space and found a door. He went in and found a place where idolatry was carried on secretly. He saw on the walls portrayed all round the pictures of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of their worship, and seventy of the principal men of the nation standing there burning incense to these idols, and in the midst of all, apparently as the chief in the wicked work, he saw one whom he recognized as Jaazaniah the son of Shaphan.

Then he was brought to another part of the temple, and there he saw the Hebrew women weeping for Tammuz, the Babylonian god of lust. Next he was taken to the inner court of the temple, between the very porch and the altar, and there he saw about twenty-five men, with their backs to the temple of the Lord and their faces toward the east, worshiping the sun. Then he saw six men drawing near with slaughter weapons, but there was another among them having a writer's inkhorn by his side; and Ezekiel heard his heavenly guide saying to this one, "Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof." The others were to follow after and slay utterly all, but not to come near any man upon whom was the mark.

Next the prophet was taken to another part of the temple, and at the door of the eastern gate he saw twenty-five men, among whom he recognized a certain other Jaazaniah, and Pelatiah, princes of the people. Then said the guide to him, "These are the men that devise mischief, and give wicked counsel in this city." Afterward he was again taken up and brought back in the vision to Chaldea,

and the vision went up from him, and he told his brethren of the captivity all that he had seen in Jerusalem.

Thus we see that when God gives a person a vision, distance is nothing. Here were a lot of men and women carrying on wicked practices in Jerusalem, some of them in secret chambers in the dark, others devising mischief and giving wicked counsel. But there was a man, sitting in his own house down in Chaldea, who saw it all. He saw exactly what they were doing, he knew just what they were saying, he looked them right in the face and called them by name. How little these people thought that all that they were saying and doing was known, not only to God, but also to one of their fellow-men, through whom it was to be made known to all the others.

Thus God "at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets."

But at the last God spake by his Son. This is not believed now as the truth really is and as it ought to be believed. It is actually taught, and the belief is gaining ground, that when Jesus came he conducted matters upon his own responsibility, while God in some mysterious way stepped aside. But it is not so. God spake by his Son. This is what he promised to do. The Lord said to Moses: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put *my words* in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that *I* shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto *my words* which he shall speak in my name, *I* will require it of him." Deut. 18:18, 19. God speaks by him, and whoever will not hearken to God's words so spoken must render his account to God. God will require it of him. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Thus God promised to do, thus Jesus says he did: "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. "The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself." "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." God spake by the prophets, and he spake by his Son, who was "that Prophet" above all prophets.

Yet, although God is the speaker both by the prophets and by his Son, there is an important difference in the manner in which he spake by them and by him. While God spake through the prophets by vision and dream, *we never read of Jesus having either a vision or a dream*. The prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, but, as we have seen, it was only upon occasion that the Holy Spirit, moved them to speak. Jesus spake also as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, but he was moved by the Holy Spirit *all the time*, "For God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." John 3:34. God gave the Spirit by measure unto the prophets, and they spake according to the measure given. But unto the Son God gave not the Spirit by measure, therefore he always spake from the immeasurable fullness of the Spirit of God, and there was no room for either vision or dream. His whole life might be called on constant, limitless vision.

Thank God that he has not only spoken unto the children of men by the prophets, but that he has also in his loving-kindness spoken unto us by his Son. "For he whom God hath sent *speaketh the words of God*; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." Therefore whosoever it be that will not hearken to the words which he speaks in his Father's name, God will require it of him, and how shall he render the account?

J.

"The Law of God" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 25 , pp. 392, 393.

"THE law of the Lord is perfect," and consequently requires perfection in every intelligent creature in the universe. Not simply what might be counted perfection as measured by man's standard, but perfection as measured by the Lord's view of perfection. It is the law of the Lord that is perfect. Its perfection is the perfection of the Lord, therefore it is his view of perfection to which men must perfectly conform. So says the Saviour, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." Matt. 5:48.

The law of God is holy, and requires perfect holiness in every person; such holiness as may be measured by his own; for it is written, "Ye shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy." The first quotation, however, expresses it all, "The law of the Lord *is perfect*." It is simply the expression of what his will is concerning the duty of man, and that will *must be* perfect, because he himself is perfect, and his will can be nothing less than the emanation of himself. As says another, "The law is, in itself, the will of the Godhead, and God himself must be unholy before his will can be." Said the Saviour, "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." And of himself he says, "I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." And, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me." Therefore, the beloved disciple declares, ""He that doeth the will of God *abideth forever*."

Nor are we left to conjecture as to what it is in which this will is expressed, or as to what this perfect law is. By Paul, the Lord declares this in a connection so clear that it cannot be misunderstood: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." To know the will of God, therefore, is to be instructed out of the law. But in what is the law expressed? "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God?"

The law therefore out of which to be instructed is to know the will of God is the law that forbids theft, adultery, and idolatry. And to break that law is to dishonor God. That law is expressed in the ten commandments, and is the law of the Lord, which is perfect. And therefore the conclusion of the whole matter, the sum of all that hath been said, 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."

Therefore, "whatever God may overlook in those who know not their duty, yet, when he reveals his perfect law, that law cannot, from the nature of its Author, allow the commission of a single sin. But if its holiness be not maintained, man is so constituted that *he* could never become holy. Every change to a better course in man's life must be preceded by a conviction of error—man cannot repent and turn from sin till he is convicted of sin in himself. Now, if the holiness of the law, as a standard of duty, be maintained, man may thus be enlightened and convicted of sin until he has seen the last sin in his soul; and if the law allowed one sin, there would be no way of convicting man of that sin, or of con-

393

verting him from it; he would, therefore, remain, in some degree, a sinner forever."

Now "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." But God does not want any man to remain a sinner forever. He sent his only begotten Son into the world, and called his name Jesus, that he might save the people from their sins. But in order to be saved from sin there must be repentance, and in order to repentance of sin there must be conviction of sin; and in order to conviction of sin there must be a knowledge of sin; and in order to a knowledge of sin, the law must be made known. "For *by the law* is the knowledge of sin." Without the law of God there can never be any knowledge of a single sin; and without a knowledge of sin a man cannot repent of sin; and except there be repentance there can be no salvation from sin. Therefore the law must go before and drag sin to light that it may be seen in its enormity and its dreadful consequences, that that sense of guilt and danger may be produced "which is necessary in order that man may love a spiritual Saviour." As has been well said: "Love in the soul is produced by the joint influence of the justice and mercy of God. It is impossible, therefore, in the nature of things, for a sinful being to appreciate God's mercy, unless he first feel his justice as manifested in the holy law."

Even so says the Scripture: "The law entered, that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5:20, 21. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that *he might be just, and the justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:24-26. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

As therefore by the law of God is the knowledge of sin; as it reveals the whole duty of man and requires perfection on every point, even to the very thoughts and intents of the heart; and as the Saviour came and condemned sin in the flesh expressly that the righteousness, the perfection, of the law might be met and fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit; how essential it is

that the commandments of God should be held before ourselves, and before all people, that we may meditate therein day and night, that Jesus may indeed save us from our sins. In view of these things, if we had not learned not to be surprised at any turn in the theology of the day, we should be astonished at the way in which the law of God has been slipped over by the churches of the land in the International Sunday-school Lessons during the present quarter.

What a splendid opportunity there was presented for the lesson committee to open to the people of this nation the vast field of God's righteousness! But instead of devoting to the study of the ten commandments a whole quarter, at the very least, or six months, or a whole year even, which might well have been done, they passed by the whole subject in *two* Sundays. It might fairly be supposed that the Sunday-schools had a certain set time in which to study the Bible, and that they were bound to get over the whole book in the shortest time possible. But have not the people all their lives in which to study the word of God? And what could possibly be of more value to the people than the thorough study of that law which is a copy of God's perfection, which reveals the whole duty of man, by which alone is the knowledge of sin, and without a knowledge of which no just conception can be had of the mercy of God as revealed in the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Men cannot appreciate the merit of Christ until they realize the demerit of sin, and of themselves as sinners. For Christ came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. Men cannot realize the righteousness of Christ and of faith in him until they realize the righteousness of the law and the unrighteousness of the transgressor of the law. For all unrighteousness is sin, and whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Therefore if the people in the Sunday-schools, or anywhere else, are ever to learn of the real salvation of Christ from sin, they will have to learn first what sin is, and that must be learned from the law of God, for by the law is the knowledge of sin, and such knowledge is not completed by any means by skimming over the ten commandments in two lessons of a half or three-quarters of an hour each. The knowledge so obtained must be at the best but superficial, and with superficial views of the law of God it is impossible to have more than superficial views of the gospel of Christ. And "not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven."

What would be thought of a college faculty that would attempt to carry a company of freshmen through Euclid in two lessons of three-quarters of an hour each? Then what *should* be thought of the lesson committee that *did* in two lessons of such length carry the Sunday-school children through that of which the inspired psalmist wrote, "I have seen an end of all perfection, but thy commandment is exceeding broad"?

J.

July 7, 1887

"The Excellency of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26 , pp. 406, 407.

GOD has not only spoken unto us by his Son, but by him also he made the worlds. It was Christ the Son of God who made all the multitude of worlds that roll in space. God made them *by him*. For "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. All things were made *by him*; and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1:1-3. "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16. 17.

The word "consist" here conveys the idea that all things were not only *put* together by him but that by him also they *hold* together. The same thing is told in another way by reading two texts together. Hebrews 11:3 says, "The worlds were *framed* [put together] by the word of God," and Heb. 1:3 speaks of Christ's "*upholding* all things by the word of his power." Thus the worlds were put together by by [*sic.*] Christ, and by him they hold together,—by him all things consist. Notice further that it was by *his word* that the worlds were framed, and it is by *the word* of his power that all things are upheld. It was by the word of Christ that the heavens were made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. It was he who spake and it was done; it was he who commanded and it stood fast. It was he who weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance. It was he who measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure. It was he who said, "Let there be light," and there was light. It was at the sound of his glorious voice that all the multitude of worlds started into space and began their wondrous orbits;

407

and it is according to his ordinances then established that they continue this day. "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:9.

It was to that time that he referred when, in his last night on earth, he said in his prayer, "Father, . . . thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." It was to the glory of that time that he referred, when, in the same prayer, he prayed, "O Father, glorify me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." John 17:5, 24. And Paul speaks of him then as "being the brightness of his [Father's] glory and the express image of his person." Heb. 1:3. Of the brightness of that glory we may form some faint idea by reading the description of him by one who saw him in his glory more than seven hundred years before he came into the world to purchase for rebels a pardon. John, in telling of the refusal of the Jews to believe on Jesus, quotes from Isaiah a prophecy which he says was fulfilled then and by them, and says that "these things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." John 12:39-41. By comparison it is seen that John 12:40 is a quotation from Isaiah 6:10. Therefore the sixth chapter of Isaiah was said when that prophet saw Christ's glory and spake of him.

In that place Isaiah says: "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." Verses 1-3. This, says John, was Jesus whom Isaiah saw in glory—a glory so intense that the bright seraphim standing in his holy presence covered their beautiful faces with their wings. After he had returned to that glory which he had with the Father before the world was, he was seen by John, who describes him thus: "His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were 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 was as the sun shineth in his strength." Rev. 1:14-16. That this was Jesus is certain, for he said to John, "I am he that liveth, and was dead."

Well, indeed, might Paul say of him that, "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?" Heb. 1:4, 5. Unto none of the angels did the Father say that, for none of the angels were begotten of the Father, they were all created by Christ, for we have read that whether they be "thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers," all were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made; while the Son himself was directly begotten of the Father, and so is called his *only* begotten Son, saying, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Therefore it was that "when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

We have seen by Isaiah, the bright seraphim worshiping him upon his throne high and lifted up, before he came to the world. And when he came into the world, an infant in Bethlehem born, he was the same person whom all the angels had worshiped before he came thus to the world, and change of place and circumstances did not in the least degree disentitle him to their worship. The Word was with God, and the Word was God, and "the Word was made flesh, and as flesh came to dwell among us, although an infant, yet he was the Lord of glory, and the word went forth, "Let all the angels of God worship him." Accordingly we read: "She brought forth her first-born Son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them. . . . And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. . . . And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

Again, unto the Son, God said: "Thy throne, O God, is forever 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." And again the Father says to the Son, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." His years can never fail, for his "goings forth have been of old, from the days of eternity." He is the "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." He is "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." And blessed be his glorious name forever and ever.

J.

"The First Commandment. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 26 , pp. 408, 409.

"THOU shalt have no other gods before me." Thus reads the first commandment of the law of God, and calls every man face to face with himself and with God. God made us, he gives us life and breath and all things richly to enjoy. In him we live and move and have our being. And the fact that he has created all things is given by those already redeemed, and who dwell in his presence, as the one great reason why he is worthy to receive the honor of all. For in their worship of him they say, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. 4:11. To do the things which please God is the purpose of man's creation, and whoever does not please God, frustrates the purpose of his creation. But all have displeased him; all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." "There is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. 3:12, 18. "We have turned every one to his own way." Isa. 53:6.

God's way is the only right way, 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. But instead of going in this, the right way, because the way of God, all men have chosen their own way, and that way is one in which the Lord cannot delight. It is not the way of his commandments, and cannot be the way of peace. Peace, whether in this world or in any other, whether in time or in eternity, is found only in the way of the commandments of God; for these contain the whole duty of man. And therefore the Lord exclaims, "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had they peace been a a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isa. 48:18.

When men knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but "became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened."

Here is the root of all idolatry—vanity and pride of opinion, men setting their opinions against God's truth. And, "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools," and the further they went the worse they became, and finally became so blinded by their own foolish vanity that they thought themselves wise even when descended so low as to change "the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." The descent was gradual of course. Men did not forget God in a single day or night so that the next day they made an image and worshiped it. Men did not deliberately turn right away from God, whom they knew, and go at once to making graven images. In their vanity they professed to be wiser than God. In their own eyes their knowledge surpassed the knowledge of God; consequently they glorified him not as God, but glorified themselves instead, and, as their own knowledge, in their view, surpassed his, it came to pass that they had neither room nor use for God in their calculations, and so every one turned to his own way and the natural and inevitable consequence was that they became "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

Nor are we to suppose that men at the first were any worse, or any more prone to idolatry, than they are now. They were men, that is all. The trouble was that they forsook God, and refused to be guided by him. And where men do that the result will always be the same. There is nothing in science, nor in the wisdom of this world, that will keep men from idolatry, and its consequent wickedness. It is faith in God, trust in his word, and conformity to his will—it is this alone that is the preventive of idolatry. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is the command, which, when obeyed, is the surety against all idolatry. And whatever is allowed to draw away from God the supreme affection and trust of the soul, thereby takes the place of God in the heart, and to so yield the affection or the trust is a denial of God, and is idolatry. The affirmative form of the commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

Of course in this land there is not that practice of idolatry which is shown in all its gross and degrading forms, nor even such as is practiced in the worship of the heavenly bodies; nevertheless there is idolatry, and abundance of it, and some of the forms under which it is practiced we are now going to search out by the word of God. Says Job:—

"If I have made gold my hope, or have said to the fine gold, Thou art my confidence; if I rejoiced because my wealth was great, and because mine hand had gotten much; if I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand; this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge; for I should have denied the God that is above." Chap. 31:24-28.

Here are several things mentioned, and to do any one of them is declared to be to deny the God that is above. 1. To allow the heart to be secretly enticed by

the glory or beauty of the sun or the moon, and the mouth to kiss the hand in token of respect or homage, is to deny the God that is above. 2. To rejoice because one's wealth is great, and because his hand has gathered much, is to deny the God that is above. 3. For a person to allow himself to make gold his hope, or to make that his confidence, is to deny the God that is above.

No one will deny but that to do the first of these would be idolatry; none would deny but that that would be indeed to deny the God that is above; no one would deny that that would be a violation of the first commandment; none would deny that that would be sin. But for a person to do that would be no more idolatry, no more a denial of God, and no more sin, that it is to rejoice because your wealth is great, and because your hand has gathered much. It is no more idolatrous to allow the heart to be secretly enticed by the brightness of the sun or the moon, than it is to allow it to be secretly enticed by the brightness of pieces of silver or gold. Yet to-day there are multitudes who rejoice because their wealth is great and because their hand has gathered much, and so deny the God that is above. There are multitudes more who grieve because their wealth is *not* great, and because their hand has *not* gotten much, and so make gold their aim, their hope, their confidence, and so deny the God that is above. Their hope, their confidence, their *trust* is in riches and not in God, and so money takes the place of God—money is their god.

But God's charge to one class of these, those who *are* rich, is this: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, *nor trust in uncertain riches*, but *in the living God*, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:17-19.

To the other class God says: "They that *will be* rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6:9, 10. But to all who would fear God he says: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." For it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God. 1 Tim. 6:11, 12; Mark 10:24, 25.

409

"Oh!" says everyone on his own behalf, "I do not trust in riches." Try yourself and see. Apply to yourself the test that Jesus put upon the young man, and see whether you love God or your riches most. "Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me." If that were demanded of you personally to-day by the Master, how would you stand the test? Would you stand it any better than the young man did? If not, then is your trust in God or in your wealth? Luke says that when that young man heard this, "he was very sorrowful; for he was very rich."

Notice, his sorrow seems to have been graduated on the scale of his riches. He was *very* sorrowful, because he was *very* rich. Perhaps if he had simply been rich, he would only have been sorrowful, yet even in that case his trust in his riches would have denied the God who is above. While had he been poor, as Matthew the publican, or as the fishermen who plied their nets on the waters of Galilee, he doubtless would have been glad of the call of the Saviour, and would have followed instantly.

The Saviour gave us a parable on this very subject (Luke 12:15-21) when he told of that rich man whose ground brought forth plentifully, and he had no room to bestow his fruits and goods; and he said he would pull down his barns and build greater and there bestow his goods, and then would say to himself, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?" What was it that God said to him? "Thou fool." What is it the fool says? "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Exactly. This man was saying, in effect, that there is no God. He was trusting in his riches, and denying the God that is above. "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." Therefore, "take heed and beware of covetousness" for "covetousness is idolatry," and "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

Nor yet do we want to run to the other extreme and unmeasuredly denounce riches, and money, and whatever bears any semblance to means. It is not in money that the evil lies. Human society cannot exist without money of some sort. There must be some circulating medium. It may be silver or gold, paper or leather, brass or copper, with some device stamped upon it. But whatever it is, it is money; and in the place where it is used, he who has the most of it will be the richest. Money is *not* the root of all evil. Of itself it is not an evil at all. It is the *love* of money that is the root of all evil. It is not a sin to have money; it *is* a sin to love it. It is not a sin even to have much; it is a sin to love, or to trust in, what we have, whether it be little or much. It is not the rich alone who fall into temptation, and a snare, and into foolish and hurtful lusts; but it is "they that *will be* rich"—they who all the time have their aim at being rich, who have their eyes on that, and who tend all their efforts toward that, who lay awake nights scheming for it, who spend their lives to attain the unattainable; for "he that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase."

It is not a sin to be rich. Abraham, the friend of God, "was *very rich* in cattle, in silver, and in gold." Gen. 13:2. Job likewise was one of the richest men of his day. Yet neither of these holy men trusted in their riches, nor rejoiced because their wealth was great. They trusted in the living God, and remembered that it was he who gave them power to get wealth. Read in the thirty-first chapter of Job, how he looked upon his wealth—always as only a means of blessing the poor, the needy, the fatherless, and the widow. The sin is not in being rich; it is in trusting in it, putting confidence in it, rejoicing in it, and being proud of it, and highminded because of it. That is to deny the God that is above. "Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God," . . . "and thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy

God; for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." Deut. 8:11, 17, 18. Trust not in uncertain riches, but in the living God, holding all subject to his call, *ready* to distribute, *willing* to communicate. For thou shalt love no other god but him, and him with all the heart, and all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength.
J.

July 14, 1887

"The Samaritans" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27 , p. 423.

"PLEASE give an explanation of John 4:20. J. S."

The text reads, "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." These are the words of the woman of Samaria to Jesus, as he talked with her at the well. Samaria was a hill that 925 years before Christ belonged to a man by the name of Shemer. When Omri had reigned as king of Israel six years in Tirzah, he bought this hill from Shemer for two talents of silver, and built a city on the hill, "and called the name of the city which he built," Samaria, "after the name of Shemer, owner of the hill." 1 Kings 16:23, 24. Omri thus made it the capital of the kingdom of Israel, and it remained the capital of the ten tribes as long as they were a kingdom.

About 740 B.C. Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, carried captive a part of the ten tribes. 2 Kings 15:29. About 721 Samaria fell after a siege of three years by the Assyrians, and Sargon, a king of Assyria, destroyed Samaria and carried the remainder of the ten tribes captive unto Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes. Then to re-people the land he "brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel."

But by taking the inhabitants away, the lions had multiplied in the land. And when he brought up the new people the lions slew some of them. Then they sent word to the king of Assyria that, as they did not know the manner of the God of that land, the lions were slaying them, and asked him to send up there some of the priests who had been carried away captive, so that they should teach the newcomers the way of the God of the land. The king did so, and the priests taught them how they should fear the Lord. So then they all feared the Lord, so as to have him keep the lions off, and went on worshiping their own gods. So "the men of Babylon made Succoth-benoth, and the men of Cuth made Nergal, and the men of Hamath made Ashima, and the Avites made Nibhaz and Tartak, and the Sepharvites burnt their children in the fire to Aarammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim." 2 Kings 17:6, 24-34. It will be seen at once that this introduced a mixed and most corrupt worship. Afterward there were some Arabians transported there by Sargon, and several peoples by Esar-haddon. Ezra 4:2, 9, 10.

When the children of Israel returned from the captivity of Babylon, B.C. 535, these people of Samaria proposed to join with them in rebuilding the temple and in re-establishing the worship of God. But Zerubbabel and Joshua and their companions would have nothing to do with them. Then the Samaritans set about to hinder the work all they possibly could, and even hired counselors against them at the court of the kings of Persia, all the time of Cyrus and Cambyses. And thus began an enmity between the two peoples, that never was quenched, but which grew more and more bitter as ages passed by.

The efforts of the Samaritans were in vain with Cyrus and Cambyses, but when the impostor Smerdis came in, they succeeded in obtaining a decree from him putting a stop to the work at Jerusalem. So it ceased for about two years, till the second year of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 520. Then the prophets Haggai and Zechariah stirred up the Jews against to go to building. But no sooner had they begun to build than the Samaritans were on hand again to stop them. There was a new governor over them, however, by this time, and he appears to have been a very honest man himself, he sent to Darius an honest account of the matter, and the effect of it was to bring a decree that not only should they let the work at Jerusalem go on, but that they should help speedily with money from the king's tribute, and with bullocks, rams, and lambs, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, all that was needed at Jerusalem. Ezra 4-6.

After this the Jews were bothered no more by the Samaritans for about seventy years, till Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem to complete the work. Then they tried their best to get the advantage of him, but failed at every effort, which only increased their bitterness. This was at Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem. But he returned to the court of Persia and stayed several years, and then went up again to Jerusalem. There he found that in his absence the Jews had intermarried with the heathen, and even with the Samaritans. Eliashib the priest had actually brought Tobiah the Ammonite to Jerusalem and had set him up at housekeeping in the chambers of the temple of God. And one of Eliashib's grandsons had married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, who seems to have been then governor of Samaria.

When Nehemiah arrived at Jerusalem, and found matters thus, he pitched all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chambers that had been given him, and commanded the chambers to be cleansed. Then he made all the Jews who had strange wives put them away. But this grandson of the high priest, Manasseh by name, who had married Sanballat's daughter, would not give her up, therefore Nehemiah chased him clear out of Jerusalem. Then Manasseh went with his wife over to Samaria to Sanballat, as also did others who, like Manasseh, clung to their heathen wives, and rebelled against the authority of Nehemiah. In B.C. 409 Sanballat obtained from Darius Nothus a grant to build on Mount Gerizim near Samaria, a temple like that at Jerusalem, and he made this Manasseh the high priest of the temple and its worship. Thus the enmity became still more bitter, and continued so down to the time of the Saviour, by which time the hatred was so bitter that when the Pharisees would apply to Jesus the most bitter epithet that they could command, it was, "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil." John 8:48. And Jesus when giving in a parable an example of perfect obedience to the

divine command to love our neighbor as ourself, pictured an instance of a Samaritan helping a Jew. And in this same conversation with the woman of Samaria, as Jesus sat on the well, the woman came, and he asked her to give him a drink. She was surprised that he, a Jew, should speak to her, a Samaritan, and so she asked, "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." John 4:7-9.

When Sanballat and Manasseh built that temple on Mount Gerizim, there was thenceforth a false worship there as rival to the true worship in Jerusalem. At first it was the mixed worship of the idolatrous Samaritans and apostate Jews. But this was not only a place of rival worship, but it became an asylum for all the rebellious, discontented Jews, and by this means it came about in the course of time that the worshipers there were mostly made up of apostate Jews and their descendants, and as the Pentateuch was used in the Samaritan temple, and as the service was made as near like that at Jerusalem as possible, the worship of the false gods was soon dropped entirely, and the Samaritans claimed to be the true people of God, and claimed that Mount Gerizim, and not Jerusalem, was the place which God had chosen, that there Abraham and Jacob had built altars and worshiped God, and that therefore theirs was the true temple and the true worship. And *that* is why it was that the woman said to Jesus, "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain [the mountain was right over their heads]; and ye [that is, the Jews] say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." That also was why Jesus replied to her, "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." Their worship was a false, corrupt worship from the beginning, and Jesus exposed it all in a word, "Ye worship ye know not what."

J.

"The Popes Among Rulers" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27 , p. 424.

IT seems that from any and every point of observation that we may choose, the Papacy appears to the worst advantage of any power on the earth. In studying the list of Popes, we were struck with the shortness of the reign of a large number of them, and were thus led to draw a comparison between the *average length* of the reigns of the Popes, and that of other rulers of the world. The following table shows the result:—

Dates.		Duration of kingdom.	No. of rulers.	Average yr.	mo.	da.	
B.C. 975-599	Judah	376 years	20	18	9	18	
" 975-720	Israel	255 "	19	13	5	1	
" 747-538	Babylon	209 "	18	11	7	10	
" 538-330	Medo-Persia	208 "	14	14	10	8	
" 795-168	Macedonia	627 "	35	17	11	2	
" 304- 30	Later-Egypt	274 "	15	18	3	5	

"	312- 65	Syria	247	"	20	12	4	6
"	48-A.D. 364	Rome	411°	"49	8	4	21	
A.D.	364- 476	Western Empire	111Ω	"	15	7	6	
"	364-1453	Eastern	1089	"	81	12	11	17
"	428-1793	France	1365	"	84	16	3	
"	411-1868	Spain	1457	"	106	13	8	28
"	404-1603	Scotland	1199	"	71	16	10	11
"	632-1258	Caliphs	626	"	55	11	4	17
"	800-1804	Germany	1000*	"	59	16	11	11
"	827-1881	England	1061	"	61	17	4	21
"	862-1881	Russia	1022 ¹¹ "		65	15	5	24
"	842-1795	Poland	950 ²² "48		19	9	5	
"	1299-1881	Turkey	588	"	36	16	4	
"	1093-1881	Portugal	788	"	36	22		10
"	1015-1881	Sweden	867	"	53	16	5	13
"	803-1881	Denmark	1060 ³³ "		52	20	6	
"	1134-1881	Prussia	744 ⁴⁴ "		37	20	3	7
"	1627-1881	China	254	"	9	28	10	20
"	66-1881	Papacy	1796Ω ⁵⁵ "		272	6	7	15

*4 years interregnum.

Thus it may be readily seen that the average length of the reigns of the Popes is within *forty-five days* of a *whole year* shorter than that of any other succession of rulers from Babylon to this day. And it is a significant fact, that the next shortest is in the *Western Empire*, and still the next shortest is in the Roman Empire before it was divided; which all goes to show that the state of affairs was *much worse* under the Popes, than during the empire either before or after its division.

But an objection might be raised against this count of the line of the Popes, to the effect that it is not exactly fair, because it embraces the era of martyrdom, during which time many of the bishops of Rome were put to death in the persecutions suffered by the Christians. It is true that many of the early bishops suffered martyrdom. Therefore we will admit the justice of the claim, and will begin at the *close* of the era of martyrdom, when Constantine gave peace (?) to the church, and count to the Reformation. From Sylvester to the death of Leo X., or from A.D. 314 to 1522, a period of 1195⁶ years, there were 202 Popes, whose average reign was five years, ten months, twenty-nine days. This reveals the fact that the state of affairs was actually worse than appears by the preceding calculation; enough worse, indeed, to *reduce the average* a period of *eight months and sixteen days*.

Without going into particulars, which would extend this article to an undue length, we will simply add a few leading facts:—

Two of the Popes reigned less than a day.

Six of them reigned less than a month.
Twenty-five of them reigned less than a year.
Eight of them were murdered.
Four of them died in prison.
Six of them were deposed. ⁷⁷

This is by no means completes the list, but is enough to show somewhat of the character of these Popes and their times. With a slight change, the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of King Richard II., would be literally true of these:—

And tell sad stories of the death of *Popes*:—

How some have been deposed,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed;
Some poisoned, some sleeping killed;
For within the hollow crown,
That rounds the mortal temples of a *Pope*,
Keeps death his court; and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state, and grinning at his pomp;
Allowing him a breath, a little scene
To monarchize, be feared, and kill with looks;
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,—
As if this flesh, which walls about our life,
Were brass impregnable, and, humored thus,
Comes at the last, and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and—farewell *Pope*.

As in Christ is embodied and manifested the "mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. 3:16), so, on the other hand, in antichrist is embodied and manifested the "mystery of iniquity." 2 Thess. 2:7. As in Christ, from whatever point we view him, we behold only godliness, so in the Papal system, from whatever point we view it, we behold only iniquity, more than in any other system the world has seen. Whether it be viewed in its representative Popes, such as Innocent III., crushing out heresy with fire and sword, deposing kings, trampling upon nations, filling Europe with bloodshed and woe; or Gregory VII., infamous Hildebrand, asserting absolute control over emperors, princes, priests, and people; or whether it be viewed as a *system*, infusing mankind with its baleful influence till it is reduced to the condition revealed by its place in the foregoing table, it presents itself as the worst of all things earthly—worse than the "unspeakable Turk," worse than the Eastern Empire of Rome when for five hundred years "the sepulcher was ever beside the throne," worse than old Rome itself when the purple was never clear of blood. It fully justifies every title bestowed upon it in the Scriptures; and by the view here given, is especially illustrated and justified the comparison given in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, between Pagan and Papal Rome, where Pagan Rome is designated as the "*daily desolation*," while the Papacy is the "ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION."

J.

"The First Commandment. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 27 , pp. 424, 425.

ANOTHER form of violation of the first commandment is brought to view by Paul in 2 Cor. 4:3, 4: "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom *the god of this world* hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." Between the children of this world and the children of God there is no connection. Between those who love God, and those who love this world there is no affinity. "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." James 4:4. "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. 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." 1 John 2:15, 16.

Yet to please the world, to gain the favor of the world, and to be a friend of the world, is that for which men seek more than for the grace of God. Men will destroy their own souls if only they can stand well with the world. They will annihilate character to acquire and maintain a reputation. Reputation is of the world, character is of God. When men are called to obey God, the love of the world stands in the way, and the god of this world blinds their minds lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them. It is the work of the gospel to open men's eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people; Satan and his hosts are "the rulers of the darkness of this world," for the whole world lieth in the wicked one. Christ called Satan "the prince of this world," and as He came to save us from this present evil world, the message of his salvation is to turn men from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive the forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in Jesus.

It is for this cause that the friendship of the world is enmity with God. Satan is the prince, the god, of this world, and to love the world is to love the rule and dominion of Satan. To be a friend of the world is to be a friend of Satan. Therefore it is that if any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him. There is no affinity between Satan and God. Satan rebelled against God, led our first parents into sin, gained possession of the world, and has kept it in rebellion against God ever since. "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." Therefore says the Lord, "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.

Yet for all this, how many there are of the professed children of God, who, instead of being transformed to the will of God, seek to be conformed to this world, and allow their minds to run in the same old worldly channel that they did before they named the name of Christ. All the capricious behests of fashion are obeyed more readily, and more willingly, than are the commands of God; all her follies and foibles are conformed to as though that were itself the way of

salvation. Does fashion command that people shall make themselves ridiculous by some such silly custom as banging the hair down over the forehead clear to the eyes, or by wearing dead birds for ornaments? It is readily followed by thousands of those who profess to be followers of God, even though the foolish fashion originate in a brothel, as did both of these. Whoever will do a thing because it is popular or fashionable to do so, will do anything, it matters not what, that may become popular or fashionable. To please the world is their aim, and please it they will. The world is their god, and the Lord must take second place. But when he is given the second place he is given no place, for he will be supreme or not at all. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," "I will be sanctified in them that come

425

nigh me," and "my glory will I not give to another."

The separating from this world, and turning from the power of Satan unto God, is a veritable, and must be a total, transfer of allegiance from one Government to another, from one sovereign to another. By this transfer we become citizens of God's kingdom, and "our citizenship is in Heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." Whereas "in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," remember "that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." But "now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. 2:2, 12, 19, 20.

Now in the affairs of the Governments of this world, when a person transfers his allegiance from one to another, from England to the United States, for instance, he takes the following oath:—

"I, —, late of England, do declare an oath, that it is *bona fide* my intention to become a citizen of the United States of America, and to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty whatever, and particularly to the queen of Great Britain and Ireland and empress of India, of whom I am now a subject.

So likewise we, in becoming fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, and in transferring our citizenship to Heaven, and our allegiance to God, must renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any other prince potentate, sovereignty, or god whatsoever, and particularly to the god of this world. This must be done or our citizenship can never be registered in Heaven. It must be maintained or our citizenship, once registered there, will be blotted out and we treated as the traitors which such a relapse surely shows us to be. By the word of God the separation is clear-cut: "It the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." There can be no compromise, there can be no playing fast and loose. If the Lord be God, follow him; but if the world, then follow

it. You can't be a citizen of two countries at once; you can't serve God and this world both at once.

Still another form of violation of this commandment is shown by Paul, in writing to the Philippians: "Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, *whose god is their belly*, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Chap. 3:18, 19. And still there are "many" such. They may, and indeed they do, pretend to be great friends of Christ, but so long as they are enemies of his cross they are enemies to him. They may pretend to be devout worshipers of Christ, but so long as they are enemies of his cross they are only worshipers of themselves, of their own desires; their god is their appetite, and that god they worship.

Jesus says plainly, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." Luke 9:23. The first requisite therefore to follow the Saviour is to deny self. And no man can be a follower of Christ without it. To deny self for Christ's sake brings a person face to face with the cross. And to refuse to deny self for his sake, is to refuse the cross and so to become an enemy of the cross of Christ. Men may make vast pretensions to being followers of Christ, but so long as they refuse to deny themselves, so long they refuse the cross, and so long they are not his followers at all. He has placed the matter in its proper order: first deny self, next take up the cross to which self-denial brings us, and *then* follow Christ. There is no other way to get into the path where Jesus has walked, there is no other way to become a follower of Christ.

The man who yields obedience to his appetite for strong drink, has another god than the Lord. His duty to God is set aside, that the arbitrary commands of a perverted appetite may be obeyed. The claims of the divine law are nullified by the, to him, higher and stronger claims of his own appetite. Such a person is an idolater. His god is his belly. But the devotee of strong drink is not the only such idolater. The devotee of opium, or tobacco, or tea or coffee, or whatever else it may be that he allows to fasten itself upon him, is an idolater equally with the lover of strong drink. "And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, *and be ye separate*, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

J.

July 21, 1887

"The First Commandment. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28 , p. 440.

"THOU shalt have no other gods before me." When Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go,"

Pharaoh answered, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go?" Before that controversy was over Pharaoh had learned by a terrible experience that the Lord God of Israel is above all gods. The Lord God of Israel is the true God, and whoever does not worship him does not worship the true God, and his worship is a false worship. This God is the God that is revealed in the Bible, that is revealed in Jesus Christ, and whoever does not worship the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whoever does not worship the God of the Bible, does not worship the true God. He it is who has created all things, and commands every nation, and kindred, and tongue and people, to "fear God, and give glory to him; . . . and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:7. Yet he must not only be worshiped, he must be worshiped in the right way.

To the woman of Samaria, Jesus said of the Samaritans, "Ye worship ye know not what;" while of the Jews he said, "We know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." And yet the Samaritans had built a temple for the worship of God; they had the Scriptures of the Pentateuch; and, no doubt, at the time of the Saviour, supposed they were worshipping God, but he told them, ye worship ye know not what. And although the great body of the Jews were no more ready to receive the Saviour than were the Samaritans; and though Jesus was just as ready to speak salvation to the Samaritans as to the Jews; yet salvation is of the Jews and the Jews knew what they worshiped while the Samaritans did not know what *they* worshiped. But whether the worshipers be Jews, Samaritans, or Gentiles, the true worshipers "worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Now because of a misinterpretation of this statement that "God is a Spirit," we very much fear that there are many people in this day, and in this land, who worship they know not what. More than one large denomination of Protestants declare in their creeds, confessions of faith, or whatever it is most proper to call them, that God is "without body, parts, or passions." Now if these people really worship strictly according to their creed, it is exceedingly difficult for us to understand how it can be otherwise than that they worship they know not what. For under such a statement as this what is there for the mind to grasp or conceive of? And if there is nothing for the mind to take hold of, how then is it possible for that person to intelligently worship anything of which he can have no intelligent conception? We know not how an utter nonentity could be more clearly described than by some such statement as that it is "without body, parts, or passions." It is but fair to state, however, that it is doubtful whether the members of these denominations really worship according to this part of the creed. Yet it is difficult to decide, for the creed is inconsistent with itself.

For, whereas, in one place it is plainly stated that God is "without body, parts, or passions," in another place it is just as plainly stated that Christ "being very and eternal God" was born "of the Virgin Mary," "was crucified, died," and "on the third day he arose from the dead, *with the same body* in which he suffered; *with which also he ascended into Heaven,*" etc. Now as Christ ascended into Heaven and is there yet, *with a body*, and as he is said to be "very and eternal God," the

query with us is, How then can it be that God is "*without body, parts, or passions*"? Besides this they will talk about the "passion" of Christ. But if Christ be very and eternal God, and God is "*without body, parts, or passions*," then how could he possibly have any passion? It will not help the matter a particle to say that this refers to the passion of his human body, because there stand their own words that "he ascended into Heaven" "with the same body in which he suffered," and *that is the same body that he has now*. Therefore, if there was ever the passion of Christ; if Christ be very and eternal God; if he ascended to Heaven with that body in which he entered his passion; then it is literally impossible that God should be "*without body, parts, or passions*." For this reason it is that we know not where to place the worshipers who profess this creed. Do they worship One without body, parts, or passions, according to the first statement of the creed? or do they worship One with a body and who endured a passion according to the second statement? or is the matter as much confused in their minds as it is in the creed, so that they worship they know not what?

Let no one suppose that we are treating this subject, or these worshipers, lightly, or disrespectfully. God forbid. It is too important and too solemn a subject for that. But we are treating the subject plainly. We are really endeavoring to expose an inconsistency in the confession of the worshipers. Jesus said that the Father seeketh such to worship him as shall worship him in spirit and in truth, and it is absolutely certain that that part of this confession which says that God is without body, parts, or passions, *is not the truth*. And those who attempt to worship him according to such a conception do not worship him "in truth," because such a conception is not the truth.

Though Jesus said, "God is a Spirit," it does not follow at all that he is a nonentity, or even unreal. "He maketh his angels spirits," yet they are real beings. They have been seen of men, they have talked with men, time and again. Jesus is a Spirit, yet the disciples saw him ascend bodily into Heaven, and Stephen, and Paul, and John, all saw him and recognized him there. And God is just as real as Jesus Christ is. God is a person and has a person, for Christ is not only the brightness of God's glory, but also "the express image of his *person*." Heb. 1:3. How could God have a "person" if he is without body or parts? God has a form, for Christ "being in the *form* of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. 2:6. How could God have a form, and yet be without body or parts. One of the gracious promises of God is that the ransomed "shall see his *face*." Rev. 22:4. How *can* they ever see his face if he be without body or parts? Did he not *speak* the ten commandments with an audible voice in the hearing of the whole nation of Israel? Did he not *write* the commandments on two tables of stone? Were not the tables the work of God? and was not the writing the writing of God graven upon the tables? Did not God give to Moses two tables of testimony, tables of stone written with the finger of God? But why need we say more? We might go through the whole Bible this way and it would all tell the same story. The truth is that there is not in all the Bible a vestige of any such idea as that God is "*without body or parts or passions*." The idea is nothing under heaven but a piece of Papal mystification by which God should be obscured to

the minds of men so that they should worship the Papacy or else worship they know not what.

There are, though, in these confessions, some texts referred to, to prove the statement. To prove that God is without body or parts we are referred to Deut. 4:15: "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire." Well, because they saw no similitude, does it follow that there was no similitude? When the mount was altogether on a smoke, as the smoke of a furnace, and blackness and darkness and tempest, it is not at all strange that they saw no similitude, even though the Lord did descend there with tens of thousands of angels and twenty thousand heavenly chariots. And the cloud and darkness upon and about the mount were expressly that they might *not* see any similitude. If there was no similitude, then what was the use of the darkness? But why did not the Lord want them to see any similitude? The Lord himself tells, and this is why: "Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, . . . and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them." Deut. 4:16-19. That explains it all in a word. If they had been allowed to see one of the angels or the cherubim or any figure at all, they would have at once made an image of it. Or if they had not even seen any of these and yet had been allowed to see only the brightness that surrounded the scene, they would have turned to worship the sun or moon or stars or all together. And *that* is why God screened the whole scene from the people, by a thick cloud, and blackness, and darkness, and tempest. It was not that there was no similitude that the cloud covered the scene, but that they should see no similitude lest they make an image of it, and corrupt themselves with idolatry.

To prove that God is without "passions" Acts 14:14, 15 is given. Barnabas and Paul "rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men *of like passions* with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein." The argument of the creed seems to be that because Barnabas and Paul were men of like passions with the Lycaonians and other men, therefore the Lord is "without passions." Profound logic indeed! Yet it is fully as profound as the idea which it is intended to support.

No, God is a real person, who loves the children of men. Yea, he "so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And that dear Son has promised that the pure in heart shall see God, that they shall see his face, and that they shall stand before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. This is he who says to all creatures, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." And him thou shalt have, him alone, and him with all the heart. "For thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

He that doeth these things will know what he worships; he will know whom he worships. And if he worships Him in harmony with his own Holy Spirit and according to his own word of truth, then he is a true worshiper, worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth. May the Lord help us that we may not only "know what we worship," but that we may be indeed "true worshipers" of the One that we know. J.

"The Excellency of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 28 , p. 441.

