**“The Promise of His Coming” The Signs of the Times, 7, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the second epistle of Peter, the third chapter, and the third and fourth verses, we find the following statement: “Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.” From this, we indirectly learn two things: First, that in the last days there will be some who are teaching that the Lord is coming; for if no one were asserting that there is a promise to that effect, there would be no reason for the inquiry as to where that promise may be found. And, second, we learn that there is such a promise, and that those who teach it are correct, for they who question it are “scoffers” who walk after their own lusts. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.1}

The question in itself is a perfectly legitimate one, if it is asked from a sincere desire to know the truth. It is only when asked by those who are “willingly ignorant,” that there is in it the element of mockery. For the benefit of the first class, a Scriptural answer to the question will be given. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.2}

The question “Will Christ come?” does not admit of argument. The answer is given in the Bible in plain and unequivocal language. Admit the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the question is at once answered in the affirmative. In this article, therefore, little more can be done than to cite the reader to a few of the passages which positively affirm that Christ is coming again to this earth. Those passages only will be quoted which state the simple fact. Other questions as to the time, manner, object etc., of his coming will be considered hereafter. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.3}

Perhaps the oldest direct testimony concerning Christ’s second advent is found in the 14th verse of Jude. “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints.” This testimony, although second-hand may not be impeached, for it is from one who “walked with God,” and is vouched for by “the servant of Jesus Christ.” {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.4}

Another testimony is found in Numbers, the 24th chapter, and 17th verse. It may be objected that Balaam was a wicked man, and, therefore, not entitled to credit; but we must remember that at this time he was under the influence of the Spirit of God, and unable to say anything except as God permitted him. Speaking of what shall happen “in the latter days,” he says: “I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.” The language used, as well as the context, shows that Christ is referred to; and it is his second coming that is spoken of for it is then that Christ’s enemies are to be destroyed. See 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9; 2:8. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.5}

But we have still more positive testimony in the Old Testament. Job, in the midst of his afflictions, comforted himself in the following manner: “Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that *he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me.” Job 19:23-27. This language is very positive; and Job shows his sense of its importance by wishing it to be preserved by all the means of writing then known. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.6}

Passing to the Psalms we read the testimony of David. That David was inspired of God, we learn from 2 Samuel 23:2: “The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.” He says: “Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.” Psalm 50:3. Again: “Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth.” Psalm 96:11-13. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.7}

We come now to the New Testament, and we shall see that the testimony is even more positive. Paul’s words in Hebrews 9:27, 28 are very explicit: “And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him *shall he appear the second time* without sin unto salvation.” There is nothing figurative or uncertain about these words. They are a plain declaration of fact. Either Christ will come the second time, or else Paul is an unreliable witness. The latter, no Christian will admit. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.8}

Again Paul writes: “For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For *the Lord himself shall descend* from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.” Could language be made plainer than this? This is a statement of what shall actually occur. No more definite language can be found in the Bible. It will not do to evade this testimony by saying that Paul did not understand what he wrote. There is not the slightest evidence that he did not fully comprehend the force of every line that he wrote; but even allowing that he did not, the Holy Spirit, which inspired him, certainly did understand what he wrote, and had an object in giving it. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.9}

Although no clearer evidence can be given than that quoted above, yet the words which come to us direct from the lips of our Lord himself, have a peculiar force. In Matthew 16:27 he says: “For the Son of man *shall come* in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.” The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew is devoted entirely to a description of his coming, but as we are now giving direct answers to the question “Will he come?” we pass this by for the present. The same subject, however, is carried on in the twenty-fifth chapter, and in the 31st verse Christ says: “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.” He here speaks of his coming as a settled fact, so that his words amount to a positive statement. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.10}

In John 14:1-3, we have a statement by our Lord, which, if such a thing is possible, is even stronger than any of the foregoing. As Jesus was about to leave this earth, he comforted his sorrowing disciples with the following words: “Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father’s house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” The point of comfort in the above is the promise that he would come again. The disciples were sorrowing because he had said he was going away. He says, Be not troubled; I will come again. He did not deceive them with a false hope; he will certainly come again. His word is pledged to this and it cannot fail. {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.11}

These are only a few of the many passages which teach that Christ will come again, but they are sufficient. They are so simple that a child can understand them. No other meaning can possibly attach to them than that Christ is coming the second time to this earth. The Bible abounds with testimony to the same effect. And yet there are people who profess to believe the Bible, who say that the second coming of Christ is a non-essential doctrine. If it is not essential, why is it given so large a place in the Bible? {SITI December 1, 1881, p. 535.12}

**“Enforcement of the ‘Christian Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 7, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The fact that people are sincere and earnest in their purposes, does not prove that they are correct in their motives. Inspiration has declared, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” And then, to show that this declaration is needed as a revelation to man, the question is asked, “Who can know it?” Without the aid of God’s word and Spirit man can never know himself. It is scarcely less difficult for the heart to know itself than for the eye to see itself. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.1}

By many, sincerity is held to be as good as the truth-an acceptable substitute for the truth. But a person may be quite sincere and still quite selfish. Indeed, intensely selfish people are always sincere; but they never understand their motives. There is no evil more prevalent than self-deception. Earnest belief, or strong feeling, is, in the estimation of some, better religion than right doing, or obedience to the commandments of God. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.2}

We have no idea that they who projected the Inquisition, or that which grew up into the inquisition, had any intention to war upon human rights. They intended to advance the cause of religion and the honor of God upon the earth. Their error was that they set out to serve God by a way of human devising, contrary to the method marked out in the Scriptures. God sent them forth as ambassadors’ they chose rather to be legislators and executioners. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.3}

It is a common saying that, “History repeats itself.” The Lord, by the prophet Isaiah (chapter 66), gives us a view of the religious world near the end of time. Verse 5 says:- {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.4}

“Hear the word of the Lord, *ye that tremble at his word;* Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name’s sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but *he shall appear to your joy*, and they shall be ashamed.” Comp. Verses 15, 16. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.5}

This indicates that another persecution shall arise before the Lord shall appear; that it will be against those who tremble at the word of God; that it will be-not against religion, but, professedly in the cause of religion; by those who affect to act for the glory of God; that, though they say, let the Lord be glorified, they are moved against those who tremble at the word of the Lord. Evidently they will hold something else-their traditions-above the word of God. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.6}

