**“Thoughts on the Twelfth Chapter of Hebrews” The Signs of the Times, 9, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Continued.)*

“And let us run with patience the race that is set before us.” The word of here rendered “patience,” has the added the idea of “perserverance.” The same word in Romans 2:7 is rendered “patient continuance.” Not only must we “endure hardness” as good soldiers, but must persevere in so doing. “He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” King Darius bore the highest testimony to Daniel’s Christian character when he said, “O Daniel, the servant of the living God, is by God, whom thou servest *continually*, and able to deliver thee from the lions?” and it is very doubtful if Daniel would have been so miraculously preserved if his service had been a fitful one. The figure itself which the apostle introduces-that of a race-implies constant progress. No man who runs a race with any intention of winning, ever stops in the course; much less does he ever turn back. “No man having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.” {SITI March 1, 1883, p. 104.1}

“Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.” The idea of continuity is still brought to view. We are to look to Jesus, to the exclusion of all others. Greenfield gives the following definition to the word rendered “looking;” “to look steadfastly, to be old, *i.e.*, to look away from all other things and fix the view on a particular object.” In the ancient races, the one who had charge of the contest sat at the goal which the runners were to touch, and held the prizes up to their view. The runners, eager to win, could not look at anything else. If they turned their heads to one side, they would be impeded just so much, and would be in danger of losing the race. So in the Christian race, he who loses sight of Jesus, is lost. {SITI March 1, 1883, p. 104.2}

This expression, “looking unto Jesus,” cannot be dwelt upon too much. People sometimes look at others for the purpose of finding fault. No one needs to be told that this is all wrong. But there is another way in which we look at our neighbors, that is almost as productive of bad results. We sometimes contrast ourselves with those whom we think are better than we are, and who doubtless are better. We say, “If such an one has fierce struggles, and finds himself yielding to temptation, there is no use for me to try to overcome.” This reasoning would be in order, if we were obliged to trust in our neighbors for help, or to depend on ourselves. But to all the exhortation is given, “Look to Jesus.” We are to look to him for “grace to help in time of need.” We are saved, not through our natural goodness, but by the blood of Christ, and that is free for all. He has no choice of persons to whom he shall impart his grace, his love is infinite, and therefore can reach the vilest sinner as easily as if to one whose life has apparently been upright. Abraham was called the “friend of God,” not because his natural disposition was better than that of anybody else, but because he believed God; and Cain was rejected solely on account of his lack of faith. We have no business to look at ourselves or others, or to compare ourselves with others. We have only one on whom to fix our eyes; and this is the faith they gives us the victory. “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.” {SITI March 1, 1883, p. 104.3}

Christ is the author of the faith. Not merely of our faith, as our version has it, but of faith in the abstract. “There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” There can be no faith except in Christ; confidence put in any other is not faith, but presumption. We cannot save ourselves; neither can any man, or any system of man’s devising saved us. Christ is also the protector of the faith. This may mean that the faith in is with him; that all faith, as we have just said, is centered in him. It is he, also, who presents the prizes at the end of the race. When we see him as he is, then faith will be lost in sight. There will no longer be any occasion for faith, for, as the psalmist says, we shall be satisfied. {SITI March 1, 1883, p. 104.4}

(*To be Continued*.)
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**“Thoughts on the Twelfth Chapter of Hebrews” The Signs of the Times, 9, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued*.)

“For consider him that endured such contradiction of the ascenders against himself, lest ye be wearied, and faint in your minds.” The apostle has given us exhortation based upon the trials and victories of the men of old, and now he directs us to Him who is our pattern. This is the same as in the preceding verse, where we are exhorted to look steadfastly on Jesus. From these two verses we learn that we are to ever keep in mind Christ’s sufferings, the “contradiction of sinners.” No one else ever suffered as he did; all the trials of the ancient worthies cannot compare with the sufferings of our Lord. But how will it benefit us to consider these things? In many ways. First, we must remember that it was as a man that Christ endured the temptations of Satan, and the mockings and persecutions of his enemies. He took upon himself “the form of a servant;” in all things he was “made like unto his brethren.” He came to show that it is possible for man to resist temptation, and to overcome. In his own strength? No; Christ was in constant communion with the Father, and was given strength from Heaven. But he exercised no greater privilege than we are permitted to enjoy. We may have constant communion with Heaven. The reason why Christ was made like us was that he might sympathize with us in our temptations; “that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest.” “For in that he himself hath suffered been tempted, he is able to succor than that are tempted.” Hebrews 2:18. Here we have the assurance that he understands our case, and knows how to give the needed help. “All power is given unto me in Heaven and earth.” Matthew 28:18. By this we know that he is abundantly able to help those who are in trouble; the same help which he himself received when he was subject to temptation, he is able to give to feeble mortals. See also Hebrews 7:25, etc. “Come unto me, all he that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Matthew 11:28. Here he invites us to come and get the benefit of that strength which he has received on our account. The burden from which he wishes to relieve us is the burden of sin; it is the “weight” which Paul exports us to lay aside in order that we may successfully run the race. {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.1}