IN the first chapter of Hebrews the great apostle treats of Christ in his exaltation before he came to the world. In the second chapter of the same book he treats of his humiliation in this world. In the first chapter he shows a contrast between Christ and the angels, as also he does in the second; but in the first chapter he shows Christ *higher* than the angels, while in the second he shows him *lower* than the angels. Hebrews 1:4 says of him, "Being made so much *better* [*Kreisson*, superior, more excellent, of a higher nature—*Greenfield*] than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they;" while chapter 2:9 says, "We see Jesus, who was made a *little lower* than the angels." In the first chapter he is presented to us as equal with God; in the second he is presented to us as equal with man. Than in the first chapter of Hebrews we know of no place in all the Bible where a greater effort has been made to set forth the excellency of Christ, as he was with the Father before the world was; and than in the second chapter we know of no place in all the Bible where a greater effort has been made to set forth his excellency as he was in the nature of man in the world.

First, it is said, "Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. 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." Although man was made a little lower than the angels, yet he was crowned with glory and honor, and was given dominion over all the earth and every living thing upon it. But now we see it is not so. Man has lost his dominion, his glory, and his honor. Instead of retaining his dominion free under God, he yielded himself to obey Satan and so became subject to him. Instead of retaining the dominion over the world and himself he surrendered himself a servant to Satan, a slave to sin, and a victim of death, and entailed it all upon all his. Thus it is "now we see not yet all things put under him." And if left to himself we nevermore should see all things put under him.

But thanks be to God, although we see not yet all things put under man, we *do* "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." Thus he stepped right into the place that man occupies, took upon him man's nature, and became subject to all the conditions of that

nature and of the world in which man dwells—all the conditions except that of sin. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." Christ put himself in man's place, and lived there, and acted there, without sin, that through him man might reach a place and condition where he can live and act without sin.

Secondly, he came not simply as a man amongst men but he became subject to the temptations, the trials, and the sufferings of men, that he might be not only a man among men but a friend and brother to all the race. "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." There is nothing that will bind hearts together as will the experience of suffering together. It is this that makes Christ and his people one. We are "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." For "it is a faithful saying, If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him." And thus "both he which sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee."

Thirdly, nor was it only that he might be a man amongst men, and a friend and brother of all through suffering, that he came, but also that he might destroy the devil and deliver all who will be delivered from the ruin which the devil brought. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The devil brought death into the world and into the universe of God, and by that evil which he brought he shall be destroyed forever; and all who desire to be freed from the bondage of sin and the consequent fear of death shall be forever delivered. Death is the consequence of sin, for "the wages of sin is death." And that it is sin that brings man into bondage and the fear of death is clear. Said Jesus to certain Jews, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant [*bond-servant*, Revised Version, *slave*, Greek] of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." And "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." And the son abideth forever. Thus Christ delivers from the bondage of sin and the fear of death.

Fourthly, "Verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Thus we see that he did not take on him the nature of the Gentile alone to the exclusion of the Jew; nor did he take on him the seed of Abraham alone to the exclusion of the Gentile; nor yet did he take on him the

nature of his brethren alone, elected to be so, to the exclusion of the non-elect. He took upon him the nature of man, whether he be Jew or Gentile, bond or free; he made himself the brother of the race, and all the race may become his brethren if they will.

"Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

J.

July 28, 1887

**"The Second Commandment. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 29 ,
pp. 454, 455.**

"THOU shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." Ex. 20:4, 5. Of course this is not all of the second commandment, but as this is all of it that we wish to dwell upon in this article, we simply quote the first portion of it.

The first commandment forbids all other gods; the second commandment forbids the making of any image or likeness of even the true God as well as of all other gods. The first commandment forbids the service of all false gods; the second commandment forbids the service or worship of the true God in any false way. When Israel made the golden calf at Sinai, they did not intend it as a sinful worship, nor as a worship of any but the true God. The true God, the one who had spoken the ten commandments, has said to them, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt," and when they made the golden calf they only said, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." They knew well enough that that piece of gold was not the God that had brought them out of the land of Egypt; they only proposed that as a tangible form through which they would worship that God who did bring them out of Egypt. But it matters not how good their purposes were, nor how innocent their intentions, their act was a grievous sin. To attempt to worship even the true God in any such way was sin, it was idolatry. It was really not only to have another god, but it was to make a graven image of that god, and to deny the God above who had brought them out of Egypt.

The true God will not be worshiped in any false way. "The true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." God being a Spirit, must be spiritually discerned and conceived of, and must be worshiped accordingly. Any other than an entirely spiritual worship is false worship, and is idolatry. Nor is it enough that the object of worship shall be spiritually discerned, and worshiped so, but the worship must be according to

truth, and as the Saviour said in speaking to the Father, "Thy word is truth," it follows that all worship must be according to the word of God—the Bible—or else it is false worship and idolatry. Therefore all worship, to be true, must be such as spiritually discerns the spiritual Father, and worships him so according to the directions given in the Bible. So notwithstanding the children of Israel intended the golden calf merely as a representation of their idea of the true God, the action was altogether sinful, and the image was only a representation of their sin. Therefore said Moses, "I took your sin, the calf which ye had made, and burnt it with fire, and stamped it, and ground it very small, even until it was as small as dust." Deut. 9:21.

When the ten tribes separated themselves from Judah and Benjamin, and Jeroboam became their king, as he saw the people going up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord, he said in his heart: "Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David; if this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto their Lord, even unto Rehoboam king of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam king of Judah. Whereupon the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold, and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem; behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And he set on in Bethel and the other put he in Dan. *And this thing became a sin;* for the people went to worship before the one even unto Dan." Notice, the text does not say that they went to worship the one even unto Dan, but that "they went to worship *before* the one." Jeroboam was persuading them that they could worship God this way just as well as to go to Jerusalem to worship—yes, even better, because it was "too much" to go all the way to Jerusalem to worship. But their worship was not the worship of God at all, they could not worship him in any such way, it was all sin, and by this conduct Jeroboam secured to himself the dreadful distinction in the word of God as, "Jeroboam who did sin, and who made Israel to sin."

As therefore it is so great a sin to make or to use any sort of a graven or molten image in the worship of the true God, it cannot be any less for anyone to worship some person, or some thing else, and make a graven image of that person or thing. Therefore the commandment is, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them."

According to this commandment and these scriptures which we have quoted, it is as certain as anything can be that Catholics are guilty of idolatry in the use of the graven images of Christ which they do use. The worship of Christ is the worship of God, for "the Word was God," and of him it is written, "Let all the angels of God worship him." And it is sin, it is idolatry, to worship him before a graven image now, just as much as it was in the days of Jeroboam, or of Moses. It is sin, it is idolatry, to worship God before a graven image now in San Francisco, in New York, or in Rome, just as much as it was then to worship before a graven image at Dan or at Sinai. That these images are in the shape of a man, while those were in the shape of a calf, makes not a particle of difference:

one is idolatry and is sin just as much as the other. At Sinai God refused to allow any similitude or any likeness to be seen lest the people should make an image of such likeness and worship the God of Israel by it, and so corrupt themselves by idolatry. And when at last for the salvation of men God did manifest himself to the world in the form of Christ Jesus the Lord, it is now idolatry, it is sin to worship him by the use of any image of that form in any way whatever. There stands the commandment of God, saying, "*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness*

455

of anything that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, . . . *thou shalt not bow down thyself to them.*" Jesus is in Heaven. To make a graven image of him and bow down to it is idolatry; it is a violent of the commandment of God; it is sin. But that is precisely what Roman Catholics do, therefore their worship is idolatrous, and their conduct is sin.

Neither does their idolatrous worship stop there, but is repeated in an almost infinite degree in the worship of the Virgin Mary, and that too by graven images. In worshipping Christ by an image they break one commandment—the second; whereas in worshipping Mary by images, they break both the first and second commandments, and so and sin to sin. They sin at the first in worshipping Mary at all, for God says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *him only* shalt thou serve," and, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Then they add to this the sin of making graven images of her and bowing down to them. Proof: In "St. John's Mission Book," pp. 219, 220, we have the following directions for "Visits to the Blessed Virgin, for every day in the week":—

"These visits usually follow immediately after those to the Blessed Sacrament. They are made by *kneeling down* before the altar of the Blessed Virgin in the church, or *before any image of her* in whatever place is may be, and making use devoutly of the following reflections and prayers."

But the commandment of God says, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of anything; . . . thou shalt not bow down thyself to them."

Further, these directions say:—

"Those who cannot always have access to the church, will do well to keep a small image for the purpose in some retired part of the house."

"Will do well"? Not by any manner of means. They who do so will do ill, for God has said, "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and *putteth it in a secret place.*" Deut. 27:15. And nothing but the blood of Christ, the benefit of which is secured by genuine repentance, will ever redeem from this curse those who keep an image of Mary or anybody else in some retired part of the house and bow down before it, or pay it any respect whatever.

But that Catholics are taught this idolatry in the church books, is not all. The Papacy has actually corrupted the word of God, so as to make it teach image-worship. In Hebrews 11:21 Paul wrote that, "By faith Jacob, when he was a

dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshiped, leaning upon the top of his staff." Instead of this the Catholic Bible reads that he "adored the top of his staff," and in a note adds these words: "Paying a relative honor to the top of his staff." Besides this the second Council of Nice, September 24 to October 23, A.D. 787, unanimously pronounced that "the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the Fathers and councils of the church," and Pope Hadrian II. accepted and announced the decree of the council. Image-worship is a part of the would-be infallible faith of the Catholic Church, and must necessarily be taught in the church books. And from the way that it is taught in the books it would seem that the worshipers actually worshiped the image itself, instead of worshipping by the image. For they are taught that the images actually move, and speak, and bleed. And when worshipers believe that there are about the images such properties of life and intelligence as these things would convey, then it is difficult to see where the worshiper can draw the line between the image and the reality.

In a Catholic book entitled "The Glories of Mary," page 139, there is given an example. Telling of a certain person who was given to evil courses, it says:—

"One night, when he was about to commit a sin, he saw a light, and, on closer observation, perceived that it was a lamp burning before a holy image of the blessed Virgin, who held the infant Jesus in her arms. He said a 'Hail Mary,' as usual; but what did he see? He saw the infant covered with wounds, and *fresh blood* flowing from them. Both terrified and moved in his feelings, he remembered that he himself too had wounded his Redeemer by his sins, and began to weep, but he observed that *the child turned away from him*. In deep confusion, he had recourse to the most holy Virgin, saying: 'Mother of mercy, thy Son rejects me; I can find no advocate more kind and more powerful than thou, who art his mother; my queen, aid me, and pray to him in my behalf.' The divine mother answered him *from that image*: 'You sinners call me mother of mercy, but yet you do not cease to make me mother of misery, renewing the passion of my Son, and my dolors.' But because Mary never sends away disconsolate those who cast themselves at her feet, she began to entreat her Son that he would pardon that miserable sinner. Jesus continued to show himself unwilling to grant such a pardon, but the holy Virgin, *placing the infant in the niche*, prostrated herself before him, saying: 'My Son, I will not leave thy feet until thou hast pardoned this sinner.' 'My mother,' answered Jesus, 'I can deny thee nothing; dost thou wish for his pardon? for love of thee I will pardon him. Let him come and kiss my wounds.' The sinner approached, weeping bitterly, and as he kissed the wounds of the infant, they were healed. Then Jesus embraced him as a sign of pardon."

On page 213 there is the record of a person who had been condemned to death and was on his way to the gallows, and thus we read:—

"On his way to the gallows, happening to pass before a statue of Mary, he saluted her with his usual prayer: '*Blessed Virgin, help me in the hour of my death,*' and the statue, in the presence of all, inclined its head and saluted him. Deeply moved, he begged to be allowed to kiss the feet of the image. The executioners refused, but afterwards consented on account of the clamor of the people. The youth stooped to kiss her feet, and Mary extended her arm from that statue, took him by the hand and held him so strongly that no power could move him. At this prodigy the multitude shouted, 'Pardon, pardon,' and pardon was granted."

Pages 232-3 give this:—

"A certain nobleman who was despairing of his eternal salvation on account of his sins, was encouraged by a religious to have recourse to the most holy Virgin, by visiting her sacred image, which was in a certain church. The nobleman went to the church, and on seeing the figure of Mary, he felt himself, as it were, invited by her to cast himself at her feet and trust. He hastens to do so, kisses her feet, and Mary, from that statue, extended her hand for him to kiss, and on it he saw these words written: 'I will deliver thee from them that afflict thee.'"

Pages 558-9 give the following:—

"We read in the Annual Letters of the Society of Jesus, that in India, a young man who was just leaving his apartment in order to commit sin, heard a voice, saying: 'Stop, where are you going?' He turned round and saw an image, in relief, of the sorrowful Mary, who drew out the sword which was in her breast, and said to him: 'Take this dagger and pierce my heart rather than wound my Son with this sin.'"

Page 680 tells of one who had gone to the church and was about to go home without confessing his sin, "when he thought he would go and recommend himself to the most holy Mary before her image which was in the church. He had hardly kneeled before it, when he felt himself entirely changed . . . and he afterwards said that he felt greater satisfaction than if he had gained all the gold in the world."

On page 711 we find the following:—

"A city of France, called Avignon, was once besieged by enemies. The citizens prayed to Mary to defend them, and placed an image of her, which they had taken from a church, at the gate of the city. One of the citizens having concealed himself behind the image, a soldier shot an arrow at him, saying: 'This image shall not save you from death.' But the image presented her knee there even to this day; and thus she saved the life of her servant. And the enemy moved by this prodigy, raised the siege."

Page 713 gives this:—

"The blessed Clement, a Franciscan, one morning delayed going to the common table, that he might stop and recite certain

accustomed devotions to the most holy Virgin; but *she spoke* from her image, and directed him to go with the others, because obedience pleased her more than all other devotions."

On pages 157-8 we are told that—

"The hand of St. John of Damascus was cut off because he defended with his pen the images of Mary; but our lady restored it to him in a miraculous manner."

If these things do not teach image-worship, and if those who do such things do not worship images, then there has never been, and can never be, in this world any such thing as the worship of images; and if such practices are not in violation of the second commandment, then that commandment has never yet been broken in this world. Nor is it to be supposed that these things were taught only in the Dark Ages, or perhaps are now only in some dark corner of Europe; they are taught now and right here in these United States. And yet the Catholic Church is recognized by Protestants as a part of the Christian Church. But to recognize as a part of the Christian Church, a church that teaches, and practices according to such teachings as these, is to condone idolatry, and to sanction sin. It shows too how sadly degenerate has become the Protestantism (?) of to-day. If the word of God, if the gospel of Christ, will be preached, Catholics must be shown that their worship of images, or by images, is an idolatrous worship, and that consequently it is sin; and that they will never know peace unless they turn from it entirely and worship God alone and him only in spirit and in truth.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." "I am Jehovah; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."

J.

**"National Reform Interpretations of Scripture" *The Signs of the Times*
13, 29 , p. 456.**

AS the leaders of the National Reform propose to make themselves the interpreters of Scripture "on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points," under the Government of the United States, it becomes important to the American people to know somewhat about the National Reform method of interpretation. As the people of this nation are asked to amend their Constitution so as to open the way for these men to make themselves the national interpreters of Scripture, the people ought to know what qualifications these self-nominated candidates possess for the high dignity to which their laboring souls aspire. That we may do our part toward enlightening the people on this subject, we propose, as far as possible to give examples of National Reform interpretations of Scripture.

The Scriptures clearly enjoin the obligation of subjection to civil government, of obedience to civil authorities: "To be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates," and to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we

may lead a quiet and peaceable life." In Romans 13:1-10 this duty is set forth at greater length than in any other one place in the Bible. The first verse reads thus: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." In the *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1884, there is quite an extended comment—more than a page—upon this text, written by Rev. David Gregg—the same who was lately installed as pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston. Mr. Gregg interprets this verse as follows:—

"The *authorities* that be are ordained of God.' 'There is no authority but of God.' All authorities that are not of God and are not in allegiance to him are usurpers. This is a self-evident truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that *'there is no authority but of God.'*"

There stands the plain declaration of the word of God that "there is no power but of God." At this Mr. Gregg gravely observes that all powers that are *not* of God are usurpers, and that this is a self-evidence truth, *i. e.*, if it be a fact that there is no power but of God. Well it certainly is a fact, for the word of God says it. Therefore, it being a fact that there is *no* power but of God, then how *can* there be any powers that are not of God? As the powers that be are ordained of God, and as there is no power but of God, it is impossible that there can be *any* power but of God. Therefore Mr. Gregg's comment amounts to just this and no more: All powers that are not powers are usurpers. We think it altogether likely that that *is* "self-evident."

But, more than this, the National Reformers will not admit that the powers that be are ordained of God. Although the Scripture says as plainly as language can say anything that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and although the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and sense of the statement, the National Reformers "interpret" it to mean, the powers that *ought to be* are ordained of God. And as the National Reform power is what ought to be, it follows that National Reform is ordained of God, and when it shall secure that power it will be exercised by a right absolutely divine. That such is the National Reform interpretation is shown by Dr. Gregg's own words. In telling what Paul was doing in writing the words of Romans 13:1-10, he says:—

"He was giving us God's ideal of civil government. He was holding up a picture of what civil government *ought to be*. He was teaching Christians *what they should strive to make Governments.*"

And again:—

The object was "to furnish then, as now, a standard by which to try existing Governments. It gives us God's ideal of civil government. If Governments conform to this divine ideal, then we are bound to recognize them as divine ordinances, and to give them conscientious support and homage, but if they do not, *we are bound to inaugurate* moral reforms and *revolutions* which will conform them to God's ideal."

By this style of interpretation, therefore, we are to understand that when the Lord speaks of the powers that be, he means the powers "that ought to be." When the word of God directs every soul to be subject to the higher powers, it means that every soul shall erect a tribunal and sit in judgment upon those

powers. When God directs that we shall not resist the power but shall be subject for conscience' sake, he, means that we "are bound to inaugurate revolutions." Where the Scripture sets forth the duty to be law-abiding citizens, leading quiet and peaceable lives, the National Reform interpretation of it demands that men, Christians too, shall be revolutionists, with their eyes constantly on the Government, weighing it in the National Reform balances, and watching for opportunities to inaugurate revolutions. In short, whereas the Scripture directs that men shall be Christians and law-abiding citizens, the National Reform interpretation of the Scripture demands that they shall be scheming politicians and revolutionists. Now could any interpretation possibly be further from the truth of the Scripture, or more directly opposed to the text under consideration? But we are not surprised at it; indeed we do not see how it could be otherwise, in view of the fact that the National Reform conception of the Saviour of the world is that he is a "divine politician." With such views of Christ, it would be impossible to hold any other views of the duty of the followers of Christ than such as are expressed in the above interpretations.—A. T. J., in *American Sentinel*.

August 4, 1887

"The Second Commandment. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30 , pp. 471, 472.

"FOR I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." This is the last half of the second commandment, and though it is one of the deepest and most far-reaching clauses of the decalogue, it is perhaps the one that is the least thought of even by those who design to strictly follow the decalogue. The second commandment is commonly passed over with a casual recognition of the fact that it forbids the making and worship of images, and that that is all there is in it. And as the image-worship of Catholics is not now considered sin, but, on the contrary, is allowed to be entirely consistent with Christian worship, this commandment seems to many not to be applicable in this country except perhaps in the cases of the few Chinese who are here. But, as we showed last week under the first part of this commandment, the image-worship of the Catholics is the sin of idolatry as well as is the image-worship of anybody else, so now the reading of the latter portion of the commandment shows it to be applicable to every person on earth, and in every act of life for all time.

For it declares the Lord to be a jealous God visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation. Now iniquity is the breaking of the commandments. This is seen by the words of this commandment itself. Notice, it says, visiting the *iniquity* upon those who *hate* the Lord, and showing mercy to those who *love* him and *keep his commandments*. As, therefore, hate is the opposite of love, so iniquity is the opposite of keeping the commandments. And as the keeping of the commandments is the whole duty of man, this latter

half of the second commandments stands before men in all places and for all time, as a warning against sin. Well did David say of the commandments of God, "By them is thy servant warned." Ps. 19:11. The second commandment stands before all men saying to them, in substance, Do not dare to break one of the commandments of God; for if you do, besides your own individual responsibility for your sin, your iniquity will be entailed upon your children even to the third and fourth generation.

In this, however, it is necessary to explain what this commandment does *not* mean. It does not mean that the child is held guilty of the parents' sin. It does not mean that if a father commits murder the child shall die for it, nor that the child is held guilty of it. God explained this matter, saying, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." Deut. 24:16. And it is recorded to the credit of Joash that as soon as the kingdom was confirmed in his hand, although he slew his servants which had slain the king, his father, yet, "The children of the murderers he slew not; according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall be put to death for his own sin." 2 Kings 14:6.

Yet in the time of Ezekiel, the people were insisting that the commandment means that the children should be put to death for the sin of the fathers, and were charging God with injustice, and had turned the subject into a proverb to the effect that "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." They argued that God meant that if a man should commit a sin, his child should die for it, and then likened it to the incongruity that would appear in the case of a man eating sour grapes and his children's teeth being set on edge by it, when they had not touched the grapes at all. But the Lord told them by Ezekiel that "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "If a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, . . . hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man, hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God." But "If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, . . . shall he then live? he shall not live; he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him."

Then he carries the subject a step further, thus: "Now, lo, if *he* beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like, . . . [but] hath executed my judgments, [and] hath walked in my statutes; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live." "Yet say ye, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Eze. 18:1-20. These scriptures make it certain that the commandment does not mean that the children are made partakers in the guilt of the parents.

And yet it is eternally true that the iniquity of the fathers is visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate the Lord. This is done through what is called the law of heredity. The evil traits of the parents are inherited by the children even to the third and fourth generation. How could it be otherwise? How can parents transmit to their offspring what they themselves have not? And if parents give themselves to wicked courses, and allow themselves to be ruled by ill tempers, evil passions, and perverted appetites, how can it be expected but that their children will inherit the same? How often it is that children inherit the ill temper of father or mother! How often the dissipated father transmits to his child, if not the actual appetite for strong drink, a will so weak that it is impotent against temptations. Now is that all. The writer has personally known three persons who were born drunk. Not, of course, born actually under the influence of strong drink in itself, but born with the nervous system so unstrung that the walk, and in fact every motion, was that of a drunken man; the voice was husky and thick, and the words mumbled, as though the persons were really drunk. All these were cases in which, in addition to the trials and besetments incident to the course of all men, the poor unfortunates were handicapped at the very start with the dreadful weight of "the iniquity of the fathers." These, to be sure, are extreme cases, but they are only the extreme in a graduated scale of iniquities of fathers which are visited upon the children. And though the evil is not so apparent in all cases, it is none the less real.

The Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following strongly illustrative instance:—

"Mr. Dugdale, an industrious statistician of New York, has traced to its common ancestor a family, the Jukes, consisting of 1,200 people, of which the majority are paupers, thieves, or prostitutes, in a greater or less degree, and who are computed to have cost the State in prison maintenance, almshouse relief, etc., something like \$1,300,000. The ancestor was a descendant of early Dutch settlers, and lived much as backwoodsmen do now upon the Indian frontiers. He is described as a 'hunter and fisherman, a hard drinker, jovial and companionable, averse to steady toil, working hard by spells and idling by turns, becoming blind in his old age, and his blindness has been entailed upon his children and grandchildren.'"—*Art. Ethnography.*

As that man was idling about, hunting and fishing, and drinking, living from hand to mouth, living in fact wholly an animal life, how little he thought that he was simply setting a stream flowing that would carry 1,199 persons far on the way to perdition! How much better it would have been for the world, as well as for himself and all this wicked progeny, if he had never been born! And when it is remembered that God will render to every man "according to his way and according to *the fruit* of his doing," what a fearful account awaits that man! These things illustrate the awful meaning of the law of God in declaring the iniquity of the fathers visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate him. They also serve in some measure to show the terrible nature of sin. They serve to emphasize the fact that sin cannot be committed with impunity. Every sin leaves a stain upon the very soul, and it may re-appear even in the

fourth generation. Every sin implants a spark in the course of nature, which, in the first, the second, the third, or even the fourth generation, may burst into a most vehement flame.

Nor does this fact sanction the doctrine of fatalism. Though the iniquity of the fathers is thus visited upon the children, the children are not thereby relieved of their own responsibility before either God or man. This is shown by the passage before quoted from Ezekiel, where it is stated that if the wicked man beget a son, "that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like . . . he shall surely live." Of course the child of such a parent will be at a disadvantage, but he will not be irresponsible, unless indeed the iniquities of the parents have rendered him idiotic, as is sometimes the case. In fact the whole race, as generation succeeds generation, is put more and more at a disadvantage in the effort to do the right. By the men of this generation it is harder in a vast degree to do the right than it was for the first generations of men who lived in the world, because we have entailed upon us so many more tendencies to evil than they had.

But God has not left us alone in this contest for the right, and the struggle to fulfill his holy law. He knows all our tendencies to evil, he knows all our defects, whether inherited or acquired, and in this very commandment he has laid it down as a part of his blessed law, that he showeth mercy unto thousands of them that love him and keep his commandments. Nor is this simply to thousands *of people*, it is to thousands *of generations*. Notice, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands [of generations] of them that love me, and keep my commandments." This is plainly proved by Deut. 7:9: "know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and *mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments* TO A THOU-

472

SAND GENERATIONS." No man can fairly deny that when Moses spake these words, he had the last clause of the second commandment directly in view, for he spake almost in the very words of the commandment; consequently it is evident that these words are an inspired comment upon those of the commandment—in short they are the Lord's own explanation of his own law, and prove that the phrase "unto thousands" is to be used with the word "generations" understood: "showing mercy unto thousands of generations of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Therefore though sin is great, the mercy of God is greater. Though the sins of men may reach even to the third and fourth generations, the mercy of God will extend to a thousand generations of those who love him and keep his commandments. This mercy is revealed in its fullness in Christ Jesus the Lord, who came "in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." And "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Oh, who will not yield to the mercy and the grace of God? Who will not yield the guilt of sin and the love of

it, as well as the tendency toward it, to the abounding grace of God, and the gracious leading of his Holy Spirit? Who will still allow the cruel reign of sin, and refuse the gentle, kindly, loving reign of the grace of God? God pities the sinner, he knows all his weakness, he waits to be gracious, he longs to show mercy to him to a thousand generations, if only he will yield. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." ""For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands [of generations] of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

J.

"The Powers that Be Are Ordained of God" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 30 , p. 472.

WE stated last week that the whole Bible bears out the plain truth and the obvious sense of the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." We have not space to present all the texts that might be given in direct proof of it, but we shall give enough to show that Paul when he wrote this declaration was only doing as was his wont, reasoning out of the Scriptures.

Everybody knows that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, and that he was a heathen. Yet God spake by his prophet directly to Nebuchadnezzar, and said, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for *the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all.*" Dan. 2:37, 38. Through the prophet Jeremiah, the Lord sent yokes and bonds to the kingdoms of Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Sidon, by the messengers that came from these kings to Jerusalem, and with them also he sent this message: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Thus shall ye say unto your masters: I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, *and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me.* And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; . . . and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand." Jer. 27:4-8.

Now as Nebuchadnezzar was a heathen, and as his kingdom was a heathen kingdom, we can hardly think that even the National Reformers would pronounce his authority to be exactly "God's ideal of civil government." Yet there can be no shadow of doubt that the power possessed by Nebuchadnezzar and exercised

by him over all the kingdoms and peoples round about, was a power that was ordained of God, for the word of God says so, and said so to him in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The word of the Lord by Jeremiah asserted not only that this power was given to him, but to "his son and his son's son" as well; and this succession covered the whole period of the kingdom of Babylon from Nebuchadnezzar to its fall. Therefore the proof is positive that the power of the Empire of Babylon was ordained of God.

The grandson of Nebuchadnezzar—Belshazzar—in the midst of the riotous feast of Tammuz, was told by the prophet of the Lord, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it;" and, "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." The commander who led the forces of the Medes and Persians was Cyrus and Persian. And of him the Lord had said: "Thus said the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand / have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure." Isa. 45:1; 44:28. When Babylon fell, the rule of the Medo-Persian Empire fell first to Darius the Mede, instead of to Cyrus. And the angel Gabriel said to Daniel, "I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him." Dan. 11:1. Therefore the word of God is clear that the power of the Medo-Persian Government was ordained of God.

But not to multiply instances by noting them in detail, we will quote the scripture that sums up the whole subject in few words: "Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are his; and he changeth the times and the seasons; *he removeth kings, and setteth up kings.*" Dan. 2:20, 21. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:25. These texts assuredly demonstrate the principle declared by Paul in Rom. 13:1, that "there is no power but of God;" and that "the powers that be are ordained of God." But if these texts should not be enough to demonstrate it, then we may add the crucial text of all Scripture. When Christ stood before Pilate, "Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that / *have power* to crucify thee, and have *power* to release thee? Jesus answered, *Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.*" John 19:10, 11.

The demonstration is complete, therefore, that the words of Rom. 13:1 are a statement of *fact* and not of *theory*; that "the powers that be *are* ordained of God;" and that "there *is* no power but of God." As the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will; when he has given the power to whom he will, whether to Babylon, to Medo-Persia, to Grecia, to Rome, to England, or to the United States; whether that will be direct or permissive, who shall say that that power is not of him? and who shall say that that is not the power that ought to be? And to such powers Christians are taught to be respectful, quiet, peaceable, obedient subjects, and not revolutionists. The following from Macaulay is to the point:—

"The powers which the apostle . . . pronounces to be ordained of God, are not the powers that can be traced back to a legitimate origin, but the powers *that be*. When Jesus was asked whether the

chosen people might lawfully give tribute to Cesar, he replied by asking the questioners, not whether Cesar could make out a pedigree derived from the old royal house of Judah, but whether the coin which they scrupled to pay into Cesar's treasury came from Cesar's mint, in other words, whether Cesar actually possessed the authority and performed the functions of a ruler.

"It is generally held, with much appearance of reason, that the most trustworthy comment on the text of the Gospels and Epistles is to be found in the practice of the primitive Christians, when that practice can be satisfactorily ascertained; and it so happened that the times during which the church is universally acknowledged to have been in the highest state of purity were times of frequent and violent political change. One at least of the apostles appears to have lived to see four emperors pulled down in a little more than a year. Of the martyrs of the third century a great proportion must have been able to remember ten or twelve revolutions. Those martyrs must have had occasion often to consider what was their duty towards a prince just raised to power by a successful insurrection. That they were, one and all, deterred by the fear of punishment from doing what they thought right, is an imputation which no candid infidel would throw on them. Yet if there be any proposition which can with perfect confidence be affirmed touching the early Christians, it is this, that they never once refused obedience to any actual ruler on account of the illegitimacy of his title. At one time, indeed, the supreme power was claimed by twenty or thirty competitors. Every province from Britain to Egypt had its own Augustus. . . . Yet it does not appear that, in any place, the faithful had any scruple about submitting to the person who, in that place, exercised the imperial functions. While the Christian of Rome obeyed Aurelian, the Christian of Lyons obeyed Tetricus, and the Christian of Palmyra obeyed Zenobia. 'Day and night'—such were the words which the great Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, addressed to the representative of Valerian and Gallienus—'day and night do we Christians pray to the one true God for the safety of our emperors.'"—*History of England, chap. 14.*

These, however, were law-abiding subjects and citizens, and not National Reform revolutionists.

J.

August 11, 1887

"The Third Commandment" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31 , pp. 487, 488.

"THOU shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." The name of God is holy and must not be used lightly, profanely, nor vainly. Often in the Scriptures the direction is given, "Neither shalt thou profane my holy name." The word profane means to make common. The name of God is not to be used in a way, nor with a frequency, that will make it to us as a common word or name. To use that holy name unnecessarily is to use it vainly, and is transgression of the commandment. To speak it in a connection, or with a frequency, that will detract from the reverence that becomes that sacred name, is to take the name of the Lord in vain, and is sin. The word reverend is used but once in the Bible and then with sole reference to that holy name, saying, "Holy and reverend is his name." Ps. 111:9. And his express will is "that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD." Deut. 28:58.

In view of this it is certain that the practice of relating anecdotes, or of inventing or repeating witticisms, in which the name of the Lord is used, is transgression of this commandment, and therefore is sin. Whether those who do such things mean wrong by it, is not the question. It is wrong whether they mean it so or not. It is sin in itself. Its tendency is to reduce to the level of common things the name of "the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy;" and it makes that "glorious and fearful name" to be the butt of the silly pleasantries and would-be witticisms of the profane lips of irreverent men. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

Nor is the transgression of this commandment confined to those who make no pretension to godliness. It is often broken by professed Christians, and that too in their prayers. We have heard people pray, by whom almost every sentence was introduced with the name of the Lord. In fact, in some instances about the only use of that name in their prayers, after the first personal address, seemed to be simply as a catch-word, and was in every sense of the word taking the name of the Lord in vain. Its use, in such cases, is purposeless so far as any idea of reverence, or any just conception of the holiness of the holy name, is concerned. Such a practice is a violation of the third commandment, and such prayers are sinful. The practice is plainly forbidden by the Saviour in his instructions on the subject of prayer: "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions." Matt. 6:7. And to use the name of the Lord at the beginning of every sentence, or of every alternate sentence, is nothing else than "vain repetition," and is sin.

We do not say that every repetition of the name is vain, nor that to repeat the name more than once in a prayer of considerable length and fervency would be sinful, because such a thing might be done with becoming reverence. In Jacob's prayer when he was "greatly afraid and distressed" because of his fear of Esau, the name of God is not used at all after the address to him at the beginning. Gen. 32:6-12. It is so also in the prayer of Abraham's servant. Gen. 24:12-14. In Solomon's long prayer at the dedication of the temple the name of the Lord is only used ten times. 2 Chron. 6:14-42. In the prayer of Moses which occupies the whole of the ninetieth psalm—seventeen verses—the name is used but four times. In David's deeply penitential prayer—the fifty-first psalm—he uses the holy name but seven times. In Ezra's most sorrowful prayer the name is used but nine times.

Ezra 9:6-15. In the longest prayer in the Bible the sacred name is used only seven times. Neh. 9:6-38. In Daniel's prayer of thanks for the secret of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, he used the name but twice. Dan. 2:20-23. The prayer in which that name is used the most of any in the Bible is Daniel's of the ninth chapter, when he was earnestly pleading for an understanding of the word of the Lord—a prayer that ended in a holy vision with the angel Gabriel talking to him. There the name is used seventeen times.

Now we believe it a perfectly safe rule to follow, that unless our prayers shall exceed these both in length and fervency, the name of the Lord should not be used more than it is in these. In fact, the model which the Saviour gave does not use the holy name at all except in the form of address, "Our Father, which art in Heaven," and then says, "hallowed be thy name." Matt. 6:9-13. We are sure that this means something in this connection, especially as it is given immediately after the command to "use not vain repetitions." Oh, that those who pray would heed these words, and really learn to fear "this glorious and fearful name, The Lord thy God"! Nor is this wish confined to those who pray, while they are praying. We would that these words might be heeded by those who preach as well as pray, and be heeded *while they are preaching*. Time and again have we been pained by the light, frivolous, and irreverent use of this holy name by preachers, even in the pulpit. We heard one "evangelical" minister in the presence of a house full of people use that name in a way which, if used by anyone else out of the pulpit, would be set down at once as outright profanity. Sacred names were used glibly, in a way in which we should not dare to write them even in giving an account of it. There is more depth of sacred meaning in that third commandment than half of even professed Christians have ever dreamed of. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

Nor yet does the commandment stop with forbidding the vain use of that name itself. The commandments of God are "exceeding broad." The commandment not only forbids the overt act of transgression, but it forbids everything which in its nature would lead to the overt act of transgression. Thus the Saviour magnified the law of God. On the subject of this commandment, he said: "Ye have heard that it hath been said to the of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths; but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; not by the earth; for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." Matt. 5:33-37.

This at once and forever forbids all manner of by-words, and every form of extravagant expression confirmation of our plain statement. Let your yes be yes, and your no be no, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. That is the truth. Whether you mean evil by it or not does not enter into the question at all. It is evil whether you mean it so or not. It cometh of evil, and is evil in itself. If to make your word acceptable to your neighbor, you require more than your plain, unvarnished statement, then you have taken the first step in the course which

leads inevitably to the taking of the name of God in vain; it is the first step in that evil way which ends in the open transgression of the commandment of God. The whole way is evil, do not walk in it; the first step cometh of evil, therefore do not take it. "Above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation." James 5:12. Therefore all by-words, all extravagant expressions in confirmation of our plain word, "whatsoever" is more than yes, or no, is a transgression of the third commandment, and therefore is sin. It "cometh of evil," and whoever does it will surely "fall into condemnation." Whosoever has done it is in condemnation, and can only be released by the faith of Christ and the merit of his precious blood.

There is nothing in this, however, that should be construed into the prohibition of the judicial oath. Civil government is of God and to promise to civil government, in other words to the whole body of civil society, in response to the just demand of the body politic, that with the help of God you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is not forbidden by the word of God. The Saviour "held his peace" until the high priest in his official capacity put him on his oath, saying, "I adjure thee [to charge on oath] by the living God" (Geikie translates it, "I put you on your oath by the living God"); *then Jesus answered*. The example of Christ therefore is in favor of the judicial oath. But both his example and his word are against all other oaths.

Another view of this subject is given in Eccl. 5:2-6: "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few. . . . When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou hast vowed. Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay. Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin; neither say thou before the angel, that it was an error; wherefore should God be angry at thy voice, and destroy the work of thine hands?" To vow a vow unto God and not to pay it is to take the name of the Lord in vain. In the one hundred and seventh psalm David shows how this is often done. Men will wander in the wilderness, and get hungry and thirsty, and their soul faints in them—they nearly perish, and suppose they are really going to perish—then they cry unto the Lord, and make confession, and strong promises of service to him if only they should be allowed to live; the Lord hears them and delivers them, then they will be very sober and exemplary for a little while, then they go back to their old ways and are as bad as ever. Or they may be seized with sickness, and draw near to the gates of death; or perchance go down to the sea in ships, a storm rises, and they think they are about to be swallowed up; then they will pray, and call loudly unto God, and he hears and delivers them, raises them up from the bed of languishing, or brings them unto their desired haven, they appear very pious for a little while and then it is all forgotten—by them. But it is not forgotten by the Lord. Such doing is taking the name of the Lord in vain and is sin, and in the day when he visits he will visit their sin upon them, except indeed they shall show genuine repentance and amendment of life through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Yet we are all ever ready to form good resolutions, and make vows and promises to God, when we

are in trouble. And that is all right. God many times suffers us to get into straits so that we may see ourselves and awake to our real relationship to him. It is right for us to make good resolutions, and vows, and promises to God. The wrong is in not sticking to the resolutions and not keeping the promises, nor paying the vows. David said: "I will go into thy house with burnt-offering; I will pay thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble." Ps. 66:13, 14. David was just like all the rest of us when he got into trouble, he made vows and promises and prayers, but he was also unlike the great majority in that he stuck to them when he got out. When he got out of trouble he paid to God the vows that he had made when he was in trouble.

Others there are who make vows to God at other times than when they are in trouble. They go to church; they hear an earnest presentation of the needs of the cause of God, and under the good influences of the Spirit of God they will vow to the Lord that if only he will enable them to secure the means they will make a donation of perhaps \$500, or \$1,000, or \$2,000, or \$5,000, or may be more. The Lord puts the money into their hands, and they keep the last cent of it, and let their vow go with the breath that uttered it, and so take the name of the Lord in vain, and live on in the sin of it, and think they are doing God service. "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform; even a freewill offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth." Deut. 23:21-23.

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy

488

God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

"That thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD."

"Wherefore . . . let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire."

J.

"For What Are the Powers That Be, Ordained?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 31 , pp. 488, 489.

HAVING shown, in another place, that the powers that be are ordained of God, the question comes up for consideration, For what are these powers ordained? The National Reform theory claims that because the powers "that ought to be" are ordained to God, it follows that those powers would be ordained to minister in all things pertaining to God and man. But such an interpretation is just as far from the truth as is the average National Reform interpretation.

The powers that be are ordained of God *in things that pertain to civil government and in that alone*. The magistrate is "the minister of God" solely in things civil and in nothing else. And men are to be subject to the higher powers in things civil, and in nothing else, for those powers have to do with things civil and nothing else. It is admitted by the National Reformers that Romans 13:1-10 treats

"of civil government and of civil duties." Now the definition of *civil* according to Webster is, "*Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State.*" Civil government, therefore, pertaining solely to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens or to the State, in the very nature of the case can have nothing at all to do with the relations of the citizens to God. And as the National Reform definition of *religion* is, "Man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God," this is to say that civil government can, of right, have nothing whatever to do with religion. That these propositions are correct, we have decisive proof in two notable instances.

We have shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar was ordained of God. Now this same Nebuchadnezzar took upon himself to play the *role* of the grand National Reformer of his day. It was not enough that he should be ordained of God to rule in the relations of men with their fellow-men or with the State, but he must take it upon himself to rule in men's relations to God. It was not enough that his power was ordained of God in things civil, but he must exercise his power in things religious. It was not enough that he should rule men's bodies, he must rule their consciences as well. He would compel men to worship the god that he should choose and as he chose. Accordingly he made a colossal image, and set it up in the plain of Dura, not far from Babylon, and then sent and gathered together "the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers" to the dedication of the image. Then when all were assembled, he published an edict by a loud-voiced herald, that at a signal sounded by all the musical instruments together, everybody should fall down and worship the great golden image, and this under penalty, upon whosoever refused, of being pitched into a fiery furnace.

But in the crowd there happened to be three "political atheists"—Jews they were then called—who chose to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and so refused to obey the law. They were called up and asked about it, but they persisted in their opposition to National Reform, and said plainly, "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." But according to President Seelye's National Reform principle, the State, *i.e.*, Nebuchadnezzar, was both "courageous" and "wise," and therefore did "not falter," and into the burning fiery furnace intensely heated the "political atheists" were thrust.

NO POWER OVER CONSCIENCE

Then King Nebuchadnezzar "rose up in haste" and cried to his counselors, "Did not we cast *three* men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O King. He answered and said, Lo, I see *four* men *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Then the king called to the men to come out, and they did so, untouched by the fire. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, *who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants* that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any

god, *except their own God.*" Thus God not only brought Nebuchadnezzar to the kingdom and ordained him a power over all the kingdoms and nations round about, but he also demonstrated to him that although his power was ordained of God, that power was not ordained in things pertaining to God. The Lord showed him that although God had given him power over all kingdoms and nations, he had not given him power over the worship, the faith, or the conscience of a single individual in any nation.