So it was in the dark ages. Persecutors were zealous for the glory of God, and tenacious of tradition; but careless of the written word. What the Doctors of the church had said was of more worth to them than what Jehovah had said. Their bitterest persecutions, even to the burning of Christians, were “Acts of Faith.” Theirs was truly and literally a *burning zeal*. Who were more faithful to religion than they? We doubt whether the followers of the present age will be able to excel them. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.7}

The Apostle Paul, in 2 Timothy 3:1-5, gives a similar view of the religious world of the last days. Though they have “the form of godliness,” they will be boastful and proud, false accusers, and despisers of those that are good. We recognize no standard of goodness but that which is erected in God’s word. It is obedience to God. Where is obedience to God to be found, if not among those who keep his commandments? In Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14, we are informed that we are to keep his commandments because he will bring every work into Judgment. Of course his commandments are the rule of the Judgment, and the measure of acceptance with him. And it is known to everybody that the religious world are violently opposed to those who keep the commandments of God *just as God gave them*. If they can have the privilege of amending them, or putting a construction upon them which their words will never justify, then no objection will be raised. And so the most willful child will obey the order of his parents, if he is permitted to do it *in his own way*. But what kind of obedience is that? Can it be acceptable to God? {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.8}

They who accuse their brethren of wrong, because they adhere closely to the commandments of Jehovah, are veritably “false accusers.” In their accusations there is neither truth nor justice. While they profess to seek God’s glory, they would do well to examine their motives to see if they are not seeking to have their own way; to see if their pleasure in having the law of the land to sustain them is now somewhat increased by their consciousness that the law of God, strictly construed, is against them. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.9}

Before we examine some other scriptures which speak of these last-day persecutions, we will further trace the parallel between the position taken by these last-day religionists and their prototypes of five to ten centuries ago. We are informed by the Protestant ministry that the law under which they are not acting is not *a religious law*, but merely *a police regulation*. And that may be the position assumed by a Court. But it is not a correct statement of the case. The law of California protects the first day of the week under the name of “the Christian Sabbath.” But this phrase, in both its terms, both “Christian” and “Sabbath,” gives it a religious character. Neither Judge nor minister can deny this. And yet we are told it is only “a police regulation,” and not at all of a religious character. Never was there a more decided mixture of “church and State” than this. Never was there a more evident deception indulged or practiced than is contained in the pretext that it is only a police regulation, and does not affect the question of religion. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.10}

Again, what is the object of the ministers in their zeal to have the law enforced? Are they working in behalf of a mere “police regulation,” or in the interests of their religious predilections? *The State* is doing the work; this is their plea. Are they helping it on for the sake of the State, or for the church. Why do they act as pastors, in concert? Do they think any are so blind as not to discern motives in this matter? {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.11}

This excuse of a secular law or police regulation is a very flimsy one. It is known to every person who is informed upon the subject that Catholics deny that the church put to death those who feel under the ban of the inquisition. The execution was performed by the civil authorities; the church not holding itself responsible. Indeed, the recommendation of the church was often to mercy. But who is deceived thereby? Was not the church using the secular power as an instrument to carry out its religious tenets and to persecute those who chose to stand closely by the word of God rather than popular traditions? And is not history repeating itself to-day? Are not the churches combining to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which they may use the arm of civil power to compel everybody in the land to observe their so-called Christian Sabbath? What is now being done in California is only a step taken in that direction. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.12}

In this land we have been accustomed to consider ourselves exempt from the worst troubles which befell the old world, because of the entire separation of church and State in our government. We have looked upon religious persecution as almost impossible here, because we have never seriously contemplated the possibility of a union of church and State. The dungeon, the rack, and the stake, were looked for as a matter of course where the State was so far controlled by ecclesiastics as to enact penalties for the observance of non-observance of religious duties, real or supposed. But what do we see to-day? We are fast approaching this very state of things. If the American people realized the snare into which they are walking they would enter a protest which would secure the equal rights of every American citizen, and leave the question of religious ordinances where they belong, in the field of theological discussion. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.13}

To show the entire fallacy of the position assumed by the religious advocates of Sunday it is necessary to examine the Sabbath commandment, and the claims of the pseudo-Christian Sabbath. This we must do very briefly. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.14}

First, The commandment. This embraces four points, namely: (1) The requirement. (2) The prohibition. (3) The permission. (4) The reason. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.15}

1. The perceptive part of the commandment is: “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” Connected with this is the explanatory remark: “The Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” This explanation is definite, and precludes all evasion. The “day of the Sabbath,” literally, or the day of the rest-the Lord’s rest-is the subject of this precept. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.16}

2. The prohibition. “In it thou shalt not do any work.” The prohibition is also explicit. In *it*, the day of the Lord’s rest, no work shall be done. To this day alone it refers. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.17}

3. The permission. This part, though permissive, is inseparable from the precept. “Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.” Some have taken the position that this also is perceptive. Be that as it may; no one can deny that it contains *a divine grant* to labor on the six days, excluding the seventh. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.18}

But we are told that it is no infringement on our rights if we are compelled to rest also on the first day, as it does not at all interfere with our resting on the seventh day. That appears plausible, but it is very deceptive. There are thousands of honest and industrious citizens of California who are compelled to use the closest economy to make their weekly wages supply the wants of their families. Forcibly deprive them of one-sixth of their earnings and they would thereby be deprived of the necessaries of life. Many business men are barely able to keep their business in operation, who would become bankrupt if regularly deprived of one-sixth of their income. You concede our right to keep the seventh day “according to the commandment,” Luke 23:56, as our conscience compels us to do. But do you not see that by forcibly depriving us of the God-given privilege of working six days, you are driving some into a state of destitution and suffering, or to a violation of their religious convictions by compelling them to work on the seventh day to support their families? Is it possible that California has an intelligent jurist or a thinking minister who cannot see that the enforcement of this law does work hardship and injustice and even distress to a certain class who live out their religion just as they read it in the Bible? We appeal to those who are trying-honestly trying-to enforce this law, who firmly believe that they are religiously bound to keep the first day of the week. Many of you are just able to make a living for your families by economizing both your time and your resources. N ow if the law of the State compelled you to rest the seventh day, and your consciences led you to keep the first day, and this loss of time deprived your families of the comforts of life, and you were pressed to decide whether to let your families suffer, or to violate the law of the land, or to violate your religious convictions, would you believe the man, let him be judge or minister, who should tell you that the law of the State did not interfere with your religion? {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 546.19}