The Lord not only showed this to Nebuchadnezzar, but by having it recorded in his word he has shown it to all people to whom that word shall come. And it is one of the most surprising things, that in the end of this nineteenth century, in this land of Bibles and consequent light and liberty, there should arise a set of men who will go about to put in practice in this Government the principles of the heathen Nebuchadnezzar. There might be allowed some excuse for a poor, blind heathen doing such a thing twenty-four hundred and sixty-seven years ago; but what shadow of excuse can there possibly be for men who will do it now, with the Bible in their hands, and in the face of a miracle of God wrought expressly to show the iniquity of it?

Nor is this case of Nebuchadnezzar the only instance in which God has shown to men that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are ordained only in things pertaining to men, in their relations to their fellow-men as citizens, and to the State. Under Darius, the Mede, whose power was ordained of God, some envious officials grew so jealous of the prime minister, that they determined to get him out of the way. But in all their searching and spying they utterly failed to find any fault at all in him. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." But there was no State law by which they could interfere with his rights of conscience or his liberty of worship.

489

So like the true National Reformers they were, they set to work to "inaugurate a revolution." They pretended to be greatly interested in the honor of the king, and the good of the State. Darius, suspecting nothing, but supposing their representations were made in good faith, fell into the trap, and enacted the law which they had framed. At their solicitation he established a statute, and signed a decree that nobody should ask any petition of either God or man, save of the king, for thirty days; and that, too, under the dreadful penalty of being made food for lions.

But Daniel knew that the power of Medo-Persia was not ordained to any such work as that, and when he "knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and, his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Then those men found Daniel praying, as was a foregone certainty, and rushed to the king with the report. Suddenly the eyes of Daniel were opened; he saw that he had been trapped, and took shame to himself that he had allowed himself to be so terribly hoodwinked, and immediately began to try to deliver Daniel out of their persecuting hands. "And he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him," but there was no remedy;

the thing was law and the law had to take its course, for it could not be changed, and consequently to the lions Daniel had to go. But so far as Daniel was concerned the result in this instance was the same as the other, for when Darius hastened to the den in the morning and called out to him, Daniel answered him cheerfully and said, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as *before him innocency was found in me*; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

DON'T TRUST THEM

Now the same evil principle illustrated in this case, is being practiced in the United States to-day. And it is being worked in the same way precisely. Preachers professing great interest in the workingman, or great regard for the safety of the State, will go to the Legislature with a petition, and get some one of their kind to introduce a bill, for the enactment of a rigorous Sunday law, or for the repeal of a protective clause in an already rigorous law, and all this professedly as a "police regulation" or "in the interests of prohibition," or anything else but what it really is. And by pious pretensions, honeyed phrases, and fair speeches, they conceal their real purpose, succeed in hoodwinking the Legislature, and secure the passage of their innocent appearing bill. But as soon as their will has been made law, their interest in the "workingman," or in "prohibition," etc., suddenly ceases, and the whole tide of inquisition, prosecution, and persecution, is turned against a few innocent people who choose to worship God on Saturday instead of on Sunday. This thing was actually accomplished two years ago in Arkansas, and in all the working of the Sunday law so secured, we have not been able to learn of a single case in which the person prosecuted was not a Seventh-day Adventist or a Seventh-day Baptist. By the efforts of the lawyers of that State, and the earnest leadership of Senator Crockett, the Legislature has remedied the iniquitous statute.

Nor is this evil spirit confined to Arkansas. In California the present year, the same scheme was tried on the Legislature, but it failed. The same thing was tried in the Legislature of Minnesota, about the same time as in California, and there too, at almost the last moment, the real intent of the thing was discovered, and the scheme frustrated. In Texas, also, and other States, it has been attempted, and all within the present year, but so far we believe all have failed, because the evil was discovered before it was too late. And what those men did in the law of Medo-Persia, and what these parties have done, and have tried to do in the laws of these States, that precisely what the National Reform party is aiming to do in the Constitution and laws of the nation.

If the Legislatures of the States, or the national Legislature, will guard against persecution, let them beware of all preachers, people, parties, or associations, who try to secure the enactment of Sunday laws, or the repeal of exemption clauses in Sunday laws already enacted.

Nor is it only in the cases of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar that God has shown that civil government is not ordained of God in things pertaining to God, but only in things pertaining to the citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens and to the

State. Christ laid down the principle that severs forever the connection between the State and religion, and which shows conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God only in things civil, and have nothing whatever to do with any man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Certain of the Pharisees came to Jesus and asked:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and laid, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

With that read the following from Paul's words in Romans 13:1-10, and compare the italicized words:—

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. . . For, for this cause *pay ye tribute also*; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. *Render therefore* to all their dues; *tribute to whom tribute is due*; custom to whom custom; honor to whom honor."

Now what man can read these two passages of Scripture together, and honestly or truthfully say other than that Paul had in view the word of Christ, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's? and that Romans 13:1-10 is an inspired comment upon the words of Christ, showing not only that the powers that be are ordained of God, but also showing *in what* they are ordained of God?—No one, assuredly. This is made even clearer still by the fact that Paul in referring to the duties that devolve upon men under the powers that be, makes not a single reference to any of the first four commandments; but says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; *and if there be any other commandment*, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," thus referring solely to the second table of the law, and showing conclusively that the powers that be are ordained of God in things civil,—in things pertaining to the relations of man with his fellow-man,—and in those things alone.

As in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing whatever to do with the first table of the law of God. Again, as the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duty that men owe to the powers that be there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties contained in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say again that the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any one of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to God, and with them the powers that be can of right have nothing to do, because Christ has commanded to render unto God—not to Cesar, nor by Cesar—that which is God's.

Therefore the proof is conclusive, and the truth absolute, that the National Reform ideas of civil government are utterly at fault, and that their interpretations of Scripture on the subject of civil government are only perversions of Scripture.—*A. T. J. in American Sentinel.*

August 18, 1887

"The Fourth Commandment. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32 , pp. 502, 503.

"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." Ex. 20:8-11.

This commandment enjoins the holy observance of a day which it calls the Sabbath-day. And as Sabbath means rest, it enjoins the holy observance of the rest-day. The commandment distinctly designates the day which is to be thus observed—"The seventh day is the Sabbath." That is to say, the commandment gives a term—"the Sabbath"—and then gives a distinct and plain definition of that term—"The seventh day is the Sabbath." Or, in other words, if translated, Remember the rest-day. The seventh day is the rest-day.

But whose Sabbath-day, whose rest-day, is it? Is it your own rest that you are to remember? Does this commandment say to men, even in substance, Remember that you are tired, or will get tired, and you need a day of rest, and you must not fail to set apart one day in seven for your physical recuperation; therefore remember a rest-day? Is that the meaning of the commandment? Not by any manner of means. Yet that is the very idea that is now most widely prevalent, as to the meaning and purpose of this commandment. But it is difficult to conceive how it would be possible to get further from the truth without denying that the commandment has any meaning or purpose at all. It is not denied of course that man's physical rest and his physical good are involved in the commandment; but these are entirely incidental. In the commandment there is no reference to any such consideration. A mere glance at the commandment will show that it relates to man's duty to God and not to himself.

The seventh day is the Sabbath, the rest, not of man, but of "the Lord thy God." It is the Sabbath-day, the rest-day of the Lord, and not of man, that is to be remembered. Man is to work six days and rest the seventh day, not because that is best for him physically, but because the Lord worked six days and rested the seventh day. It is not denied that this proportion of work to rest is the best, but it is not commanded because it is best, it is best because it is commanded. It is best, as everything else in the line of obedience to God is best, because it is in obedience to the commandment of God. Man is to keep

the rest-day holy, not because it is best for society that all should agree upon one certain day, but because God made the day holy. All this is borne on the very face of the commandment itself. Notice, first, "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." This is that part of the commandment which enjoins man's duty. Now what is the reason for all this? Why is it that man must remember the Sabbath-day; to work six days; and to do no work on the seventh day? The commandment gives just one answer, and that is full and explicit. And here it is: "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 which reason] the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

These are the fundamental and genuine reasons which underlie the obligations that rest upon man by the fourth commandment. And thus it is not only in the commandment but throughout the whole Bible in treating of this subject. It is the honor of God that is in view in the commandment, and not the good of man, only as the highest and best good of man is always bound up in his supremely honoring God. This is clearly revealed in another important text: "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, 15. In view of the commandment, and of this text and a number of others that might be given, it is hard to understand how that man can be, as he too often is, made the prime object in the meaning of the commandment, unless it be that in the minds of such people man occupies a larger place than does the Creator of all things. This however is to be expected now, for in these last days the leading characteristic is that "men shall be lovers of their own selves," and of their selfish "pleasures, more than lovers of God."

It is true that "The Sabbath was made for man," for so said the Saviour. But it was *not* made for man in the sense which is made most prominent in these days. It was made for him expressly that by it he might ever keep in memory the Creator of heaven and earth and all that in them is, and that man might honor him as such; that man might know the Lord of all and honor him whom he should know. This is plainly stated: "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, *that ye may know* that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:20. But by what means does it become a sign of the true God? Thus: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; *for* [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." Ex. 31:17. The Sabbath therefore is the sign of God's creative power, and if remembered to be kept holy it will ever keep the Creator of all things in the memory of whosoever remembers it to so keep it. And if all men had ever so

remembered to keep it, even after the fall, there would never have been in all the world a false god nor an idolater.

To bear in mind the fact that it is the Lord's rest, and the Lord's rest-day, and not man's, that are to be remembered; in short, to bear in mind the words of the commandment, at once relieves the Sabbath question of all obscurity. But to misread the commandment, or to ignore its plain statements, is only to create obscurity and confusion. Thus, men nowadays read the first sentence of the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy;" and then say that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Sabbath, and wholly ignore all the rest of the commandment. Yet the word "ignore" does not half express the fact in the case. The truth is that to call Sunday the Sabbath is to flatly contradict the commandment of God; and to make the commandment teach the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath is to make it teach open falsehood. For—

1. Everybody knows that Sunday is the *first day* of the week, and the commandment of God says that "*The seventh day* is the Sabbath." Therefore to call Sunday the Sabbath is to contradict the commandment of God.

.2. The word "Sabbath" means *rest*. The phrase, "the Sabbath of the Lord," means, the *rest* of the Lord. And the command to remember the Sabbath-day of the Lord, is only the command to remember the rest-day of the Lord. But to call the first day of the week the Sabbath-day of the Lord, is to call it the *rest*-day of the Lord, while it is not, and never was, and never can be, the rest-day of the Lord. The word of God says that he "rested the seventh day;" therefore to call the first day of the week the Sabbath-day—the *rest*-day—is to contradict the word of God.

.3. Because God had rested the seventh day, therefore he blessed (put honor upon) the Sabbath—the *rest*-day and hallowed it—made it holy. It was thus that he made it the holy Sabbath-day. Now to call Sunday a holy day or the holy Sabbath-day, is to say that God rested the first day, that he blessed the first day, and that he hallowed the first day; whereas the word of God says that he rested the seventh day, that he blessed the seventh day and hallowed it. Therefore to call Sunday the Sabbath-day, the holy Sabbath-day, or the Lord's day, is to contradict the word of God. And to make the commandment of God teach any such thing as that of the first day of the week is to make it teach falsehood.

God did not rest the first day; therefore it is not, and cannot truthfully be called, the rest or Sabbath-day. God did not bless (put honor upon) the first day; then it is not, and cannot truthfully be called, "honorable." God did not hallow the first day; therefore it is not, and cannot truthfully be called, "holy," nor can it possibly be kept holy. But all these God did with the seventh day. He rested the seventh day; therefore he says "the seventh day is the Sabbath." He blessed the seventh day; therefore he calls it "holy," and commands men to call it "holy" and remember it to keep it holy. And it is one of the strangest things imaginable how it can be that right in the face of the plain, positive statement of the word of God, men will try to pass off upon themselves and others, as the Sabbath, that which is not, and cannot by any possibility be, the Sabbath. We know, of course, that there are thousands of people keeping Sunday who have never looked into the subject attentively, and who are not intentionally breaking the commandment of

God, and who, when they see what the word of God really says about the Sabbath, will readily conform to the truth of God, in the fear of the Lord. The discussion of this question is now, however, becoming so prominent and so widespread, that no one can much longer escape a decision for or against the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord.

The seventh day is the only day that can be kept holy, because it is the only day of the week that the Lord ever made holy. As therefore it is impossible for man to keep holy what has never been made holy, and the first day of the week never having been made holy, it is impossible for any man, or even for all men together with one unanimous consent, to keep holy the Sunday. While, on the other hand, the Lord having made the seventh day holy and honorable, it *is* holy and honorable whether men keep it so, or regard it so, or not. If not a man on earth should keep the seventh day yet that day would be just as holy as though there was not a man who did not keep it. God made the day holy at the creation of the world, and holy it will ever remain, whatever man may do. Therefore the fourth commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath-day *to keep it holy*," and to not do so is to sin and make ourselves unholy. Our keeping or not keeping the Sabbath holy, does not in the least affect the character of the day; but it does most decidedly affect our own character and standing in the sight of the Holy One who made the day holy, and who commands all men to remember it to keep it holy.

"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; . . . 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." And "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." Will you call the Sabbath of the Lord what he commands you to call it? Will you do as he here tells you to do? Will you "honor him" thus? Remember, thus saith the Lord, "Them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed."

J.

"A Political Gospel" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32 , pp. 503, 504.

MRS. MARY A. WOODBRIDGE, recording secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and vice-president of the National Reform Association, made the principal National Reform speech at Chautauqua Assembly, on National Reform Day, July 23, last year. Among many other such like things in her speech, we find the following:—

"Shall we not amend our National Constitution, that the world shall know that we acknowledge Christ as Ruler? as the Head of our nation? and in his name,

and for his glory, shall not 'We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union,' thus 'ordain'? While we render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's and unto God the things that are God's, is eminently sound and practical Christian doctrine. But the practice of that principle is not at all what the National Reformers want the people of this nation to do. The National Reformers not only want us to render to Cesar that which is Cesar's but they want to *compel* us to render to Cesar that *which is God's*. This we, under Christ, deny their right to do; and by his help, it is what we will never submit to do.

In these words Christ established a clear distinction between Cesar and God, between that which is Cesar's and that which is God's; that is, between the civil and the religious power, and between what we owe to the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. We owe to Cesar, the civil power, that which is civil; we owe to God, the religious power, that which is religious. This is the distinction which God, in Christ, has absolutely fixed. Whoever seeks to confound this distinction is against God and against Christ; to join, or to seek to join, the religious with the civil power is to confound the distinction; and to join the religious with the civil power is precisely what the National Reform party proposes to do. The logical conclusion from this is clear, and we do not hesitate to say that it is strictly according to Scripture, and, therefore, perfectly true.

For the State to enforce religious duties it thereby demands that to Cesar shall be rendered that which is God's, and therefore it usurps the place of God, and so far as it is obeyed, it destroys the true worship of God. We know the claim that these men make, as of all of their kind in the dreadful history of persecution everywhere, that is, that it is the true worship of God and of Christ which they ask that the civil power shall enforce, and this according to the Bible. But no such thing can be alone. Christ did not say that we should render to Cesar that which is God's; neither did he say that we should render to God *by Cesar* that which is God's. That which is God's is his, and we are to render it to him direct, without

504

any of the meddling mediumship of Cesar. When we have rendered to Cesar that which is Cesar's we have rendered to Cesar all his due, and he has no right to demand any more. And when he has so received his just due on all his proper claims, then what business is it of Cesar's how we render to God that which is God's, or whether we render if at all or not? It is just none of his business. And when he seeks to make it his business he is meddling with that which in no wise concerns him. One of the unbecoming and irreverent results of such action is well expressed by Gibbon, in speaking of Constantine and his sons:—

"Those princes presumed to extend their despotism over the faith, as well as over the lives and fortunes, of their subjects; and the prerogatives of the King of Heaven were settled, or changed, or modified, in the cabinet of an earthly monarch."
Decline and Fall, chap. 21, par. 16.

Could anything possibly be more incongruous! It is just such incongruity that these words of Christ are intended forever to prevent. Yet history is full of it, and while our own Government has escaped it so far, now the National Reform party seeks by the subversion of the Constitution to inflict it upon this great nation.

Whenever the civil power steps between a man and God and proposes to regulate just what shall be rendered to God, and just how it shall be rendered, then Cesar is entirely out of his place. George Washington was a man for whose opinions we suppose there is yet remaining some respect on the part of Americans, and he said:—

"I have often expressed my opinion that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

We say again, that in the words, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's" (Matt. 22:21), Christ separated forever the civil from the religious power. And the National Reform party, in its endeavor to join them, clearly sets itself against the word of Christ.

But the National Reform idea of the work of the gospel is as crude as its idea of the relation of the civil and the religious power. Mrs. Woodbridge says further:—

"An Amendment to the National Constitution requires the indorsement of two-thirds of the States to become law. Although the action must be taken by State legislative bodies, let such an Amendment be submitted, and it would become the paramount issue at the election of legislators, and thus God would be in the thought, and his name upon the lip of every man. May not this be the way opened to us? How to bring the gospel of Christ to the masses has been, and is, the vexing problem of the church. Would not the problem be solved? . . . In considering the submission of such an Amendment, we may use the very argument used by Moses, in his song containing these words of Jehovah, 'For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life; and through this thing ye shall prolong your days in the land.' How prayerfulness would be stimulated! Conscience would press the words, 'If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him!' Then would there be searchings of heart, as David's, of which we learn in the fifty-first psalm. Prayer would bring faith and the power of the Spirit; and when such power shall rest upon the children of God, there *will* be added to the church daily such as shall be saved."

Oh, yes; to be sure! What a most excellent method of bringing the gospel (?) to the masses! Most assuredly the problem would be solved. This scheme has been tried, and the problem solved, before, and in much the same way. By making the subject of the Trinitarian controversy a national and governmental issue the name of God and of Christ was "upon the lip," clubs, stones, or military weapons in the hands, and murder in the heart, of every man. Thus the gospel was brought to the masses, and so there was added to the church daily such as should be—. Especially in the city of Rome, by this means, the masses became so devout that in the most exciting and decisive moment of a horse-race, the whole multitude in the vast circus could in an instant turn their minds to the gospel (?) and shout, "One God, One Christ, One Bishop." And, by the way, the

women were among the leaders, and were the main help in bringing about this triumph of the gospel among the masses at a horse-race in the Roman circus. Thus, in that age, was the gospel brought to the masses; thus, then, was the problem solved. And "history repeats itself," even to the part the women play in the political project of bringing the gospel to the masses. (See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. 38, par. 35.)

But illustrations are hardly needed to show how entirely foreign to the gospel of Christ are such propositions and such arguments as we here present from the Chautauqua National Reform Speech.

Such stuff needs but to be read to be condemned utterly by everyone who has any respect for the gospel or for its Author. But if the reading of this is not enough to condemn both it and the cause in behalf of which it must be used, then we shall insert just one more sentence from the very midst of whence these are copied. Immediately following the words "Would not the problem be solved?" are these:—

"Yea, Christ would then be lifted up, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and would we not have right to claim the fulfillment of the promise, that 'He will draw all men unto himself?'"

To think of a political campaign managed by ambitious clerics, political hypocrites, ward politicians, and city bosses, and call that bringing the gospel of Christ to the masses, and the means of adding to the church daily such as shall be saved, is certainly a conception of the gospel of Christ which is degrading enough in all conscience. But when to cap such a conception, it is avowed that such would be the lifting up of Christ, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and the fulfillment of the promise that he will draw all men unto him, the whole idea becomes one that is vastly nearer to open blasphemy than it is to the proper conception of the gospel of Christ. But such, and of such, is the gospel of National Reform.

J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Trust in Our Heavenly Father.
Matt. 6:24-34" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 32 , pp. 506, 507.**

(September 4.—Matt. 6:24-34.)

"YE cannot serve God and mammon." "Mammon is a Syriac word meaning riches. It is riches personified." The meaning therefore is, "Ye cannot serve God and riches." Ye cannot trust in God and trust in riches. Yet, although the word is so abundant, so strong, and so explicit on this subject, there are many who do attempt to serve God and riches both, and multitudes more who serve, and trust in, riches alone. There are multitudes who rejoice because their wealth is great and because their hand has gathered much. There are multitudes more who grieve because their wealth is *not* great, and because their hand has *not* gotten much, and so make gold their aim, their hope, and their confidence. The *trust* is in riches and not in God.

BUT God's charge to one class of these, those who *are* rich, is this: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, *nor trust in uncertain riches*, but *in the living God* who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:17-19.

TO the other class God says: "They that *will be* rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6:9, 10. But to all who would fear God he says: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." For "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." 1 Tim. 6:11, 12; Mark 10:25.

BUT says everyone on his own behalf, "I do not trust in riches." Try yourself and see. Apply to yourself the test that Jesus put upon the young man, and see whether you love God or your riches most. "Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me." If that were demanded of you personally to-day by the Master, how would you stand the test? Would you stand it any better than the young man did? If not, then is your trust in God or in your wealth? Luke says that when that young man heard this, "he was very sorrowful; for he was very rich." Notice, his sorrow seems to have been graduated on the scale of his riches. He was *very* sorrowful, because he was *very* rich. Perhaps if he had simply been rich, he would only have been sorrowful, yet even in that case his trust in his riches would have denied the God who is above. While had he been poor, as Matthew the publican, or as the fishermen who plied their nets on the waters of Galilee, he doubtless would have been glad of the call of the Saviour, and would have followed instantly.

THE Saviour gave us a parable on this very subject (Luke 12:15-21) when he told of that rich man whose ground brought forth plentifully, and he had no room to bestow his fruits and goods; and he said he would pull down his barns and build greater, and there bestow his goods, and then would say to himself, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?" What was it that God said to him? "Thou fool." What is it the fool says? "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Exactly. This man was saying, in effect, that there is not God. He was trusting in his riches, and denying the God that is above. "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." Therefore, "take heed and beware of covetousness," for "covetousness is idolatry," and "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

NOR yet do we want to run to the other extreme and unmeasuredly denounce riches, and money, and whatever bears any semblance to means. It is not in

money that the evil lies. Human society cannot exist without money of some sort. There must be some circulating medium. It may be silver or gold, paper or leather, brass or copper, with some device stamped upon it. But whatever it is, it is money; and in the place where it is used, he who has the most of it will be the richest. Money is *not* the root of all evil. Of itself it is not an evil at all. It is the *love* of money that is the root of all evil. It is not a sin to have money; it *is* a sin to love it. It is not a sin even to have much; it is a sin to love, or to trust in what we have, whether it be little or much. It is not the rich alone who fall into temptation and a snare, and into foolish and hurtful lusts; but it is "they that *will be* rich"—they who all the time have their aim at being rich, who have their eyes on that, and who tend all their efforts toward that, who lie awake nights scheming for it, who spend their lives to attain the unattainable; for "he that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver, nor he that loveth abundance with increase."

IT is not a sin to be rich. Abraham, the friend of God, "was *very rich* in cattle, in silver, and in gold." Gen. 13:2. Job likewise was one of the richest men of his day. Yet neither of these holy men trusted in their riches, nor rejoiced because their wealth was great. They trusted in the living God, and remembered that it was he who gave them power to get wealth. Read in the thirty-first chapter of Job, how he looked upon his wealth—always as only a means of blessing the poor, the needy, the fatherless, and the widow. The sin is not in being rich; it is in trusting in it, putting confidence in it, rejoicing in it, and being proud of it, and highminded because of it. That is to deny the God that is above. "Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God," "and thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God; for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." Deut. 8:11, 17, 18. Trust not in uncertain riches, but in the living God, holding all subject to his call, *ready* to distribute, *willing* to communicate. For thou shalt love no other god but him, and him with all the heart, and all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength.

YET why is it that men will not trust in the Lord entirely and always? Why is it that people will go on in anxious care about what they shall eat or what they shall drink, or wherewithal they shall be clothed? It is because they have not faith in the heavenly Father. But why is it that they have no faith in him? Is it because he has given no assurances of his faithfulness? Oh, no; for what greater assurances could he give? Here is his word by Peter, chosen for the golden text of this lesson, "Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you." He wants no one burdened with care. He wants all to cast all their care upon him and let him do all the caring, while we dwell safely under the shadow of his wings rejoicing. Here is another consideration presented by Paul, and it is one of the strongest encouragements to faith in all the Book. "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." Notice the question is not, "How *shall he* freely give us all things?" but, "How shall he *not*?" The argument is, that if in his great love for us, he would freely give up his dear Son, how shall he not with him freely give us everything else. But more than this: It was while we were yet enemies that God gave his Son to die for us, and those who will obey him he calls his friends. Now if he

would give up his own dear Son to die for his enemies, how shall he not with him freely give all things to his friends?—how can he keep from doing it? Oh, that men would trust the Lord and praise the Lord for his goodness and for his wonderful works to the children of men!

IT seems that the Lord has done his very best—he has exhausted the language and every other resource—in his effort to convey to men the idea of his love and care for them; so that by the prophet he exclaims, "What more could have been done that I have not done?" Here he gives a lesson from "the fowls of the air," Luke says "the ravens." "Your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are

506

ye not much better than they?" And if he so feed them, will he not much more feed you, who are "much better than they"? Next he cites the lilies of the field, which he clothes so gorgeously that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them. But if he "so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not *much more* clothe you, O ye of little faith." If he so care for the grass of the field, which is but for a day, shall he not much more care for you whom he has made for eternity if you will but have it?

IN another place the Saviour brings up this point again, and tries to convey to his people the deep care that he has for them. In Matt. 10:29, he says: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. . . . Fear ye not, therefore ye are more value than many sparrows." Two sparrows for a farthing. Four farthings make one penny, English money, and one penny English money equals two cents of our money. As therefore four farthings make two cents, one farthing would be one-fourth of two cents, which is one-half a cent. But *two* sparrows were sold for a half a cent, therefore one sparrow would be worth but a half of a half a cent, which would be but a quarter of a cent. It seems that this was the highest price too, if they took more they would get them for less, for Luke says *five* sparrows were sold for *two* farthings; so the phrase would be "two for a farthing or five for two." Now the lesson conveyed in this is that, As one sparrow, worth but a quarter of a cent, shall not fall on the ground without our heavenly Father, so, likewise, nothing shall befall a child of God, even to the value of a quarter of a cent, without our heavenly Father. The care of our heavenly Father for his children, extends even to things as small and of as little consequence as the value of a quarter of a cent.

NOR does even this express the extent of our heavenly Father's care for us; for immediately the Saviour says, "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." And being given in this connection it shows that the care of our heavenly Father for us extends lower yet than to things of the value of a quarter of a cent. It extends even to things of the value of a hair of our heads. And he means to tell us that nothing even to the value of a hair, shall befall the child of God without the care of our heavenly Father. He means to tell us that our heavenly Father's care for us is greater than can possibly be our care for ourselves. Then why should we not trust him rather than ourselves, or riches, or anything, or anybody else? His care for us is so great, why not let the care *be* his, as it *is* his, and we trust him wholly, and so trusting rest in the peace which passeth all understanding? It is

only thus that that promise can ever be realized, because this is the basis upon which the promise rests. See: "*Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.*" Phil. 4:6, 7.

NOW yet do these lessons express the abundance of the far-reaching care of our heavenly Father for the children of men. For he "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, *according to the power that worketh in us.*" Eph. 3:20. The only power that can possibly work in us, to connect us at all to God, is the power of faith. Therefore as his care is so great in all these directions, how much more exceeding abundantly will it be towards you, O ye of much faith. "Lord, increase our faith." Trust in the Lord and do good, and verily thou shalt be fed. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee. Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is the rock of ages." Isa. 26:3, 4, margin.

J.

August 25, 1887

"The Fourth Commandment. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33 , p. 518.

"REMEMBER the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Although this is the plainly expressed command of God, and although there are multitudes who profess to obey it, yet there is just ground to fear that of this multitude those who do really obey it are few. Of course those who profess to obey it by keeping the first day of the week do not obey it at all. This is certain because the Lord's own word in explanation of this is that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." All who keep Sunday therefore must be set down at once as not obeying the command to "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." But after dropping all these, it yet remains that there is just cause for fear that of those who really observe the seventh day, the true Sabbath, there are few who really obey the command to "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." In fact we very much fear that of these there are many who don't even try to obey it.

What! keep the seventh day, the true Sabbath, and yet don't try to obey the commandment that says, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy"? Yes, that is what we very much fear is the case with many even of Seventh-day Adventists, because they try to obey something that is not the commandment. They misread the commandment thus: Remember the Sabbath-day *and* keep it holy, and then try to keep that instead of the real command of God, "Remember the Sabbath-day *to* keep it holy." This we fear because we have so often heard it thus read wrong; and we cannot see how that a person who habitually reads or quotes it wrong can obey it right. At the best they can only live up to the conception of the commandment which they have in their own minds, and if their conception of the commandment is incorrect, it can only be that obedience according to that

incorrect conception is defective also. The obedience is in the right line, of course, and it is right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough to meet the requirement of the commandment. We have actually heard Seventh-day Adventist ministers quote that commandment, over and over, as though it was written, Remember the Sabbath-day *and* keep it holy. It fairly seemed as though they really supposed that to be the idea of the commandment.

It may be supposed that the difference between "to" and "and" is so slight as to make not so much difference as we would seem to insist is there. True, the difference is not so great as to make the words opposites, but it is sufficient to involve a very important principle in the keeping of the commandment. The truth is that in that little word "to" lies the very gist of the commandment. Webster defines "to" thus: "The preposition *to* . . . indicates motion, course, or tendency toward a time, a state or condition, an aim, or anything capable of being regarded as a limit to movement or action."

Now let us read the commandment in the light of this definition: "Remember the Sabbath day *to* keep it holy." What does "to" mean? Motion, course, or tendency toward (1) "A time." What time is the object of this "to"? The Sabbath-day. (2) "A state or condition." What is the state or condition of rest—"in it thou shalt not do any work." (3) "An aim." What is the aim? "The Sabbath of the Lord thy God." (4) "Anything capable of being regarded as a limit to movement or action." What is the limit of the movement or action allowed under this commandment? The seventh day, which is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Our movement or action is limited to six days by the regular recurrence of the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord. Therefore the Sabbath of the Lord fully meets the requirement of the word "to" in the commandment, as being the object of our motion, course, or tendency under the guidance of God, in that it is "a *time*, a *state or condition*, an *aim*," and "a *limit*" to our "movement or action." And that it may ever be held in view as such is the purpose of God in commanding all men to "remember the Sabbath-day *to* keep it holy."

When, therefore, does the obligation of this commandment begin? when should we begin to obey it? Whenever conscious motion or tendency toward it begins, certainly. And right here is where we can detect the difference between the "to" that is in the commandment and the "and" that is put into it by those who misquote it so. When the sun has set and the Sabbath is past, Saturday evening, many think they have no more to do with the Sabbath, at any rate until the next Friday—the preparation day—comes, and then that it is mostly the women in the house who are to act in view of it in baking and boiling that which shall be necessary on the Sabbath to follow, while out on the farm the remembrance of it does not begin till toward the middle of the afternoon, or perhaps not till about sunset; then the putting away of the teams and all the preparatory chores follow sunset, and so are done on the Sabbath. Now if the commandment read, Remember the Sabbath-day *and* keep it, such a course might be considered obedience to it—except of course in the case of those who do their closing work of the week on the Sabbath itself—but so long as the commandment reads, "Remember the Sabbath-day *to* keep it *holy*," in no case could any such course be considered obedience to it. Because unless we remember the Sabbath-day *to*

keep it holy, we cannot keep it holy. Unless we remember it as it comes, we cannot keep it when it comes. Therefore, when the sun has set and the Sabbath has passed away, just then begins our motion and tendency toward the Sabbath-day, and *just then* begins the obligation to "remember the Sabbath-day, *to keep it holy*;" *just then* must begin or rather *must not cease* our obedience to this commandment.

In fact, the obligation of this commandment, and the duty of active obedience to it, never depart from us in any minute of life, any more than any other one of the sacred ten. Obedience to this commandment is not at all confined to the hours of the Sabbath-day itself, but it attaches to every conscious minute, and enters into every act and plan of life. Never are we free from the obligation to "remember the Sabbath-day *TO keep it holy*." It is the "time" toward which we are constantly moving during the hours and days of the week, and we must remember it. Its rest is the "state or condition" which follows the labor of the week, and we are to remember it so, when that labor begins at the beginning of the first day of the week, the first laboring day. To be not inconsistent with the keeping of the Sabbath holy must be the aim of all labor, and all plans of the laboring days as the days go by. And, finally, its sacred threshold it is which marks the limit of our movements or action of labor. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, *but* the seventh day is the Sabbath-day, is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work. And this must be remembered at the very beginning of the work of the six days, and all through them, remembering the Sabbath-day *to keep it holy*.

Thus the obligation of the commandment covers the whole week—during the six working days remembering the Sabbath *to keep it*, and then when the Sabbath has fully come, *to keep it*. It is because of this important principle that the Hebrew idea of the Sabbath covered the whole week, and by which the days of the week, instead of being called first day, second day, etc., *of the week*, were called day one of the Sabbath, day two of the Sabbath, and so on to day six of the Sabbath, and then Sabbath; thus throughout the week keeping ever before the mind the Sabbath, which is really the aim and object of the week, and which is so set before the minds of all men in the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath-day *TO keep it holy*." The person who so far forgets the Sabbath-day during the week, as to involve himself in work, or in plans that will distract his mind from the proper contemplation and worship of God on the Sabbath, disobeys the commandment of God—he *does not* "remember the Sabbath-day *to keep it holy*," consequently he *cannot* remember it *and* keep it holy.

As God designed the Sabbath of the Lord to be the sign of the true God, the Creator of all things, and the memorial of his created works, so in his commandment to "remember the Sabbath-day *to keep it holy*," he designed to keep ever in the minds of men the remembrance of himself and of his wonderful works. Therefore, "remember the Sabbath-day *to keep it holy*" "then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord."

J.

**"Which of These Is Not Spiritualism?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 33 ,
pp. 519, 520.**

HERE is one statement:—

"There is, strictly speaking, no such thing as death, in the popular signification of that term. Death, so called—the death of the human—is a veritable birth into a higher life. It is a change in the condition consequent upon outward dissolution. . . The real man survives the process intact, and still exists in full life and consciousness, upon a plane beyond, far beyond, the reach of fire and flood."

Here is another:—

"At the death of the outer body, the true life of the inner spirit commences."

Here is another:—

"Hence the dark hearse, the black pall, the bitter lamentation over the grave, which shows that it is not realized that death is only a glorious birth."

And another:—

"But hark! a voice comes from beyond the grave to tell us that death is not our foe; that he is the messenger of life and joy; that he is the grand accoucheur of the soul, and comes to usher it into light and life eternal."

And then here is another, the very latest production on this subject that we have seen:—

"One of our dear Sabbath-school pupils has graduated into the higher school. The great Teacher has promoted her to the celestial sphere where the freed spirit shall never tire as it soars into the knowledge of the infinite, which only God and the angels can reveal to her. Death, whom we call the great destroyer, set free from flight this immortal soul after a struggle of only nine days with the fair form which held it to earth. . . . Ah! death has proved to her the genius of the fountain of eternal youth."

Now can anyone tell which of these quotations speak the language of Spiritualism and which do not? We cannot. And yet all but the last were written by avowed Spiritualists, by people who make no pretensions to anything else, while the last is from a strictly evangelical—heaven save the mar—paper. The first quotation is from the *Spiritual Telegraph*; the second from Andrew Jackson Davis's "Healing of the Nations;" the third is from Dr. Hare's "Spiritualism Scientifically Demonstrated;" the fourth is from a lecture on Spiritualism by Joel Tiffany; and the last is from the official organ of the Presbyterian Church of East Oakland, a paper entitled the *Christian Home*, in an editorial notice in the issue for August, 1887. But not one of the first four is a whit more impregnated with Spiritualism than is the last.

The fact is that to-day the churches are to Spiritualism the basis of its strongest hopes. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is the sole foundation of Spiritualism, and in the estimation of the evangelical (?) pulpit to deny the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is to proclaim yourself an infidel if not an atheist. The churches lay down the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and Spiritualism builds upon it and destroys its multitudes. The pulpits defend it by such arguments as that "matter cannot think, nor move, nor feel;" and then the so-called "Christian Science" stands upon the doctrine, and accepts the arguments, and carries them in their logical conclusion into practice, and deludes its thousands into the belief that it is really so, and into the expectation of thereby surviving all that is, in their

520

estimation, miscalled disease. Then too there comes the New Theology, of probation after death, because it cannot admit the justice of an eternity of torment, upon those who have lived and died without a knowledge of the gospel; and all that the orthodox can do against these and numberless other heresies springing from the same source, is to make ineffectual attempts to stem the tide

of evil, because she herself stands upon the doctrine of which the evils and heresies are only the logical outcome.

Let the truth of the word of God be preached as it is, that "The dead know not anything, . . . 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" (Eccl. 9:5, 6); "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4); and Spiritualism can have no place. But as long as the pulpit tells the church and the world that the dead are conscious and know all about us, and are hovering round us, just so long is Spiritualism going to seize the logic of it and do its best to show both the church and the world that through *it* the channel of communication is open. And when the pulpit presents the proposition, it will find that the logic that leads to Spiritualism will prove a thousand times stronger than will be any attempt that the pulpit can make in opposition to the logic of its own proposition.

Let the truth of God be preached and believed that man is mortal, and that immortality is the gift of God alone, and that alone through the faith of Jesus Christ; that man is made of the dust of the ground and will never be anything else except through an abiding faith in Christ;—let this be preached and believed, and the so-called Christian so-called Science can have no place. But so long as the pulpit furnishes the arguments, so long this Christian Science, that is neither Christian nor science, will use the arguments which the pulpit furnishes.

Let the truth of God be preached and believed, that the dead know not anything, and that without a resurrection from the dead even they "which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (1 Cor. 15:16-18), and that will annihilate at once the New Theology with its question of probation after death.

Let the truth of God be preached and believed that "the soul that sinneth it shall die," and "the wages of sin is death," and that will annihilate forever the horrible doctrine of an eternity of torment, and with it will be annihilated the infidel charge of cruelty and injustice against God, who is supremely just and who is Love itself.

And so God charges men: "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 . . . with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come ["will come?" it *has* come] when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4:1-4.

J.

September 1, 1887

**"The Fourth Commandment. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 34 ,
pp. 534, 535.**

"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." But when the commandment says that we shall not do any *work*, it does not say that we shall not do *anything*. It is not the intent of the commandment that we shall spend the day in listless idleness. Besides the worship of God, and the going to the place of worship, which we shall notice afterward, the Saviour gives us the plain meaning of the commandment when he says, "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." To know therefore what form of activity is in keeping with the purpose of the fourth commandment, we need to study closely the words of the Saviour on that subject.

The prophecy said of Christ, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable." In all his teaching he did so. He was constantly expanding the people's view of the law of God, and spreading forth that law and its claims till it reached the very thoughts and intents of the heart. In Matt. 5:21-26 he sets forth the sixth commandment; in verses 27-32 he magnifies the seventh commandment; in verses 33-36 he expounds the third commandment; in other places others; and in Matt. 12:5-13, with its parallel passages, we have his instructions upon the fourth commandment, in which he magnifies that commandment and spreads it abroad no less than any other one of the ten. That which was the immediate occasion which called forth his instruction upon this subject, was this: He and his disciples and some Pharisees were going to the synagogue on the Sabbath, and their way led through a field of wheat. As they were passing along, his disciples, being hungry, pulled off some of the heads of wheat, and, "rubbing them in their hands, he shelled out the wheat and ate it. The Pharisees saw it and at once turned to Jesus with the charge, "Behold thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath day."

Notice that there was no question raised as to what day is the Sabbath, nor anything of the kind; nor in fact was any such question ever raised in all the Saviour's work on earth. The sole point in question here was, Were the disciples doing contrary to the law of the Sabbath, or were they acting in harmony with its provisions?

First, to show that the disciples did no wrong in plucking the heads of wheat and shelling out the kernels to satisfy their hunger, on the Sabbath day, Jesus cited the case of David, who, fleeing for his life from the wrath of Saul, went into the house of God on the Sabbath day and ate the show-bread, which, according to a precept of the ceremonial law, was only to be eaten by the priests. Now they all allowed that David did no wrong. But if David was innocent in thus satisfying his hunger on the Sabbath, even though, in his extremity, he had to go beyond a precept of the ceremonial law to do it, most certainly the disciples were guiltless in satisfying their hunger as they did on the Sabbath, and all the more as at the time they were acting strictly according to the permission of the Mosaic law. For it was plainly written, "When thou comest into the standing corn of thy neighbor, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand." Deut. 23:25. So the Saviour in citing the case of David condemned the Pharisees, and justified his disciples by the very thing which the Pharisees allowed.

Then Jesus shows what kind of work may be done on the Sabbath day, without sin. He says: "Have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?" On the Sabbath day there was a double routine of priestly service in the sanctuary. Whereas during the week there was one lamb with the accompanying offerings in the morning, and another in the evening, on the Sabbath there were two of these in the morning and two in the evening. Thus the priests in the temple had double work to perform on the Sabbath, yet they were blameless. This did not violate the commandment at all, because it was not their work at all, nor for their own benefit; it was

535

the Lord's work and wholly in the conduct of his worship and the service of his sanctuary. From this it is evident that the words of the commandment, "In it thou shalt not do any work," is not a command to remain listlessly idle on the Sabbath, but a command not to do any of our own work, nor any which partakes of any material or worldly interest. The six days are given us for this, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all *thy* work," but the Sabbath is for the work, the worship, and the special service of the Lord, "in it thou shalt not do any [of thy] work."

Next Jesus shows the nature and purpose of the Sabbath, and what kind of works are according to its provisions and the fulfillment [*sic.*] of its purpose. He says: "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." By this it is shown that the Sabbath of the Lord is a merciful, and not a sacrificial, institution; and that whatever contravenes mercy on the Sabbath, and tends to make the Sabbath a burden instead of a joy, a yoke instead of a delight, is contrary to the intent of the Sabbath, and is a violation of the commandment instead of an observance of it, and is the breaking of the Sabbath rather than the keeping of it.

This is shown more fully in what followed the foregoing conversation with the Pharisees. For they all went immediately into the synagogue, "And, behold, there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days? that they might accuse him." Jesus said to the man with the withered hand "Stand forth in the midst." Then talking to the Pharisees he asked, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace." And well they might hold their peace, for they did not dare to take the position that it was lawful to do evil on the Sabbath, they knew that the Sabbath was not made for the promotion of evil. And they did not want to allow that it was lawful to do good, or that that was the purpose of the Sabbath, for then they would be sanctioning the deeds of Jesus, which they were determined not to do. So all they could do was to hold their peace and in their bitter prejudice deepen their hatred of him, in their hearts. But it was not simply to silence the Pharisees that the Saviour asked these questions. It was more fully to bring forth the deep meaning and the merciful purpose of the Sabbath of the Lord.

Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath, or to do evil? Of course everyone will say at once that it is not lawful to do evil. But if it is in the power of our hand to do good on the Sabbath day and we refuse to do it, *in that very refusal* we do evil,

and so break the Sabbath instead of keeping it. Therefore the only possible deduction from the Saviour's words is, It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, and that such is entirely in harmony with the purpose, and is carrying out the intent, of the Sabbath. Is it lawful to save life on the Sabbath, or to kill? But if it is within our power to save life on the Sabbath, and we refuse to do it, in that very refusal we have killed, and so have devoted the Sabbath to the most profane of all uses, instead of having fulfilled its sacred and heavenly purpose of mercy. Is it lawful to inflict sickness, distress, or suffering upon any person or thing, on the Sabbath day? Everyone will say at once that it is not lawful to do so. But if there is sickness, distress, or suffering on the Sabbath, which it is within our power to relieve, and we refuse to do so, then in that very refusal we have inflicted sickness, distress, or suffering, and so have debased the Sabbath and profaned it to the worst of uses, instead of remembering it to keep it holy, and devoting it to the purposes of mercy and heavenly good which God designs to accomplish by it. Such doings would be but to make the Sabbath the occasion of violating the law of God, and of dishonoring him, rather than of keeping holy that law and of honoring him.

Nor are these considerations confined to our dealings with our fellow-men. We have found that the purpose of the commandment is mercy; and saith the Scripture, "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast, but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel." Prov. 12:10. Therefore said the Saviour in this same discourse, "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out?" Therefore, whether it be suffering in man or in beast, that we may relieve on the Sabbath, it is keeping the Sabbath to render that relief, and it is breaking the Sabbath not to render it. Whether it be to man or to beast that we may do good on the Sabbath, it is keeping the Sabbath to do that good, and it is breaking the Sabbath not to do it. Yet it is not in keeping with the commandment to neglect to do good on other days of the week in order to do it on the Sabbath. Consequently the sum of it all is, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." "Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

J.

"What Is This But Spiritualism?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 34 , pp. 536, 537.

LAST week we gave some extracts which show that the churches and pulpits are in reality the strongest hope and support of Spiritualism. Through the kindness of a friend we are enabled to lay before our readers further and stronger proofs of this. Our correspondent sent us a paper containing a sermon by Dr. T. De Witt Talmage, entitled, "Employments in Heaven." The Doctor has taken it upon himself to tell the world what dead people are doing. As he is the preacher whose sermons are the most widely read of any in the world, except perhaps Spurgeon's, we shall make quite liberal extracts, especially as the sermon is of the very essence of Spiritualism. The sermon was preached Sunday, July 31, 1887. The "Rev." Spiritualist says:—

"The question is often silently asked, though perhaps never audibly propounded: '*What are our departed Christian friends doing now?*' The question is more easily answered than you might perhaps suppose. Though there has come no recent intelligence from the heavenly city, and we seem dependent upon the story of eighteen centuries ago, still I think we may from strongest inference decide what are the present occupations of our transferred kinsfolk."

Yes, this question *is* more easily answered than the people generally suppose; and it is answered abundantly and authoritatively, but the trouble is the people will not believe the answer, even though it be given by the Lord himself. The word of God says, "The dead know not anything," also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, and even their thoughts, "is now perished," and that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. 9:6, 10. All this and much more says the Bible plainly, and yet says the Bible plainly, and yet says Dr. Talmage, "There has come no recent intelligence" on the subject. Has Mr. Talmage, with the rest of the Spiritualists, "progressed" beyond the Bible? Has the Bible become to him also as "a last year's almanac," so that it conveys no recent intelligence? For our part we would far rather have one sentence from the Bible than ten thousand from Dr. Talmage.

"Our transferred kinsfolk." Of course they are not dead. According to Dr. Talmage's idea nobody ever dies. In his opinion the death of a Christian is a "translation better than Elijah's." And as they are only transferred of course their employment there is the same as here. So *he* says:—

"You have, then, only by a sum in subtraction and a sum in addition to decide what are the employments of your departed friends in the better world. You are to subtract from them all earthly grossness and add all earthly goodness, and then you are to come to the conclusion that they are doing now in Heaven what in their best moments they did on earth.

"In the first place, I remark that all those of our departed Christian friends who on earth found great joy in the fine arts are now indulging their tastes in the same direction. . . . Are you so obtuse as to suppose that because the painter drops his easel and the sculptor his chisel and the engraver his knife, that therefore that taste, which he was enlarging and intensifying for forty or fifty years, is entirely obliterated? These artists, or these friends of art, on earth worked in coarse material and with imperfect brain and with frail hand. Now they have carried their art into larger liberties and into wider circumference. They are at their old business yet but without the fatigues, without the limitations, without the hindrances of the terrestrial studio. Raphael could now improve upon his masterpiece of Michael the Archangel, now that he has seen him, and could improve upon his masterpiece of the Holy Family, now that he has visited them. Michael Angelo could better present the

Last Judgment after he has seen its flash and heard the rumbling battering rams of its thunder. Exquisite colors here, graceful lines here, powerful chiaroscuro here. . . . The reason that God took away their eye and their hand, and their brain, was that he might give them something more limber, more widely, more skillful, more multipliant."

So Michael Angelo has seen the last Judgment has he? If that be so how are the cases to end of those who are now living? And the painter, and the sculptor, and the engraver, are all "at their old business yet"! At first sight it would seem that Mr. Talmage has them "at their same old business," *in Heaven*, but from what follows we might almost conclude that he allows them to conduct "their same old business" at the same old stand. But suppose he means that "they are at their same old business" *in Heaven*; then are we to believe that they are painting with brushes, on canvas, with oil? are they carving with knives on stones? or are they painting-engraving, etc., with space, on the sky, with air? We cannot see how it could be the former, because he says that "God took away their eye, and their hand, and their brain," consequently they have no hand to handle a brush, and no eye to see canvas or brush or anything else, and no brain to know how to do anything, even if they had eyes and hands. Therefore it must be that they are painting, carving, engraving, etc., with space, on the sky, with air; that would seem to be about the only thing for such people to do who have neither body nor brain, nor eye nor hand. Unless indeed the Doctor allows them to carry on "their same old business," on earth, through the mediumship of those who have eyes and hands and brains. From what follows it would fairly seem that he does even allow this. True, he does not say it of the painter, the sculptor, the engraver, and the musician, but he *does* say that the "Christian soldier," the doctor, and the preacher carry on *their* "same old business" on earth.

Here is what he says of the military folks:—

"Again, I remark that those of our departed Christian friends who in this world had very strong military spirit are now in armies celestial and out on bloodless battle. There are hundreds of people born soldiers. They cannot help it. They belong to regiments in time of peace. They cannot hear a drum or fife without trying to keep step to the music. They are Christians, and when they fight they fight on the right side. Now when these, our Christian friends who had natural and powerful military spirit, entered Heaven, they entered the celestial army. . . .

"When those who had the military spirit on earth sanctified entered glory, I suppose they right away enlisted in some heavenly campaign, they volunteered right away. There must needs be in Heaven soldiers with a soldierly spirit. There are grand parade days when the King reviews the troops. *There must be armed escorts sent out to bring up from earth to Heaven those who were more than conquerors.* . . . Besides that, in our own world there are battles for the right and against the wrong, where we must have the heavenly military. This is what keeps us Christian reformers so

buoyant. So few good men against so many bad men; so few churches against so many grog shops; so few pure printing presses against so many polluted printing presses; and yet *we are buoyant and courageous, because while we know that the armies of evil in the world* are larger in numbers than the army of the truth, there are celestial cohorts in the air fighting on our side.

I have not so much faith in the army on the ground as I have in the army in the air. O God! open our eyes that we may see them. The military spirits that went up from earth to join the military spirits before the throne—Joshua, and Caleb, and Gideon, and David, and Samson, and the hundreds of Christian warriors who on earth fought with fleshly arm, and now having gone up on high are coming down the hill of heaven ready to fight among the invisibles. Yonder they are—*coming, coming. Did you not hear them as they swept by?*"

Anybody who is at all acquainted with Dr. Talmage's intensely demonstrative, dramatic style of delivery, can readily imagine what effect this last appeal would have upon his audience. They would imagine that a host of them were really sweeping by

538

and that they did "hear them as they swept by."

Then he talks in the Talmagian way of what "our mathematical friends," and "our transferred and transported metaphysicians," are doing. Then he tells of "our departed Christian explorers" scaling Mount Blanc "without alpenstock" and exploring "the coral depths of the ocean without a diving bell;" and tells what our departed students, and historians, and astronomers, and chemists, and geologists, and lawyers are doing, and finally comes to the doctors—not the doctors of a spiritualistic divinity, but the doctors of medicine—and tells what they are doing. Thus he says:—

"What are our departed Christian friends who in this world had their old business. No sickness in Heaven, but plenty of sickness on earth, plenty of wounds in the different parts of God's dominion to be healed and to be medicated. You cannot understand why that patient got well after all the skillful doctors of New York and Brooklyn had said he must die. Perhaps Abercrombie touched him—Abercrombie, who, after many years' doctoring the bodies and the souls of people in Scotland, went up to God in 1864. Perhaps Abercrombie touched him."

Now suppose somebody who believes in Dr. Talmage's spiritualistic bombast, should form a personal friendship and alliance with "Dr. Abercrombie" and should thereby become a "healing medium" who could deny the correctness of the logic of the thing? Who?

Next he notices the people whose chief employment in this world was in visiting. Of them he says:—

"But what are our friends who found their chief joy in conversation and in sociality doing now? In brighter conversation

there and in grander sociality. What a place to visit in, where your next-door neighbors are kings and queens; you yourselves kingly and queenly. If they want to know more particularly about the first paradise, they have only to go over and ask Adam. If they want to know how the sun and the moon halted, they have only to go over and ask Joshua. [Indeed! What will Joshua know about it, more than anybody else? When he was on earth he didn't know any more about "how" it was done, than we do. And when all get to Heaven will not all have an equal chance to know?] If they want to know how the storm pelted Sodom, they have only to go over and ask Lot. [What will Lot know about it? He didn't see it. His wife did—perhaps.] If they want to know more about the arrogance of Haman, they have only to go over and ask Mordecai. If they want to know how the Red Sea boiled when it was cloven, they have only to go over and ask Moses."

He got off a long string of this kind of stuff, but we shall impose no more of it on our readers. But it is when he comes to the preachers, that he gives us the very cream of the cream of Spiritualism. Hear him:—

"What are our departed Christian friends doing in Heaven, those who on earth found their chief joy in the gospel ministry? *They are visiting their old congregations.* Most of those ministers have got their people around them already. When I get to Heaven—as, by the grace of God I am destined to go to that place—*I will come and see you all.* Yea, I will come to all the people to whom I have administered in the gospel, and to the millions of souls to whom, through the kindness of the printing-press, I am permitted to preach every week in this land and in other lands—letters coming from New Zealand and Australia, and uttermost parts of the earth, as well as from near nations, telling me of the souls I have helped—*I will visit them all. I give them fair notice.* Our departed friends of the ministry engage in that delectable entertainment now."

Oh, yes! He is going to be a great man when he "gets to Heaven," that is, when he dies. No doubt he will be as ubiquitous as the grandest saint in the Catholic calendar. He will have to be, to visit "the millions" in "near nations" and the "uttermost parts of the earth." But will he "communicate" with them? If not, why not? If he can find someone of his friends still in the flesh through whom he can speak to his old audiences, what is to hinder him from thus developing an "inspirational speaker"? But even if *he* does not, if someone comes to his old audiences and *pretends* to be inspired by the spirit of Doctor Talmage, and talks to them in the theology of Doctor Talmage, and with the manner and tone of Doctor Talmage, then how are the people to know that it is not he, as long as they bear in mind the promise and the expectation that he is going to visit them, according to the "fair notice" which he has given?

These are but parts of the sermon, but what more need we give to prove our statement that the so-called Christian pulpits, it to-day the strongest bulwark of Spiritualism? As we said at the beginning of this article, Doctor Talmage is the

one preacher whose sermons are the most widely read of any in the world, unless Mr. Spurgeon be an exception. And this single sermon sent broadcast as it is by the printing-press even to the "uttermost parts of the earth," will do more to help forward the work and the iniquity of Spiritualism, than Spiritualism itself could do in a year.

It is high time that everywhere, and by every means, the truth of God should be spread to "near nations" and to the "uttermost parts of the earth" that "the dead know not anything"; that "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, *whither thou goest*"; and that the thoughts of the dead are perished. As for these would-be wise men "Lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord; and what wisdom is in them."

J.

September 8, 1887

**"The Fourth Commandment. No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 35 ,
pp. 550, 551.**

WE have shown what works may be done on the Sabbath—relieving the sick or the distressed—"It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day." Yet that we shall do these things is not the purpose of the Sabbath. They may be done on the Sabbath day without doing contrary to the principle of the Sabbath, but they are only incidental. The prime object of the Sabbath day is that it is the memorial of God and his great works, and the best Sabbath-keeping, that which most nearly meets the design of the commandment of God, is that which has in it the most thought of God and his works. Says the Lord of the Sabbath, "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.*"

Here the command is given to call the Sabbath *a delight*. but the Sabbath must really be a delight before we can really call it a delight. And if the Sabbath is not to us a delight, we do not get out of it that which God designs that we should. True Sabbath-keeping will always be a delight. The ninety-second psalm is entitled, "A Psalm or Song for the Sabbath day." It was written by inspiration specially for the Sabbath day, and a careful study of it will give us an idea of what should be our occupation on the Sabbath.

First, is the idea of worship: "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O Most High; to show forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night, upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery; upon the harp with a solemn sound." Verses 1-3. The Sabbath therefore is the day set apart—sanctified—of the Lord, for the worship of God. Not simply individual or family worship, but for collective congregational worship as well, for it is written, "Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, *an holy convocation.*" Lev. 23:3. A "convocation" is an

assembly or meeting. Therefore there must be on the Sabbath a holy meeting or assembly for the worship of God, for giving thanks unto him, for singing his praises, and for showing forth his lovingkindness and his faithfulness. It is one of the duties of men on the Sabbath to go to the assembly of the saints,—to go to meeting. The obligation to go to meeting is binding as well as is any other duty of the Sabbath day; and when it is within our power, we cannot neglect it and do right; in short we cannot neglect it and properly observe the Sabbath.

Secondly, the mind is directed to the works of God: "For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands. O Lord, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep. A brutish man knoweth not; neither doth a fool understand this." Here is presented the one grand idea of the Sabbath of the Lord. That is, seeing God in his wondrous works. A fool does not understand it because, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." And a brutish man does not understand it, because, although he sees the works of God above, beneath, and all about him, he does not see God in his works. That it is wherein the psalm refers to such a man as brutish. The brute eats and drinks, and sees all the works of God, that a man sees. The brute sees the trees, the flowers, the sun, the moon, the stars, the birds, he sees his fellow-brutes, he sees men, but in none of all these does he see God, nor is he thankful to him. So the man who sees all about him the wonderful works of God, and yet sees not God in and through all his works; the man who receives food and raiment from God and yet does not acknowledge nor thank him; that man in that is brutish. This is why the word speaks of such a man so. A brutish man is not made glad through the work of God; he does not triumph in the works of His hands; he makes him; that man in that is brutish. This is why the word speaks of such a man so. A brutish man is not made glad through the work of God; he does not triumph in the works of His hands; he makes no such exclamation as, "O Lord, how great are thy works!" nor does he say to the Lord, either in admiration or otherwise, "Thy thoughts are very deep," for he never attempts to follow the thoughts of God. God does not want men to be so, and therefore he planted the institution of the Sabbath of the Lord made it a part of his holy law, and wrote that law in the heart of man, that man might keep him as Creator ever in mind and in heart; that man might see him in all his works and glorify him as the author of all things.

How often and how clearly, in the word of God, we are directed to the contemplation of his works: Says Isaiah, "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number; he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth." See the stars, that cannot be numbered for multitude! But all these that we see are but a speck in space compared to the multitudes that lie beyond our sight. What makes the "Milky Way"? It is the multitude of stars so thickly set that the accumulated rays even from the depths of space make a distinct path of light spanning the whole heavens.

"Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out the heavens with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?" Why is it that,

though "all the rivers run unto the sea yet the sea is not full"? How is it that, "unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again"? How is it that "the wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits"? How is it that "he stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hudgeth the earth upon nothing"? Why is the sea salt? Why is it that Britain, Denmark, the north of Germany, and the south of Scandinavia are all in the same latitude as Labrador, and yet are mild and habitable while Labrador, "as a permanent abode of civilized man, is on the whole one of the most uninviting regions on the face of the earth?" Why is it that ice forms at the bottom, as well as at the top, of the Baltic Sea? Why is it that it never rains in Peru, while in Brazil rain falls in such quantities as to create the largest river in the world? Why is it that the little snowdrop flower grows up straight for a while then bends its stock and bows its head for a while, then straightens up again and stays upright? How is it that in our solar system there are planets all the way from 36,000,000 to 2,760,000,000 miles from the sun, yet so far as the heat derived from the sun is concerned one is habitable as well as another? How is it that in a bunch of snow that a child might hold in its hands there is represented an amount of energy that would be required to pick up an Alpine avalanche and pitch it bodily over Mount Shasta?

These and ten thousand other questions might be asked and investigated, in thinking of the wonderful works of God, on the Sabbath too, and if people would employ some of the Sabbath hours in such thought they would find the Sabbath to be indeed a delight. True many may say, "We don't know anything about these things." But God wants us to know, and therefore he tells us, "The works of the Lord are great, *sought out of all them that have pleasure therein.*" Psalm 111:2. If you will but exercise your mind in such a field as this you will soon find the greatest pleasure in it, and each consideration will conduce to the other—the more you seek them out the more pleasure you will have in the works of the Lord, and the more pleasure you have thus the more you will find delight in seeking them out. Thus the mind will be enlarged, the faculties developed and strengthened, the conceptions of God will be more

551

sublime, the reverence will be deepened, and the worship more devout, and the Sabbath of the Lord which is set apart for the free and unrestrained exercise of the mind in these things, will be found ever more and more a blessing and a delight. If the mind be filled with thoughts of this kind, thoughts of God, it will be found not so hard to obey the injunction, to call the Sabbath a delight, to honor Him, and not to do thine own ways, nor find thine own pleasure, nor speak thine own words. For then the mind will be led upward to God, and the heart to contemplation of him, and out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will speak the praises of God.

This is the true idea of the Sabbath, and such is true Sabbath-keeping. Thus the Sabbath may easily be kept holy. And thus it will be found easy to obey the commandment, "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."

J.

September 15, 1887

"Whither I Go Ye Cannot Come" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36 , pp. 567, 568.

IN the Bible School at Northfield, last month, Mr. Moody preached one Sunday on the second coming of Christ, arguing that Christ will come to earth in bodily form as he left it, and that it is a duty of the Christian to watch for his coming and to expect to meet him when he comes. But to Mr. Moody's argument some of the attendants at the school made answer:—

"We expect to meet Christ in death and be with him. What difference can it make in our Christian life and work whether we are always on the tiptoe of expectation to meet him thus, or go to him. In other words, what difference does it make whether we go to a friend or he comes to us, provided we are with our friend?"

With such an expectation for the premise, then that argument is sound, and as Mr. Moody accepts the premise he could not avoid the conclusion, and therefore in defense of his sermon he could only reply to this that, "we should get great encouragement in our evangelical work by the thought that at any moment Christ may come to help us in that work." Thus by admitting one error as a premise, Mr. Moody became involved in a dilemma where he had to commit another error to get out.

Did Mr. Moody teach those young men whom he was there training for evangelical work, that they were to go forward and engage in that work without the help of Christ, and to be constantly on the watch and waiting for Christ, and that their encouragement should be the thought that at any moment he may come and help them in their work? Not at all. Mr. Moody knows the "Great Commission," and he knows that when Christ gave that Commission, he said to every soul who should ever engage in evangelistic work, "Lo, I *am with you always*, even to the end of the world." And that is the only way in which Christ has ever promised to be with anybody to help them in their evangelistic work. When he comes to earth in bodily form, that is, when he comes in his second advent, he does not come to help anybody in "evangelical work," but to take his people unto himself. When he comes, all evangelical work is done, and he comes to reward the workers and to take vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Rev. 22:12; 2 Thess. 1:7. He comes then, not as a priest making reconciliation for the people, but as King of kings and Lord of lords. He comes not then as a Saviour of sinners, but as the Judge of all men, and the Saviour of saints. Therefore, Mr. Moody in answering

his young men as he did only set them on further in their erroneous course. Because the very idea of their answer to his statement in the first place is erroneous, that the Lord will come to earth in bodily form.

They argued, We expect to go to him at death. Then what difference does it make whether we are always watching for and expecting him to come to us or whether we go to him? In other words, what is the difference whether Jesus comes again or not? We say again that that is a valid argument provided the expectation is correct. But the expectation is a deception. It is directly contrary to the plainly expressed word of Christ. In that last night, just after the Last Supper, Jesus said to his disciples, "Whither I go, ye cannot come." John 13:33. And that there might be no mistake about it, he said, "As I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come." And what he said to the Jews on this subject was this, Ye "shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come." John 8:21. We suppose it would be considered by Mr. Moody and these same young men at Northfield, a most presumptuous thing for a man who was about to die in his sins to say, "I expect to meet Christ in death and be with him. I expect to go to him." And yet it would be no more presumptuous so far as the fact is concerned, than it was or is for these young students at Northfield to say it. For to the men who die in their sins, Jesus says, "Whither I go ye cannot come" and to his disciples Jesus says the same thing, "Whither I go ye cannot come." "As I said unto" them, "so now I say to you."

568

Now why didn't Mr. Moody answer these young men in the words of Christ, "Whither I go ye cannot come?" Then they could have seen the necessity of the Saviour's coming again, and the beauty of the doctrine. For when his disciples were troubled at this saying, Jesus said, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. . . 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." This is Christ's own word and doctrine on that subject. And the only way in which his children can ever be with him, is by his coming to receive them unto himself. And in that coming "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 [in this way, by this means] shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.

But instead of believing the plain word of Christ, these young men have their minds full of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and so according to Satan's promise at the beginning they expect to be gods as soon as they die, and expect to go to Jesus when they die, although he has told them as plainly as he could possibly do so, that they can do no such thing. And Mr. Moody is wrapped up in the same delusion, and so when his own sermon is disputed from the standpoint of this erroneous expectation, all he can do is to confirm the young men in their delusion, and to add to it another error, by teaching them to expect the coming of Jesus in bodily form only to help them in their evangelical work. If there is any doctrine that was ever taught in this world, that is more thoroughly

subversive of the word of God than is the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, we have never heard of it, and we do not think we ever shall hear of one such. And that is the kind of training that young men get nowadays in theological training-schools. Even I Mr. Moody's which is undoubtedly the best in the nation.
J.

"Apostolic Example" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 36 , pp. 568, 569.

OF all the arguments that are made in support of the first day of the week as the Sabbath or Lord's day, the one which above all is the most thoroughly sophistical and deceptive is the argument that proposes to rest its obligation upon "the example of the apostles." We want to look into this thing a little and see what the claim is worth.

First we will examine the claim of apostolic example upon its own merits. "The example of the apostles." What is it? and where shall it be found? The phrase must refer to the actions of the apostles, and what these actions were must be gathered from the New Testament, of course, because that is the only record there is of the apostles or their actions. Very well, then, to the record let us turn. How many apostles were there? Fourteen, at least. Well then, have we fourteen examples? Is each one of them an exemplar to be followed by all? and do the actions of each one form an example for all to copy? Or does it take all fourteen of them to make up the one "example of the apostles" which is to be obligatory upon all men? In either case it is essential of course that we know what the apostles did, and what is the example which they set. What example, then, did the apostles set in the matter of keeping the first day of the week?

The day the Saviour arose from the dead there were eleven apostles. That day was past before they believed he was risen from the dead. For,—

1. The first person to whom he appeared was Mary Magdalene, "And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." Mark 16:9-11.

2. "After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country" (Mark 16:12), and even they did not believe he was risen until they had reached Emmaus and were sitting at supper with him, the day being "far spent." Then and there "he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him." Luke 24:10, 11, 13, 28-31.

3. "And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and" "the same day at evening" "found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them," "as they sat at meat," "saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread," "neither believed they them." "And as they thus spake," "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." "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he" "upbraided them with their unbelief

and hardness of heart, because they had not believed them which had seen him after he was risen," and "said unto them, Why are ye troubled? And why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet," "and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord." "And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and a honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them." Luke 24:33-43; Mark 16:13, 14; John 20:19, 20.

It is certain, therefore, that so far as that day is concerned there is no apostolic example for keeping the first day of the week, because it was in the very last moments of the day before they believed that Jesus was risen from the dead. Even though apostolic exclaims were claimed upon the actions of the apostles on that day, the claim would be defective for a further reason, and that is, because Thomas was not there, when Jesus came, and even refused to believe upon the testimony of all of them. And so, any way the thing may be fixed, there is neither truth nor justice in claiming apostolic example for the observance of the first day of the week, based upon the actions of the disciples on the day of the resurrection of the Saviour.

After that night when Jesus made himself and his resurrection known to the disciples, there is no record in all the New Testament that the eleven or the twelve or the fourteen apostles, were ever together again *on the first day of the week*. Therefore we must follow them individually if we would know what was their example after that. After Jesus had ascended to Heaven, Matthias was chosen by lot in the place of Judas Iscariot, "and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." Acts 1:23-26. Then the twelve apostles were these: Peter and James, and John; Andrew, Philip, and Thomas; Bartholomew, and Matthew; James the son of Alphaeus, Simon Zelotes, Thaddeus, and Matthias. Afterward Barnabas and Paul were called, thus making the fourteen apostles.

Now as Thaddeus and Simon Zelotes, James the son of Alphaeus, and Matthew, Bartholomew, and Thomas, and Andrew, and Philip, and Matthias, are not mentioned again in all the New Testament, not one of them even being named, and as the only mention that is made of James the brother of John is that Herod killed him with the sword (Acts 12:2), all these must be dropped bodily and forever from all calculations upon "the example of the apostles" either in regard to the first day of the week or anything else. Therefore, whatever apostolic example there may be, will have to be such without the example of these *ten*.

Barnabas is first mentioned in Acts 4:36. He sold his land and laid the money at the apostles' feet. And when Paul came from Damascus to Jerusalem, and all the disciples were afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple, Barnabas "took him and brought him to the apostles," and persuaded them to receive him (Acts 9:27). When tidings came to Jerusalem that the Gentiles at Antioch had received the gospel, the church sent forth Barnabas to Antioch. From Antioch he went "to Tarsus, for to seek Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch," and there they taught, "a whole year." Then, as they, with others, "ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas

and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." "So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost," traveled together a long while and to many places, till at last they fell into that dispute about whether John Mark should go with them or not. "And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other," and so far as the record goes, we know not whether they ever saw one another again (Acts 15:36-41). And that closes the record about Barnabas; and in all that is said of him, there is not one word nor a hint about the first day of the week; so Barnabas, too, must be left out of the calculations in regard to "the example of the apostles" for keeping Sunday. Therefore if there be any apostolic example for it it must be such without the example of *eleven* of the apostles.

John was with Peter at the beautiful gate of the temple when the lame man was healed, and was imprisoned with Peter and was released with him. He and Peter were sent by the apostles to Samaria together, when they heard of the work of Philip there, and they "preached in many villages of the Samaritans." And that is all that is said about John in the book of Acts; Paul mentions him in Galatians 2:9; but in all that is said about him there is nothing about the first day of the week. Besides the gospel, whose statements we have already notice, John wrote three epistles and the book of Revelation, and in not one of them is there a word said about the first day of the week, much less is anything said about the example of the apostles in favor of keeping it. He did say, however, "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk, even as He walked." 1 John 2:6. So John, too, must be left out of all calculations upon "the example of the apostles" for Sunday keeping, and if there be any such example it must be such without the example of *twelve* of the apostles.

Peter preached the Pentecostal sermon, and again when the lame man was healed, got into prison several times, preached in Samaria, was sent for by the angel to preach the gospel to Cornelius and his house, and was put into prison by Herod and was brought out by an angel. That is the last that is said of him in Acts, but in all that is said about Peter and his work there is not one word about the first day of the week; much less is there named any example of the apostles for keeping it. Paul merely mentions him in first and second Corinthians, and in Galatians 2 he says of him, "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed;" he dissembled, "and the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation." And "I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." Peter wrote two epistles, but in neither of them does he say a word about the first day of the week, not about any apostolic example for keeping it. But he does say that *Christ* left "us an example, that ye should *follow his steps*" (1 Pet. 2:21); not the example of the apostles. Therefore Peter also must be left out of all calculations based upon "the example of the apostles" for keeping the first day of the week.

This makes now thirteen of the fourteen apostles who have to be dropped and left entirely out of the count in looking for "the example of the apostles" for keeping the first day of the week. So far as these thirteen are concerned there is not a word in all the New Testament, that gives any room whatever upon which to

base any kind of apostolic example for keeping the first day of the week. And as there remains but one more apostle to be noticed, it is bound to be that if there is any such thing at all, instead of it being the example of the apostles, it will have to be the example of the *apostle*.

Paul alone, then, is the one person in whom must be summoned up the whole subject of "the example of

570

the *apostles*" for keeping the first day of the week. If there is any such thing at all it will have to be found in him and in him alone. And here at last we find a meeting on the first day of the week mentioned in connection with the name of an apostle, the only instance in all the book, after they believed the Saviour was risen from the dead. The record in which is found this "example of the apostle" is as follows:—

"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. And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted. And we 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." Acts 20:7-14.

There is the complete inspired record of the events of the only first day of the week upon which there is any shadow of a chance to base any "example of the apostle" in favor of its observance. What example then, is here set by the apostle?

1. There was a meeting on the first day of the week.
2. The meeting was at night, because, "When the disciples came together . . . there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together."
3. "Paul preached unto them."
4. He preached all night, because, "he continued his speech until midnight. . . . And talked a long while, even till break of day."
5. There this was an all-night meeting.
6. At break of day "he departed" "afoot" for Assos, about twenty miles, and his companions "went before to ship and sailed unto Assos, for so had he appointed." And when he met them at Assos he went abroad and sailed on to Mitylene.

Such is the "example" of the only apostle, on the only first day of the week, that can by any right enter into the question. But of all those who profess to keep the first day of the week, how many follow the example? Not one. How many of

them even attempt to follow it? Not one. Notice, the example was a meeting at night on the first day of the week; they profess to follow the example by meeting in the daytime. The example was a meeting *all night*; they profess to follow it by having a meeting of perhaps two hours in the daytime. In the example the bread was broken shortly after *midnight*; those who profess to follow the example do it by breaking the bread about *midday*. "The example of the apostle" is that he preached in the night "until midnight" and then, shortly after, talked "a long while, even till break of day;" they profess to follow the example by preaching in the daytime from a half an hour to an hour. The example of the apostle is, that in the daytime on this exemplary first day of the week, "he appointed" the sailing of a ship, and he himself "departed" "afoot," on a long journey; they propose to follow "the example of the apostle" by refusing, themselves, to journey, and prohibiting by law all others from journeying at all on that day. In short, they propose to follow the example by going directly contrary to it. But if a rule is not to be followed according to its terms, then what is the use of a rule at all? If a problem is not to be solved according to the example, then what is the use of the example? Now, on the part of those who keep Sunday, "the example of the apostle" is their own chosen rule, in fact it is at once both their rule and their example, and yet in solving the problem of Christian duty as they themselves have chosen it, they go directly contrary to the terms of the rule which they themselves have chosen. Then what is the use of their rule? By what right do they claim the authority of the example of the apostle for their practice, and then in their practice go directly contrary to the record in the only instance there is in existence upon which to base their claim?

If this rule of apostolic example be binding in any one of its terms, it must be equally binding in every one of its terms. If not, why not? If it binds men to meet on the first day of the week, it certainly must be equally binding upon them to meet in the night of the first day of the week, for that is according to the example. If this example binds the minister to preach on the first day of the week any more than at any other time, then it certainly must be that it binds him to preach in the night, and all night too, of the first day of the week, for that is according to the example of the apostle. In fact there is no shadow of anything upon which to base a claim of apostolic example for holding meeting at all *in the daytime* on the first day of the week, for in all the apostolic record there is no instance of a meeting *in the daytime* on the first day of the week, after they believed that Jesus was risen from the dead. Therefore, when in pretense Sunday is kept on the authority of "the example of the apostles," and that of only one apostle, and then in practice it is kept in a manner directly contrary to the example which they claim as authority, that is but practically to deny the authority which they in pretense claim. It is only to say that there is no such thing as apostolic example for their practice. And that is the truth in the case. As a matter of fact, the sum of it all is that the claim of "the example of the apostles" for Sunday-keeping is nothing but a pretense by which those who make the claim seek to justify themselves in their transgression of the commandment of God in refusing to keep the Sabbath of the Lord.

Next week, if the Lord will, we shall show that in matters of moral obligation there is no such thing as apostolic example. J.

September 22, 1887

"Partakers of the Divine Nature" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 37 , p. 583.

A SHORT time ago the question was asked the *Interior*:—

"Is it orthodox, in a Presbyterian sense, to teach for sound doctrine that as Christ took upon himself human nature, so we shall at last take upon us the divine nature?"

The *Interior* gave the answer, "There is no warrant in Scripture for such an assertion." Now whether the *Interior* made its answer upon the broad sense of the question, or upon the particular point involved in the terms "as" and "so," of course we cannot say. But be that as it may, there certainly is in Scripture ample warrant for the statement that we shall "at last" be partakers of the divine nature. For Peter says directly, "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." 2 Peter 1:4.

John says: "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*, he is assuredly divine, and if we shall be like him as he is, it cannot be otherwise than that we shall be partakers of the divine nature. Paul says on this point: "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. His glorious body is most certainly divine; and when our bodies shall be changed and fashioned like unto his glorious body, then we shall be partakers of the divine nature.

This too is precisely that to which Peter referred in the verse quoted above. For in his first letter, chapter 5:1, he uses the same word "partaker" saying, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed." And Paul says of this glory: "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*. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be *revealed in us*." Rom. 8:16-18. And again, we shall be "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. 3:18. And Jesus said, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. 13:43. Now how all this can be, and yet we not "take upon us the divine nature," is more than any man can make to appear. And how the *Interior* can say that "there is no warrant in the Scripture for such an assertion," is more than we can understand.

There is another consideration that proves clearly that we shall "be partakers of the divine nature." Immortality is an attribute of Divinity. It inheres solely in Him. For thus it is written: "Not unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." 1 Tim. 1:17. And again, speaking of the "appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ," it is written: "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; *who only hath immortality.*" 1 Tim. 6:15, 16. Yet, although he only hath immortality, he has promised to give of it to all who will obey him; for Christ has brought it to light through the gospel. And to all who seek for it through him it will be given, "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.*" 1 Cor. 15:52, 53. Therefore as immortality is a property solely of the divine nature, when we shall have put on immortality, and so shall have been made like unto the glorious Son of God, we shall then have taken upon us the divine nature, we shall then, with all the redeemed, be "partakers of the glory that shall be revealed," and "partakers of the divine nature" of the glorious One who reveals it. Thanks be unto God for the unspeakable gift of his exceeding great and precious promises. J.

"Apostolic Example, or Christ's Example" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 37 , pp. 584, 585.

IF the phrase, "apostolic example" means anything at all, it means that the example of the apostles is the standard of human duty in moral things. But if that be so their example must be the standard in every other duty as well as in the duty of keeping the first day of the week. But nobody ever thinks of appealing to the example of the apostles in any question of morals, except in the (supposed moral) matter of the observance of the first day of the week as a sacred day. By this, therefore, even those who make the claim of apostolic example, do, in effect, deny the very claim which they themselves set up.

Who ever thinks of resting upon the example of the apostles, the obligation to obey any one of the ten commandments? Take the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Who ever thinks of appealing to the example of the apostles in impressing upon men the obligation to obey this? and what should be thought of a person anyhow who would do it? That commandment is the will of God, and the basis of its obligation is as much higher than the example of the apostles, as Heaven is higher than earth, or as God is higher than man.

And the obligation to obey that commandment rested just as strongly upon the apostles as it ever did, or as it ever will, upon anybody else. Nor was their obedience to it of such transcendent merit, that it was established forever as an example for all men to follow.

It is so with every commandment of the decalogue, and with every form of duty under any one of the commandments. Who would think of impressing upon children the duty to honor their parents, by citing them to the example of the

apostles? The duty to honor parents possesses higher sanctions than the example of the apostles, even the sanctions of the will of God. And to inculcate upon the minds of children this duty upon the basis of the example of the apostles, would only be to turn them away from God, and would destroy all the force of this duty upon the conscience. It is so in relation to every moral precept. The apostles were subjects and not masters of moral obligation. Moral duties spring from the will of God, and not from the example of men; and a knowledge of moral duties is derivable alone from the commands of God and not from the actions of men; all of which goes to show that in point of morals there is no such things as apostolic example. This is shown by other considerations as well. In fact every consideration only the more fully demonstrates it.

The law of God—the ten commandments—is the supreme standard of morals for the universe, and so expresses the whole duty of man. That law is perfect, and demands perfection in every subject of it. Therefore, whoever would be an example to men, in the things pertaining to the law of God, that is in any moral duty, must be perfect. Whoever would be an example to men in moral duties, must not only *be* perfect, but he must have always been perfect. He must always have met to the full every requirement of the law of God. But this no man whom the world ever saw has done. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "They are all gone out of the way." The perfection of the law of God has never been met in any man whom the world ever saw. Therefore, no man whom the world ever saw can ever be an example to men in moral duties. Consequently there is not, and there never can be any such thing as apostolic example in moral things.

We know that to many this will appear as stating the case too strongly, because it is plainly taught now by prominent men, Protestants too, that the apostles, because they were inspired men, are examples in moral duties. But we say without the slightest hesitation that, although the apostles were indeed inspired, they are not examples to men in moral duties. Because, first, no degree of inspiration can ever put a man above the law of God; and because, secondly, although we know that the doctrine and the writings of the apostles are inspired, yet we know also that their *actions were not* inspired. This we know because the inspired record tells us so. Although we mentioned the facts last week, we present them again, in this connection. Here is the inspired record of one instance in point: "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, *because he was to be blamed*. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they *walked not uprightly* according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all" etc., Gal. 2:11-14.

Peter "was to be blamed." He "walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." Then what kind of "apostolic example" was that to follow? and where were those led who followed it? They were being carried away with *dissimulation*—two-facedness, hypocrisy; they were being led away from "the truth of the gospel." But they could claim apostolic example for it, and that too with the

very apostles—Peter and Barnabas—present, who were their examples. But God did not leave them there, he rebuked their sin and corrected their fault, and brought them back from their blameworthiness to uprightness once more according to the truth of the gospel. And in the record of it God has shown all men that there is no such thing as "apostolic example" for anybody to follow, but that the truth of the gospel and the word of God is that according to which all men must walk.

Another instance, and in this even Paul himself was involved: "Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other." Acts 15:36-39.

"The *contention* was so *sharp* between them." Is that "apostolic example" which is to be followed by all men? Everybody will at once say, "No." But why is it not? Because it is not right. But when we say that that is not right, in that very saying, we at once declare that there is a standard by which the apostles themselves must be tried, and by which their "example" must be measured. And that is to acknowledge at once that there is no such thing as "apostolic example." We do not cite these things to reproach the apostles, nor to charge them with not being Christians. They were men of like passions with all the rest of us; and were subject to failings as well as all the rest of us. They had weaknesses in themselves to strengthen by exercise in divine grace, and defects of moral character to overcome by the help of God. They had to fight the

585

good fight of faith as well as all the rest of us. And they fought the good fight and became at last "more than conquerors through Him that hath loved" them as well as us, and hath washed us all "from our sins in his own blood." Far be it, that we should cite these things to reproach the apostles; we simply bring forth the record which God has given of the apostles, to show to men that if they will be perfect they must have a higher aim than "the example of the apostles." By these things from the word of God we would show to men that in working out the problem of human destiny under the perfect law of God, that problem must be worked by an example that never fails. We write these things not that we love the apostles less, but Christ more. And this is only what the apostles themselves have shown. Ask the apostles whether we shall follow them as examples. Peter, shall we follow your example? Answer: "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us *an example*, that ye should follow *his steps*; *who did not sin*, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2:21, 22. Paul, shall we not follow your example? Answer: "Be ye followers of me, *even as I also am of Christ*." 1 Cor. 11:1. John, "that disciple whom Jesus loved," shall we not follow your example? shall we not walk in your ways? Answer: "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought also so to walk, even as He walked." 1 John 2:6. Wherefore, as the apostles themselves repudiate the claim of apostolic example, it follows that there is no such thing as "the example of the apostles."

Jesus Christ is the one only example for men to follow. To every man he commands absolutely, "Follow me." "Take *my* yoke upon you and *learn of me*." "I am the door," "he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." "By *me* if any man enter in, he shall be saved." The Lord Jesus is the one only person whom this world ever saw who met perfectly, in the fullest measure, every requirement of the perfect law of God. He was made flesh, and he in the flesh and form and nature of man, stood in every place and met every temptation that any man can ever meet, and in every place and in everything he met all the demands of the perfect law of God. He did it from infancy to the prime of manhood, and never failed. "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." Therefore, as he is the only person whom this world ever saw who ever met to the full all the perfect requirements of the law of God, it follows that he is the only person whom the world ever saw, or ever shall see, who can be an example for men, or whose example is worthy to be followed by men.

Therefore, when preachers and leaders of theological thought anywhere present before men any other example, even though it be the example of the apostles, and seek to induce men to follow any other example, even though it be proposed as apostolic example, such conduct is sin against God, and treason against our Lord Jesus Christ. And that there are men, in this day, Protestants too, who are doing that very thing only shows how far from Christ the religious teachers of the day have gone. It is time that they and all men should be told, that the law of God is the one perfect rule of human duty; that the Lord Jesus Christ is the one perfect example that has been worked out, in this world, under that rule; and that all men who will correctly solve the problem of human destiny must solve it by the terms of that rule as exemplified in, and according to, that example. Whoever attempts to solve the problem by any other rule or according to any other example will utterly fail of a correct solution; and whoever teaches men to attempt to solve it by any other rule or according to any other example, even though it be by "the example of the apostles," both acts and teaches treason against the Lord Jesus Christ.

What, then, is the example of Christ in regard to keeping the first day of the week? There is no example about it at all. He never kept it. But where there is no example of Christ there *can* be no example of the apostles. Therefore there is not, and cannot be, any such thing as the example of the apostles for keeping the first day of the week.