Forcible as this illustration is, it does not fully meet the case-the parallel is not complete-because *for the keeping of the seventh day we have the commandment of God; for the keeping of the first day you have not*. We give you the benefit of the supposition that you have never considered the subject in this light. But why have you not? Is it not because your neighbor, not yourself, has to suffer the injustice? Did it affect you as it does us, would you not very readily have made this application of it? Do you walk Christianly toward your neighbor when you subject his conscience to a test to which you would not be willing to have your own subjected? Please to put this upon a more reasonable b asis. Say at once that your convictions are more sacred than ours, notwithstanding that we have the plain reading of the decalogue to sustain us; but do not deceive yourselves (you cannot so deceive us,) by saying that this law interferes with no man’s religion. Do not present to the world the inconsistency shown by New Englanders more than a century ago, who declared it to be every man’s right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience,-with the *practical proviso* that his conscience did not lead him to be a Baptist or a Quaker! {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 547.1}

4. The reason. As there is but one commandment in all the Bible for the observance of a *weekly Sabbath* (the fourth commandment of the decalogue), so there is but one reason in the Bible for the institution and sanctification of the Sabbath. This is given in the following words: “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.” The reason and the sanctification refer to the seventh day, and to no other. This is confirmed by Genesis 2:3, “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 547.2}

But our friends, knowing they can produce no other commandment, tell us that they keep the first day of the week in obedience to this. Will they allow us to plead that we obey the present law of California by keep the seventh day? If not, why not? If keeping the first day is obedience to the law which commands to keep the seventh day, why is not the keeping of the seventh day obedience to the law which requires to keep the first day? Or is such caviling admissible only when the law of God is in question? But, to make the fourth commandment justify the keeping of the first day, you must be able to read the commandment inse rting therein the first day instead of the seventh. Then it will tell us that God created all things in six days and rested the first day. *But that is not true*. He did not rest the first day. He did not bless and sanctify the first day. Now if you cannot read the first day in the commandment without making it contradict the facts on which it is based, you surely cannot enforce the first day by the commandment. Justice Morrison, (in whose decision so great delight is taken at this time), as a jurist would admit this position, as it is always admitted by the teachings of the church of his choice. It is only by Protestants that the inconsistent-yes, the absurd-claim is set up that you can enforce a certain thing by a law to which the terms of the law cannot possibly be made to apply. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 547.3}

We shall resume this subject next week, and examine the claims of the so-called “Christian Sabbath.” {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 547.4}

**“Manner of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 7, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is most unfortunate that the tendency nowadays is almost entirely against a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. It seems difficult for people to understand that Christ and the apostles ever spoken plain, simple language, such as one person would use in speaking to another. Whenever a passage is read, the first thought with many is, What hidden meaning is there in it? What lesson is conveyed? Any one who reads the popular Sunday-school comments will see this tendency conspicuously displayed. Now it is proper to search the Scriptures; and if there be a difficult text, it is right to find out its meaning, by comparing it with other texts; but there are some things that are so plain that any attempt at explanation only obscures the meaning. And this is the case with by far the greater part of the Bible. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.1}

It is true that there are parables, but these are readily distinguished from the direct, simple statements, and are usually either explained, or in such common use as to need no explanation. When Christ was on earth, one of the proofs of his divine mission was that the poor had the Gospel preached unto them; consequently we should expect his teaching to be such as could be understood by poor people who have not had the advantages of an education. And this is the case. The Bible is a model of simplicity; it uses the language of the common people. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.2}

We have seen how very plain and direct the statements are in the Bible concerning the second coming of Christ. No believer in the Bible pretends to deny these statements, for to do so would be to deny the Bible. But there are very many who evade these statements, and virtually deny them, by claiming that Christ’s second coming is spiritual. Some claim that Christ comes when a good man dies; and others claim that his coming is at conversion; while others still, carrying the latter idea out still further, claim that there will sometime in the future be a temporal millennium, when all men shall have been converted, and that Christ will then come and reign over his people spiritually, and that this is what is meant by the second coming of Christ. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.3}

Now the Bible is just as definite in regard to the manner of Christ’s coming, as it is in regard to the fact of his coming. It plainly says that Christ will come personally and visibly. The texts which prove this will of course furnish additional evidence that Christ will certainly come. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.4}

And first it may be well to notice Hebrews 9:28: “And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” Christ is to come the *second* time; but if the theory that he comes at death or conversion be correct, he would already have come many thousands of times. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.5}

Again, the time of Christ’s ministry here on earth, of which we have a record in the New Testament, is conceded by all to be his first advent. But men had been converted previously to that time, and for thousands of years good men had been dying. If Christ comes at conversion or at death, he must have come millions of times before his first advent. Anyone can see the absurdity of those theories. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.6}

It is not denied that Christ has, at different times in the world’s history, met and conversed with certain of his devoted followers, or that he is ever present with his people by his Spirit; but nothing of this kind can be referred to in the texts under consideration. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.7}

It would, however, be manifestly inconsistent to refer to any one of these times as the second coming of Christ. One of them has no precedence over another. But there was one time when he was here in person, when he talked with thousands, and was seen by thousands more. At that time there was probably no nation on earth that did not know of him and his mighty works; and there has been no nation since then that has not heard of that wonderful event. Now at that time he said he was coming “*again*,” and Paul speaking of that first advent and its object, said that he would come the “*second* time.” Consistency, therefore, would demand that his second coming be also personal and visible, and no less conspicuous nor less widely known than his first. And this we are positively told shall be the case: “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every *eye shall see him*, and they also which pierced him.” Revelation 1:7. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.8}