What then, is the example of Christ in regard to keeping the seventh day? He kept the first seventh day the world ever saw, when he had finished his great work of creation. When he came into the world, everybody knows that he kept it as long as he lived in the world. And "he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk even as he walked." Therefore those who walk as he walked will have to keep the seventh day. His steps led him to the place of worship on the seventh day for thus "his custom was" (Luke 4:16), and he taught the people how to keep the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord (Matt. 12:1-12). And he has left "us an example that ye should follow his steps." And all who

follow his steps will be led by those steps to keep the seventh day, and to turn away their feet from the Sabbath, for such is his example.

Paul said, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." Now was Paul a follower of Christ in the matter of the seventh day? Let us see: "And he [Christ] 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. And of Paul it is said, by the same writer, "They came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, and Paul, *as his manner [custom] was*, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days *reasoned with them out of the Scriptures*." Acts 17:1, 2. Paul *did* follow Christ in his "custom" of keeping the Sabbath day—the seventh day—therefore if any man will obey the word of God by Paul and will be a follower of Paul as he followed Christ, it will have to be his "custom" to go to the house of God, and to worship God, on the seventh day.

For the keeping of the seventh day we have the commandment of God and the example of the living God (Ex. 20:8-11; Gen. 2:3), and of the Lord Jesus Christ both in Heaven and on earth, both as Creator and Redeemer. And there is neither command nor example for the keeping of any other day. Will you obey the commandment of God, and follow the divine example in divine things? or will you instead obey a human command and follow human examples in human things, and expect the divine reward for it? Answer now as you expect to answer in the Judgment.

J.

September 29, 1887

"So Difficult!" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38 , p. 599.

DOCTOR JUDSON, the great missionary, translated the Bible into the Burmese language. It seems that he *translated* it too, that is, he put into the Burmese language the meaning of the Greek and Hebrew of the original; he used Burmese words instead of Greek or Hebrew in conveying to the Burmese the meaning of the Greek or Hebrew of the Scriptures. In doing so, he honestly translated instead of transferred, into Burmese the Greek word *baptize*. In causing the word of God to speak to the Burmese, he used a Burmese word instead of a Greek word, and had the word of God to speak to them in Burmese instead of in Greek. It is self-evident, that this is the only thing he could have done, if the Scriptures were to be caused to speak to the people in a tongue that they could understand.

This Burmese Bible is owned and published by the American Baptist Missionary Union, and it is the only Burmese translation of the Scriptures that there is in existence. Now other religious bodies contemplate sending missionaries to Burmah, but as they do not baptize, they cannot use the Burmese translation of the Scriptures because their practice does not correspond to the word of God which they profess to teach. But instead of coming into conformity with the word of God, and preaching to the Burmese the word of God

in their own tongue, the Bishop of Rangoon, through the British and Foreign Bible Society, asks the American Baptist Missionary Union to "sanction the publishing of an edition of the Burmese New Testament owned by them," and allow the use "either of a Greek word, or some neutral word in those few passages which make it so difficult for us to use this excellent translation."

That is, these people ask the American Baptist Missionary Union to sanction a translation that is not a translation, or else a translation that is unfaithful to the word of God. In other words, they want to make the Lord speak to the Burmese in Greek, or else speak to them in Burmese with an uncertain sound, so that His word will either be to them meaningless or else "yea and nay" instead of "yea and amen." For there is no question raised as to the correctness of Doctor Judson's translation. There is no complaint that the translation is not faithful to the original. There is no charge that the Greek word *baptize* does not mean "immerse," as Doctor Judson has translated it into the Burmese language. They themselves pronounce it "an excellent translation." The only trouble is that it is "so difficult for us to use this excellent translation," while it speaks to the Burmese in the Burmese language instead of in Greek or in some word that is neither Greek nor Burmese. And what makes it "so difficult" for those "missionaries" to use "this excellent translation?" Oh, their practice is contrary to the precept that is all. And so, they want to fix it so that they can lead the Burmese people to conform to their practice instead of to the precept of Christ. And then they want the American Baptist Missionary Union, not only to "sanction" their disobedience, but also their treacherous dealing with the Burmese! The Union does well to tell them, "No." Let them obey the precept of Christ, and then they will not find it "so difficult" to use "this excellent translation."

J.

"The Fifth Commandment. No. 1" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 38 , pp. 600, 601.

"HONOR thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." This is the first commandment of the second table of the law of God, the first commandment in relation to our duties toward our fellow-men, the first commandment following it with promise, it is in fact the only commandment following it with promise, it is in fact the only commandment of the ten, with promise. To the second table of the law this commandment stands in the same relation that the first commandment stands to the first table. As to honor God alone is the first duty of every conscious, intelligent soul, so to honor parents is the first duty of every man in relation to his fellow-men. To "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," is the first of all the commandments; to "love thy neighbor as thyself" is the second of all the commandments, and is "like unto" the first. And to first of all duties under the second of all the commandments is given in this commandment, "honor thy father and thy mother."

Nor does the obligation of this commandment cease when the young man or the young woman becomes "of age." We know that in the practice of most people

nowadays, its obligation ceases long before that time, and we know that this evil will grow worse and worse, because the Scripture has foreseen it so. "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, . . . disobedient to parents." And "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:1, 2, 13. But although this commandment is so regarded in the practice of men, it is not so regarded in the will of God, for it is written, "Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or his mother. And all the people shall say, Amen." This being so, it is certainly true that this age, and this nation, is fast becoming one of the most cursed ages and nations that time itself has seen. To cite but one illustration out of multitudes that might be given and which will readily recur to any thinking person: It does not require that a person shall be beyond middle age to easily remember the time when a parent's "last will and testament" was considered a sacred thing and children would hardly think of breaking it any more than they would think of rifling the grave. Whereas now about the least sacred thing that a parent can leave when he dies is his last will and testament. It is only expected and looked upon by the children as a thing to be criticized; it is only heard to be found fault with. It matters not though each of the children may have been left an amount sufficient to make him independently rich, or even a millionaire, it only seems to increase the spirit of vandalism unless they get it all.

The obligations of this commandment do not cease, neither when children become "of age," nor at the death of the parents, nor at any other time while men live. And these obligations and the way in which we have met them will meet us in the Judgment. Even though we have no parents living, the obligation to honor them still remains, because we should constantly honor their memory, and seek ever to do that which will be an honor to them were they living, and men may at any time do that which would disgrace their parentage, and thousands often do. The commandment to honor thy father and mother is of no narrower compass, nor of any shorter duration, than is any other part of the law of God, and blessed is he who does it.

Yet it is clear from the word of God that the responsibility for the transgression of this commandment rests not altogether upon the children, but it does rest in a much greater measure than is generally supposed up the parents themselves. Nor is it alone from the word of God that this may be discerned. Let a child or a youth publicly commit some act of impropriety, and instantly it reflects upon the parents, in the question, "Whose boy is that?" or, "Whose girl is that?" and, when the information is given, in the remark, "Well, he [or she] has been very poorly brought up." This is exactly the way in which the word of God views it. That word is, "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Prov. 22:6. Now the commandments of God are "the way" in which every person "should go," and this shows that whether men will go in that way or not depends much upon the way in which they are trained, and the training devolves altogether upon the parents. Therefore we say it is clear by the word of God that the responsibility for the wickedness of children rests not altogether nor even in the greatest measure, upon themselves, but that it does rest in a much greater measure than many realize upon the parents. This is

shown by many instances in the Bible, of which we shall give two—one on each side of the question.

Eli was high-priest over the house of God. He had two sons. "Now the sons of Eli were sons of Belial; they knew not the Lord." "Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord; for men abhorred the offering of the Lord." "Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did unto all Israel; and how they lay with the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And he said unto them, Why do ye such things? for I hear of your evil dealings by all this people. Nay, my sons; for it is no good report that I hear: ye make the Lord's people to transgress." 1 Sam. 2:12, 17, 22-24. "And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house; when I begin, I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever." Chap. 3:11-14.

"His sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not." Why, did he not talk to the young men? Of course he did. Did he not tell them not to do so? Undoubtedly. Did he not tell them they were doing wrong? To be sure he did. But this was not enough. Although he did all this, yet "he restrained them not." Something more than mere words was needed there, as is often the case in many other families. No doubt Eli used enough words, too many, in fact, under the circumstances, but he did not use enough *authority*. He seems to have been one of those parents who love (?) their children so much that they cannot bear to correct them in any other way than by smooth, would-be-persuasive words, and so in reality let the children take the reins into their own hands and drive everything before them, doing as they please. But to all such parents God says, as he did to Eli: "Therefore kick ye at my sacrifice and at mine offerings, which I have commanded in my habitation; and *honorest thy sons above me?*" While children must honor parents, the parents must honor God; but when parents honor their children above God, there is then neither honor of God, nor parental authority in the family—the children have then usurped both. "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me forever; but now

601

the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Sam. 2:29, 30.

Now here is the other case. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Gen. 18:17-19.

"He will *command* his children, . . . and they shall keep the way of the Lord." Eli "*said* unto them" and "his sons made themselves vile." Abraham "will

command his children . . . and they shall keep the way of the Lord . . . that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Eli "said unto them," and "his sons made themselves vile," and the Lord could not bring upon him that which he had spoken of him and his house; for, although the Lord had said indeed that his house should walk before him forever, "but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me." If Abraham had not commanded his children and his household, they too would not have kept the way of the Lord, and then the Lord could never have brought upon Abraham that which he had spoken of him.

And in all this there is inculcated the additional and important lesson, that, although the commandment demands of the children that they honor their parents, it equally demands of the parents that they by an assertion of parental authority, in the fear of God, shall show themselves worthy of honor, and not, by lack of proper discipline, honor their children above God, and so cause themselves to be despised by their children.

J.

October 6, 1887

"The Fifth Commandment. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 39 , pp. 615, 616.

"AND, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6:4. Nurture signifies, "The act of nourishing or nursing, tender care, education, instruction." Admonition signifies, "Gentle or friendship reproof; counsel against a fault or error; instruction in duties."

This shows that the Lord has given directions for the training, the bringing up, of children. This is only to be expected, because God has given one of the ten commandments especially to children, and whenever the Lord has given a commandment, he has also given directions how to fulfill the requirements of it. But, as shown last week, the first duty toward the fulfillment of the fifth commandment devolves upon the parents. The above text shows the same thing. But this is evidently true from the very nature of the case, because it is the duty of every responsible being to honor God above all. But for a considerable length of time the child is irresponsible and incapable of knowing God, or of knowing of him. If, therefore, the child is to know of God, and his one obligation and relationship to him, it is evident that he must be taught. But there is no one to teach him but his parents. Consequently the first steps taken by a child toward the fulfillment of his duty toward God, or his duty toward man in obedience to God, must be taken under the guidance of his parents. In other words, the parents must stand virtually in the place of God to the child until he reaches the age of responsibility himself. And it is the duty of the parents to see that when the child reaches the age of responsibility, he shall be prepared to fulfill the obligations that devolve upon him, in the fear of God.

This is what is involved in the words, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it;" and also in the text which stands at the head of this article, "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The way in which he should go is in the way of the commandments of God; for saith the Lord: "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. 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. The way of the commandments of God is the way of peace, for, "Great peace have they that love thy law; and nothing shall offend them." Ps. 119:165. And, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee." Isa. 26:3. Therefore it is certain that "the way" in which the child is to be trained up so that he may not depart from it when he is old, is the way of the commandments of God; the "nurture and admonition of the Lord" in which the parents are to bring up the children, is that which is found in following the directions of the word of God. What these directions are, we shall now endeavor to set forth.

There is given us in the Scripture a notable instance in illustration of the point which we here wish to develop. Paul wrote to Timothy: "I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also." Now unfeigned faith is one of the very graces that is connected with the great aim of the law of God. For, "Now the end [the purpose] of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." 1 Tim. 1:5. And here we find this great grace in a straight line to the third generation, and that too in a country and in an age that was as corrupt as any since the flood, and his father a Gentile too. How did it ever come about that this unfeigned faith was found in Timothy? It was not born in him, that is certain, for says the Scripture, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child." Prov. 22:15. How then happened it. Here is how: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 3:15. There is the whole secret revealed. "From a child he had known the Scriptures." He had been trained up in the way that he should go. He had been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

What then says the Scripture about this? If we can find the course that was followed by which Timothy was brought to the grace of unfeigned faith, we may know what to do with our children that theirs may be the same happy experience. "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 thy life; but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' 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." Deut. 4:9, 10. Of all the times, therefore, which that people were to remember, they were *specially* to remember the day that they stood before Sinai and heard the words of God. And of all the things which they were

diligently to remember, and to teach their children, they were *especially* to remember and teach the words which they heard from the voice of God, the day when they stood before Sinai. And those words which above all were to be specially remembered and taught, were the ten commandments. These were the specialty therefore in Timothy's instruction.

Further, the instructions are: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6:5-7. "Thou shalt teach them diligently." The margin reads, Hebrew, "Thou shalt *whet* or *sharpen* them diligently," etc. On this word Dr. Clarke remarks that it signifies "to *repeat*, *iterate*, or do a thing *again* and *again*; hence to *whet* or *sharpen* any instrument, which is done by *reiterated friction* or *grinding*." There is the secret of the successful teaching of the commandments of God. To do it over and over, again and again. Not however in the way of having the child learn them by rote, and then stop at that. A parrot can be taught that much, and a child may be taught these things in such a way that he will learn them in about such a way as a parrot would, and with not much more of an intelligent understanding than a parrot might have to repeat them. But that is not the idea of these directions. It is, by constant instruction and watching to instill the principles of the law of God into the mind of the child and cause them to become a part of the very texture of his being and conduct; that his conduct even though a child may be regulated by these principles in the fear of God.

Of course this will not be accomplished by only a word now and then, nor by an hour's exercise in Sabbath-school on the Sabbath. No man thinks of

616

sharpening a dull axe by a few turns of the grindstone once a week, but, as many a boy can testify, that is a task that is accomplished by steady and persistent application until the angle of the axe edge is so evenly drawn that a few circles of the whetstone will refine the edge to an almost perfect keenness. Now this is precisely what the Lord directs that the parents shall do to the minds and hearts of their children by the application of the words and principles of the commandments of God. It is that the minds of the children shall be so keenly sharpened by the application of the principles of the word of God that they shall be able instantly to discern, to choose, and to do the right. But thousands of fathers will take more pains to sharpen an old rusty axe than they will to sharpen the minds of their own children to know and do the right.

Nor is this so hard a thing to do as is often imagined, if only it be done in the right way. That which makes it so hard for many is that they attempt to do it by set tasks rather than by making it a part of life itself. They attempt to do the teaching by set lessons apart from the regular conduct of life, rather than by making the lessons and the principles a part of the practical conduct of the daily life itself. Many a mother will teach her little daughter the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and the child can learn it by rote in a few minutes, and by repeating it a few days can recollect it at any time; and then

just as likely as not while the child is repeating the commandment, the mother is dressing her up in all the frills and ruffles and ribbons that the latest and loudest demands of fashion may demand, and just because it is the fashion. At the very moment when the child is repeating the commandment the mother perhaps is preparing to pierce the child's ears like an Ishmaelite, or "bang" her hair like a savage, and all because it is fashionable and because everybody else does so. That is to say, the child is taught to *say*, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and at the same time is taught to *do* as the world does, and to seek to please the world, to do as others do, *because* they do it, to make and keep fast friendship with the world. But all such teaching of the commandments of God is vain. "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." James 4:4. To teach the child to *say*, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and then teach the child to do the ways of the world and to seek to please the world, is only to teach him to put "the god of this world" above the true God; to obey the god of this world instead of the God of Heaven; and to seek to please the god of this world rather than the God of love, of truth, and of righteousness.

Such a way of doing is not by any means to teach the commandments of God diligently unto the children; it is not to train up the children in the way they should go; nor is it to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. When the children are taught to *say* the commandments of God, it is equally the parents' duty to teach them to *do* the commandments which they have been taught. But to do this successfully the principle of obedience to God, and the love of his commandments, must be woven into the texture of the daily life of the parents. The fear of God must be before the parents, and his honor that which they shall seek above all and endeavor to promote. If our teaching shall not be sustained by our daily practice, we cannot expect that our teaching shall be sustained by the practice of our children. "Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, . . . and ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. . . . That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them, as the days of heaven upon the earth." Deut. 11:13-21.

J.

"Mr. Moody's 'Bible' School" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 39 , pp. 616, 617.

A SHORT time ago we gave a specimen of the teaching that is given in Mr. Moody's Bible school. Since writing that another specimen has come to hand. If these two specimens form any criterion at all we are justified in concluding that the Northfield Summer School is anything but a *Bible* school. The following is from an official report of one of Mr. Moody's addresses to the Bible students at his school:—

"If you had gone into Sodom, and asked about Lot they would have told you he was the most prosperous man in all Sodom; he

owned the best property in Sodom—he owned the best corner lots. His family moved in the very highest circles—at the very top. He wasn't too religious. He wasn't like his uncle, Abraham. They thought Abraham a very narrow-minded man. But Lot was a noble man—he was just the kind of a man the Sodomites liked. They liked that kind of Christianity. He was their style of a man. If there had been a railroad running from Sodom to Jerusalem, he would have been a prominent director in it. He believed in all modern improvements. He was getting along amazingly well. Bear in mind, Lot is a typical character. He represents the professing Christians of to-day who don't want to be too religious. They just want to get into Heaven. They keep their religion as a sort of fire-escape. They don't want to be too religious—peculiar—narrow-minded. Lot wasn't too religious. He didn't belong to that class. He was 'a noble man.' But God knew about him; and when he came to investigate him, he found a rotten state of things. Lot had been there twenty years and hadn't any family altar—been there twenty-years and hadn't got a convert—been there twenty years and not one man had been made better in all Sodom. God he said: 'Lot has been there twenty years. Certainly he has got some converts.' But there wasn't a convert, and all Sodom suffered one fate. Young men say: 'Let us make the best of both worlds.' That is what you hear now. Well; Lot tried that, and he came to a miserable end."

Now as this was an address to Bible students, in a school professedly devoted particularly to Bible study, it is but natural to suppose that the ideas and instruction of the chief instructors would be almost entirely biblical. It is therefore but fair to inquire whereabouts in the Bible did Mr. Moody learn all these particulars in relation to Lot? Here he has given a long series of statements, all given in a tone of supercilious criticism, in regard to a person named several times in the Bible, and there is hardly one statement in the whole account that is according to the truth of the Bible, and not one of the criticisms that is justified by the word of God. The tone of the whole tirade is such, and only such, as to set forth Lot as a man who used the profession of godliness only as a cloak, and only as a stepping-stone to worldly prosperity—in short to show him up as a systematic hypocrite, only keeping "his religion as a sort of fire-escape." And, by the way, if Mr. Moody be right, that is certainly a most excellent thing to do, for it is certain that God sent his angels personally to see that Lot should escape the fire that destroyed Sodom. If it be indeed that Lot, as described by Mr. Moody, was "a typical character," then those who pattern after him most assuredly have all the encouragement that could be given to continue in their pernicious ways, seeing that, hypocrite though he was, God sent his angels to deliver him from the destruction of the place where he dwelt.

But the truth is, the Bible truth too, that Lot was no such person at all as is here set forth in this display of Mr. Moody's extra-biblical wisdom. The word of God calls him "just Lot," and "that righteous man." But in the character drawn by Mr. Moody there is no element of righteousness. The word of God says of Lot

and of his conduct in Sodom, that God "delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked; for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds" (2 Peter 2:7, 8); while Mr. Moody's whole sketch conveys the idea that he was a familiar associate, and a hail fellow well met, among the Sodomites. But the same angels who condescended to associate with Abraham, and to share his hospitality, also associated with Lot and shared his hospitality. The same holy beings who counted Abraham worthy to entertain them, also counted Lot worthy to entertain them. Abraham sat in his tent door, and when he saw the angels "he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground, and said, My Lord, if not I have found favor in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant; let a little water, it pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree; and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts; after that ye shall pass on And they said, So do, as thou hast said. . . . And he took butter, and milk, and the calf which he had dressed, and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree, and they did eat." Lot sat in the gate of Sodom, and when two of the same angels came to Sodom at even, "Lot seeing them rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground; 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. And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night. And he pressed upon the greatly; and they turned in unto him, and entered into his house; and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat." Gen. 18:1-8; 19:1-3. Now when the angels of God treated these two men so nearly alike, and when the word of God shows them so nearly alike in their hospitality to the angels; we question Mr. Moody's right to draw so wide a distinction between them as he has done here, and we seriously question both the propriety, and the reverence of Mr. Moody's laying such hypocrisy to the charge of God's elect.

Mr. Moody says, "Lot had been there twenty years, and hadn't any family altar." How does he know? God calls Lot a "righteous man," and the Lord is not in the habit of calling men righteous who are his family from his fury poured out upon Sodom. But instead of so delivering the families that call not upon his name, the Word is "Pour out thy fury upon . . . the *families* that call not on thy name." Jer. 10:25. Therefore we are free to say that we think the idea that he had a family altar is a good deal nearer in harmony with the word of God, than is Mr. Moody's statement that he "hadn't."

Mr. Moody says, Lot had "been there twenty years and hadn't got a convert." And "I have no doubt when Abraham was pleading with God he said: 'Lot has been there twenty years. Certainly he has got some converts.' But there wasn't a convert, and all Sodom suffered one fate." Well Noah was *there a hundred* and twenty years, and he didn't get a convert in all the world. *There* "wasn't a convert," and all the world "suffered one fate"—drowned by the flood. And yet God has not laid this to the charge of either Lot or Noah. It has remained for Mr. Moody to go beyond the Lord and usurp the authority to perform that extra-judicial service. It is altogether likely however that both "just Lot" and "righteous"

Noah were more concerned in getting men to live righteous lives before God, than they were in getting "converts."

Then at last, this extra-biblical teacher says: "Young men say, 'Let us make the best of both worlds.' That is what we hear now. Well, Lot tried that, and he came to a miserable end." Lot did not try that Mr. Moody. For "whosoever will be the friend of the world, is the enemy of God" (James 4:4), and "just Lot" "that righteous man" was not the enemy of God. But the fitting climax to this whole piece of Bible (?) teaching is the statement that Lot "came to a miserable end"! To what miserable end did Lot come? Does Mr. Moody think that Lot came to the same miserable end that Sodom did? Is that a part of his Bible teaching? How does Mr. Moody know to what end Lot came, whether miserable or otherwise? The Bible nowhere tells. We may therefore very properly suppose that Mr. Moody got this remarkable piece of information, where he got all the rest of this intelligence that he

617

has given us about Lot—that is, outside of the Bible. And that is the sort of *Bible* study and *Bible* teaching, that they have at Mr. Moody's *Bible* school! We most devoutly wish that that Bible school may become a Bible school indeed, and that at last both teachers and students may come to the same "miserable end" that "that righteous man," "just Lot," will. Amen.

J.

October 20, 1887

"Conscience and Sunday Laws" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40 , pp. 631, 632.

WITH the Sunday-law advocates "there is no recognition of the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but every man must worship according to the dictates of the conscience of the Sunday-law claimant. Yet even this is not entirely the true statement of the case, but rather that every man must worship according to the *will* of the Sunday-law claimant. We say *will*, because in this case, as a matter of fact, *there is no conscience at all.*"

That there is no recognition of the rights of conscience in others, is proved by the following quotation from the organ of the National Reform party, the *Christian Statesman*, of November 1, 1883: "If there be any Christian who objects to the proposed amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me that it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in the matter." In the same article it is plainly shown that whoever does not keep Sunday stands in the same position as the infidel; and so it appears that whatever religious rites they may choose to have enforced by law, it must be so wholly out of respect for their wishes who will have it so, with no regard for the consciences of any who differ with them. And now as they so decidedly show that they will not respect our conscience, we propose to

show that in this thing, at least, their action does not spring from conscience at all, and that therefore, on their part, there is no conscience for us to respect.

CONSCIENCE

Is defined by Webster's Unabridged to be "the moral faculty; the moral sense;" and "the English word implies a moral standard of action in the mind." Now the only moral standard of action for the human mind that there is in existence, is the moral law, the law of God, the ten commandments. That this definition and this statement are strictly in accordance with the Scripture is readily seen by Heb. 10:15, 16: "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." "Written . . . with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Cor. 3:3. "So then," says Paul, "*with the mind* I myself serve the law of God." Rom. 7:25.

Again, "For if the *blood of bulls* and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the *flesh*, how much more shall the *blood of Christ*, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your *conscience* from dead works to serve the living God." "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an *evil conscience*." Heb. 9:13, 14; 10:22. So then the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience "from dead works," "from evil," from *sin*. But how does the conscience discover that it is defiled by sin? Rom. 3:20 answers: "*By the law* is the knowledge of sin." And 1 John 3:4: "*Sin* is the transgression of *the law*."

Once more; Rom. 2:14, 15: "When the Gentiles, which have not the [writte, see context] law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the [written] law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness." When the Gentiles *do* the things contained in the *law*, their *conscience bears witness*. And by doing the things of the law, they show the work of the law written in their hearts, and to that their conscience bears witness. Observe, the conscience bears witness *only to the things contained in the law*. Therefore

632

as much of the law of God as is in the heart *so much conscience* a man has, *and no more*. By these "proofs of Holy Writ," then, the definition above given is justified, and it is proved that the ten commandments are the moral standard of action of the human mind; that they are the detector of the stains of sin upon the conscience, that they are the great regulator of the conscience; and that, virtually, the law of God is conscience. And by these proofs it is clear that when, out of respect for the law of God, a person does what is commanded in the law, he acts conscientiously. And it is equally clear that when a person, with the law of God before him, chooses to go contrary to the plain reading of the text of the law, he does *not* act conscientiously, but willfully, and his own will becomes the standard of his mind, and so conscience is shut out.

The fourth commandment is the original and only moral standard of action that there is in the world regarding the observance of the Sabbath. It alone is the regulator of the conscience on that subject. By it alone can be detected Sabbath-breaking stains upon the conscience. Obedience to it, out of respect to the commandment and its Author, is conscientious obedience. Disobedience to it, even though we seek to substitute another day, cannot be conscientiousness.

"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." Ex. 20:8-11. This commandment is just as plain as it can be written, even by the Lord himself. So that to everyone who can read it, his duty is plain, and he is without excuse in disobedience. There is in it room for only one possible question; that is, What day is the seventh day? and having found it, honestly before God, to obey the word with all our God-given powers; and to *such obedience*, and to such only, *conscience bears witness*; such obedience is conscientious.

Sunday-keeping is no part of the law of God. The Sunday institution is not based upon the fourth commandment; nor is it sanctioned by it. No man can read the first day of the week, the Sunday, into the commandment without destroying the commandment. And outside of the fourth commandment no one claims any commandment for Sunday-keeping in the Bible. They know there is no such commandment in all the Book. Therefore, as there is no commandment from God for the observance of Sunday, as there is no law of God on the subject, its observance *cannot be* a matter of conscience. Being not of God, there is nothing in it that can be recognized by the conscience, which is of God. Not resting upon the authority of God, it rests upon no authority that the conscience can respect. And there lies the weakness of the Sunday cause. If there were anything in it that would touch the conscience, anything that the conscience could recognize; if it rested upon authority that the conscience could respect, its advocates, moving in the fear of God, would never have need to ask for human laws to compel people to observe it.

If, then, the Sunday institution and Sunday laws are not founded in conscience, from what do they spring? From

Superstition is defined by Webster: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites *not commanded*." In the zeal and the efforts of the National Reform party and of those who demand laws compelling the observance of Sunday, this definition is met *exactly*. The keeping of Sunday religiously is the observance of a rite *absolutely not commanded* by the Lord in any place in all his revelation to men. Let them show us a commandment from the Lord for the observance of Sunday and we will willingly and gladly keep it, and do all that we possibly can to get all others to observe it; and thus on our part at least they will have no need of the enactment of laws enforcing its observance. Let them show us from the Bible, Old Testament or New, any such expression in favor of Sunday

as that "ye ought" to keep it, or that "I have given you an example that ye should do" it, or that "happy are ye if ye do" it, and we will obey the injunction, and thenceforth will keep Sunday. We will keep it *conscientiously*. And until they shall open the Bible and show us a command for it, that we may see it and say, This is the word of God, until then we utterly refuse to keep it, civil law or constitutional amendment to the contrary notwithstanding. But they never can produce such a commandment, and they know it, and *therefore* they *will have* civil enactments and constitutional amendment to supply their want, and thus seek to remedy the fatal defect.

More, as we find in the Bible, in the moral law, that great regulator of the conscience, a plain commandment enjoining the observance of the *seventh day* as the Sabbath of the Lord, our consciences oblige us to keep it so, out of conscientious regard for the authority of the Author of the law. And so long as that commandment stands, and they fail to produce from the word of God a commandment for us to keep the *first day*, just so long we refuse to give up the observances of *that which is commanded*, to adopt the practice of that which is *not* commanded. In other words, and according to the definitions given above, we refuse to yield our *conscience* for their *superstition*.

By some this may be thought strong language. But the question is not, Is it strong? but, Is it true? And the answer must be, according to the Scriptures, and the highest authority in the English language. *It is true*. And it being also true that for the sake of this *superstition*, its advocates will annul the chartered liberties of this whole liberty-loving people; liberties which were bought with much blood and untold suffering; liberties for which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor; liberties which have been the vital principle in the work of every reformer from the day of Arnold of Brescia to our own; liberties which are the legitimate outgrowth of the Reformation as a whole, and consequent upon the spread of its enlightenment,—when all these must be ruthlessly torn away, and relentlessly crushed out, for the establishment of a *superstition*, we know of no words that would be too strong by which to characterize it. We cannot sit idly by and see all our so dearly-bought rights so cruelly taken away. They urge the contest upon us, and in the name of civil and religious liberty, in the name of human rights, in the name of conscience, in the name of Him who alone can cleanse the conscience from all stain, and in the name of Him who alone is Ruler of the conscience, we accept the issue. We accept the issue, and in *conscience* reject the *superstition*.

J.

"Perilous Times" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 40 , pp. 632, 633.

"IN the last days perilous times shall come," says the Scripture. 2 Tim. 3:1. That we are in the last days no one can doubt who will give any attention to the word of God on that subject, for that word has spoken so much about the last days that no one who will study can fail to see that the times in which we live are those days. The disciples asked the Saviour, "What shall be the *sign* of thy coming?" Matt. 24:3. He answered, "There shall be *signs*." Luke 21:25. They

asked for but one "sign," he said there shall be a number, "signs." Peter, quoted from Joel, says, "And I will show wonders in heaven above and signs in the earth beneath." Acts 2:19. These signs are so numerous, and in such places, that everyone who is not warned by them will be without excuse. "And 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 that are coming on the earth." Luke 21:25, 26. Now count the number of places where these signs are to be: (1) In the sun, (2) in the moon, (3) in the stars, (4) and upon the earth, (5) and amongst the nations, (6) and upon the seas, (7) and among men themselves, their hearts failing for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. Men will see these things coming, their hearts will fail them for fear, because of them, yet they will fail to draw from them the only lesson that there is in them, namely, the Lord is coming. He says: "When these things *begin* to come to pass then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." These things began to come to pass in 1780. Then the sun was darkened, and the moon also, as the consequence. Again, the Saviour said, "When ye shall see all these things, know that he is near, *even at the doors.*"

Now is there any one of these things named by the Saviour as signs which cannot be seen by any one at the present day? It is a historical fact that the sun and the moon were darkened May 19, 1780; and this fact is perpetuated as unexplainable, in each successive edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, the highest human authority in the English language. It is likewise a fact that in November 1833, occurred the greatest star-shower ever known, which fact is perpetuated in the astronomical geographies and treatises, as well as in many other kinds of records. Again, what nation is at ease and in quiet? Not one. Our own nation, the best one of all, is not. It is a fact that there is distress with perplexity as never before in every nation. Mark the expression, "distress of nations, *with perplexity.*" Webster says, "We are *perplexed* when our feelings, as well as judgment, are so affected that we know not how to decide or act." Nations have been grievously distressed before, but they always knew just

633

what to do to relieve themselves. The peculiarity of the present "distress of nations" is the "perplexity"—they do not know how to decide or act; they do not know which way to turn. Therein lies the sign, and nothing below the divine mind of Christ could have penetrated it. "The sea and the waves roaring," spreading affliction and calamity, and all can see it. "Men's hearts" *are* "failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." The cyclones, the water-spouts, and the fearful floods, carrying destruction in their paths, none knowing when nor where they will come, are the very embodiment of that which causes men's hearts to fail them for fear. There is not one of those signs in the heavens that may not be seen by all, in the most authentic records; and there is not one of these signs upon the earth that *is not seen* by all in the very fact itself. Be he believer or unbeliever, he does see all these things. This is the fact, but it only points to the other, and most stupendous fact, that the second coming of Christ is at the doors. He says, "When ye shall see all these things, *know* that he

is . . . even at the doors." The people *do* see all these things. He *is* at the very doors.

But it is not in these things that the peril lies which is referred to in 2 Tim. 3. These evidences only show that we are in the days when the perilous times shall be. The perils are from other causes: "In the last days perilous times shall come *for* [because] men shall be lovers of their own selves." And from this root, *selfishness*, grows the fearful catalogue of eighteen forms of sin, named in the following verses. In the sins of the last days lies the peril.

"As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:37. "The earth also was corrupt before God; and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6:11, 12, 5. "Every imagination of the thoughts," on which Dr. Clarke says: "The very first embryo of every idea, the figment of every thought, the very materials out of which perception, conception, and ideas were formed, were all evil." "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh." Again says Dr. Clarke: "They were flesh, wholly sensual, the desires of the mind overwhelmed and lost in the desires of the flesh." Every desire was fleshly, and every effort was only in the direction of satisfying such desires, with the natural and inevitable result, as the Saviour expresses it, "They were marrying and giving in marriage;" and with nothing in view but the satisfaction of the fleshly desires, it was an easy step to where "they took them wives of all which they chose." Gen. 6:2.

Now let anyone take the divorce records of any of the County or District Courts in the United States, or the statistics which are compiled from these, and in view of the wonderful facility with which divorces are obtained, let him ask himself whether we are not fallen upon such times as were in the days of Noah? whether men do not now take to them wives of all that they choose? In itself marriage is right. It was instituted by the Lord himself. It was the dearest relationship of the human race. It is honorable in all when it is entered into in the fear of God, and when the relationship is maintained in accordance with those sanctions which God has established. But when people are married to be divorced and divorced to be married, all respect for the relationship and its obligations is annihilated, and the institution is destroyed.

From this the evil goes on in the descending scale to another stage mentioned by the Saviour, "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot . . . even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:28-30. That it is the moral condition of the world that is here referred to, as well as to worldly carelessness and lack of faith in the great event which is to come upon them, is plainly shown in 2 Peter 2, where he is writing of the same things spoken of by the Saviour; after giving the instance of Noah and his times, he takes up Sodom and Gomorrah, and speaks of "just Lot vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked; for that righteous man dwelling among them in *seeing* and *hearing* vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds."

Paul also shows that this is the point that is reached in the full development of the perilous times. He says: "For of this sort are they which creep into houses and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." But he not only shows how it is brought about. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." 2 Tim. 3:6-8. "As [in the same manner] Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses." By turning to the record in the seventh and eighth chapters of Exodus, we learn that it was by miracles that these men withstood Moses, and Paul says as they did, "*so do these resist the truth.*" Now if it be so, as all the other scriptures show that we are in the perilous times, for this specification to be met, and thus these positions be fully confirmed, there should be in the world at the present time people who resist the truth (the word of God, John 17:17) by working miracles, showing signs, and doing wonders. It is well known that Spiritualism does these things. It is equally well known that the very first of the efforts of Spiritualism everywhere is to destroy confidence in the Bible as the truth of God, and to resist its obligations upon the people.

In speaking of the second coming of the Lord, Paul says, "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." This shows that just before the Saviour comes, Satan, by power and signs and wonders, will resist the truth of his coming, and the truth which will prepare a people for his coming. It is thus then that Satan, by miracles and signs, resists the truth of God, and brings to the full the last days as were the days of Noah and the days of Lot. If anyone will know the possibilities of evil that are in Spiritualism, let him read Deut. 18:9-14, with the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus, and he will see what it did for those nations which dwelt in Canaan. And when in the last days these same "spirits of devils, working miracles," "with all power" "go forth to the kings of the earth and the whole world" *it is* "to gather them to the battle of the great day of God." Thirty-nine years have these "spirits of devils" been going forth. Soon, very soon, will they gather the nations to the battle of the great day. "Who is on the Lord's side?" We are in the perilous times. Who will escape? Christ is at the doors. Who is ready when he shall knock to open to him *immediately?* Luke 12:36.

J.

October 27, 1887

"The Scripture Cannot Be Broken" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41 , p. 647.

HOW much of the Bible shall remain when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is in question? Here comes the *Christian Union* and says that the fifth and tenth verses of the ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes, "are not to be regarded as divine revelations respecting the future state." The *Union* had said that there is

nothing in the Bible limiting probation to this life, and a correspondent asked for an explanation of these two verses. Here is the answer in full:—

"The passages referred to are as follows: 'But the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten.' '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.' Ecclesiastes records the experience of one who had made full trial of the world and its pleasure, living without any spiritual faith or hope. He regards, as a result, that life as vanity, and the conclusion of his experiences is that the true way to live is to fear God and keep his commandments. The verses given above are not to be regarded as divine revelations respecting the future state; if so, then divine revelation would disclose that there is no immortality, no life beyond the grave; they are to be regarded as the expression of despair which inevitably and always accompanies the philosophy of materialism and the life of worldliness."

Well, let that stand so for a little while, and let us look further. David said of man, "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:4. And this, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17. And this, "In death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?" Ps. 6:5. Are these words "to be regarded as the expression of despair which inevitably and always accompanies the philosophy of materialism and the life of worldliness"? Are these the words also of one who is recording "the experience of one who had made full trial of the world and its pleasure, living without any spiritual faith or hope"? Is that the kind of a man that David was? Did he live without any spiritual faith or hope? Was his the philosophy of materialism and the life of worldliness? And are these verses also not to be regarded as divine revelations respecting the future state?

Job, too, according to the estimate of the *Christian Union*, was a man living without any spiritual faith or hope. His, too, was "the philosophy of materialism and the life of worldliness." For he said: "But man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Chap. 14:10-12. Again, speaking of his infancy, he said: "Oh that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me! I should have been as though I had not been; I should have been carried from the womb to the grave." And again he says: "Are not my days few? cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before 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." Chap. 10:18-22. Of the dead he says: "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Chap. 14:21.

Good king Hezekiah, too, just after the Lord had miraculously restored him to health, and while thanking and praising the Lord for it, fell into the "materialistic philosophy" of the same worldly crowd, for he said, "The grave cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Isa. 38:18.

Paul also was tainted with it, for he said: "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." And, "If the dead rise not . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15:32, 16-18.

Now if the words in Ecclesiastes 9:5, 10 are not to be regarded as divine revelations respecting the future state, then how can these words of David, and Job, and Hezekiah, and Paul be regarded as such? And if it be left for men to decide which of the words of God are to be regarded as divine revelations regarding a future state, and which are not, then what is the use of the Lord's saying anything on the subject?

The fact is that the words of Ecclesiastes 9:5, 10 *are* divine revelations regarding the state of man between death and the resurrection; as are also the words of David, and Job, and Hezekiah, and Paul, above quoted, with many others that might be quoted. In short, the whole Bible, with all its doctrines, all its arguments, and all its conclusions, is in perfect accord with the plain text of these passages which the *Christian Union* sets down and excludes from divine revelation as the expression of the despair of the philosophy of materialism and a life of worldliness. It is true that with this view of the Scriptures, there is no place there for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. But that does not affect the Scripture at all; it only shows the utter falsity of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. And it is time to suspect the correctness of any doctrine when it presumes to set aside the plain words of inspiration, as "not to be regarded as divine revelations" upon the very subject on which they speak.

But, says the *Union*, if these words are to be regarded as divine revelations, "then divine revelation would disclose that there is no immortality, no life beyond the grave." Not at all. It only shows what it was intended to show, and what is manifestly the divinely revealed truth, that there is no immortality, no life *in* the grave, where men do certainly go. For that same book of Ecclesiastes abundantly shows that there is to be life *beyond* the grave. But that life can only come through the resurrection of the dead. The whole difficulty is that in the doctrinal scheme of the immortality of the soul there is no place for death, nor for the grave, nor for the resurrection of the dead, while by the Bible all these are held constantly in view. Death comes alike to all; all go alike to the grave; and there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. Those who, through faith in Christ, have done good, shall come forth from the graves unto the resurrection of life, while those who have done evil shall come forth unto the resurrection of damnation.

It is better to believe what the Bible says than to try to set aside so much of it as does not agree with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. "The Scripture cannot be broken." "The word of God shall stand forever."

J.

"The Fifth Commandment. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41 , pp. 647, 648.

"CHILDREN, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right." Eph. 6:1. The Scripture here announces the principle that must actuate all true obedience: the principle that leads to doing right, not from interested motives, but because it is right. One of the profoundest of moral writers has said that, "To obey a parent, or to obey God, from interested motives, would be sin." This is pre-eminently true. But the child must learn to obey his parents before he can learn to obey God; and if he learns to obey his parents from interested motives, that principle will become so imbedded in his nature that even though when a man he should be brought to professed obedience to God, he will always be at a disadvantage in his best efforts, until, by a thorough discipline of himself, he shall have uprooted every vestige of the evil principle learned in his infancy and youth. Therefore, in bringing up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," it is incumbent upon parents diligently to impress upon the minds of the children the principle of obedience which God has given—"Obey . . . because it is right."

But to be obeyed, the parent must assert authority, and have that authority respected. Both Peter and Jude speak particularly of a class of evil-doers who despise government, and Peter says that of the unjust whom the Lord will reserve unto the day of Judgment to be punished, these are the chief. He says they are presumptuous and self-willed. But no person who is made to learn obedience and to respect authority when he is a child, will despise government when he grows up. There, however, is the great difficulty nowadays. Children are allowed to despise government in their own homes, then they despise it at school, then they despise it in the State, and they despise it before God; they become presumptuous, self-willed, and hardly anything short of the Judgment itself will convince them that there is a government and a law that will be respected.

It is the truth that genuine scriptural government in the home is now the exception. Indeed, it is so exceptional as to be almost the occasion of special remark wherever found. In the vast majority of families children are either not taught to obey, or else are taught to obey from interested motives; and in either case their actions are sin. Obedience is not natural in any child. Every child has to be taught to obey; and it requires diligence to teach him, too. Take a child who is just learning obedience; tell him, for instance, not to touch a certain thing, and that is the very thing he will touch if there is any possible show. And just here is where this principle of disobedience and of disrespect for authority is confirmed in many a child. The mother tells the child, in many instances, not to do certain things which in themselves are of very little importance, and which, except for the principle of obedience involved, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether the child does or not. Being, then, but matters of indifference, the child is told not to do so; he does so, and then because it is so slight a matter it is let pass, and he is allowed to disobey, which is *not* a slight matter. For as surely as your child is allowed to disobey in any point, he by that learns these three things: (1) He

learns to disobey; (2) he learns that your command may be slighted with impunity, and (3) in that he learns to despise your authority. And again we say, That is not by any means a slight matter, although it may be the outcome of a matter in itself wholly indifferent.