Again we read: “For the Son of Man shall, in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.” Matthew 16:27. Those who place the second coming of Christ at death, or at conversion, must have a very faint conception of the glory of the Father. When the Lord came down on Sinai, “the whole mountain quaked greatly” (Exodus 19:18); and when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, even Moses was not able to enter. See Exodus 40:34, 35. The glory of a single angel, at the resurrection of Jesus, caused the Roman guard to fall as dead men. Matthew 28:4. What then will be the manifestation when he comes in his own glory, and that of the Father, and all the holy angels? This glory which will attend Christ’s coming is thus described: “Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.” Psalm 50:3. Paul says that when Christ comes he will be “revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire.” 2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8. That this glory will be seen by all is proved by Revelation 1:7 already quoted, and by the words of our Saviour in Matthew 24:27: “For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” Any one who has seen the lightning flash across the sky in the sheets so tensely bright to that even the closed eyelids could not wholly shut out the impression, can appreciate to a faint degree the terror of that day. Of the key facts of that glory, we learn again 2 Thessalonians 2:8: “And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” The fire that David says shall “devour before him,” is the glory of his presence. {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.9}

Nothing further is needed to prove that the coming of the Lord will be nothing like the quiet of a death-bed scene, or the hour when an individual gives his heart to God. There are, however, a host of other texts on this point, no less strong than those already quoted. Two only will be given to show how literal and personal that coming is. The first is Acts 1:9-11: “And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up in heaven? *this same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.” The second is 1 Thessalonians 4:16: “For *the Lord himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*; and the dead in Christ shall rise first.” {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.10}

These texts speak for themselves. The language is clear and plain, and anyone can understand them. And yet, who can realize the terrible scene which they foretell? The human mind cannot conceive of the awful grandeur of that hour when the Lord of heaven and earth shall be revealed. Let each one ask himself the question:- {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.11}

*“How will my heart endure
The terrors of that day,
When the earth and heaven, before the judge,
Astonished, shrink away!” {SITI December 8, 1881, p. 448.12}*

**“Enforcement of the ‘Christian Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 7, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

SECONDLY, we shall examine the claims of the so-called Christian Sabbath. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.1}

Christian institutions are peculiar to the gospel of Christ-they are institutions erected by Christ. We have gospel precepts for certain ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord’s supper. These are peculiar to the gospel, wherein they are plainly instituted. We might quote to a great length from the best of Protestant writers to prove their general agreement in this, that *gospel duties are based only on plain and positive precepts*. We cannot say, however, that they are all and always consistent with this declaration, for it is made to meet the Catholics in their argument for tradition. It does not seem to have been made strictly for home use! This principle, applied to Sunday, will rule it out, as not being a gospel institution. There is not precept for its observance; no reason was ever given why it should be observed; no instance of its having been observed. A few inferences, anything but necessary, are all that is ever adduced in its favor. But these can never institute an ordinance; nothing but an express precept will suffice for this. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.2}

We have another principle to apply to it which must be decisive. While the gospel enforces morality, it does not originate it. Gospel institutions, therefore, are *not moral*, but *positive*. This truth is, and must be, acknowledged by all. We do not mean that positive institutions are not obligatory; they are, but not in the same sense that moral duties are, because we are differently related to them. And this distinction is not merely one in theory; it is universally recognized in practice. This we will show. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.3}

Christian ordinances are for the household of faith; not for infidels or disbelievers; while moral duties are of universal application. By a simple statement of facts, of ordinary occurrence, this may be made clear to every mind. Two persons-a young gentleman and a young lady-call upon a minister and ask to have the rite of marriage solemnized. As a matter of professional duty the minister may inquire if they are, or intend to become, followers of Christ. Nut this is not a requisite to marriage. He will marry them if they are unbelievers, became he recognizes the truth that marriage is not a Christian institution. Marriage was instituted before the fall of man; it was given to the race, and does not belong to any class or nation. It wa s never restricted to a class. If it were a religious institution there would be no legitimate children except those born in the church. But the Bible will not justify such a position. Doubtless the minister does right in marrying them, though they are not Christians. And for this reason it is proper for legislators to enact laws for the protection of the marriage rite and tie; it is in no sense religious legislation, or legislation for the church. It is for all classes-for the people at large. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.4}

But suppose that the same couple return to the same minister and ask to be baptized. Now the question of their belief in Christ is relevant-it is a necessity. Suppose they both declare their entire disregard of Christ and his gospel-will he baptize them? Of course he will not. And why not? Because baptism is *a Christian institution*, and they are not competent to receive it. But if they cannot be baptized, may they not at least partake of the Lord’s supper? Again they are refused. This, too, is a Christian ordinance, *and they who reject Christ have no right to observe the institutions of Christ*. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.5}

This being an accepted fact, we never find the pastors and their flocks asking the legislature to enact laws compelling all classes-believers and unbelievers-to be baptized and to partake of the Lord’s supper. So far are they from this, they would reject as a monstrous innovation any legislation to that end by the civil government. As ordinances of Christ-Christian institutions-they may not be the subjects of civil enactments. No church would for a moment accept a law of the State which required infidels to observe these ordinances of Christ. No minister would comply with the terms of such a law if it were enacted. We repeat it: this distinction is clearly defined, easily recognized, and universally accepted in practice. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.6}

And now we inquire, In this classification of institutions, where does the Sabbath belong? We have denied and repeatedly asked the clergy of the Protestant churches to make good their position, that the Sabbath is a Christian institution. But we have never succeeded in getting one in argue the position. We declare that there is no such thing as “the Christian Sabbath.” It has no existence. We point to the chapter and verse where baptism was commanded; we can show the act of instituting the Lord’s supper; but who will show us when, and by whom, a “Christian Sabbath” was instituted? What are the terms in which is was enacted? It has no foundation in the Scriptures. And our Sunday-Sabbath friends virtually acknowledge their weakness on th is point by acting inconsistently with their own position. They affirm, that the Sabbath is a Christian institution, and then, in contravention of every principle which governs their actions in regard to Christian institutions, they ask the legislature to make and enforce a law to compel infidels and atheists to observe it! To be perfectly consistent they should unite in asking for “a police regulation” in behalf of baptism and the Lord’s supper, and thus place all Christian institutions on an equal footing! {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.7}

While we declare, and produce the proof, that there is no Christian Sabbath, we freely admit that the Sunday-rest is a church institution. It is a creature of the church;-but it is of the Roman Church. History fully justifies the claims put forth by the Catholic Church in this behalf. This claim we briefly present. In “A Sure Way to Find the True Religion,” a Catholic book, is an argument for tradition, in which are the following words:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.8}

“The keeping holy the Sunday is a thing absolutely necessary to salvation; and yet this is nowhere put down in the Bible; on the contrary, the Bible says, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Exodus 20:8, which is Saturday, and not Sunday; therefore, the Bible does not contain all things necessary to salvation.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.9}