But someone may ask, "Would you insist thus strictly upon matters in themselves wholly indifferent?" No, that would be tyranny. What then shall be done? This: Let matters that are indiffer-

648

ent remain so. If it makes no difference whether the child does a certain thing or not, say nothing at all about it. Insist not at all, make no test at all, upon any matter in itself indifferent. Before you give a command be sure that the matter is of sufficient importance to involve the principle, and then be sure to insist upon the principle. Be sure of these points and then you may be sure that your child will not learn to disobey you, nor to slight your command, nor to despise your authority.

It is true that to do this will require more thought and careful watching than nine-tenths of parents are accustomed to give to this subject; but what subject can more worthily engage the thoughtful attention of parents? A dutiful, obedient, respectful child is an honor to his parents, and an ornament to society. And if children are not to learn these things at home, where shall they learn them? At school? No. Because if they are not taught them at home, and the attempt is made to teach them at school, all that is done in this direction at school will be undone, and in many cases worse than undone, at home. For if the child despises authority and government at home, he will despise them at school. And if the attempt is made to compel him to respect them, perchance by a proper and very much needed use of the whip, then the parents are at once up in arms against the teacher, and in defense of the child and only to confirm him in his rebellion. "Oh," they say, "our children are not whipped at home, and they shall not be at school." True, they are not whipped at home, but, unless they come a good deal nearer to being natural-born saints than children generally do in this world, they ought to be. The Bible says, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." Prov. 22:15. And "the rod of correction" is the only remedy that the Bible gives for this universal defect. J.

"Let Justice Be Done" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 41 , p. 648.

TO execute justice upon the rich and influential is one of the hardest tasks that the body politic, in these days, has to perform. About three or four months ago, in New York City, Jacob Sharp was convicted of bribery, and was sentenced to the penitentiary, and yet he has not, so far, seen the penitentiary. First there was a stay of proceedings granted, for a hearing before the State Supreme Court. Then, that there might be no delay, Governor Hill called a special sitting of the Supreme Court to consider this case alone. The Supreme Court decided against him. Then another stay of proceedings was granted for a hearing before the Court of Appeals; and there the case hangs. And there is not the least doubt

that if the Court of Appeals decides against him, then an appeal will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, if there is any possibility of the tricky lawyers finding the slightest technicality; and if they can't find one they will create one. It is exceedingly doubtful whether this man will ever receive the punishment due for his crimes, or the penalty already pronounced upon him. For precisely the same crime, a poor man would have been in the penitentiary long ago.

The Anarchists in Chicago form another case in point. Nearly a year ago they were found guilty of murder, and justly condemned. Then the case was appealed to the State Supreme Court. That court decided against them. Now, every possible effort is being made to secure a hearing before the United States Supreme Court. To gain this point, the best talent in the United States is secured, and the claim is made that the jury law of the State of Illinois is contrary to the Constitution of the United States. Thus the whole legal machinery of the State for years back must be broken up, that a gang of murderers may escape the penalty due their crimes. And this because they belong to a noisy rabble that can cast a lot of votes.

In San Francisco lately, a man was held for trial in \$10,000 bail, on a crime of jury-bribing. At the trial he was convicted, and was to be sentenced in a few days, but meantime was let go on the bail of \$10,000. Of course the man left the place at once, and when the day for his sentence came, he was in Mexico. And now instead of . . . the \$10,000 forfeit at once, the State has to institute suit for it, and if ever half of it reaches the State treasury it will be a wonder. But even if all of it should have been paid into court without a word, what satisfaction would that have been for the criminal who was convicted?

Another case in this same connection is one in which a lawyer was convicted of contempt of court, and sentenced to \$500 fine and six months in jail. He had scarcely landed in his cell before a writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out, and he was released on bail till the court chose to hear his case. When he was heard the court decided against him and remanded him again to jail. He had barely reached the jail again when another writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out from a judge of the State Supreme Court, and he was let go on \$500 bail for a hearing before that court when the court gets ready. This is but a part of the story, for there is no telling where the thing will stop, or whether the sentence will ever be executed.

All these cases happening at the same time in different parts of the country—New York, Illinois, and California, in the Eastern, Central, and Western States—only go to show how almost entirely the course of law has become only a travesty of justice. It is not very long that the forms of law can stand such outrages. At such a rate all respect for law will soon be gone, and downright violence will take its place. But where is the prospect of its growing any better? There is none at all. These criminal lawyers and tricksters are constantly growing worse and more abundant. And nothing but violence can be the end of it all.

J.

November 3, 1887

"Who Shall Be Able to Stand?" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42 , pp. 663, 664.

THE prophet Joel in speaking of the day of the Lord says, "The day of the Lord is great and very terrible;" and then inquires, "Who can abide it?" Joel 2:11. Balaam, away in his distant day, speaking of the time when "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city," exclaims, "Alas, who shall live when God doeth this?" Num. 24:33. Malachi also wonderingly asks, "Who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth?" Mal. 3:2. And when at last that terrible day shall have come, the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, the bondmen and the free, hide themselves in the dens, and the rocks of the mountains, and cry to the mountains and rocks to fall on them, and hide from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb, because the great day of his wrath is come; and in terror they too inquire, "Who shall be able to stand"? Rev. 6:15-17.

The connection in which these questions are asked shows that they are questions of no slight importance. Who can abide the day of the coming of the Lord? Who shall stand when he appeareth? Job in viewing that dreadful time exclaimed, "O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past." Job 14:13. And Habakkuk, beholding it in vision, said, "When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice: rottenness entered into my bones, and I trembled in myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble." Hab. 3:16. This is the time of which Daniel said "There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." Dan. 12:1. Yet for all this there will be those who may abide the day of his coming; there will be those who shall stand when he appeareth. Jesus speaks of them, and to them, and exhorts them, saying, "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.

John also speaks to these, saying, "And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." 1 John 2:28. Isaiah speaks of the same company, and says, "It shall be said in that day, 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. And Paul gives a point more in regard to the same ones: "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.

But, although it is certain that there will be a company who will abide the day of his coming, and although from other texts we know that the number will be one hundred and forty-four thousand, the question still remains, "*Who* shall abide the day of his coming?" "*Who* shall stand, when he appeareth?" More than this, the time of trouble, and of the wrath of God, is a longer period than just the short time

in which the blaze of Christ's glory shall burst upon the earth, and his people shall be delivered. The wrath of God, the pouring out of which creates the time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, and which culminates in the personal coming of Christ to take vengeance on the wicked,—this wrath of God will be poured out in the seven last plagues.

The first manifestation of this wrath will be a dreadful pestilence,—a noisome and grievous sore,—which falls upon them that have the mark of the beast, and upon them which worship his image. The second will be seen in the waters of the sea being turned to a pestilential mass, as the blood of a dead man. The third will be seen in the rivers and fountains of water becoming blood. The fourth will be manifested in the increased heat of the sun, to such a degree that even men will be scorched with it. The fifth will be a dreadful pall of darkness overhanging the greater part of the earth. The sixth will be such a manifestation of Spiritualism as will deceive everybody but the very elect. And with the seventh there comes the great voice out of the temple of Heaven from the throne, saying, "It is done." And then there are voices and thunderings and lightnings and a great earthquake such as was not since men were upon the earth so mighty an earthquake and so great; the cities of the nations fall; every island flees away, and the mountains will not be found; and there will fall upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent. And these plagues are cumulative—the terrors of each one being added to those which have gone before. (See Revelation 16.) Well indeed may all the prophets lament the dreadful day. Well indeed may all men anxiously inquire, Who shall be able to stand?

God spake by Ezekiel of this time of trouble, saying: "If I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood, to cut off from it man and beast; though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness." Eze. 14:19, 20. Noah, the one man only whom the Lord found righteous in the generation before the flood; Daniel, whom God twice called "greatly beloved;" and Job, the one chief example of suffering affliction and of patience—though these three God-chosen men were in this land in this fast-hastening day, no man could be supported by their righteousness or their faithfulness; no man can then be delivered but by the righteousness which he himself possesses, nor be sustained in the time of trial, of trouble, of temptation, and of opposition, except by the connection which he himself sustains with God, and by the confidence which is begotten of personal and thorough conviction of the truth of God fixed in the very soul, and witnessed, as it will ever be, by the Spirit of God through an abiding faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

We know not how we can better illustrate this than by giving two instances from the Bible—one from the Old Testament and one from the New. Jeremiah had spoken to all the people in Jerusalem the message of the Lord, that they should be carried captive to Babylon and there remain seventy years. Many of them had already been taken to Babylon, Jeconiah the king among them, and Jeremiah had said that Jeconiah should see his native land no more, but should die in Babylonia. One day there was a great assembly of all the people and the priests at the house of the Lord. Jeremiah was there among them, and he had on his

neck a wooden yoke which he had been wearing for some time as a sign to the people of their doomed servitude to Babylon. A false prophet, Hananiah by name, spoke to Jeremiah directly, "in the presence of the priests

664

and of all the people, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, saying, I have broken the yoke of the king of Babylon. Within two full years will I bring again into this place all the vessels of the Lord's house, that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took away from this place, and carried them to Babylon; and I will bring again to this place Jeconiah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, with all the captives of Judah, that went into Babylon, saith the Lord; for I will break the yoke of the king of Babylon."

Jeremiah answered in substance that he would be glad if it could be so, and that he would be glad if the Lord would but do it, "Nevertheless, hear thou now this word that I speak in thine ears, and in the ears of all the people. . . . The prophet which prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known, that the Lord hath truly sent him." This only roused up Hananiah to greater boldness, and he deliberately walked up to Jeremiah and "took the yoke from off the prophet Jeremiah's neck, and brake it. And Hananiah spake in the presence of all the people, saying, Thus saith the Lord: Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years." And then the record is, "And the prophet Jeremiah went his way." He had nothing more to say just then, and so silently walked away.

Now when it is understood that all the people were already dead set against Jeremiah, it may be imagined what effect this public and palpable defeat, as they regarded it, of him whom they already hated would have upon the populace. We can fairly hear the scoffs, and hoots, and jeers, and groans, that followed Jeremiah as he edged his way through the crowd. Cries of, "Ah-h-h, you're beat, you're beat, you're beat," "Prophecy again, won't you?" "Put another yoke on him," etc., etc., would fairly split the air. But what did it all amount to, to Jeremiah? Just nothing at all. He was right, and they were all wrong, the whole crowd of them, and though not a person in the whole nation should believe him made not a particle of difference to him so far as the truth or his conviction of it was concerned.

Paul stood before the embodiment of worldly power, the Emperor Nero, to answer for his life and especially for his faith. There also, to oppose him and to blind and confuse men's minds to the truth, stood an apostate from the faith, Alexander the coppersmith; and his opposition was so successful that Paul himself tells us, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me." 2 Tim. 4:16. Added to this all his brethren in Asia were turned away from him—those at Antioch for whom he had labored so earnestly; those at Iconium, and Lystra, and Derbe for whom he had labored and suffered; those at Troas from whom he was so loth to take his farewell; those of Ephesus for whose good he had labored three long years, whom he had not ceased to warn night and day with tears, with whom he had talked, and prayed, and wept so tenderly at their final parting; those of Galatia, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Pamphylia, all—"all they which

be in Asia are turned away from me." And then, as though that could not tell all the greatness of his cause for sorrow, he adds, "of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes." And yet more, added to all this there was his own fellow-laborer, of whom he was compelled to write, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world."

For all this, though his life was in the balance, and though no man stood with him, yet he never faltered, but calmly stood forth alone, saying, "Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me." There was the source of his strength. It depended not upon any influence of the world, of men, or of the church—not even upon the moral influence and support of his own intimate brethren—it sprung solely from his own personal, living connection with the Lord Jesus Christ. That alone it was which sustained him in all his trials and afflictions; in all his contradiction and opposition of unbelievers and apostates; and in all the desertions of brethren and fellow-laborers in the faith. And that alone it is which will sustain any man in the time of trouble, and in the day of the coming of Christ; that alone it is which will enable anyone to stand when he appears. Paul was able to stand unmoved amidst all earth's vicissitudes because he was able to say from the heart, "I know whom I have believed." Not as is too often misquoted, I know *in* whom I have believed, but, "I *know whom* I have believed;" and he used the word "know" in its real, proper sense too. The following from a late number of the *Sunday School Times* will give an idea of what Paul meant by this use of the word "know:"—

"'To know' primarily means to have the ability to create or produce; hence it properly includes the idea of a perfect understanding of the innermost nature, or the most intricate parts, of the subject of knowledge."

This is the sense in which Paul used the word "know." It was a living experience with him. As he expressed it in other words, "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." Such as these shall abide the day of Christ's coming; they shall stand when he appeareth. *And none others can.* Are you looking and waiting for that day? Do you *know* whom you believe? It was written in the prophecy, of those upon whom should come the great tribulation, that "the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits." Dan. 11:32. Only the people who do *know* God and the Lord Jesus Christ shall be able to stand in the day of his wrath; only these may abide the day of his coming; only these shall stand when he appeareth.

J.

"The Fifth Commandment. No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42 , pp. 664, 665.

LAST week's article closed with the Scripture quotation, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him," and stated that "the rod of correction" is the only remedy that the Bible gives for

this universal defect. Of course it is not meant that children shall be ruled by the rod, nor that it is to be wielded so promiscuously and indiscriminately that they shall live in constant dread of it. That would be tyranny. But children must be held accountable for their actions. Strict obedience must be required; and transgression and disobedience must be visited with inevitable penalty. Nor does it follow that every act of disobedience or transgression must be visited with the same invariable penalty of the rod. Yet it is emphatically true that there are times in the life of every child when nothing but a good whipping will meet the requirements of the case; there are times when in no other way can a parent do justice either to himself or to his child.

We know that in many quarters this idea is considered too old-fogyish for the enlightened progressiveness of this age; and we know likewise that because it is so considered is the very reason of the so widespread defiance of law and discipline of this age in the home, in the school, in the church, and in the State. There is a good deal being said just now about "progressive theology" that is in fact a theology that has progressed, or is fast progressing, beyond the theology of the Bible. Yet just as much might be said, and with a good deal more propriety, of this progressive system of parental discipline, which has "progressed" beyond that laid down in the word of God. In that Bible hand-book of every-day life, the book of Proverbs, there is a good deal said directly upon this subject; and the two sides of the subject are so clearly and forcibly presented that we shall here reproduce them in full.

"He that spareth his rod hatheth his son; but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Prov. 13:24. "Betimes" means *early*. "He that loveth him chasteneth him early," is the real meaning of this phrase. The reason why it should be done early is explained in the next passage: "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." Chap. 19:18. Chasten him early, while there is hope,—before he becomes confirmed in the wrong way, for then the habit will be stronger than the impression that will be made by the correction, and more than this, the wrong habit will then be strengthened by a will confirmed in perverseness. Let the principle of obedience and respect for authority be the first that is rooted in the heart of the child, and do not leave him to follow his own way till it is too late to do him any good. Chasten him early, while there is hope. The reason why you are not to "spare for his crying" is manifest,—if you do, it will be but a little while till he will make "his crying" take the place of the correction every time. Let him know that when correction is deserved he will receive what he deserves with no allowance for crying, and your task is half done.

"Withhold not correction from the child; for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." Chap. 23:13, 14. "Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul." Chap. 29:17.

The good and sufficient reason for all these directions is given in the following: "The rod and reproof give wisdom; but *a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame.*" Chap. 29:15. Yet, evidently true as this is, there are to-day many parents who leave their children to themselves, and the inevitable

consequence follows—the parents are brought to shame. Nor is it alone that many children are left to themselves, but we have seen parents who would actually advocate the principle of so doing, some pleading that they could not bear to punish "the dear little things," and others who seemingly expected to fulfill with the rod the whole course of training, saying that whipping did no good, and both classes saying, "Just let the child alone till he gets older, and then he will know better and do better of his own choice." So they leave the child to himself, and he brings his mother to shame. How can it be otherwise? How shall the child know better when he grows older if he is not taught better now? No; such ways will never do. The Scripture is right in its direction to "chasten thy son while there is hope."

But one of the worst features about the ways of such parents is that they think they love their children, when in fact they hate them. This is the fat, for the Lord says: "He that spareth his rod hatheth his son; but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Yet, although the Lord says it, many parents cannot see how they can punish their children and at the same time love them. They cannot as long as they mistake for love the puling sentimentalism which now too often passes for love. But the truth is that no child should ever be punished from any other motive than that of love. Nor should it be alone love to the child, but love to God as well.

No child should ever be punished in anger, because anger begets anger. Anger in the parent will only tend to provoke anger in the child; and this is directly forbidden by the word of God: "Fathers, provoke not your children to anger," and the all-important reason is given, "lest they be discouraged." Col. 3:21. Whose case is more deplorable than that of the *man* who is discouraged? He is totally *unmanned*. He can do nothing for himself, and all efforts of others to get him to do are lost on him. It is not only a cruel but a dreadful thing to discourage a child. But for parents to provoke their children to anger will discourage them, and to punish them in anger will provoke them to anger. The Lord is careful to guard both extremes—leave not the child to himself, but chasten him early while there is hope, lest he bring his mother to shame; provoke him not to anger, lest he be discouraged. Another scripture to the same point is: "Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6:4.

But some may ask, "Does the nurture and admonition of the Lord allow chastisement? does it allow the use of the rod?" It certainly does, or the Lord never would have commanded it at all, much less as

665

often as he has. Yet we are not left to even this necessary conclusion: we have the plain word of God to the effect that this is allowable in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Here is the whole subject set forth both in the precept and in the principle, and in such a way that it might be woven into the very texture of the life of all Christians under God, and of all parents over their children. "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as

with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Heb. 12:5-11. And the Faithful and True Witness says: "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten." Rev. 3:19. Therefore, fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

J.

"A Generous Proposition" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 42 , p. 665.

THE Knights of Labor at their late convention at Minneapolis, adopted a report approving a bill to be submitted to Congress "providing that settlers under the Homestead Act may borrow \$500 from the Government, secured by the land at three per cent." Now a settler under the Homestead Act must reside upon and cultivate his land for five years before he can get a title to it. Does this bill of the Knights of Labor propose that the Government shall loan the settler the \$500 when he first makes his entry and settles upon the land? That is assuredly the time when he most needs the money. He needs the money then more than at any other time, so that he may have the use of it in opening up his claim until the land itself can be made to render a return. But if they mean that he shall receive the money then, how is it to be "secured by the land"? for the land will not be his for five years. That is only to propose that the Government shall loan the settler, under the Homestead Act, \$500 at three per cent., without any security at all. In other words, this action proposes that the Government shall give to every homestead settler one hundred and sixty acres of land, and then give him \$500 for taking it. But why not propose that the Government shall give every one of these settlers \$500 outright and keep the land? and why confine it to the Homestead settler? Why confine it to settlers at all? Why not give it to every person that wants it? Oh! such a proposition as that would be rather too raw, to make it outright; the Socialism of such a proposition as that would be patent upon its very face; so it must be veiled under the pretense of helping the Homestead settler. The pretense is entirely too thin.

There is, however, an alternative to the settler under the Homestead Act by which he can secure title to his claim in less than five years. After dwelling upon and cultivating his claim a certain prescribed time—eighteen months we *think*—he may secure title by paying \$200. Is it *then* that the Knights propose that the Government shall loan him the \$500, so that he may pay for his land and get his title, in order that he may render the land as security for the money? If it is, then the proposition is that the Government shall *give* the land *and* \$200, so that it may in return get a mortgage on the land as security for the other \$300. But that

brings us to the same point as before, and to the same question, Why shall not the Government give the \$300 outright to every man that wants it? for that is what it amounts to in the end.

Why didn't the Knights ask that the Government should give outright to every man that would ask for it, one hundred and sixty acres of land without any consideration at all in return? Aye, there is the rub. It is not land that they want, *it is the ready cash*. If they had the land it would require labor to put it in a condition in which they might readily sell it for \$500, and that is not what these Knights of Labor want; they want the ready \$500, without labor. This is proved by the fact that while we write this, there are 3,000 men in New York on strike to secure the half of Saturday in which to do nothing, while their employers shall pay the regular wages for it. But why set the sum at \$500? Why not make it \$500,000 at once? for \$500,000 can be secured to the Government by one hundred and sixty acres of land *that already belongs to the Government*, just as well as can \$500. There would be a double advantage in this too: (1) It would stop the labored cries of the Knights of Labor; and (2) then the Knight, receiving his \$500,000 at three per cent., could loan the money to the oppressive capitalist at six per cent., which would enable the Knight to pay his annual interest to the Government, and then he would have \$15,000 of his own upon which to labor while the bloated capitalist was loafing on the \$500,000 which he had borrowed from the poor laboring Knight.

The truth of the matter is, and there is no use in trying to dodge it, that all these so-called labor movements are, in the last analysis, Socialism. And Socialism, in the last analysis, is Anarchism. J.

November 10, 1887

"A Pernicious Illustration" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43 , pp. 679, 680.

WE have presented several articles on the subject of the fifth commandment, and the relations of parents and children under that commandment. We are sure that we have made it plain by the Scriptures that parental authority must be exercised, and that obedience to it and respect for it on the part of the child, must be insisted on, on the part of the parents. We find an editorial on this subject in the *Sunday School Times* of September 17, which we have decided to notice, for two reasons: (1) Because the teaching of the article is essentially pernicious; and (2) because the utterances of the *Times* are so widely received as authoritative, that it is necessary to counteract as far as possible its pernicious teaching on this important subject.

The *Times* had said that "no parent has a right to break his child's will." A correspondent replied, asking the *Times* to tell what it meant by the will, and then what it meant by the expression, breaking the will. The correspondent also argued that if the child's will be to do foolishly, and he willfully persists in his folly, then that will ought to be broken. We shall not attempt to discuss the

metaphysical question of, "What is the will?" nor the discussion of what the *Times* meant by the expression, "breaking the will." There is given in the article an illustration which explains the whole matter, and which displays the pernicious error of the teaching. We quote:—

"And now to illustrate this by a very simple example. A father says to a little child: 'Johnny, shut that door.' Johnny says, 'I won't.' The father says, 'You shall.' Johnny responds, 'I won't.' An issue is here made between two wills—the father's and the son's. The father is determined not to yield his will to his child's will. The child is determined not to yield his will to his father's will. It is the old conflict between 'an irresistible force and an immovable body.' . . . What then should be done with such a child in an issue like this? . . . Let the parent turn to the child in loving gentleness, . . . and tell him tenderly of a better way than that which he is pursuing, and urge his wiser, nobler choice. . . . But if the worst comes to the worst, let the parent say to the child: 'Johnny, I shall have to give you your choice in this matter. You can either shut that door or take a whipping.' Then a new choice is before the boy, and his will is free and unbroken for its meeting. . . . If the boy chooses to be whipped rather than to obey, the father must accept the result so far, and begin again for the next time."

680

But suppose he follows this advice, then what has he upon which to begin again for the next time? Nothing but a disobedient and stubborn child, confirmed in his stubbornness and in his disobedience, by the weakness of the father in following the pernicious advice of the *Sunday School Times*. Then when the "next time" comes, the result will be the same, and "the father must accept the result," and at that rate when shall the child ever learn to obey? Never in the world. For whenever he is told to do a thing which he does not want to do all that he has to do is to say, "I won't," and stick to it, and "the father must accept the result." True, the father may whip him, but he must never even attempt to compel him to do what he has chosen not to do, for "that would be to deprive the boy of a choice," don't you see—the choice to disobey his parents—and that would never do! The truth is, that if the *Sunday School Times* had deliberately set about to formulate a rule for the cultivation of stubborn, rebellious, and disobedient children, it would be impossible to formulate a rule more perfectly adapted to the purpose than it has done in the illustration here given.

We say again, We refuse to consider, even in this connection, the question of what is the will? or What is it to break the will? or whether the will may rightly be broken. All this is only metaphysical, and unprofitable as well. What we want to consider is the wholly moral, and, to the children intensely important, question, Shall the child obey the parent? or shall the parent yield to the stubborn disobedience of the child? The *Times* says that if a father tells his son to shut the door, and the son replies, "I won't," and sticks to it, and chooses a whipping instead, then the father may whip the son, "accept the result so far, and begin again for the next time." *But who is to shut that door?* According to this instruction the father must shut the door, if it is to be shut at all. If the door is not shut by either, then the son will therefore count himself of equal importance to his father in any difference that may arise between them; and he will have a right to so

count himself, because the father himself has admitted it. Then what becomes of parental authority? It is surrendered. And just as surely as the father shuts that door, just so surely will that son take to himself the credit of superior importance, and will count his choice as of superior authority, to that of his father; henceforth he will hold his father's authority (?) in contempt, because of the defeat which that father has confessed; and in the strength and confidence of the victory which he has won, which the father has confessed, and for which he will give himself the fullest credit,—in the strength and confidence of that victory he will confirm himself "for the next time," and when "the next time" comes he will surely repeat the performance, and so on *ad lib*. Then what has become of the principle of parental authority? It is not simply surrendered, it is soon annihilated, and the child rules the parent, despising the government in the home, in the school, and at last in the State, and if he doesn't finally bring up in the penitentiary, it will be because of his good fortune more than because of his desert.

Instead of such pernicious teaching as this, gives us the word of God, which commands *obedience*. "Children, obey your parents," is the precept of the word of God, and not as the *Sunday School Times* would have it, children, choose a whipping, if you wish, rather than obey your parents. The word of God is, "I know him [Abraham], that he will *command* his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." And Abraham was the friend of God, and the father of all them that believe. May men walk forever in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, and according to the precept of the word of God, in the training of children, rather than in the way of the pernicious metaphysics of the *Sunday School Times*.

There is hardly one child in ten who, having once taken such a position as is here supposed, would not rather take a whipping than to yield. And if, as is suggested by the *Sunday School Times*, he is to be given the whipping and the matter dropped there, the child will be satisfied—and almost irreparably injured. Whereas if he is given the whipping and compelled to shut the door besides, he may indeed be dissatisfied, but he will also be humbled, and lastingly benefited. J.

"The Working of Satan" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 43 , pp. 680, 681.

LAST week we cited some scriptures upon the important question, "Who shall be able to stand" when the Lord appears? The question is of sufficient importance to justify further consideration, especially as there are many other passages of Scripture that refer to it. The Saviour said that at the time when his coming is at the doors, there will "arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24. When falsehood shall have gained such power as that, every person who will not be deceived will have to have such a connection with the truth and with its Author, that falsehood, even in its most powerful manifestation, shall not affect him.

Paul presents this point in a manner so forcible that we shall make his words the subject of an extended analysis, because (1) it is the key to all the events of

the time to which it refers, and (2) as we are now living upon the closest confines of the time to which it refers, its consideration is of the utmost importance to the people now living.

In Second Thessalonians, second chapter, Paul, writing particularly of the second coming of the Lord, says, "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Verses 9, 10. In other words, immediately preceding the coming of the Lord, God will give to men full opportunity to accept the truth, the love of which will save them from deception, and from the destruction that will surely come upon all who do not receive the love of the truth. But many will reject that truth, they will not receive the love of it, and in rejecting the truth they place themselves on the side of falsehood, and in a position where Satan can and will work in them with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. When men reject the truth and will not receive the love of the truth, what then can they receive but lies? what can they love but falsehood?

"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Verses 11, 12. God will send them strong delusion, by simply giving them up to their own delusion, by letting them have their own way. This is shown by Paul's reference to the heathen of old, "who changed the truth of God into a lie," and "for this cause God gave them up unto vile affections." "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." Rom. 1:25-31.

Now with that read this description of men in the last days: "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." 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

Thus it is seen that in the last days men having a form of godliness will reach the same condition in which stood the heathen of old; and that they reach that condition by the same means as did the heathen of old—they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, so God gave them up to their own vile affections; they would not receive the love of the truth, so God gave them up to their own delusion, that they should believe a lie; they "had pleasure in unrighteousness," and as "all unrighteousness is sin" this is only to say that they had pleasure in sin, therefore God gave them up to their own wishes and their own ways. As they love sin more than they love God, and then persist in their love of sin by rejecting the very means by which God endeavors to save them, the Lord can do nothing

more; it is impossible to reach them; they will have their own way; that way is in the love of sin; and in choosing that way rather than the love of the truth that they might be saved, they give themselves over to Satan, who works in them "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness."

But how do we know that now is the time in which this danger is more imminent than it has been at any other time? We shall explain. In the first letter to the Thessalonians Paul wrote so much and spoke so plainly of the coming of the Lord, that the brethren, not keeping in mind what he had preached to them when he was there, had drawn from his letter the erroneous conclusion that the coming of the Lord was then immediately at hand. This erroneous conclusion had been strengthened by the pretended revelations of some, and even by forged letters as from Paul, that it was so. And some had even gone so far wrong that they thought the coming of the Lord was so near that they need do no more work. 2 Thess. 3:11. Now the second letter to the Thessalonians was written expressly to set the disciples right on this point. But so far is he from covering up, or toning down, the reality, the greatness, or the importance of that event, that the first thing after the address, he introduces the coming of the Lord Jesus, "revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Then after that he takes up the direct purpose of this letter.

He says: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. *Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?*"

It is plain from this that when Paul was at Thessalonica he talked to them, and told them, about this falling away, and the development of the man of sin, and the self-exaltation of this son of perdition, and his opposition to the Lord. But where did Paul get his knowledge of these things? Upon what authority did he present these things for their acceptance? We read: "When they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews; and Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days *reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.*" Acts 17:1, 2. Where, then, in the Scriptures did Paul learn anything of the rise of a power which he might fitly describe as "that man of sin" (lawlessness, or transgression of the law) and "the son of perdition" (utter destruction), which should exalt himself so highly and oppose God and his law? In the scriptures of the book of Daniel, and in that alone, he found the basis and the authority for his argument on this subject.

In Dan. 7:7 he found the prophecy of the rise of a great and terrible beast, which represented Rome. He found that the beast had ten horns, representing ten kingdoms which should rise upon the fall of

Rome. After the rise of these ten kingdoms and among them, and by the destruction of three of them, he found another power that was to arise, diverse from the others. He found that this power would "speak great words against the Most High" ("opposeth himself" against God), and "wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws" (the man of sin, the lawless one, exalting himself above God). He found there also the prophet saying, "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit; . . . the Judgment was set and the books were opened. . . I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame;" and therefore, with the authority of the word of God, Paul could speak and write to the Thessalonians, that after the falling away, "that Wicked" should "be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming;" and so could very appropriately call this power "the son of utter destruction."

Again, in Daniel 8. Paul would read of a "little horn which waxed exceeding great," and which covered the whole work and period of both the beast and the "little horn" of Dan. 7. In this eighth chapter he would read of this little horn that he should "magnify himself in his heart," "Yea, he magnified himself even to the Prince of the host," "it cast down the truth [the word of God] to the ground," and "he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes, but he shall be broken without hand." Dan. 8:25, 11. Therefore Paul could speak and write the Thessalonians that after the falling away, then should arise that man of sin, "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," and that when he should be revealed and run his wicked course, then the Lord would consume him with the spirit of his mouth and destroy him with the brightness of his coming; "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

There can be no shadow of doubt that these scriptures from the book of Daniel are the basis of Paul's words in Second Thessalonians, second chapter. Nor can there be any just doubt that both these scriptures from the book of Daniel and from Second Thessalonians refer specifically to the Papacy. The "little horn" power of Daniel 7 was to continue a time, times, and the dividing of time—1,260 years—then the Judgment should sit, and they should take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end, and then "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Dan. 7:26, 27. The time of Papal supremacy—the 1,260 years—ended in 1798, at the time the world entered upon the time called in the prophecy, "The time of the end." Dan. 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4. The Judgment was set in 1844. His dominion has been taken away to consume and to destroy it unto the end. Soon He shall come whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; and who shall consume "that Wicked"

with the spirit of His mouth and destroy him with the brightness of His coming. But *before He comes*, Satan is to work "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Therefore it is certain that we are now living in the time when this working of Satan is to be looked for, and also the time when the truth is to be given, the love of which will save men from the falsehood and deception of the working of Satan.

In our next we shall definitely locate the place where this working of Satan should arise, and the power through which it will be most prominently manifested.
J.

November 17, 1887

"That Paper Carnival" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44 , pp. 695, 696.

THE "Paper Carnival" seems to have become a regular annual thing in the religious work of the "Church of the Advent," San Francisco, "Rev. John Gray, pastor," following immediately upon the close of the annual exhibition of the Mechanics' Fair, and held in the Mechanics' Fair Pavilion. This special religious effort of the Church of the Advent, for the year, continues a whole week—thus it did last year, and thus it has done this year. This year this season of special devotion began October 29, and ended November 6, the holy vigils being kept only at night, however. For the edification of our readers, we shall insert some of the published accounts of the particularly devotional scenes of these very devout people. Perhaps some sketches from the account of the exercises of the opening night will be all that is necessary. So we quote:—

"Had a stranger stepped into the Mechanics' Pavilion last night between 9 and 10 o'clock, he could have believed himself, if it were not for the spectators in modern dress, transported to Rome in the time of the great Cesar. In the center of the great Pavilion was the triumphal car of the first of the Cesar, drawn by slaves from the countries which the world conqueror had taken, and surrounded by some of the prettiest slaves that could have been gathered in all the empire, except that the 'slaves' on this occasion were from the Church of the Advent. Upon the car sat Caius Julius Cesar—at least Robert White, Jr., sat there, and although somewhat younger than Julius would have been, looked much as the busts of the great Consul represent him. 'Cesar' had designed the triumphal car, as also all the cars which were used, and showed a talent in this direction that the gentleman of the *Pello Gallico* might have envied. Standing over 'Cesar' was 'Victory,' a charming young lady, dressed in a striking costume of dazzling white. This was Miss Nellie Morse, and she grew rather weary of holding the gilt crown over 'Cesar's' head.

"Standing around 'Cesar' as a center, and filling the vast hall, were all the participants, to the number of over 1,000, arrayed in the costumes of every nation, every century, and every clime. . . . As all those taking part stood upon the Pavilion floor and the differently colored lights were flashed upon them, a scene was presented never to be forgotten by the beholders. Such a wreath of color, such gorgeousness of detail, were never seen before in this city at a similar entertainment. The flashing spears of the Roman soldiers; the chaste, white robes of the vestal virgins; the varied hues of the oriental garments worn by those from the far East, made up a pageant of barbarian splendor long to be remembered."

This "pageant of barbaric splendor" was divided up into about nine divisions, and conducted through a grand march. We have not space for the account of all the divisions; we shall content ourselves—and doubtless our readers will be contented—with the description of only two or three of them:—

"The second division consisted of Greek mythological characters. It was led by Mrs. Gage as Juno, and beautiful-looking young ladies who took the parts of Minerva, Sybil, Pomona, Faith, Hope, Charity, Nemesis, The Three Fates, Peace, Fame, Diana, Ceres, Imps, Rhea, Luna, Saetitus, Felicity, Tranquillity, Concordia, Fortuna, Italia, Aurora, Daphne, Psyche, Night, Egeria, the Muses, Iris, and Satellites. Miss Lizzie McCormick, who took the part of Diana, was particularly noticeable, her dark blue robe falling in graceful folds around her, and contrasting strongly with the white vestments of the others. The car of Iris was much noticed. Iris was Miss Dottie Gray. In the forward part of the car were two swans, and back of Iris was a representation of a rainbow."

This is the account exactly as we find it, and although we are not very well versed in either the principles or the practices of Greek and Roman gods and goddesses, we know that neither Faith, Hope, nor Charity, ever had any place among them. This, however, is no doubt the mistake of the reporter, who, seeing these excellent Christians confounding the pure graces of the Spirit of Christ, with the vengeful and impure gods and goddesses of the shameful

696

heathen, supposed that these really were Greek gods, and of a class with all the others. But what sort of Christians can they be, anyhow, who have no more respect for the religion of Christ than to place its three choice graces in a confused association with a lot of

"Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were, rage, revenge, and lust"?

But, as though this was not enough, they must descend yet lower. A short time ago the Chinese of San Francisco got a new god, and inaugurated its worship by a grand procession in which a huge Chinese dragon was carried in honor; and so to make their heathenish carnival complete, the celebrants of the Church of the Advent went to the Chinese and got the dragon that had been carried in the Chinese procession. The report continues:—

"The last division was the hit of the evening. It was a take-off on the recent procession in Chinatown in honor of the joss, and was given by the Chinese booth. They marched along to the barbaric music of the tom-tom and the gong, carrying the same dragon that was carried in the real procession, Dugg Maynard acting as high-priest, and William C. Meagher, Paul Davis, and others jumping around the dragon in a very humorous way."

Exceedingly "humorous" it must have been indeed to see a company of men jumping around a Chinese dragon, like a veritable lot of heathen Chinamen themselves! An excellent way, this, to commend to the Chinese the superior merit and dignity of Christianity!

But this was not all:—

"At the conclusion of the grand march five tableaux were given, as follows, all of which showed much elaboration in their presentation: 'Cesar Offering Sacrifice at the Temple of Jupiter,' 'Iris and Mercury Displaying the Messages of the Gods,' 'Pictures from Mother Goose,' 'The Sacrifice to Priapus,' 'Penelope Carrying the Bow.' These called forth much applause."

These things may, perhaps, have been worthy of the applause which they received—from those from whom they received it. But we cannot imagine what kind of a sacrifice to Priapus it could have been that should have called forth applause, unless indeed it were this: Donkeys were among the most acceptable sacrifices to Priapus; not if these 1,000 Church of the Advent devotees of Priapus and his fellow-gods and goddesses were represented in the tableau as donkeys being offered in sacrifice to Priapus, then we freely confess that the tableau was so perfectly appropriate as to justly deserve all the applause that could have been reasonably bestowed. To the minds of those who understand what Priapus really was, this will be considered what Priapus really was, this will be considered a very charitable view of what the sacrifice to Priapus probably was, as compared with what it might very properly be supposed to have been.

This is only a part of the report of a single night's revel. The exercises of all the other nights were only variations of this, "interspersed with favorite dances." And the carnival was most fittingly closed with another Chinese-dragon parade, with accompaniments described as follows:—

"The youthful portion of the attendants were thrown into ecstasies of delight by the reckless antics of the Chinese clowns, who formed themselves into a dragon procession and paraded about the hall, bearing aloft the huge head of a hideous monster, who had a frightful habit of gnashing his teeth and making awful lunges at every small boy within range. The parade being over, the Chinese were 'captured' and dragged forth from their laundry quarters, quaking with simulated terror, by a squad of policemen. The small boy's cup of delight, which was already full to the brim, was caused to run over by this performance, and if he doesn't dream of spooks and hobgoblins for a month to come it will not be the fault of the Chinese clowns."

The net profit of the carnival is reported to be "upward of \$2,500," and the whole report closes thus:—

"All in all, the exhibition has been a grand success, and the results attained reflect much credit upon those who have had the management in hand."

It may be so, but it is certain that the more of such credit as that that is reflected upon a professed Christian, the more discreditable he will appear to all people who have any respect for the reality of the Christian profession. To realize that such practices as these can be carried on by people who profess to be Christians, is enough to bring the blush of indignant shame to the cheek of every soul who remembers the cross of Calvary, and the dying agonies of Him who was the "Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

J.

**"The Time of the Working of Satan" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 44 ,
pp. 696, 697.**

WE have found by the prophecy of Daniel, and the exposition of Paul, that the "working of Satan," of 2 Thess. 2:9, 10, was to be developed after 1798, and before the Lord comes. In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation is given the prophecy of the rise of the power through which this working will be developed. The first part of Revelation 13 is a prophecy relating to the same events as those in Daniel 7, which are spoken of in connection with the little horn power; a brief parallel will show this.

In Dan. 7:8 it is said of the little horn that he had "a mouth speaking great things;" Rev. 13:5 says of the beast, "There was given unto him a mouth speaking great things." In Dan. 7:25 the little horn is said to "speak great words against the Most High;" in Rev. 13:6 the beast is said to open "his mouth in blasphemy against God." In Dan. 7:21 the little horn is said to have made "war with the saints, and prevailed against them;" in Rev. 13:7 the beast is said to "make war with the saints and overcome them." In Dan. 7:25 the little horn is said to continue "a time and times and the dividing of time"—1,260 years, in Rev. 13:5 the beast is said "to continue forty and two months"—1,260 years. In Dan. 7 the little horn is also shown to have succeeded Pagan Rome and the ten kingdoms. In Dan. 7:26 it is shown that after the little horn power had continued the allotted time, then his dominion was to be taken away; in Rev. 13:3, 10 it is shown that when the beast had continued the same allotted time, speaking the same words and doing the same work, he also was to meet with the same fate—he was to be led into captivity, and to be wounded to death, although the deadly wound should be healed. All this shows that Rev. 13:1-10 and Dan. 7:20-26 refer to the same identical power, and both alike bring us to 1798, when the Pope was led into captivity and died in captivity—when the Papacy received the dead wound.

But the very next verse in Dan. 7—verse 27—introduces the coming of the Lord and the kingdom given to the saints, whereas in the parallel line of prophecy in Rev. 13 and 14, the coming of the Lord is not introduced until verse 14 of chapter 14. It is therefore certain that that portion of prophecy contained in Rev. 13:11-18

and 14:6-13 lies between 1798 and the coming of the Lord, and these passages may with perfect propriety be inserted and read between verses 26 and 27 of Dan. 7. Now as the events prophesied in these parts of Rev. 13 and 14 stand between 1798 and the coming of the Lord; and as Paul's words in 2 Thess. 2, compared with Dan. 7, show that the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, is also manifested in the last part of this same period, it follows that the power through which the working of Satan will be developed, must arise in this period, and that these scriptures must contain the prophecy which relates to the rise and work of this power. And such, in fact, is the case. That it is so will be seen by merely reading the prophecy in the last part of Rev. 13.

Immediately following the verse in which it is said of the Papacy, "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity," which was in 1798, the prophecy says: "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him [in his sight or presence], and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he *doeth great wonders*, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and *deceiveth them* that dwell on the earth by the means of those *miracles which he had power* to do in the sight of the beast; 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." We have not the space to go into an analysis of this prophecy, nor to give an extended explanation of the symbols and sentences used; we can state the sum of it all in this single sentence: *There is not a specification in this prophecy that is met in any nation except the United States; and there is not a specification in the prophecy that is not met to the full in the United States.* And thus in Dan. 7, and Rev. 13 and 14, there is given a prophetic view of history, without a break, from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, to the end of the world and the reign of Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords. There is (1) the kingdom of Babylon (Dan. 7:4), which ended B.C. 538; (2) Medo-Persia (Dan. 7:5), which ended 331 B.C.; (3) Grecia (Dan. 7:6), which continued till 168 B.C.; (4) Rome and the ten kingdoms (Dan. 7:7) bring us to 538 A.D.; (5) the Papacy (Dan. 7:8, 20-26; Rev. 13:1-10), from 538 till 1798; and (6) the United States (Rev. 13:11-18; 14:9-14), ending with the coming of the Lord and the end of the world.

These things being true, for they *are* true, it inevitably follows that the United States is the power through which is to be developed the working of Satan "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." This will be seen by reference to Rev. 13:13, 14, and connecting scriptures: "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do." Here it is said there will be miracles (signs, Revised Version) and wonders wrought with power; they will be wonders to deceive, and which will deceive; and that is precisely what Paul refers to by the phrase "power, and signs [miracles]

and lying wonders." And they are wrought by, and at the instigation of, Satan too, because he is the only one whose interest it is to deceive people. Satanic agency is the only one by which miracles to deceive can ever be wrought.

More than this, we have the plain word of God that *these miracles* will be wrought by Satanic agency. Notice, they are wrought for the purpose of deceiving people into the worship of the beast and his image: "And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; *saying to them* that dwell on the earth, *that they should make an image to the beast.*" And when Jesus comes it is said, "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, *with which he deceived them* that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image." Rev. 19:11, 20. Now the word 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." Rev. 14:9, 10. The wine of the wrath of God is the seven last plagues, for says the prophet, "I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God." Rev. 15:1. The very first of these plagues falls upon "the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image" (Rev. 16:2); the others follow in quick succession, and when the sixth one is poured out, "Unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet [the image of the beast]. For *they are the spirits of devils, working miracles*, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." And when the very next word is from Christ, "Behold, I come as a thief." Rev. 15:13-15.

If, therefore, this prophecy of the image of the beast and the rise of this miracle-working power, be

697

applicable to the United States, as we have said, and if now is the time when a fulfillment of the prophecy should be expected, it is proper to inquire, Is there anything that has yet appeared in this country which would go to show a fulfillment of the prophecy? There is decidedly. Modern Spiritualism, with its signs and lying wonders, its spirits of devils working miracles, arose in the United States. Here it has developed what power it has, and from here it has spread to all the world. The prophecy is being fast fulfilled.

Further, the prophecy says that there should be made an image to the beast—an image of the Papacy. If, therefore, this prophecy be applicable to the United States, and if now is the time when its fulfillment should be looked for, it is proper also to ask, Is there anything that has appeared which would promise a fulfillment of the prophecy? Again the answer is, There is decidedly. That is the loud demand that is now being so persistently made for the constitutional establishment of a National religion, which will be in effect the union of Church and State in this Government. The essential characteristic of the beast—the Papacy—is the union of Church and State, the Church using the civil power for the enforcement of her dogmas. For this Government to be revamped upon that model, would be the making of an image to the beast. And at this moment there

is not only such a demand being loudly and persistently made, but there is actual danger that the scheme will be soon accomplished. Those who are working for it say themselves that assured success will be theirs not later than 1896. And although Spiritualism is not, as yet, actively engaged in the work, it is through the success of that movement that Spiritualism and its working of Satan is to be developed to that extent that it will work "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

Once more; if the agency has already arisen and spread abroad in the world by which Satan is to manifest his signs and lying wonders; and if the power—the image of the beast—is already being formed through which Satan's power is to be manifested to the utmost degree in working "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved," then too a proper question to ask would be, Is there at this time any particular manifestation of the truth of God, specially designed to expose and counteract this working of Satan and the iniquity of the fast-developing image of the Papacy? To this question also the answer must be decidedly, There is. This truth is embodied in the Third Angel's Message, of Revelation 14. The special and direct purpose of this message is to protect men from the deception of Satan, and from the worship of the beast and his image.

The work of deception is to say to them that dwell upon the earth that they should make an image to the beast, and cause the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the beast; and yet more, both to speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed; and to cause all to receive a mark in their right hand or in their forehead. But says the word of God by the Third Angel's Message: "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."

In that message is embodied the truth which will save all who receive the love of it. It will not only save them from the worship of the beast and his image, and from the power and deception of Satan, but it will save them with the everlasting salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ when he comes in the glory of the Father, and all the holy angels with him. It is for this that the truth of the message is to fit all who will receive the love of it, for the event which immediately follows the message is the coming of the Lord: "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." Rev. 14:9-16. And "the harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39.

Thus we find by every evidence of Scripture and of that that *now is the time* when the working of Satan "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish," is at the very doors. Next week we shall dwell upon the truth, the love of which alone will save men from the deceptions of the workings of Satan.

J.

November 24, 1887

"The Image to the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 45 , pp. 713, 714.

LAST week we found that the United States is the power through which is to be developed the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders; we found that the agency—Spiritualism—has already arisen, by which Satan is to manifest his great power and his strong delusion; and we also mentioned the fact that through the loud and persistent demand for the establishment of a national religion, the power—the image of the Papacy—is about to be formed by which the working of Satan is to be made effective. Our readers are acquainted with the manifestations of Spiritualism; but with the work of the National Reform Association which is to culminate in the living image of the Papacy, we fear they are not nearly as well acquainted as they ought to be. Although we have written about it a good deal in the SIGNS, we have never yet given our readers a summary view of this movement as it now stands. In this article we propose to give a statement of the prospect of the success of the National Reform movement as it actually stands at present.

1. The movement is supported by "all evangelical denominations." The Association has one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, *eighty* of whom, including Joseph Cook, are Revs. And Rev. D.Ds., and Rev. D.D., LL.Ds., and some are even *Right* Rev. D.D., LL.Ds. Of these eighty, *eleven* are bishops made up from the Episcopal, Evangelical, and United Brethren Churches. Besides these eighty divines, there are in the list *ten* college professors, *one* governor, *three* ex-governors, *nine* justices of Supreme Courts, *two* judges of Superior Courts, *one* judge of the United States District Court, *one* brevet brigadier-general, *one* colonel, and *seven* prominent officials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It is true that not all of these eminent personages are really in favor of the movement, but the National Reform managers use their names and full titles for all they are worth, and thus make their *influence* tell for as much as though they everyone favored it.

2. The W.C.T.U. is counted, both by themselves and the National Reformers, as one with the National Reform Association. Miss Willard, Mrs. Woodbridge, Mrs. Bateham, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Mrs. Clara Hoffman, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrop, and Mrs. W. I. Sibley, of the Union, are all vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. In the Pittsburg National Reform Convention, May 11, 12, 1887, Rev.

T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman* and corresponding secretary of the Nation Reform Association, in his annual report made the following statement of the co-operation of the W.C.T.U. with National Reform:—

"Two years ago Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, suggested the creation of a special department of its already manifold work for the promotion of Sabbath observance, '*co-operating with the National Reform Association.*' The suggestion was adopted at the National Convention in St. Louis, and the department was placed in charge of Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, of Ohio, as national superin-

714

tendent. Mrs. Bateham has since, with her own cordial assent, been made one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. . . .

"On year ago your secretary placed in the hands of President Willard a memorandum suggesting the creation of another department 'for the retention of the Bible in the public schools,' and assigning reasons for such action. This step was recommended by Miss Willard in her annual address before the late National Convention at Minneapolis, and was adopted in so far that a committee was appointed to make preliminary inquiries during the coming year, with Miss Willard herself at the head of the committee.

"In the series of 'Monthly Readings' for the use of local Unions as a responsive exercise, prepared or edited by Miss Willard, the reading for last July was on 'God in Government;' that for August on 'Sabbath Observance' (prepared by Mrs. Bateham), and that for September on 'Our National Sins.' *Touching the first and last-named readings* your secretary had correspondence with Miss Willard *before they appeared.*

"A letter has been prepared to W.C.T.U. workers and speakers, asking them, in their public addresses, to refer to and plead for the Christian principles of civil government. The president of the National Union allows us to say that this letter is sent *with her sanction and by her desire*.

"The heartiness and intelligence, the faith and courage, with which these Christian women embrace and advocate the fundamental principles of Christian government are most gratifying. Mrs. Woodbridge chose for her theme at Ocean Grove and Chautauqua, 'Shall the United States Acknowledge Christ as Sovereign?' Miss Willard loses no opportunity of declaring that 'the Government is on his shoulder.' Similar expressions are constantly on the lips of their leading speakers and writers. . . . Mrs. Woodbridge, in her address to the Workingmen's Assembly in Cleveland, appealed to them to join hands with the temperance forces in placing this 'Government upon the shoulder 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.'"

3. The workingmen. It will be seen by the above that the National Reform Association has not only gained the Union itself, but that through the Union it is making strong bids for the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations. Indeed, it was stated in the late convention that "the Anarchists, the Socialists, and the Catholic Church are all trying to catch the workingmen, but *National Reform must secure the workingmen*." And we are safe in saying that National Reform will secure them. Even though the Roman Church should secure the workingmen's associations, bodily, that will be no hindrance to National Reform's securing them, for of all the bids for support that the National Reform Association is making the strongest are made *for the support of*

4. *The Catholic Church*. Thus says the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

And again:—

"We cordially, gladly recognize the fact that in South American republics, and in France, and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism. . . . In a world's conference for the promotion of national Christianity many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics.—*Editorial before quoted*.

Now let us read a word from Rome. In his Encyclical published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. says:—

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and

elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled to the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart and soul and body and mind in defense of the church and Christian wisdom."

From the above quotations from [sic.] the *Statesman* it is seen that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity. National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation is the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what "all Catholics" are by the Pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, and not to lose sight of it for an instant. What the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome are identical and of course they will "gladly join hands."

But to show how very eager the National Reformers are to join hands with Rome, we present another item. Last August the corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association went to Saratoga and held a National Reform meeting of the watering-place preachers assembled there. The principal point of discussion was religion in the public schools. Mr. Stevenson opened the discussion and argued against the present school system, and the official report says:—

"The speaker argued against the secular programme: 1. That it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics or conciliate them to our school system. Their special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious worship and instruction from the schools only gives color to the charge."

Then in the discussion that followed Mr. Stevenson was asked this question:—

"If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, *how could we object to the Douay version [the Catholic Bible] in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?*"

"The corresponding secretary" answered,—

"WE WOULDN'T OBJECT."

They "wouldn't object!!" They "wouldn't object" to a majority of Roman Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands of the children of Protestants

and other non-Catholics, in the public schools! They "wouldn't object" to twenty Catholics forcing the Catholic Bible into the hands, and the Catholic worship upon the minds, of the children of nineteen non-Catholics in any public-school district! J.

(*Concluded next week.*)

December 1, 1887

"A Singular Case" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46 , p. 729.

THE following dispatch we insert entire, as it shows what the wicked arrogance of Rome still attempts to do:—

"A special to the *Chicago Times*, dated Ottawa (Ontario), November 3, says: One of the most extraordinary cases that has ever come up before the Supreme Court of the Dominion has just been argued here, and is likely to be carried to the Imperial Privy Counsel of Great Britain, the highest tribunal in the realm, before it is finally disposed of. It involves the question of the right of the Roman Catholic Church to exact or collect fines from members of the congregation who have failed to conform to the rules of the church. The case at issue is that of Poitras against Lebeau. The suit arose out of the refusal of Poitras to kneel on both knees during high mass in the Church of Ste. Anne du Rout de Sile, near Montreal.

"Action for \$2,000 was brought against Lebeau for having instituted proceedings charging Poitras with having committed, in said church, an irreverent act, for which he, Poitras, had to pay an \$820 penalty. The case was tried by a jury, and a verdict was rendered in favor of Lebeau. This verdict was moved against before the Court of Review, when a new trial was granted on the ground that the evidence was contradictory, and that Poitras had suffered damage. The Court of Appeal reversed this judgment, and confirmed the verdict. Appeal was then made to the Supreme Court here.

"In laying the case before the Judge of the Supreme Court, Poitras stated that on Sunday, August 9, 1885, he was rowed across the river to St. Ann's to church, being too weak after a recent illness to drive. Finding no vacant seat when he entered the church, he remained near the door, and when kneeling-time came attempted to fall on both knees, but on account of the pain which the effort caused him, could only kneel on one knee. Lebeau was constable of the church, and ordered him to kneel on both knees, to which Poitras replied that he was too ill.

"After service Lebeau called him a blackguard, and said he would fix him. During the afternoon of the same day, Poitras was

arrested on a warrant charging him with committing in the church of St. Ann's an act of irreverence, in kneeling on one knee only, the other being slightly bent. At the solicitation of his friends, to avoid scandal, he paid the amount—\$820—under protest.

"In his defense, Lebeau argues that a by-law which is explained from the pulpit every year exists in the church, ordering people to kneel on both knees, and notifying sick persons to attend mass in the sacristy. The case is being made a test of the right of the church to exact the penalty imposed, and there is no lack of money on both sides, to carry it to the highest tribunal. The judges of the Supreme Court, two of whom are Roman Catholic and four Protestant, have reserved their judgment, which is awaited with great interest."

This is called "a singular case," but it is not so very singular after all. It might be thought singular that any court under British rule should decide in favor of the enforcement of a fine imposed by the authorities of the Roman Church. But it is certain that such a fine imposed by the authority of the British Church would be enforced by the British Courts, and it is altogether likely that the courts here referred to considered it as much within their province to confirm a fine for "irreverence" in one place as in another.

This case serves perfectly to illustrate the essential wickedness of all legal establishment of religion, and of any interconnection whatever between religion and the civil law. What more unseemly confusion of ideas and interests can be conceived of than the infliction of a civil penalty for an offense wholly spiritual, and inflicted too by spiritual authorities? And then to realize that among any civilized people on earth there could be found, in this age, civil courts that would confirm such an iniquitous imposition, and that would lend the machinery of the civil law to the sanction and enforcement of civil penalties imposed by ecclesiastical authority, for the violation of an ecclesiastical by-law, is almost enough to cause thinking men to lose all faith in human progress.

Nor is this the worst feature of the matter. This case occurred in Canada. Such a case could find no sanction in the United States. But, alas! even in this free and enlightened nation there is danger, even now, that such an order of things shall be established. The aim of the National Reform Association is to secure a constitutional establishment of religion, so that ecclesiastical offenses shall be punished by civil penalties. And this association proposes to bring this about by the recognition and the help of the Roman Church. In other words, the National Reform Association proposes by amendment of the national Constitution to establish an order of procedure here by which the Papal church may do all over this nation what she is now allowed to do in Canada, in Spain, in France, and other such benighted countries.

The Scripture says of Rome that "the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication." And all any person has to do to behold the proof of it is only to turn his eyes in any direction.

J.

"Image to the Beast. *Concluded*" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 46 , pp. 729, 730.

WE have not the space now to thoroughly ventilate this wicked offer; we may do that at another time. At present we shall only say that if this scheme were adopted at this hour it would place the public schools of *ten States* and *four Territories* under the control of the Catholic Church. This shows to what lengths the National Reformers are willing to go to gain the alliance of Rome in their project for the establishment of a national religion.

5. The Prohibition party as such. The National Reform report before mentioned says on this point:

"The national platform of the Prohibition party adopted in Pittsburg in 1884, contained an explicit acknowledgment of Almighty God, and of the paramount authority of his law as the supreme standard of all human legislation. The Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner, D.D., of Boston, an eloquent and devoted friend and *one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association*, was a member of the committee *which framed the declaration*. After that presidential campaign was over, and before the State conventions of 1885, Professor Wallace, of Wooster University, wrote to your secretary, suggesting that all diligence be used to secure similar acknowledgments and kindred declarations on related points, in the Prohibition platforms of the several States. Under this most judicious and timely suggestion, a large correspondence has been held with the leaders of the party, and its chief workers in many States."

And then of the State and county Prohibition Conventions that have "incorporated into their platforms" distinct acknowledgment of National Reform principles, there are named the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, Texas, and Connecticut; and the counties of Washington, Lancaster, and Chester, Pa., and Belmont, Ohio.

Now take the voters of "all the evangelical denominations;" the voters of the Prohibition party; the voters of the workingmen's associations; and the voters of the Catholic Church; and it is perfectly clear that they compose an overwhelming majority of all the voters in this nation; and much more would it be so if the W.C.T.U. should secure their demanded right of suffrage. *And against this thing there will be no "solid South."* Take, then, all the voters that are here represented; take with them an issue upon which all will heartily unite; veil National Reform under that issue; then bring that issue to a vote at the polls, and it is absolutely certain that it will carry by a vast majority.

Is there then any such issue in view? There is such an issue, and that already clearly defined and well developed. That issue is THE UNIVERSAL DEMAND FOR SUNDAY LAWS, or, as otherwise expressed, laws enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath." Every one of these bodies that we have named will almost unanimously support whatever demand may be made for

Sunday laws, even to the subversion of the national Constitution to secure them. The reader needs not to be told that all the churches are in favor of rigid Sunday laws. It is well known that one grand aim of the W.C.T.U. is to secure the enactment and enforcement of strict Sunday laws. The Baltimore Plenary Council, indorsed by the Pope, commands the observance of Sunday, and the Romish Church will heartily support any movement to enforce its observance by national laws. It is this very thing that makes the National Reform Association so anxious to secure the help of Rome. Both the Catholic and the National Reform papers urge upon the workingmen that as they have already struck for eight hours for a day's work, now they must strike for six days for a week's work, and Sunday secured by law.

In the late National Reform Convention it was not only stated, as we have quoted, that "National Reform must secure the workingmen," but it was also said that "they could best be secured through the agitation of the Sabbath." And they are securing them by this very means. The Illinois Legislature, which we believe is yet in session, had before it for passage a Sunday law framed by the preachers of Chicago—it might well have been framed by the Inquisition itself—and a petition, said to represent 25,000 Knights of Labor, was sent up urging its passage. Nor does the movement stop with the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's associations, but even the Socialists join themselves to the movement and are welcome, as the following from the *Christian Union* testifies:—

"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-enforce 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."

Are not the Legislatures of all the States already being besieged at every session with demands for the enactment of rigorous Sunday laws with no respect whatever to the rights of conscience? Only the past winter such demands were made upon the Legislatures of California, Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Illinois, and we know not how many other States. Such laws were secured in Massachusetts and Tennessee, and passed the House in Illinois sweepingly and with cheers. But State laws will amount to but little while national statutes are wanting. And now Congress itself is to be besieged. The W.C.T.U. is now circulating everywhere for signatures, petitions to be presented to Congress next month asking for the enactment of laws forbidding Sunday mails in any shape, and Sunday interstate railroad traffic. And it is safe to say that they will very readily get millions of signatures to the petitions.

Here, then, is the situation. The National Reform Association proposes a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Through such an amendment there will be formed a union of Church and State. Under cover of the universal demand for Sunday laws the question of the constitutional amendment can be made a question of national politics, and can be brought to a vote of the nation. When it is so brought to a vote, the National Reform Association can bring

to the polls, in its support, the voters of "all evangelical churches," the voters of the Prohibition party, the voters of the Catholic Church, the voters of the Knights of Labor, and the workingmen generally, and with these the Socialists and all the rest of the non-religious rabble, and the whole thing sanctified by the sweet influences of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and so can carry it as sweepingly as inquisitorial Sunday laws are now carried in some of the State Legislatures.

By these evidences it will be seen that it will be but a little while till this question can be made a national issue. The National Reformers themselves say that their amendment will be secured "within the next nine years *at the very furthest*." And Dr. McAllister says: "I think in a much less time than that, probably within the next five years, this will be the living issue, an issue that American politicians can no longer quibble over, but that they must face and settle." He says that there may be a partial success in the campaign of 1892, but that there will be a much broader success in 1896. Of this we can offer no opinion only to say that we very much fear that they are right in their estimate. But this we know, and everyone else may know, that whenever the day comes that it is brought to a vote it will as

730

surely carry as that day comes. That that day will come is as sure as that these facts exist. And when it does come, then there comes with it a union of Church and State, with its whole train of attendant evils in this Government. And in that day, liberty—whether civil or religious—will forever take her departure from this dear land, her last and happiest home on earth.

Then will be formed the image to the beast, and his enforced worship will speedily follow. But the message of God is speaking 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." And speedily to follow there will be "the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth [*this truth*], that they might be saved." Thus the most fearful contest between truth and error that the world has ever seen, is at the very doors, and who is ready? Who has received such a love for the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus that by that love they shall be able to defeat all the deceptions of Satan in all his power? Who?

J.

December 8, 1887

"The Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47 , pp. 743, 744.

THE Third Angel's Message being that part of the truth of God which is designed especially to warn the world against the worship of the beast and his image, and which embodies the truth, the love of which will save from the deceptions of Satan all who receive the love of it; and as the enforcement of the worship of the beast and his image, and the accompanying power and signs and lying wonders, is, as we have seen, most dangerously near, it becomes especially important that we should study this message with the most intense interest. This message presents the truth of God which is to save the people of this generation, whosoever of them will be saved when the Lord comes.

The Third Angel's Message calls all men to the keep of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The commandments of God here referred to are the ten commandments—the law of God—and that "law is the truth." Ps. 119:142. The faith of Jesus is the faith of Him who said, "I am the way, the truth." John 14:6. The truth of this message is therefore the very supremacy of truth itself, and to receive the love of the truth of this message is to receive the love of the very highest manifestation of truth that is known to the universe of God. How appropriate therefore that this should be the message which should be given to men to save them from the influence of the "*lying wonders*" of Satan's greatest efforts—that this should be the *truth* the love of which should save the men of this generation from the delusion of believing only a *lie*.

The law of God is itself righteousness (Ps. 119:172), and therefore holds as unrighteous all the race of man, because all have transgressed it. Rom. 3:19, 20. And being transgressors, the only way in which they can ever attain to harmony with the righteous law of God is through the righteousness of God, which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*. Rom. 3:20, 21. The righteousness embodied in the Third Angel's Message, therefore, is the very supremacy of righteousness itself, and to receive the love of the truth of this message is to receive the love of the highest manifestation of righteousness that is known to the universe of God. How appropriate therefore it is that this should be the message which should be given to men in this generation to save them from all the "deceivableness of *unrighteousness*" which Satan will work with all "power and signs and lying wonders."

The line is clearly drawn. The "strong delusion that they should believe a lie" comes upon men because "they believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Because men received not the love of the truth, Satan works in them with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. In the Third Angel's Message is embodied the supreme truth and the supreme righteousness. Satan's work is to deceive men into the making of an image to the beast and the worshiping of the beast and his image. The Third Angel's Message is aimed directly against the worship of the beast and his image. Therefore it is absolutely certain that in the Third Angel's Message is embodied the truth, the love of which alone will enable any person to withstand the power and the lying deceptions of Satan, which are now dangerously near to being plunged upon the world. This message alone embodies the truth, through the love of which alone any soul will ever get "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name."

We have found that the agency through which Satan is to develop his lying wonders is already in the world, and that the power—the tyranny of a national religion—by which Satan's work is to be made effective is not only already in process of formation, but is near completion. But is not the Third Angel's Message also already in the world? Most assuredly it is and has been for forty-two years. Starting in February, 1845, with but one person, it has spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from British Columbia to Mexico; building up thirty-eight Conferences; establishing two large printing-houses, issuing millions upon millions of pages of printed matter every year; building one of the largest health institutions in the world, besides other important health and educational institutions—all in our own country. From this country it has spread to Australia, New Zealand, and the smaller islands of the Pacific; to Europe, establishing missions, churches, Conferences, and printing-houses in Great Britain, Scandinavia, Russia, and Central Europe; to Central America, South America, and South Africa: thus have almost compassed the earth with its solemn warning and its gracious call. The "few" everywhere receive the love of the truth which it embodies, while the "many" believe not its truth, and receive not the love of it, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.

That the Third Angel's Message shall encompass the earth, even to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, giving them ample opportunity to receive the truth and the love of it, which, if received, will deliver them from the power of Satan and give them victory over all his deceivableness of unrighteousness, is clear from the word of God. This we shall now make plain.

1. This is the "third" in a series of messages in which the second and the third follow the first in quick succession. Rev. 14:6-12. The first of the three (verses 6, 7) said with a loud voice to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people; the second *followed* this one, and the third angel *followed them*. As, therefore, the first one was to go 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 says with a loud voice, "*If any man* worship the beast and his image," etc. This phrase, "If any man," shows that it is to all men; that it is a universal message.

3. Of the beast it is said that, "*All that dwell upon the earth* shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb." Rev. 13, 8. The work of the image of the beast is to cause the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the beast, as well as himself; therefore, the worship of the image of the beast is indirectly the worship of the beast, and it is the mark of the beast which the image causes men to receive. Now as the worship of the beast is to be by "all them that dwell on the earth;" as the Third Angel's Message is the warning against that worship; and as obedience to this message is the only means of escaping that worship and the wrath of God; it is, therefore, certain that this message must go to "all that dwell on the earth"—the warning must be as extensive as the worship will be.

Here, then, is a message of the word of God which is to be sounded loudly to all the world, calling upon men to keep the commandments of God and the faith

of Jesus, that out of "all that dwell upon the earth" there may be gathered a people of whom it can be truly said by the Lord, "*Here* are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," and that so all who will may escape the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. Having almost compassed the earth, the preliminary work of this message is almost done. Soon it will rise up in the strength of God, and speak with a mighty voice that will arrest the attention of the nations and kingdoms of all the earth, and turn it to such a world-wide study of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus as there has not been since the world began. This makes it incumbent upon all people *now* to study the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus as they have never studied them 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? Have I received such a love of this truth that I can stand against all the wiles of Satan when he shall work with all power and signs and lying wonders?"

By the evidences which we have now presented from the word of God, it is certain that we have reached the day and generation when all these things shall be. God sends no message to a people

744

to whom its warnings do not apply. He did not send a warning of a coming flood to a people who should never see a flood; the people whom the Lord warned of a coming flood, those were the very people who saw the flood come. The people whom the Lord besought to escape from the impending doom of Sodom, those were the people who saw the doom of Sodom. So the people to whom the Lord sends this message of warning against the worship of the beast and his image, these are the people who will see the worship of the beast and his image. The people upon whom God calls to keep his commandments and the faith of Jesus, that they may escape the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation, these are the very people who will see the wrath of God poured out without mixture—these are the people who will see the seven last plagues poured upon the earth.

It was necessary to bring out the points shown in this and the four preceding articles, that the reader might fully understand that which is to follow. In the next two, or perhaps three, articles we shall trace the development of the working of Satan, even to its culmination.

J.

"A Sunday-school Lesson" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47 , pp. 744, 745.

THE international Sunday-school lesson for November 27 was on Matt. 12:1-14, and was entitled, "Jesus and the Sabbath." It has give the lesson writers of the "evangelical" papers another opportunity to display their erudition on the subject of the Sunday-sabbath. The one that seems to contain the most authoritative statements on the subject is found in the *Congregationalist*. The subject is summed up in the following oracular utterances:—

"No rule for its observance can be binding, which has ceased to be useful in developing man's higher life. No particular portion of time is in itself more sacred than another. God created the universe in six periods of time, and then entered on a period of rest. In Jewish law, corresponding to this fact, the last of the days of the week was fixed upon as the day of rest. But the day which we call Saturday was never in itself more sacred than any other of the seven. One-seventh of the time by divine law is sacred. Jewish law and custom made that time fall on Saturday. To Christians the day of the Lord's resurrection, the first day of the week, gathered about itself peculiarly sacred associations. At first they observed Saturday and Sunday each week by abstaining from labor, and by gathering together for worship. Gradually they ceased their observance of Saturday, and made Sunday their sabbath. The custom became confirmed and sanctioned by the churches, guided by the Holy Spirit. Sunday is therefore the sabbath of the Christian church, and every true follower of Christ will use it as a precious gift of God for himself, for his neighbors, and for the world."

Here is a series of rather important statements, and we desire to examine them a little more closely than merely to read them over.

1. "No rule for its [the Sabbath] observance can be binding, which has ceased to be useful in developing man's higher life." In another place the same writer says, "The moral law which the ten commandments expressed . . . is inseparable from the nature of man who is governed by it." This being true, then can any rule for its observance ever cease to be useful in developing man's higher life? God has given definite rules for the observance of the Sabbath. The Sabbath being a part of the moral law, and inseparable from the nature of man, then rules for its observance must involve moral duty; and again we ask, Can any such rule ever cease to be useful in developing man's higher life? If it can, who is to decide just when it ceases to be useful? Is each man to decide the question for himself and in his own case? If so, then what is the use of having any rule at all in the matter? This proposition of this lesson writer inevitably makes every man his own judge in matters of morals, and ends in the subversion of all law.

2. "No particular portion of time is in itself more sacred than another." Perhaps not "in itself," but when God makes sacred a particular portion of time, and calls it sacred, then it *is* more sacred than any portion of time which he has not made sacred. Now the word of God is, that "God blessed the *seventh day* and sanctified *it*;" and the Lord "rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord *blessed* the Sabbath *day* and *hallowed* it." If, therefore, there is any such thing as the seventh day, then it is certain that that particular portion of time is more sacred than another. God blessed that portion of time and made it holy, which he has done to no other portion of time; therefore if the blessing and the hallowing of a thing by the Lord has any effect at all in making that thing sacred, then it is made certain by the word of God that that particular portion of time known as the seventh day is more sacred than any other. And whoever does not regard it so

commits sin. The above statement by the *Congregationalist's* lesson writer contradicts the truth.

3. "God created the universe in six periods of time, and then entered on a period of rest." Yes, that is so, and these six periods of time were the first six days of the first week of time; and the period of rest upon which he then entered was the seventh day, which, when he "had rested" upon it, he blessed and sanctified, to be forever a like period of rest for man in his remembrance of the Creator. But if the lesson writer means here the geological idea of six periods of time for the creation of the universe, and then a seventh period for the rest of the Lord, then when did the seventh period end that the Scripture might be fulfilled in saying that he "*blessed* the seventh day and *sanctified* it, *because* that in it he *had* rested"? According to the Scripture the seventh day and its rest were past before God blessed and sanctified the day. But according to the geological period idea, this period of rest is not yet past, consequently the blessing and the sanctification cannot yet have been put upon it, "because that in it he *had* rested," and from that it inevitably follows that there is no divinely-appointed Sabbath for man. And the sum of the matter is that the scientific idea of creation is in direct contradiction to the word of God. We know that the great mass of the divines of the present day have adopted that idea, nevertheless; but that in nowise proves that the scientific idea is the scriptural one, as it contradicts the word of God; it only proves that in this the divines have forsaken the word of God and are turned unto fables.

4. "In Jewish law, corresponding to this fact, the last of the days of the week was fixed upon as the day of rest." Is then a commandment that "is inseparable from the nature of man," a "Jewish law"? If so, how so? And by whom was the last of the days of the week fixed upon as the day of rest? It was by the Lord himself. He not only in the commandment said the seventh day is the Sabbath, but by withholding the manna on a certain day and causing it to keep over that day, which it would not do any other day, and by continuing this for forty years, he showed to all people precisely what he means when he says in the commandment, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." The people had no part whatever in the fixing of the day of rest. It was not only fixed without their will, but directly against the will of some of them. The lesson writer is correct in saying that the last of the days of the week was fixed upon as the day of rest. And it was fixed upon by the Creator himself, and no power can unfix it—there it must remain fixed forever. God has given commandment that the seventh day is the Sabbath, he has also given his own interpretation of what he means by the seventh day; that interpretation he has held before the world from Sinai to this day, and no power can reverse it. The day which God fixed as the Sabbath by withholding the manna is the day which he means when he says in the commandment, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and that day is "the last of the days of the week,"—the seventh day, commonly called Saturday.

5. "The day which we call Saturday was never in itself more sacred than any other of the seven," says Mr. A. E. Dunning, D.D., the *Congregationalist's* Sunday-school lesson writer. But God says that is *was*, and *is*, more holy than any other of the seven. The Lord made that day holy. He calls it holy. He

commands man to *keep* it holy. This he has done for no other day of the week. Therefore that day always was, it always is, and it always will be, "more sacred than any other of the seven." We prefer to believe the word of God rather than that of Mr. A. E. Dunning, D.D., and everybody else will do well to do so also.

6. "One-seventh of time by divine law is sacred." Which one?

7. "Jewish law and custom made that time fall on Saturday." Neither Jewish law nor Jewish custom made that time fall on Saturday. It was the example of God in resting that day from the work of creation; it was the law of God which commanded that day to be kept, and the custom of God, kept up for forty years, in withholding the manna on that day and causing it to keep over that day,—it was the law of God and the acts of God which made that time fall on Saturday. And those who have respect to the law of God and the ways of God, will remember that that time always falls on Saturday, and will honor God by keeping it holy unto the Lord. Isa. 58:13.

8. "To Christians the day of the Lord's resurrection, the first day of the week, gathered about itself peculiarly sacred associations." Suppose it did, what effect can that have upon the peculiarly sacred associations of the seventh day and the commandment of God to keep it holy? By what right can the peculiarly sacred associations which the first day of the week gathered about itself, rob the seventh day of the peculiarly sacred associations with which God has clothed it? It is a queer idea that because the first day of the week should have gathered about itself peculiarly sacred associations, therefore the commandment of God, which enjoins that the seventh day shall be kept sacred, should be made void!

9. "At first they observed Saturday and Sunday each week by abstaining from labor, and by gathering together for worship." This is not wholly true. It is true that at first they kept Saturday, because the word of God says, "They rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. But as for their observing Sunday also, at first or at any other time, the word of God says nothing about it. But suppose we grant that they did keep Sunday also, by what authority did they keep it? The word of God says, they kept the Sabbath—Saturday—according to the commandment. Did they keep Sunday too according to the commandment? Is so, according to what commandment did they keep it? There is nobody in the wide world who can point to any commandment of God for keeping the day called Sunday. And nobody in the wide world ever kept Sunday in obedience to a commandment of God. There is no such commandment. Where there is no commandment of God there can be no obedience to God. And as there is no commandment of God for keeping Sunday, therefore nobody can obey God by keeping Sunday.

10. "Gradually they ceased their observance of Saturday, and made Sunday their Sabbath." That is to say, they ceased to obey the commandment of God, and obeyed one of their own instead. As *they* made Sunday *their* sabbath, their own will was the only authority for its observance. Consequently their humility was only a "voluntary humility," and their worship was only "will worship," and as it was all contrary to the word of God, the result was to beguile them of their reward. But now, dear reader, "let no man beguile *you* of *your* reward in a voluntary humility . . . after the commandments and doctrines of man." "For these

precepts, though they have a show of wisdom, in a self-chosen worship, and in humiliation, and chastening of the body, are of no value to check the indulgence of fleshly passions." Col. 2:18-23 with Conybeare's and Howson's translation.

11. "The custom became confirmed and sanctioned by the churches guided by the Holy Spirit." We have read, before, somewhere, some such doctrine as this. Let us see where. Here is it:—

"*Question*—Is it, then, Saturday we should sanctify in order to obey the ordinance of God?

"*Answer*—During the old law Saturday was the day sanctified; *but the church*, instructed by Jesus Christ, and *directed by the Spirit of God*, has substituted Sunday for Saturday.

745

"Q.—Had the church power to make such change?

"A.—Certainly, since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit."—*Catholic Catechism of Christian Religion*.

The Sunday-sabbath doctrine leads to Rome every time, but this is not always so clearly shown as it is here by the *Congregationalist's* lesson writer. Christians need to be told that the Holy Spirit guides neither the church nor individuals away from the law of God. Whoever turns away from the commandment of God is not led of the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit guides men into the truth, and the law of God, exactly as he wrote it, is the truth. And "he that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9.

.12. "Sunday is therefore the sabbath of the Christian church," etc. But it is not the Sabbath of the Lord. And no man is under any obligation to keep the sabbath of the Christian church. The Christian church has no authority to make a Sabbath. And as this writer has plainly said that the Christians "made Sunday their sabbath," we should like to know how and where the Sunday-sabbath comes in as "a precious gift of God." God did not give it at all. They made it themselves, it is their own gift to themselves, and as they ceased to observe the commandment of God that they might make this for themselves, there is nothing precious about it. The Sabbath of the Lord is that which the commandment of God directs shall be kept. And the word of God is, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Jesus observed it, and left us an example that we should follow his steps. Will you follow the steps of Jesus in keeping the Sabbath of the Lord? or will you follow the pernicious doctrines of men, which lead straight to Rome. J.

"True Temperance Is Self-control" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 47 , pp. 745, 746.

TRUE temperance is temperance in *all things*. To be temperate in one thing and intemperate in others is not temperance at all. This will be the more readily seen when it is understood, as it always ought to be, that *temperance* is *self-control*. Whatsoever it may be in which a person has not the control, the mastery,

of himself, just so far he is intemperate. Thus it will be seen at a glance that the practice of temperance is not completed when a person has only renounced the use of strong drink. A person may never have touched a drop of spirituous or of malt liquors, yet at the same time he may be intemperate in many ways. In many things he may not have control of himself.

Some there are, yes, a multitude, who have not control of their temper. They are as quick-tempered as a flash. In this respect they have hardly any control of themselves at all. They are intemperate. Others there are by the thousands who are ruled by their passions. Such was Felix, before whom and with whom Paul reasoned of righteousness, *self-control*, and judgment to come. Such are intemperate. Others again are ruled by their appetites—things which in themselves are perfectly lawful, but by which thousands of people allow themselves to be controlled, instead of assuming the mastery themselves, and acting with self-control. These are intemperate. Others yet again allow the desire of gain to rule, and to drive them onward into many foolish and hurtful things. All such are intemperant.

So it is in all things, in every phase of life. Instead of ruling themselves they allow themselves to be ruled by some wicked, sinful thing. One is controlled by strong drink, another is controlled by impure thoughts and lustful desires, another by a gluttonous appetite, and so on through the long list of human frailties. All are intemperate. Each one lacks something of that self-control which he owes himself, in filling the place of a real manly man, or womanly woman, in the world. No one of us has much in which he can boast himself over his fellow-mortals.

"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth," saith the Lord. Rom. 14:22. It is perfectly allowable to eat and to drink. How could any live without it? But the human race from the first pair onward through the world's history has condemned itself in that thing which in itself is one of God's good gifts to men. God created men and women in the world together. He himself established the marriage relation and surrounded it with his own holy sanctions. He created men and women with social qualities, capable of enjoying and mutually profiting by the social relation with the sanctions which he established. But for men and women to condemn themselves in these relations, which in themselves are perfectly allowable, has been not the least of the banes of human existence. The Lord directs that men shall be diligent in business, and prosperity is the inevitable result of such a course. But instead of holding the course with an even hand under God, men allow prosperity to lead them into the love of it for its own sake, and so condemn themselves in the thing which in itself is not only strictly allowable, but highly commendable. In all these things we must needs keep ourselves the subjects of our own control, or else we shall always be what we always have been, and that is, very slaves sold to serve under the arbitrary and cruel mastery of a perverted appetite or an unholy ambition.

It is for this cause that in the Scriptures we are so often exhorted to the practice of self-control, that is, temperance. Does the great apostle tell of "the faith in Christ"? He does it by reasoning of "righteousness, temperance [self-control], and judgment to come." Acts 24:24, 25. Does he call men to a race for the heavenly crown? He lays down the one great rule of the contest, "every man

that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." 1 Cor. 9:24, 25. Does he give directions as to who shall be intrusted with the care of the flock of God? One of the necessary qualifications is that he shall be "temperate." Titus 1:8. Does he enumerate for us the fruits of the Spirit of God? One of these precious fruits is "temperance." Gal. 5:23. Does Peter show us how we shall obtain an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? It is by adding to "faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, *temperance*," etc. 2 Peter 1:5, 6, 11. Does Jesus himself tell us who shall be his follower? He says: "If any man will come after me, let him *deny himself* [control himself, master himself], and take up his cross daily, and follow me." Luke 9:23.

This is true temperance. Without it man is not himself. Without it he is not the whole man that God wants him to be, and which he must be to enjoy the full, symmetrical measure of all his powers.

It follows from this that if a man will be master of himself in all things, he must have the full use of his own will. Paul simply expressed the experience of the human race when he said, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." Rom. 7:18. Every man is ready to, and does, will to do certain things, but he cannot hold himself up to the height of his will. He resolves to do many things, but cannot hold himself to his resolution. To will to do better is ever present with every man, but they do not do better. How to perform that which their own better judgment, and their honest convictions, tell them is the right thing to do, is what they do not find.

The sole trouble about all this failure is that men have not the full use of their own will. Evil habits and intemperate practices destroy the will; they render impotent the power to perform that to which the mind readily assents as being right and proper. To convince men of what is right is ever the easiest task of the reformer, while the hardest task is always to bring them up to the place where they will do that which they know to be right. With temperance workers it is not at all difficult to convince men that the use of alcoholic drinks is injurious, and that the only right thing to do is to let it entirely alone; but the great task is to get them to let it entirely and forever alone. It is not at all difficult to convince men that the use of tobacco is only injurious and that continually, without one redeeming quality; but it is the hardest kind of a task to get them to quit it, even when they themselves confess that they ought to quit it. It is so also with the man or woman who uses opium or arsenic or morphine, or who is addicted to any wrong habit whatever.

And yet all are ready to say, "Oh, I *could* quit it if I only would!" Yes, that is true, but they don't. As one old gentleman expressed it, who had been an inveterate user of tobacco, and had at last really quit: "I always said I could quit it if I would, but I *couldn't would*." In that single expression there lies couched whole volumes of philosophy. Men can quit evil habits if they will, but they can't will. Men can do right if they only will, but they can't will. They can say "I will," but they can't *do* "I will." This truth was excellently illustrated in an article in the sanitary columns of the New York *Independent* a few years ago. In discussing the subject of "Stimulants and Narcotics as Related to Health," the writer referred to

those who have become enslaved by the use of these things, and then remarked:—

"If ever we have seen sadness in this world, it is in the case of those who are conscious of this enthralling enchantment and yet feel unable to extricate themselves from the wiles of the adversary. . . We do not believe anything has happened to us over and above the experience of most practitioners; yet we almost shudder to recall instance after instance where life has been burdened with this direful deceit, and whole families involved in the secret malady. The remedies are few *unless the will itself is rallied to a high determination, and then for a time fortified and affiliated with another will stronger than itself.*"

This is true. And whether the remedies be many or few, this is the *only* one that is sure. But it is also true that with no human will can any will be fortified or affiliated in any adequate degree whatever. A stronger human will may be found, and by it the weak will may be fortified in a certain sense by personal encouragement and watchful influence, and this only while that stronger will is present. But even then there can be no affiliation of wills so that the weaker will shall be really vitalized from the energy of the stronger. That is an impossible relationship between human wills. Under such circumstances the most that can possibly be done is that the weaker will shall be encouraged and guarded by the stronger until it shall of itself recover its wasted energies. But that is not enough, by far, and therefore such a remedy can never be certain in its results.