In the “Plain Talk about Protestantism,” by M. Segur, is the following:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.10}

“It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the *Sabbath* [Sunday]-in which, after all, the only Protestant *worship* consists-not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath which is Saturday. It was the Catholic Church, which, by the authority of Jesus Christ has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they page, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.11}

This is pointed and true. From a Catholic tract we copy the following, being part of an appeal to Protestants on this subject:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.12}

“You tell me that Saturday was the *Jewish* Sabbath, but that the *Christian* Sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express command of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work, and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day, in its stead? This is the most important question, which I know not how you can answer. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.13}

“You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible, and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with you own principles, if you really follow the Bible, and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or, at least, from which you may confidently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.14}

“Now mind, in all this, you would greatly misunderstand me if you supposed I was quarreling with you for acting in this manner on a true and right principle-in other words, a Catholic principle, viz., the acceptance, without hesitation, of that which has been handed down to you by an unbroken tradition. I would not tear from you a single one of those shreds and fragments of divine truth which you have retained. God forbid! They are the most precious things you possess, and by God’s blessing may serve as clues to bring you out of that labyrinth of error in which you find yourself involved, far more by the fault of your forefathers, three centuries ago, than by your own. What I do quarrel with you for is, not your inconsistency in occasionally acting on a true principle, but your adoption, as a general rule, of a false one. You keep the Sunday, and not the Saturday; and you do so rightly, for this was the practice of all Christians when Protestantism began; but you have abandoned other Catholic observances, which were equally universal at that day, preferring the novelties introduced by the man who invented Protestantism, to the unvarying tradition of above fifteen hundred years. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.15}

“We blame you, not for making Sunday your weekly holiday, instead of Saturday, but for rejecting tradition, which is the only safe and clear rule by which this observance can be justified.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.16}

And in the “Doctrinal Catechism” of that church we find the following language:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.17}

“ *Ques*. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept? {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.18}

“ *Ans*. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;-she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.19}

Now if our Protestant pastors deny this position of “the church,” will they please to produce the Scriptural authority,” will they please to produce the Scriptural authority? Not fine-spun inferences, but such authority as is demanded in questions of law. Here we might fill pages with admissions that no such authority exists. Dr. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, admits that there is no law for keeping Sunday, but argues for the correctness of it. Argument in the entire absence of law is self-condemnatory. Dr. Scott says it came into practice gradually, without a precept; as did, we add, every traditional innovation. Dr. Matthew Henry says the Sunday was not called the Sabbath in the first two centuries of the Christian era. We add a century or more to his statement, and are still on safe ground. Dr. Clarke observes an ominous silence in regard to any evidence for a change, which he certainly would not do if the evidence existed. Dr. Heylyn, an eminent historian of the church of England, says there was no law to restrain from labor on the first day of the week in the first three centuries. Constantine’s edict is the first which can be produced, A.D. 321, and this has often been referred to as the law of the “first Christian emperor,” many overlooking the fact that the emperor had yet made no profession of Christianity when he made this decree. Of this decree Dr. Schaff, in his Church History, says he “enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini* [Lord’s day], but as *dies solis* [day of the sun], in conformity to his worship of Apollos.” That such is the origin of Sunday consecration is beyond dispute. A late edition of the “Sunday-school Union Bible Dictionary” contains the following:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.20}

“Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.21}

Dr. Webster said:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.22}

“The heathen nations in the north of Europe, dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.23}

The Religious Encyclopedia says:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.24}

“The ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.25}

The Douay Catechism says:- {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.26}

“It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of *dies solis*, the day of the sun, *to which it was sacred*.” {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.27}

We have not space to extend this point. We only add that, inasmuch as we are enjoined to keep God’s commandments because he will bring every work into Judgment, we would much rather risk our case in the Judgment standing on what God has commanded, than on what he has not, even though *all the world* may choose the things which God has not commanded. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.28}

With this proof of our statement, that it is a creature of the Roman Church, we see the consistency of Justice Morrison in deciding in its favor. Reverence for the church is enjoined as the first consideration with all who acknowledge allegiance to her, and this would lead him, yea, compel him to give the decision he has given. All his educational bias; every feeling of his heart, would coincide with this decision, because his church holds that nations and governments should be in subservience to the church, and enforce the decrees of the church. But his decision is inconsistent with the very instincts of Protestantism-contrary to every principle which it professes. It is a triumph of Catholicism in this professedly Protestant and Chri stian land, which is well calculated to strengthen the assurance expressed by the declining power at Rome, that what the church is losing in Europe she is gaining in the United States. Protestants, American freemen, may affect to think that this is a small matter; but they may remember that the greatest abuses and usurpation that the world has ever witnessed arose from small beginnings. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 558.29}

The ministry may meet our argument on “the Christian Sabbath” and the nature of Christian institutions with silence,-they may ignore it and act as if no such facts and truths existed, because they are in the majority. Our experience in past efforts to get the truth before them, and our knowledge of the spirit of majorities, and of human nature, gained from our reading of history and the Bible, incline us to fear that this will be the course mostly pursued. But if so it will be additional proof that the spirit of Protestant Christianity is on the wane; that power of majorities, not truth, is the arm on which they depend. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 559.1}

We will conclude our remarks on this subject next week, with a brief examination of the prophecies relating to the approaching warfare against the commandments of God and those who keep them. {SITI December 15, 1881, p. 559.2}

**“Enforcement of the ‘Christian Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 7, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

Having compared the claims of the Sabbath and the Sunday, we must return to the consideration of the prophecies. We regret that so few take any interest in this important and interesting part of the sacred Scriptures. They who do not examine our position on this point cannot appreciate the stand we take upon the fourth commandment. They think the subject of this commandment a matter of comparative indifference. We firmly believe that the restoration of the Sabbath of the Lord is the great religious reform of the age. The Sunday has long usurped its place in the Christian world. And this elevation of the day of the sun to the honors of the Sabbath of the Lord, has been attended with the most disastrous consequences to the churches. Not willing to acknowledge that the Roman power has authority “to command holy days under sin,” and not willing to reform their practice and exchange popular tradition for the commandment of God, they have been reduced to the greatest straits in their vain efforts to uphold Sunday by the Scriptures. To do this they have not only done violence to the language of the commandment, but, again, to justify this, they have adopted rules of interpretation which make the Bible a plaything for their fancies, and cause it to be scorned by many thinking men. If, in as plain a matter as *law*, words may be made to mean the opposite of what they say, and applied to anything except that of which they speak, what is the value of the Bible as a revelation? {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.1}