Far more than that is required if the wasted energies of the will are ever to be restored. As we have stated, what is required is that the stronger will shall be one that can be ever present, and which, at the same time, can be so affiliated with the weakened will that the weaker shall be actually vitalized and renewed by the very energy itself imparted from the stronger. It is evident that such a remedy would prove effectual and permanent. And there is such an one offered willingly to every enthralled soul. It is found alone in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ. There is a will with which by faith every weakened and enthralled will on earth may be fortified and affiliated, and that to such a degree that whereas it was a struggling, despairing victim, it may be transformed and translated into the glorious liberty of a conqueror, to such a degree that whereas the enthralled soul could only cry, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" he may freely and gladly exclaim, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." And then, and so, God, in Christ, "worketh in us both *to will* and *to do* of his good pleasure." Jesus is the great Physician, who will supply strength for every weakness, a remedy for every ill, freedom to every slave, and victory to every warrior. Through Jesus Christ alone every man may become master of himself, and so, alone, can we be temperate in all things.

But out of Christ none can attain to it. Christ filled the measure of every perfection. He did it as a man, that *in him* man might do it. Out of Christ man is not himself, as he ought to be, nor as God wants him to be; he is handicapped with the weight

of his own wrong tendencies, entailed upon him or acquired by him, and of himself he cannot rise to the complete dignity of a man. But in Christ his lapsed powers are restored, he recovers the strength that he must have to control himself completely. In Christ, and in him alone, can man surely acquire the mastery of himself, and so succeed in the practice of true temperance—self-control. Then he will be his own free man and Christ's servant forever.

J.

December 15, 1887

"Plan of Biblical Course for 1888" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48 , p. 760.

IT has been thought best that I should say a word in regard to the work contemplated in the Biblical Course the coming quarter.

First, we want to make it as profitable as possible to all who attend, whether they have been there before or not. Therefore we expect to give as full a view of the present truth as is possible in the time that we shall have. This work in the regular Bible-class will be carried forward much in the same form as a series of sermons would be in a new place, where it was certain that the minister would remain fifteen weeks. This on the part of the teacher. Then it will be the work of the students to learn to make Bible-readings, following the same course.

Secondly, we wish to make this term one of special interest and profit to those who have publicly labored in the cause, or who intend to do so. therefore all thee will form a special class, and in addition to the course named above, will be given: (1) The history of the rise and establishment of the Papacy, and of the formation of the union of Church and State, both in the establishment of the Papacy, and in the making of the image to the Papacy, which is fast approaching in our own country; (2) drill in speaking; (3) drill in writing reports of sermons, and of meetings, and in writing articles for the press; (4) drill in reading, especially in reading the Scriptures, and hymns. In short, it is intended to make this class a school of practice for work in the field, so that when the school term is ended, and the students go into the field to work, they will be simply going on with that which they have been doing in the class. In this class we want to do everything that can be done to profit those who take the course, and to make them efficient in the work to which we hope they have devoted their lives.

ALONZO T. JONES.

"The Place of the Sabbath in the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48 , pp. 760, 761.

WE have shown that the third Angel's Message alone presents to the world the truth, the love of which is to save men from being deceived by the lying wonders of Satan; that the truth of this message alone will develop in those who

receive the Lord of it, the righteousness which will shield them from the "deceivableness of unrighteousness," which Satan will work "with all power and signs and lying wonders" in them that receive no the love of it. This message calls upon all men to "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," while Satan's whole endeavor is by whatever means he may employ, to keep all people from doing this.

Although it is universally true that Satan is engaged always in deceiving men and seducing them from the truth of God on every conceivable point, yet there are in the Third Angel's Message two main points, above all others, against which all of Satan's power will be employed, and all his signs and lying wonders will be wrought to deceive men into receiving a counterfeit of each instead of the true, and into believing a lie instead of the truth. These two points are: (1) The Sabbath of the fourth commandment; and (2) the coming of the Lord. Inseparably connected with these main points there are to others; with the first, the obligation of the ten commandments as a whole; and with the second, life and immortality only through faith in Christ. Through opposition to these Satan will largely develop his deceptions, but against the first two points all his power and signs and lying wonders will culminate.

That the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the pivot upon which turns the controversy of the Third Angel's Message is clear both by the Scripture and by the facts in the case. The three messages of Rev. 14:6-12 are not three distinct and separate messages, so that each one is fully given and past before the next one begins. But rather they are cumulative, the second blending its voice with the first, and the third blending its "loud voice" with the other two, thus making what might be termed a threefold message rather than three distinct messages. Yet they are properly termed first, second, and third, because there is this order in their rise. The first warns of the hour of God's Judgment come, and calls upon men to worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. Then there *follows* another, announcing the result of the rejection of the first. And then the third angel *follows them*, warning against the evil which is developed through the "fall" announced by the second, in consequence of the rejection of the first.

The first carries "the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nations, 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." When this message, which would have healed Babylon, was rejected, then there followed another, saying, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen," etc. Out of this "fall" there grows the image of the beast and the worship of the beast and his image; therefore "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 without mixture into the cup of his indignation." The first angel speaks of the hour of God's Judgment come. And since "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),

therefore the third angel follows close upon this, saying, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus will fit men to stand in the Judgment.

The first message calls the attention of all men to the Judgment of God, and tells them that its time is come; and the third message follows, telling all men what to do that they may meet the Judgment in peace, that is, "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

The first message calls upon men to worship God. They refuse, and are led to worship the beast and his image instead. Then the third angel follows, not only warning against the worship of the beast and his image, but also telling them what they must do to worship God, that is, "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

The First Angel's Message commands men specifically to "worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." The Third Angel's Message calls men specifically to "keep the commandments of God." Now is there any part of the commandments of God that points specifically to "Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters"? There is decidedly. Let us read: "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, . . . 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." Therefore as the first message commands men specifically to "worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters;" and as the third message, following, calls men to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; and as the fourth commandment, through the Sabbath of the Lord, points specifically to "Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters;" therefore it is certain that in the time of the Third Angel's Message every nation and kindred and tongue and people will be called to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, and so to "worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters," and escape the worship of the beast and his image.

The keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day—is the sign that those who do so worship the true God. "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord." Eze. 20:20. And it is the sign that he is the true God, because it is the sign that he made heaven and earth and all things that are therein. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Now as the one great question, above every other, of the Third Angel's Message is whether men will worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters or whether they will worship the beast and his image; and as the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord

is the sign that those who do keep it do worship Him that made heaven and earth; and as the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord; therefore it certainly follows that the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord is the one point above every other that distinguishes the worshipers of Him that made heaven and earth from the worshipers of the beast and his image, and is the pivot upon which the Third Angel's Message turns.

So much for the Scripture proofs; now for the proofs from the other side of the controversy.

J.

"Tobacco and Wiskey" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 48 , p. 761.

THE fiftieth Congress has assembled, and the President has delivered his annual message. As the Government annually receives more money than it knows what to do with, the question how to reduce the surplus in the National Treasury is the principal one before Congress. The President has recommended that the tariff on foreign fabrics be reduced, while the revenue on certain home products, whisky and tobacco for instance, shall be retained. This has made a great stir in our own country, and has caused much favorable comment in England. Upon the question itself, we have nothing particular to say, but Hon. James G. Blaine has made some remarks upon it, about which we have a few words to say. In an interview with Mr. Blaine, the following conversation occurred. Mr. Blaine, speaking of the President, said:—

"He recommends that the tax on tobacco be retained, and thus that many millions annually shall be levied on domestic products which would far better come from a tariff on foreign fabrics."

"Then do you mean to imply that you would favor the repeal of the tobacco tax?"

"Certainly; I mean just that," said Mr. Blaine. "I should urge that it be done at once, even before the Christmas holidays. It would, in the first place, bring great relief to the growers of tobacco all over the country, and would, moreover, materially lessen the price of the article to consumers. Tobacco to millions of men is a necessity. The President calls it a luxury. It is well to remember that the luxury of yesterday becomes the necessity of to-day. Watch the number of men at work on farms, in coal mines, along railroads, in iron foundries, or in any calling, and you will find ninety-five out of one hundred chewing while they work. After each meal, the same proportion seek the solace of a pipe or cigar. These men not only pay millions of tobacco tax, but pay an enhanced price, which the tax enables the manufacturers and retailers to impose."

"Well, then, Mr. Blaine, would you advise the repeal of the whisky tax?"

"No, I would not. Other considerations than those of financial administration are to be taken into account with regard to whisky. There is a moral side to it. To cheapen the price of whisky is to

increase the consumption enormously. There would be no sense in urging the reform wrought by high license in many States if the National Government neutralizes the good effect of making whisky within the reach of everyone. At twenty cents a gallon it would destroy high license at once in all the States. Whisky has done a vast deal of harm in the United States. I would try to make it do some good. I would use the tax to fortify our cities on the seaboard."

"But, after fortification construction, would you still maintain the tax on whisky?"

"Yes, so long as there is whisky to tax, I would tax it, and then if the National Government should have no use for the money, I would divide the tax among the Federal Union with the specific object of lightening the tax on real estate. If ultimately relief could be given in that direction, in my judgment it would be a wise and beneficial policy. Some honest but misguided friends of temperance have urged that the Government should not use the money derived from the tax on whisky. My reply is that the tax imposed on whisky by the Federal Government and the consequent enhancement of the price has been a powerful agent in temperance reform has been a powerful agent in temperance reform by putting it beyond the reach of so many."

Mr. Blaine's argument for retaining the whisky tax while abolishing the tobacco tax is not good. The same argument by which he would justify free tobacco is equally valid for free whisky. To test it we have but to substitute the word "whisky" for "tobacco" in the above extract and read it again.

To repeal the tax on whisky would be just as much of a relief to the producers of whisky as the repeal of the tobacco tax would be to the growers of tobacco. This would lessen the price of whisky to consumers as well as that would lessen the price of tobacco. Whisky to millions of men is a necessity as well as tobacco is. It is just as true of whisky as it is of tobacco that the luxury of yesterday becomes the necessity of to-day. By watching the number of men at work on farms, in coal mines, along railroads, in iron foundries, or in any calling, you will find that a vast percentage of them, though perhaps not exactly drinking *while they work*, do drink as well as work; and it is a fact that thousands of them actually drink while they work. After each meal the same percentage seek the solace of a drink of whisky, of wine, or of beer, as the others, and many of the same ones do of the pipe or cigar. These men also not only pay millions of whisky tax, but pay an enhanced price for the whisky itself, which the tax enables the manufacturers and retailers to impose. Then why not abolish the tax on whisky as well as on tobacco? One is just as much of a luxury as is the other; and one is no more of a necessity than is the other.

There is another point that makes the argument of Mr. Blaine's inconsistent, and that is that whisky is now made an essential ingredient in manufactured tobacco whether in the shape of cigars, cigarettes, fine-cut, or plug. See the tobacco advertisements everywhere of the "Piper-heidseik," the "Champagne

Cocktail—A chew as good as a drink." Any manufacturer of tobacco can tell of large quantities of brandy, New England rum, etc., that are used in his business. A few years ago, when prohibition was proposed in Virginia, the strongest argument against it, made by a Richmond paper, was that the manufacture of tobacco would be most seriously interfered with, because the whisky, rum, brandy, etc., that was necessary to the business could not be obtained. Now why should the tax be removed from manufactured tobacco and not removed from whisky, which is the most essential ingredient in it? Suppose the tax be removed from the tobacco, the price will not be materially lessened to the consumers, as long as the manufacturers of tobacco have to pay a high tax on the whisky which they put into the tobacco.

Mr. Blaine says the enhancement of the price of whisky has been a powerful agent in temperance reform, by putting it beyond the reach of many. But to make tobacco free does not help the matter a particle, it will rather make it worse, because the more there is consumed the more whisky there is consumed, and that only increases the intemperance. For, as he says, "To cheapen the price of whisky is to increase the consumption enormously." Then it is certainly true that to cheapen the price of tobacco is likewise to increase the consumption enormously, and that is only to enormously increase the consumption of whisky, because the whisky is in the tobacco.

Again says Mr. Blaine, "Whisky has done a vast deal of harm in the United States." That is true. And it is equally true that through the mediumship of tobacco, whisky has done, and is doing, more harm in the United States than by any other means. And no effort in behalf of temperance in the United States can consistently stop short of tobacco. If whisky is to be taxed in the interests of temperance, how can tobacco be made free when it itself is saturated with whisky. If prohibition is the only remedy for the evil of the liquor traffic, then, to be effectual, prohibition must include tobacco also, or at the very least it must prohibit the use of liquor in the manufacture of tobacco. But whatever either tax or prohibition may do or try to do, there is one thing certain, no argument can be framed to justify free tobacco that will not equally justify free whisky. Tobacco and whisky are boon companions in devilry, and the devilry of tobacco only paves the way for that of whisky.

J.

December 22, 1887

"The Place of the Sabbath in the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49 , pp. 775, 776.

WE have before shown that the image of the beast—the union of Church and State in this Nation—is almost formed. But the pretensions of those who are carrying forward that wicked work will so closely resemble the work of the Third Angel's Message, the counterfeit will so closely resemble the true, that those only who receive the love of the truth of God as given in the Third Angel's Message,

and whose eyes are anointed with the heavenly eyesalve, will be able to detect the deviltry in the thing.

Counterfeit number one. The word of God, spoken directly against the worship of the beast and his image, and intended to save men from that wicked worship, says, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." These, who are making here the image of the Papacy, pretending boundless faith in Jesus, propose to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, which will make the ten commandments the supreme law of the Nation, to be enforced upon all men as such. Here, then, are those who are set to warn the world against the worship of the beast and his image, urging all people to keep the commandments of God. On the other hand, here, also, are those who are making that image and who will enforce his worship even to the last extreme, and they propose to compel all men to keep the commandments of God. Now where lies the difference between these two classes? How is it that the first of these escape the wrath of God, and get the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark and over the number of his name, while the second actually make the image of the beast, and worship both the image and the beast, and drink the wine of the wrath of God? Remember that it is "evangelical" Protestantism that is making

776

the image of the Papacy in the United States, by the proposed establishment of National Christianity, and that it is the Seventh-day Adventists that are opposing it with all their might by giving the Third Angel's Message. Where, then, is the difference between "evangelical" Protestants and Seventh-day Adventists in regard to the ten commandments? Take the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." They all view it and teach its obligations exactly alike. It is so also with the second commandment, with the third, with the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, the eighth, the ninth, and the tenth. Upon all these there is scarcely a shade of difference between the views of Seventh-day Adventists and the great body of Protestants. The only difference that there is between these two bodies is in their respective views of what day is the Sabbath. The Seventh-day Adventists hold to the fourth commandment as it is: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do an work;" they endeavor to obey it strictly as God spoke it, as he wrote it, and as he interpreted it. On the other hand the whole body of Protestants hold that the seventh day is not the Sabbath, but that the first day is the Sabbath, and that to so keep the first day is the one great distinguishing badge of Christianity. This is the only difference between the two bodies so far as the ten commandments are concerned. And this is just the difference between the Third Angel's Message and the movement to make an image of the Papacy, against which that message warns men. This is just the difference between the worship of him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the mountains of waters, and the worship of the beast and his image. Therefore, it is evident from the facts in the case as they exist to-day, as well as from the Scriptures, that the Sabbath question is the pivot upon which turns the Third Angel's Message.

All this, however, is nothing new to us. We have known this and have been telling the world so these forty years. All these years we have been holding before the world the great principles of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and calling the attention of the people to the truth that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and the great sign which God has set by which it may be known who they are who worship him that made heaven and earth; and also that by this they should escape the worship of the beast and his image. We have known all these years, and have told the world so, that the Sabbath question would yet be the greatest question in the world. The greater part of this time we were counted fools, hodge-riders, and all such like things, by the great body of Protestants. They said that the Sabbath question was the least of the great questions of our holy religion. They said that the great questions of how the gospel of Christ could be conveyed to the masses, at home and abroad, how infidelity and atheism could be checked,—that these were the great, the transcendent questions that must occupy the thoughts and efforts of the church, while as for the Sabbath question, that was one of the least and only incidental at that.

Thus it was in former years. But now how is it? What now is the leading topic in all the temperance and religious bodies in the land? It is, "How shall our American Christian civil Sunday sabbath be preserve?" Large conventions of ecclesiastics all over the land are held solely to discuss this question. The W.C.T.U. works it up all over the United States. Prohibition conventions put it in their platforms. The leading preachers and lecturers of the Nation discuss it from pulpit and platform. Legislatures, both State and National, from beginning to end of their sessions, are petitioned for the enactment of stringent laws in its behalf. The religious papers of the country lift up one united cry that it must and shall be preserved. Knights of Labor, and workingmen's unions, and socialists, call loudly for laws enforcing its observance. Political conventions are "worked" and Legislatures are "lobbied" in the interests of the Christian Sunday. Saloon-keepers enforce laws for its observance. Now, instead of its being the least and most incidental of the questions of our holy religion, it is by their own confession the greatest and most urgent of all. Now, instead of the question of how to reach the masses with the gospel being the greater, that question must take a back seat, while there comes to the front the universal demand for stringent Sunday laws strictly enforced, that *by this means* the masses may be reached. Now, instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking the far greater precedence, it has come to this, that if you don't favor Sunday laws you are an infidel, and if you oppose them you are an atheist. Now, instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking precedence, it has come to pass that the question of the Sunday sabbath is made the test of fidelity and theism.

What, then, does all this mean? Well, it means this one thing if nothing else, it means that we were telling the truth all these years when we told the world that the Sabbath question would yet be the greatest question in the world. How did we know it? We knew it by the truth of God, the love of which will save men. How could we see it when as yet there was not only none of it, but when those denied it who we said would preach it? We saw it by the light of the Third Angel's

Message, of which it is the pivot. And this further shows that the Third Angel's Message is abroad in the world, and there is no use in denying it.

J.

"Prophecy Fulfilled" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49 , pp. 776, 777.

MUCH has been said in these columns about the fulfillment of prophecy in regard to the rise and fall of the great empires and nations of history; and also about the prophecies concerning the last days. These things will never grow old, but will grow plainer and more interesting as time passes, and too much never can be said about them. Prophecy, the foretelling of events, is one of the evidences which God has given to show that it is God who has spoken, and that men might believe. "Because I knew that thou art obstinate, and thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy brow brass; I have even from the beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I showed it thee; lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them, and my graven image, and my molten image, hath commanded them." Isa. 48:4, 5.

The Lord utters this as a challenge to all who deny his power: "Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and show us what shall happen; let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods." Isa. 41:21-23. Thus it is shown that prophecy is an attribute of Deity. "Show the things that are to come hereafter, *that we may know that ye are gods.*" From this it is evident that the power to show the things that are to come belongs to God alone, and by the following text it is made yet more evident; "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done." Isa. 46:9-11.

Although it is interesting to study the great lines of prophecy which show the rise of the successive empires and kingdoms of the world it is no less interesting to study the prophecies concerning individual nations and particular cities. In all of them God has borne witness of himself, of his power and his wisdom. The history of Tyre is remarkable in its fulfillment of prophecy.

Tyre "whose antiquity is of ancient days" (Isa. 23:7), was founded by a colony from Sidon (verse 12) about twenty-five miles south of the mother city on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea. It was "planted in a pleasant place" (Hosea 9:13), and in the days of Isaiah, 715 B.C., she was "the crowning city," "a mart of nations," and her merchants were princes, and her "traffickers" were "the honorable of the earth." As early as the time of Jehoram, 904-896 B.C., Tyre, in company with the Philistines, invaded the land of Judah and took silver and gold and "goodly pleasant things" and carried them into her temples; "the children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem" she sold unto the Grecians that she might remove them far from their borders. Joel 3:4-6; Amos 1:6, 9; 2 Chron. 21:16,17.

The builders of Tyre were so accomplished that they are said to "have perfected her beauty." A thousand years before Christ, when Solomon was about to build the temple of God in Jerusalem, he wrote to Hiram, the king of Tyre, saying: "Send me now therefore a man cunning to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in iron, and in purple, and crimson, and blue, and that can skill to grave with the cunning men that are with me in Judah and in Jerusalem, whom David my father did provide. Send me also cedar trees, fir trees, and algum trees, out of Lebanon; for I know that thy servants can skill to cut timber in Lebanon; and, behold, my servants shall be with thy servants, even to prepare me timber in abundance; for the house which I am about to build shall be wonderful great." King Hiram answered: "I have sent a cunning man, endued with understanding, of Hiram my father's, the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan, and his father was a man of Tyre, skillful to work in gold, and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, and in timber, in purple, in blue, and in fine linen, and in crimson; also to grave any manner of graving, and to find out every device which shall be put to him." 2 Chron. 2:7-9, 13, 14.

Five hundred and eighty-eight years before Christ, Tyre was so rich that she could afford to make all her shipboards of fir, and their masts of cedar of Lebanon; their oars of oak of Bashan, and their benches of ivory; their sails of fine linen with brodered work from Egypt, and their coverings of blue and purple from the isles of Elishah. The inhabitants of Zidon and Arvad were her mariners, her own wise men were her pilots, and her army was hired from Persia, Lud, Phut, and Arvad. Her traffic was so great that she enjoyed a continual "world's fair."

Because of the multitude of all kind of riches, and the multitude of the wares of her own making, Tarshish came to trade in her fairs with silver, iron, tin, and lead. Javan, Tubal, and Meshech came with persons of men and vessels of brass. The house of Togarmah came with horses, horsemen, and mules. Dedan came with horns of ivory and ebony, and with precious clothes for chariots. Syria came with emeralds, purple and brodered work, and fine linen, and coral, and agate. Damascus came with the wine of Helbon and white wool; Judah and Israel with wheat, and honey, and oil, and balm; Arabia came with lambs, and rams, and goats; Sheba and Raamah came with chief of all spices, and with precious stones and gold; Babylonia and Assyria came with all sorts of things in blue clothes and brodered work, chests of rich apparel bound with cords and made of cedar; and she enriched the kings of the earth with the multitude of her riches and her merchandise. See Ezekiel 27.

And yet for all this, she coveted more. As though this was not enough, she envied Jerusalem the trade that passed through her gates; and when Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, Tyre rejoiced and exultingly exclaimed, "Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished, now she is laid waste." Eze. 26:2. Then it was that Ezekiel uttered the following prophecy concerning Tyre: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up. And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers; I will also scrape her dust from

her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea; for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God. . . . For thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots,

777

and with horsemen, and companies, and much people. He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field; and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee. And he shall set engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers. By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust shall cover thee; thy walls shall shake at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, when he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city wherein is made a breach. With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all thy streets; he shall slay thy people by the sword, and thy strong garrisons shall go down to the ground." Eze. 26:3-11.

When this prophecy was spoken, Ezekiel was at Babylon, and Nebuchadnezzar had just completed the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 587. Soon afterward Nebuchadnezzar invaded Phenicia, and all the towns hastily submitted, except Tyre, which made such stout resistance that it required of the armies of Nebuchadnezzar a siege of thirteen years, from 585, to take it. The main part of the city was on the mainland, but on an island about a half mile from the mainland, there was the temple of the chief god of the Tyrians, and there was a considerable settlement on the island also. Although the siege lasted so long, and was so persistently pressed that by the continuous wearing of the helmet "every head was made bald," and by the constant working of the battering-rams "every shoulder was peeled," yet the city was finally utterly ruined. And although they at last acknowledged the authority of Nebuchadnezzar, "Yet he had no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it" (Eze. 29:18), because the remnant of the people removed with all their valuables to the island. By the work of Nebuchadnezzar there was fulfilled that part of the prophecy which said that they should destroy the walls and break down the towers, and that with the hoofs of their horses they should tread down all her streets; but there were yet two important statements unfulfilled; these were: (1) "I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock;" (2) "and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water." This part of the prophecy, however, was as perfectly fulfilled as was the other, and it was accomplished in this way:—

After its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, the Tyrians rebuilt the city, but they rebuilt it on the island instead of on the mainland, and left the old city lying in its ruins. The new city in the course of time regained much of the glory that had so exalted the old, and one of her principal articles of traffic was fish, for when Nehemiah was rebuilding Jerusalem, B.C. 445, he says: "There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem." Neh. 13:16. It was built very strong, being "completely surrounded by prodigious walls, the loftiest portion of which on the side fronting the mainland reached a height not less than a

hundred and fifty feet." Thus it stood, a mighty city, when, in 332 B.C., Alexander the Great, in his course of conquest, was compelled also to besiege it, or leave behind him a most powerful enemy. He determined to take the city, and accordingly began "one of the most remarkable sieges ever recorded," which lasted seven months. When Alexander determined to besiege the city he had no fleet, and as the city lay wholly on an island nearly a half a mile from the mainland, with the water eighteen feet deep, the prospect of his taking it would seem to have been not the most promising; nevertheless he began the work at once.

His first move was to build a solid mole two hundred feet broad from the mainland to the wall of the city, and, says Grote, "he had stones in abundance" from Old Tyre, for the work. And here was the perfect, literal fulfillment of the prophecy, spoken more than two hundred and fifty years before, that "they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water;" for to make that mole the troops of Alexander the Great did literally lay the stones and the timber and the dust of Old Tyre in the midst of the water.

Nor was that all, for the prophecy had also said that they should "*scrape* her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock." There was abundance of material there to have made the mole as first designed, only two hundred feet broad, without any very close scraping, if all had gone well. But the channel was exposed to the full blast of the wind, and the work was often broken by the heavy waves. Besides this, as soon as the Tyrians began to see that the enterprise really threatened them, they applied all their power and ingenuity to defeat it by annoying the builders, burning the timbers, and breaking down the mole and scattering the stones in the water. And when, even against all these hindrances, the mole had been carried almost to the city wall, on a stormy day the Tyrians, pouring out their whole naval force in ships and little boats of all kinds, drove a great fire-ship loaded with the most combustible materials against the two great protective towers that defended the advancing mole, setting them on fire, while at the same time every Tyrian that could get in a damaging blow at the mole itself did so. They burnt the towers, drove off the workmen, tore out the woodwork that held the mole together, and the waves being dashed against it, the greater part of the structure was broken to pieces and sank in the sea.

It then became necessary to begin the mole nearly new, but, nothing daunted, Alexander at once set to work not only to rebuild the mole, but to make it broader and stronger than before. Of course the work that had been destroyed formed a good foundation upon which to make the new one both broader and stronger. But every reverse made it necessary to have more stones and especially more dust, and so it came about that in the very nature of the case the builders were compelled to literally "scrape" the dust from Old Tyre, and at the last to leave her "like the top of a rock."

But even yet there was one more word of prophecy unfulfilled: "Thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon," and it is evident that this refers to the city on the island rather than to that on the mainland, for another passage says, "It shall be a place for the spreading of nets *in the midst of the sea.*" Eze. 26:14, 5. This was not fulfilled by the capture of the city by Alexander. Although he took the city he

did not destroy it, and although Alexander sold many of the people into slavery, yet the place was soon re-peopled, and regained much prosperity. Under Roman rule Tyre was a free city till the reign of Augustus, who for seditious conduct deprived her of this liberty. At that time she is described by Strabo as a city of great wealth, which was chiefly derived from dyeing and selling the Tyrian purple. He also says that the houses consisted of many stories, even of more than in the houses at Rome. It is often mentioned in the Gospels, and there was a company of Christians there with whom Paul stayed a week as he made his last journey to Jerusalem. Acts 21:3, 4. The number of Christians multiplied till Tyre became the seat of a bishop in the second century. And in the fourth century Jerome called it the noblest and most beautiful city of Phenicia, and wondered at what seemed to be the non-fulfillment of the prophecy that pronounced its desolation. In the time of the crusades it sustained a long siege, and was taken in 1124, and was made an archbishopric; but from the conquest of Syria by Selim I., A.D. 1516, its decline was rapid, and soon its ruin became complete.

In A.D. 1610-11 it was visited by Sandys, the traveler, who said: "This once famous Tyre is now no other than a heap of ruins; yet they have a reverent aspect, and do instruct the pensive beholder with their exemplary frailty." In 1697 Maundrell visited it and said of it: "On the north side is an old Turkish ungarrisoned castle, besides which you see nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, etc., there being not so much as one entire house left; its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches, harboring themselves in the vaults, and subsisting chiefly upon fishing."

In 1751 Hasselquist was there, and said: "We . . . came to Tyre, now called Zur, where we lay all night. None of these cities, which formerly were so famous, are so totally ruined as this, except Troy. Zur now scarcely can be called a miserable village, though it was formerly Tyre, the queen of the sea. Here are about ten inhabitants, Turks and Christians, who live by fishing." About 1780 Volney was there, and said: "The whole village of Tyre contains only fifty or sixty families, who live obscurely on the produce of their little ground, and a trifling fishery."

In 1820 Jolliffe wrote of it: "Some miserable cabins ranged in irregular lines, dignified with the name of streets, and a few buildings of a rather better description, occupied by the officers of government, compose nearly the whole town." And in 1838 Dr. Robinson spent a Sunday there, and wrote of it thus: "I continued my walk along the shore of the peninsula [formed by the mole of Alexander the Great], part of which is now unoccupied, except as a place to spread nets upon, musing upon the pride and fall of ancient Tyre. Here was the little isle once covered by her palaces, and surrounded by her fleets; but alas! thy riches and thy fame, thy merchandise, thy mariners, and thy pilots, thy calkers and the occupiers of thy merchandise that were in thee—where are they? Tyre has indeed become like the top of a rock. The sole tokens of her ancient splendor—columns of red and gray granite, sometimes forty or fifty heaped together, or marble pillars—lie broken and strewed beneath the waves in the midst of the sea; and the hovels that now nestle upon a portion of her site, present no

contradiction of the dread decree, 'Thou shalt be built no more.'" And those who have visited it since "all concur in the account of its general aspect of desolation."

Thus the word uttered by Ezekiel two thousand four hundred and seventy-four years ago, concerning Tyre, has been completely and literally fulfilled. Ezekiel said that they should break down her walls and destroy her pleasant palaces. Fifteen years afterward it was done. Ezekiel said they should lay her stones and her timber and her dust in the midst of the water, and they should scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. Two hundred and fifty-five years afterward it was done. Although the city was rebuilt in the midst of the sea, Ezekiel said in 587 B.C. that Tyre should be like the top of a rock, and should be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea. That is what she was in A.D. 1697, and that is what she is at the present time, and she shall be built no more. The word spoken by Ezekiel, 587 B.C., is the word of God. Empires perish, nations fall, cities are brought to ruin, the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever.

In A.D. 1727 Anthony Collins, an English deist, said: "A prophecy literally fulfilled is a real miracle, and one such produced to which no exception could justly be made, would go a great way in convincing all reasonable men." We have here noticed some prophecies, more than one of which has been so literally fulfilled that we cannot conceive of any exception that could justly be made in any point. There are yet others that we hope to notice, and as one such "would go a great way in convincing all reasonable men," several such ought entirely to accomplish the task of convincing at least all the reasonable men whom we can reach.

J.

"Nedry" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 49 , p. 782.

NEDRY.—Died of consumption, in San Francisco, Cal., December 8, 1887. Sarah A. Nedry, aged 48 years, 1 month, and 26 days. Sister Nedry had been a sufferer for fifteen years, but the comfort of the Christian's hope has been her solace through it all. She embraced the truth in Elmore, Ohio, when Elder I. D. Van Horn held a tent-meeting there in 1869. She fell sweetly asleep in Jesus, and rests in hope. The services were conducted by the writer. A. T. J.

December 29, 1887

"Not Without Witness" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50 , pp. 791, 792.

WHEN Paul and Barnabas were trying to persuade the people of Lystra to turn from the vanities of idolatry, they said unto them that although God "suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." These are some of the means by which God witnesses of himself to all nations. When the prophet Isaiah sets forth the

absurdity and inexcusableness of idolatry, by simply showing how a god is made, a man who plants a tree, which the rain nourishes until it has grown large enough to be used; then he cuts it down, and with part of it he makes a fire, by which he warms himself and cooks his food, and the residue he makes into a god, and falls down to it and worships it, and cries to it, "Deliver me; for thou art my god." Isa. 44:14-17. Then the prophet shows where such people fail to use the common sense that belongs with nature itself. As it is that the rain nourishes the tree from which he makes his god, if he does not know who is the God, why don't he worship the Power that gives the rain? If he would but do that he would be walking in the light of common sense, of reason, and of faith, and would soon find out God. Men can, by searching find out God. But God expects him to search, and in the search to use the common sense and the faculties generally that God has given to him. And men are without excuse who do not do it. Rom. 1:20.

But it is not alone by the giving of rain and fruitful seasons that God has "left not himself without witness." He has done it by revelation, and through living testimony. When Egypt stood at the head of the world in power, wisdom, and influence, God made manifest in that land his power and his glory in such a way that all the nations heard of it. The Canaanites heard of it, and knew that the God that delivered Israel was God of Heaven and earth. Josh. 2:9-11.

The next nation that arose to power and influence in the world was Assyria. And when Assyria had grown corrupt and had gone far away from God, the Lord graciously sent a Hebrew prophet to the people, and called them to repentance. Jonah 1:2, 3. After this, again and again, he bore witness to Assyria that he is God above all, the most notable instance, perhaps, being the slaughter of the host of Sennacherib. Isa. 37.

Babylon next spread her empire over all nations, and to them God left not himself without witness. He bore witness directly to Nebuchadnezzar, in the dream of the great image, and its interpretation by Daniel, the captive Hebrew. Again in the affair of the three Hebrews and the fiery furnace, God bore witness of himself to all the power and all the provinces of that mighty empire, both by the representatives that were present (Dan. 3:3), and also by the decree of the king, which followed. Verse 29. Again when Nebuchadnezzar, after being warned of God (Dan. 4:4-27), was driven out from the presence of men to run wild for seven years, he learned by it that Jehovah rules in the affairs of men, and that he is above all gods; and when he recovered his understanding, he published "unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth," that he "thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God" had wrought. Verses 1, 2. Again, when that empire was on the brink of ruin, God, by the handwriting on the wall of the palace, bore a last parting witness to the lascivious king, that he was weighed in the balances and found wanting, and that his kingdom was given to the Medes and Persians. Dan. 5:27, 28.

The power of Media and Persia came after, and through that power, also, God again bore witness of himself "unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth." For Daniel, the servant of God, was cast into a den of lions, and came forth unhurt, because God sent his angel and shut the lions' mouths that

they should do him no hurt. "Then King Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth," that the God of Daniel "is the living God, and steadfast forever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end." Dan. 6:25, 26. When Darius was dead and Cyrus reigned, he also "made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, the Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at 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*)."

When Alexander the Great was in the full tide of his career of conquest, he stood at the temple of the Most High in Jerusalem, and heard the witness of God concerning himself read from the Hebrew Scriptures. And through the Greek language, which the career of Alexander was instrumental in spreading throughout all the Eastern world, God chose to give witness of himself in the salvation wrought for man in the death and resurrection of his own dear Son.

When Rome ruled the world, God not only left not himself without witness, in the preaching of the gospel to every nation under heaven, but also by the apostle Paul he bore witness more than once to the head of the Roman world himself. And from that day to this, God has left not himself without witness to all nations.

Nor was it only to these great empires and nations that the Lord bore witness of himself. In Jer. 27:2-11 is the copy of a message from the Lord that was written by the prophet Jeremiah, and was sent "to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which come to Jerusalem." And the time would fail us to tell of all the testimonies that God bore by Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Joel, and Amos, and Obadiah, and Zephaniah, and Zech-

792

ariah, not only to Assyria, and Babylon, and Egypt, and Medo-Persia, but also to Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Zidon, and Syria, and Arabia, and all the nations round about. It is literally true that God has "left not himself without witness" unto "all nations" in all ages. And when in that great day of the Lord the great trumpet shall be blown, there shall gather before the glorious throne of the Most High God, "a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," and will cry "with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

J.

"The Working of Satan" *The Signs of the Times* 13, 50 , p. 792.

WE have said that this message alone embodies the truth, the love of which will save men from the deceivableness of unrighteousness of Satan's power and signs and lying wonders. When the truth of this message is presented to men, and is rejected, then the way is opened for Satan to work with the power of his deception as never before. This is a principle that accompanies the representation of the truth of God at all times, but much more now because

Satan's power is to be manifested now to a great extent than ever before. Jesus says, "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you." John 12:55. When God presents lights to men and they refuse to walk in it, then the darkness becomes greater to them than ever it was before. And as the darkness is greater, they are more easily deceived and led astray, because "he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." Now the light of the Third Angel's Message is to lighten the earth with its glory (Rev. 18:1), and when that light is rejected and men refuse to walk in it, their darkness becomes greater than that of any age since the world began, and consequently the working of Satan will be more powerfully deceptive than it has ever yet been in the world; and this emphasized by the fact that "he knoweth that he hath but a short time."

Now see the deceitful working of Satan against this point of truth, the Sabbath of the Lord. The world, especially the Christian world, professes to have some respect for the ten commandments. The Third Angel's Message calls upon all men to keep these commandments, and I presenting this call, it points to the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord as given in the fourth commandment. But just as soon as this duty is presented, all manner of opposition is raised against it. And it is a fact that cannot be denied, that the greatest opposition to it arises from the professed Christian world, the very ones who profess the greatest respect for the commandments of God. Any scheme that can be employed, is employed, to blind the minds and dull the consciences of men to the duty of obeying the fourth commandment and honoring God by keeping the Sabbath of the Lord; and in about nine cases out of every ten this opposition winds up with the argument that the law is abolished. When once people can be given to understand that the ten commandments are abolished, it is not hard then for such teachers to satisfy them that they are under no obligation to keep the seventh day, as the commandment of God enjoins.

But such teaching as that cannot be set forth with safety. Its only effect is to loosen the restraints of the law and conscience, and lawlessness is the inevitable result. "They that forsake the law praise the wicked," and the wicked cannot be praised from the pulpit, without profiting by the praise. It matters not at all that the thing be not intended, when the pulpit sets forth the idea that the law of God is abolished, and thus loosens the wholesome restraints of law, the effect of it will be seen of it in our land to-day. This is the secret of the prevailing lawlessness of all classes. Where it is not manifested in outbreking lawlessness itself, it is manifested in the almost universal sympathy with the lawless. Nor is this confined to the wicked world as such; it prevails in the churches. Preachers cannot tell their congregations that the ten commandments are abolished, without the evil fruit being seen in a general letting down of conscientious respect for all things sacred; the church then loses its godly influence over the world, and then if it is to influence the world at all it must do it by ungodly means such as are seen everywhere in the fairs, the feasts, the carnivals, and the revelry which now characterize the efforts of the church, and which only increase unto more ungodliness.

Well, having taken this turn to prevent people from keeping the commandment of God, and by it having given place to a general spirit of

lawlessness both in the church and in the world, what next must be done? Oh, the civil power must be called to the rescue to enforce laws dictated by the church! For when the preachers tell the people that the Sabbath is a Jewish institution and has been abolished, and then try to impress upon them the duty of keeping Sunday as the Sabbath, they are met with the same arguments that they themselves have used against the Sabbath of the Lord. This was plainly stated by Dr. Pierson, of Philadelphia, in 1884, in these words:—

"The sanctity of the Lord's day is but a remnant, if not a relic, of the past; and if this process goes within the present century Sabbath sanctification will be among the curiosities of archeology and paleontology! Christians apologize for this on the ground that the 'Sabbath is a Jewish institution' and is abrogated, making no distinction between the *ceremonial* and the *moral* law. . . . Other disciples do away with the consecrated seventh of time, as with the consecrated tenth of money, on the ground that *all time* and property are holy unto the Lord, and so the practical effect is that they consecrate *nothing*."

This is the sober truth, but the people are not primarily to blame. These same apologies, in these very words, have been preached to them time and again all over the land. These very arguments have been put into the mouths of the people by the preachers in their efforts to persuade them not to obey the commandment of God, and now the ministers turn about and complain of the people for doing exactly as they themselves have taught them to do. Little did these men think all these years that in thus opposing the Sabbath of the Lord, they were brandishing a sword that would cut both ways. Little did they think that they were weaving a spider web, and hatching cockatrice's eggs that would break out into vipers to sting themselves. Little did they think that in raising these objections, and appealing to popularity and worldly interest, against the Sabbath of the Lord, they were destroying respect for the whole law of God, and implanting a disposition of lawlessness that would break any commandment of God or men that conflicts with those interests.

The ministers have taught the people to say, "If everybody else will keep Sabbath, I will." Now when they are called upon to more strictly observe Sunday, the teaching comes back to the teachers in the words, "If everybody else will keep *Sunday*, I will." Accordingly the church members go on Sunday excursions, read Sunday newspapers, and so on, because "everybody else" does the same. Therefore to have the church members keep Sunday, all Sunday trains must be stopped and all Sunday papers must be abolished. Thus to satisfy a demand which they themselves have created, and to meet arguments which they themselves have invented, the preachers are obliged to work up civil enactments and constitutional amendments by which everybody shall be compelled to keep Sunday.

But Sunday is only a counterfeit of the Sabbath of the Lord. It has no sacred quality whatever. There is no authority from God for its observance at all as a sacred institution of any sort. Its only authority is that of Rome, pagan as well as papal. And that is simply *no authority* to the man who recognizes God and the

authority of his word. Rome sets forth Sunday as the sign of her authority, as the signs that she has power to command men under penalty of sin for disobedience. As the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of the true God, so Sunday is the sign of that false god, "the man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The only image and superscription that the Sunday institution bears, is the image and superscription of Rome. As the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord is an acknowledgment of the authority of the true God, so to refuse to do that, and deliberately choose to keep Sunday instead, is to acknowledge the authority of Rome instead of the authority of God, and is to worship Rome instead of God. For, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." And whenever the people of the United States, or of any other country, whether by State or National law, try to compel men to keep Sunday, it is only trying to compel men to keep Sunday, it is only trying to compel them to bow to the authority of Rome—it is only trying to compel them to worship the beast. And when the union of religion and the State is formed here, and thus an image of the Papacy is erected for the express purpose of compelling men to keep Sunday, then in that men will be compelled to worship the beast *and his image*.

Through this evil channel, and to help forward this wicked work, Satan will develop his power and signs and lying wonders, and his deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. But against it all, the Third Angel's Message utters the solemn warning of God, "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 to save men from this dreadful fate, it presents the supreme truth of "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

J.

¹ 3 yrs. inter.

² 7 yrs. inter. and anarchy.

³ 15 yrs. inter.

⁴ 3 yrs. inter.

⁵ 18Ω yrs. inter.

⁶ 13 yrs. interregnum.

⁷ All of this list is between A.D. 315 and 1522.