In speaking of the prophecies we quoted from 2 Timothy 3:1-5 to show Paul’s estimate of the prevailing religion of the world in the last days. With all other Bible writers he gives it a low place. Having said that they who will have the form of godliness will be despisers of those that are good, and false accusers, he adds, that “all that will lively godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” It cannot be questioned that there have been many godly people in this favored land who have lived respected, and quietly and peaceably served God to the end of their days. Has the prophecy, therefore, failed? By no means. We must look at it right where Paul placed it-“in the last days.” The evidence is so strong and so clear from the “sure wor d of prophecy,” and its fulfillment even to the present hour, that we are in the last days, that it is more than a mere *belief;* it has the force of a demonstration. Our Saviour, speaking of his second coming, gave certain signs (as unmistakable in their import as the budding trees are evidence of coming summer), and said, “So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, *know* that it is near, even at the doors.” We have seen “these things” and do not doubt the ability and duty of the disciples of the Lord to “know that it is near.” And no parts of the prophecies are more clear to us than those which point to a persecution for the truth-the truth of the commandments of God. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.2}

In Revelation 14 is a prophecy of the coming of the Son of man to reap the harvest of the earth. Jesus said, “The harvest is the end of the world,” or age-the gospel age. Matthew 13:39-41. Preceding the advent a message of warning is given to the world to which is added: “Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” Revelation 14:12. It is a significant fact that *patience* is so often spoken of in connection with the near coming of Christ. Compare Hebrews 9:28; 10:25, 35-37; James 5:1-9; Revelation 3:10, 11. Patience is called for, not in prosperity, but under afflictions. This accords with the statement of Paul that all the godly will suffer persecution in the last days; also with the text first quoted in Isaiah 66. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.3}

There is much evidence on this subject which we would be pleased to present, and it would give clearness and strength to our argument could we present it all. But our limited space will only permit us to give a compend of it. The following points may easily be verified by any one who will read the Scriptures to which reference is made. Very little knowledge of history is needed to see the correctness of our applications. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.4}

1. Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, with Daniel’s interpretation, revealed the succession of the empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome, with the breaking up or division of the Roman empire. Daniel 2. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.5}

2. Daniel’s vision in chapter 7, explained by an angel, gives the same succession of kingdoms, and, in addition, the rise of a “diverse” power, after ten kingdoms had arisen on the Roman territory. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.6}

3. The explanation shows that governments or nations are represented in the prophecies by “beasts;” the term “beast” being no index to their character. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.7}

4. A “horn” is also used to represent a kingdom or power. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.8}

5. “Horn” is a comprehensive term, not only used as a symbol of governments or powers, but is used as a figures of emblem of power, no matter what may be its nature. See the Psalms, etc. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.9}

6. The terms “kind” and “kingdom” are used interchangeably in the prophecies. As a king represents the kingdom in which he rules, the word king is sometimes used when the kingdom is meant. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.10}

Rome was broken up, and ten kingdoms had arisen on its territory before the close of the fifth century. At this time a power “diverse” from those kingdoms was becoming prominent. It was an ecclesiastical power, which, in the words of the prophecy, became “more stout than his fellows,” becoming even so strong as to rule over all the other kingdoms. Of the action of this power it is said:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.11}

“And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.” Daniel 7:25. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.12}

In Dr. Scott’s Commentary on this text are these words, speaking of Papal Rome:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.13}

“It had also a mouth speaking great things, and we shall have frequent occasion to speak of the arrogant claims, blasphemous titles, and great swelling words of vanity of this horn. The style of ‘his holiness,’ and the claim of infallibility, and of a power to dispense with God’s laws, to forgive sins, and to sell admittance into heaven, may serve as a specimen of the great things which this mouth hath spoken.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.14}

The reader will find copious extracts from Scott on this subject, in Dr. Nelson’s work, “Cause and Cure of Infidelity.” Dr. Clarke on this verse says:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.15}

“‘He shall speak as if he were God.’ So St. Jerome quotes from Symmachus. To none can this apply so well and so fully as to the popes of Rome. They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut Heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. And they go beyond God, in pretending to loose whole nations from their oath of allegiance to their kings, when such kings do not please them. And they go against God, when they give indulgences for sin. Th is is the worst of all blasphemies. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.16}

“And shall wear out the saints. By wars, crusades, massacres, inquisitions, and persecutions of all kinds. What, in this way, have they not done against all those who have protested against their innovations and refused to submit to their idolatrous worship? Witness the exterminating crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenses. Witness John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. Witness the Smithfield fires in England. Witness God and man against this bloody, persecuting, ruthless, and impure church.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.17}

This is strong language, but perhaps none too strong, considering the tortures of the Inquisition; the millions immured in its dungeons and put to death; and the martyrs at the burning stake. To no power but the Papacy, “diverse” from all kingdoms, will this symbol apply. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.18}

On the expression: “He shall think to change times and laws,” Dr. Clarke says:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.19}

“Instituting new modes of worship utterly unknown to the Christian church; new articles of faith, new rules of practice; and reversing with pleasure the laws both of God and man.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.20}

Alexander Campbell, in his celebrated debate with Bishop Purcell, said:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.21}

“I have here two Catechisms published by the authority of the church. They have both wholly expunged the second commandment.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.22}

On being told that it was not expunged from the Douay Bible, he replied as follows:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.23}

“It is a poor apology for this expurgation of the Decalogue, that it is not so done in the Douay Bible. [Because so many have the Catechism who never read the Bible.] What myriads then, through this fraud, must have lived and died in the belief that the second commandment was no part of God’s law. It is clearly proved that the pastors of the church have struck out one of God’s *ten words*, which, not only in the Old Testament, but in *all revelation*, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.24}

And again:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.25}

“License is given to violate in some way or other, every precept of the decalogue. The Sabbath, as a divine institution, is set aside.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.26}

In harmony with this is the proof offered from Catholic books wherein they claim that “the church” substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the decalogue. This tampering with the decalogue, the only instrument which Jehovah ever revealed in person, is the boldest act of treason which a mortal could commit, and in releasing (or professedly releasing) man from obligation to the law, or any part of it, that power has well earned the title which inspiration has conferred upon it-“that man of sin.” 2 Thessalonians 2:1-8. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.27}

Protestants have been nearly unanimous in applying the symbol of the “little horn” of Daniel 7 to Romanism; and it is equally evident that Paul’s man of sin has the same application. 2 Thessalonians 2. The man of sin was to be revealed by reason of a “falling away” in the church-it is a church power. The influences were already working in Paul’s day which brought it into existence; it was developed at an early age in the church. He was to sit in the temple of God, “setting himself forth as God.” (Revised Version). He should exalt himself above all that is called God. And surely, if he has authority to revise the law of Jehovah, and to absolve men from its claims, no higher position in the universe than his can be found. Yet this he claims. No power but the Papacy ever fulfilled this prophecy. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.28}

We now turn to the book of Revelation. This book of symbols is given mostly in series, as the seven churches, the seven seals, and seven trumpets, each series reaching to the second coming of Christ. The fourth is a series of beasts. This we now briefly examine. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.29}

The first in this line is a great red dragon. Revelation 12. This has been applied, by a well-known writer on Romanism, to the Catholic Church, but the application is not correct. It represents the Roman Empire before the church obtained supremacy. It was Pagan Rome that put the man-child to death-that stood ready to devour him as soon as he was born. Matthew 2. This child was Jesus Christ, for to no other will these words apply-“her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.” The empire gave civil authority to the Bishop of Rome, (see letter of Justinian, A.D. 535), which laid the foundation of all his usurpations. Paganism exalted the church, and affiliated with the church; it infused its principles into the church; it was honored upon the altars and in the institutions of the church; its spirit pervaded the church throughout its long and bloody reign. Hence the dragon, with other earthly powers, is said to persecute the people of God even to the end of time. It makes war with the “remnant”-the very last stage of the church-which “keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.” This coincides with Revelation 14: 12. “The patience of the saints” indicates afflictions; they “keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus;” and this also just before the Son of man comes to reap the harvest of the earth. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 570.30}

The second of this series is a beast, which has all the characteristics of the four beasts of Daniel 7, namely, the lion’s mouth, the bear’s feet, the leopard’s body, the ten horns of the terrible beast, with the blasphemous arrogance of the “little horn” of that chapter. This description proves its location and the extent of its power. It is the inheritor of the power possessed successively by Babylon, Persia, Greece, and the Roman empire; not on their several seats of empire, but, as they, so strong that “no beast might stand before him.” Daniel 8. “All the world wondered af ter the beast,” and they said, “Who is able to make war with him?” Revelation 13:3, 4. It had ten horns, showing its supremacy over the kingdoms. “The dragon [Pagan Rome] gave him his power [civil power], and his seat [the city of Rome], and great authority.” All this was literally fulfilled. The dragon transferred his seat to Constantinople, and gave his seat, Rome, to the Popes. “And he opens his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name [for he bore that name himself,] and his tabernacle [claiming that the seat of his Pontificate is the temple of God,] and them that dwell therein;” degrading the holy angels, by making the “ministering spirits” to be the souls of dead men. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.1}

“It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them;” and this power was to continue forty-two months-twelve hundred and sixty days, or years. The time, times, and half a time allotted to the little horn in Daniel 7:25, is the same period. Comp. Revelation 12:6. This computation may be found in the comments of Clarke, Scott, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and others. Justinian’s letter to the Bishop of Rome in 535, taking effect in 538, was really the beginning of his power-the foundation was then laid. One thousand two hundred and sixty years from 538 brings us to 1798, at which time Pius VI. Was taken prisoner by the French, a blow from which the papacy never recovered, so far as the civil power was concerned. Pius VI. died in exile, and the power to “wear out the saints of the Most High” was taken away. Nominally, a little civil power was left to the pope, when another was created, but this was taken from Pius IX. The prophecy says the beast received a deadly wound, and yet lived. A deadly wound, when its head was forcibly removed, and its power to “correct heretics” entirely destroyed. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.2}

We regret that these comments must be so brief; but our limits make this necessary. We pass to the third of this series, which more particularly interest us now. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.3}

“And I beheld another beast coming up out the earth.” Verse 11. The first beast came out of *the sea*. Waters represent peoples and nations. Revelation 17:15. The first ruled the nations; this *grows up* as a tree comes up from the earth. So did our country, of which this beast is clearly a symbol. Its rise and progress was by immigration and growth-not by subduing nations, or ruling over them. Where no government existed, there it sprang up and grew. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.4}

“And he had two horns like a lamb.” We have seen that horns represent powers of any nature-civil or ecclesiastical. The first beast was a union of Catholicism and Paganism. The second a union of Protestantism and Republicanism. We owe our remarkable growth and prosperity as much to the former as to the latter. “A State without a king, and a church without a pope,” or earthly head, was the ideal of our fathers. Lamb-like in profession and appearance. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.5}

“And he spake as a dragon.” This is mostly yet to be developed. Yet it is worth while to raise the question whether the *civil policy adopted* by our fathers (to the deep sorrow of the present generation), was consistent with their Declaration of Independence; and whether the *Protestant avowal* that all in this land might worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, was consistent with their treatment of Baptists and Quakers and of Seventh-day Adventists. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.6}

“And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.” An important point to notice is, that the action here point out occurs after the first beast is wounded to death, or this side of 1798. The worship here referred to-the worship of the first beast enforced-is the great point of interest in this inquiry. 1. He causeth the earth-to worship the first beast. The earth may be, and sometimes is, used for its inhabitants; but it is not here, as both are mentioned. The earth is caused to worship, and them that dwell in the earth are caused to worship. How can this be? Consider the evidence which has been produced, that the Sunday festival is a Catholic institution, and the following w ords from a Catholic author: “Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they page, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church.” This is true. And in this manner the very earth is made to worship that power. Baptists and others have tried to apply this prophecy to various papal institutions, as to infant baptism, and to sprinkling for baptism; but all in vain. God commanded that man should rest upon the Sabbath, in seed time and in harvest. But now, according to an ordinance of “the church” the land must be neither sowed nor reaped on the Sunday. The earth must thus do homage to the papal power. In this, and in this alone, can the prophecy be fulfilled. No other institution of Catholic appointment can meet the case. We may reasonably ask two things of those who dissent from this; 1. Show that the Sunday is to be observed by divine appointment. 2. Produce some institution, or something, wherein the earth, as well as them that dwell therein, is caused to worship that power. Here we have a most important prophecy, coming home to every one of us, in process of fulfillment by the enforcement of the Sunday-Sabbath, in Protestant-Republican America. True, it is mild and lamb-like yet, even in this; but the dragon spirit is fast asserting itself wherever the issue is made. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.7}

We have no space to notice all the points of this prophecy, but the following assists in identifying this power, and must be noticed. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.8}

“And he doeth great wonders.... and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by those miracles which he had power to do.” The wonders of “Modern Spiritualism” sprang up in this country. They are not all mere pretence; they are just what this scripture says they are-miracles to deceive; to turn man away from God and the Bible. As these take in this work it is well to remember that hosts of church members and many ministers, even eminent ones, are firm believers in the phenomena of Spiritualism. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.9}

“Saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make *an image* to the beast which had a wound by a sword and did live.” The first beast was a union of church and State. An image of that will be the same. There seems to be a great and general misapprehension of what constituted a union of church and State. It consisted in an arrangement by which the State was so far subservient to the church that it enforced the decrees of the church, and punished those who dissented-who were heretics. And in times of persecution minorities are always heretics, no matter how strongly they sustain themselves by the Bible. It was an arrangement by which “police regulations” were made to enforce religious observances. The church excused herself in the iniquity because it was a “police regulation” which the State alone enforced. And the State excused itself because it was persuaded that the peace and welfare of society required it. When the National Association, which is now clamoring for a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, shall be successful and the General Government is called upon to enforce the “Christian Sabbath,” that, too, will be a police regulation, but who instigates it? Let no one be deceived. *The “Christian Sabbath” is a church regulation enforced by the police of the State!* It is to all intents a union of church and State; it is a complete image of the first beast. Here are facts which cannot be met, nor fairly evaded. And when religious bigotry is once let loose, where will it stop? {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.10}

“And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive *a mark* in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” It is easy to show by the Scriptures, as Romans 4:11; Revelation 7:3; Ezekiel 9:4-6, etc., that sign, seal, and mark are used as equivalents, in the Bible. God gave the Sabbath as a *sign* of his work of creation, and of himself as Creator. Exodus 31:13-17. Ezekiel 20:11, 12, 19, 20. In six days the Lord made heaven and earth: the seventh day-the rest day or Sabbath-commemorates that work. It is a sign of the Creator; a perp etual reminder of his power; a safeguard against heathenism, if observed by the nations. Had not man turned away from the Sabbath he *could not* have forgotten God. “The things that are made” attest “his eternal power and Godhead.” Romans 1:20. He himself gave the Sabbath as a sign of this. How presumptuous is feeble man to treat with contempt this God-given sign, and displace it by another sign without a sentence of Scripture to warrant the action. We will listen again to a Catholic Catechism:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.11}

“ *Ques*. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days? {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.12}

“ *Ans*. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.13}

“ *Ques*. How prove you that? {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.14}

“ *Ans*. Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church’s power to ordain feasts, and to commend them under sin,” etc. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.15}

That is, they virtually acknowledge that that church has power to make that sinful of which God has never spoken, and to make it right to neglect that which God has commanded and never repealed. This is the highest possible assumption of power, and “the church” offers the church festival of Sunday as a standing monument of that power. The Sabbath is Jehovah’s sign of power; the Sunday is the Pope’s sign of power. In this the very earth is caused to worship Papacy; this is his peculiar *mark* of allegiance, for in this (they say) the Protestants, “in spite of themselves,” do homage to “the church.” Who can gainsay the declaration? {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.16}

We are watching with interest those passing events which show that *this image* will soon be made, and this *mark* or *sign* will be enforced. Prejudice is proving stronger than reason, and men refuse to be warned. But our Heavenly Father, who watches over every step of his people, and notes every weapon formed against them, has inspired his prophets to speak on this subject. A solemn warning has been put on record against the very work which is already being started and pushed forward to completion. Just before the Son of man comes, the following message is given:- {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.17}

“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.” {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.18}

“Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” Revelation 14:9-12. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.19}

This is the most solemn warning-the most terrible denunciation to be found in the Holy Scriptures. And it is easy to see why it is given in such terms. It is founded upon the most daring usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the divine government that the world has ever seen. And it is in close proximity to the coming of the Lord, when he shall have ceased to act as a priest or mediator between God and man. The judgments threatened are to fall “without mixture” upon the incorrigible and presumptuous. No mercy can reach them in that day, and they will call upon rocks and mountains to shield them from “the wrath of the Lamb.” Terrible day when he that is filthy must remain filthy still; Revelation 22:1-12; and the blessed Son of God, wh o is now pleading for all, shall come to take vengeance on his foes. 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.20}

While this article is longer than we desire for one number of our paper, we regret that it is not possible to give more fully the proof of our position. The reader will find a work at our office entitled, “The United States in the Light of Prophecy,” to which we refer him. It is a small book, but big with facts and strong in argument. No one can read it impartially, divested of prejudice, and not feel that we have a reason for the hope that is in us. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.21}

Now the reader can judge something of our feelings in regard to the impending crisis and to the present state of the “Sunday Law” question. It would be a pleasure to us to act in harmony with our fellow citizens, especially that class who love order and sobriety. But while their action requires of us to violate our convictions, based on the plain reading of the commandment of God, *we dare not* do different from what we are doing. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.22}

We have carefully, for a long time, even for more than a quarter of a century, and with many prayers, examined the ground covered by the present Sunday enforcement excitement. We have anticipated it, and have announced its coming to those who persisted in their incredulity. And even now, those who engaged in arousing the popular enthusiasm in its behalf have no idea of the lengths to which it will be carried when once it is fairly set in motion. *Every Catholic in the land is watching the issue with interest*. They all favor it, but are politic enough to say little, satisfied that what they so strongly desire will be done more readily in their absence than with their presence. {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.23}

Our patriotism is appealed to. Alas! we tremble for our country when we see what is coming. But more than all we “tremble at the word” of God. We plant ourselves on the commandment of God, and with Luther we say-We cannot go back! {SITI December 22, 1881, p. 571.24}