Besides the assurance that Christ’s example gives us that we may overcome, a contemplation of what he endured, of the sacrifice that he made for us, will tend to make us more content with our lot. Compared with his sufferings, all that we may be called upon to undergo is nothing. When we complain of the hardness of the way, and murmur at trials and crosses, is it not because we have not been thinking upon “Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself”? {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.2}

“Ye have not yet resist it on to blood, striving against sin.” The commonly accepted idea of this is, that those to whom the apostle was speaking here have not endured such persecutions for their faith as did the martyrs; but it seems that there is a deeper meaning than this; that the apostle refers to Christ himself. I can do no better on this point than to quote the following from Barnes:- {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.3}

“I find in none of the commentators what seems to me to be the true sense of this passage, and what gives an exquisite beauty to it-the allusion to the sufferings of the Saviour in the garden. The reasons which lead me to believe that there is such an allusion are briefly these: 1. The connection. The apostle is appealing to the example of the Saviour, and urging Christians to persevere amidst their trials by looking to him. Nothing would be more natural, in this connection, than to refer to that dark night when the severest conflict with temptation which he ever encountered, he so signally showed his own firmness of purpose, and the effect of resistance on his own bleeding body, and his signal victory, in the garden of Gethsemane. 2. The expression, ‘striving against sin,’ seems to demand the same interpretation. On the common interpretation, the solution would be merely to their resisting *persecution;* but here the allusion is to some struggle in their minds against *committing sin*. The apostle exhorts them to strive manfully and perserveringly against sin in every form, and especially against the sin of apostasy. To encourage them, he refers to the highest instance on record where there was a ‘striving again sin’-the struggle of the Redeemer in the garden with the great enemy, who there made his most violent assault, and where the resistance of the Redeemer was so great as to force the blood through his pores.” {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.4}

Compared with this mighty struggle of our Saviour, how feeble are our efforts to resist the temptations that beset us. And it is evident that we are expected not to give up without making such a struggle, if it be necessary in order to gain the victory. If it were not so, the case would not have been brought forward as an example. Who, then, has any business to be discouraged? “But,” you say, “I am too great a sinner; I have tried and failed so many times.” That is not to the point. Christ died to save sinners. The Bible was written for the benefit of sinners; and all the promises which it contains are for the encouragement of sinners. All that is asked of you is to strive to sin no more, implicitly accepting the strength which Christ is able and anxious to bestow. Cannot overcome! The path too narrow! The temptations and natural inclinations too strong! How do you know this? You have not yet “resisted unto blood, striving against sin.” You have not fully tested the matter. You have no right to say that you cannot overcome until you have put forth as great efforts as did the Saviour; and if you thus resist you cannot fail, for “God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.” {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.5}

“And 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 scoureth every son whom he receiveth.” The comment of Barnes on this text is excellent, and I quote it:- {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.6}

“The word here rendered ‘chastening,’-*paideia*-and in verses 6, 7, 8, and the word which occurs in verse 9, and rendered ‘corrected’ *paideutas*-does not refer to affliction in general, but to that kind of affliction which is designed to *correct* us for our faults, or which is of the nature of *discipline*. The verb properly relates to the training up of a child-including instruction, counsel, discipline, and correction [see the use of the verb in Acts 7:22; 2 Timothy 2:25; Titus 2:12), and then especially discipline or correction for faults-to *correct, chastize, chasten*. 1 Corinthians 11:32; 2 Corinthians 6:9; Revelation 3:19. This is the meaning here; and the idea is not that God will afflict his people in general, but that if they wander away he will *correct* them for their faults. He will bring calamity upon them as a *punishment* for their offenses, and in order to bring them back to himself. He will not suffer them to wander away unrebuked, but will mercifully reclaim them, though by great sufferings. Affliction have many are objects, and produce many happy effects. That referred to here is, they are means of reclaiming the wandering and erring children of God, and are proofs of his paternal care and love.” {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.7}

It should be borne in mind, however, that God uses human instruments to perform his work. Men are employed to preach the everlasting gospel, and to direct the affairs connected with the church of God. If God chooses men to do his work, then he speaks through them, and these persons stand, as it were, in the place of God; they are his representatives. To rebel against their counsel or reproof, is to rebel against God. We see this illustrated in the case of Moses and the children of Israel. {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.8}

But there are many who do not look at the matter in this light. If they are reproved, they make it a personal matter, and regard the reproof as persecution. Too many regard the church as a place of the enjoyment simply, and the service of God as a continual holiday. They mistake self-enjoyment for the enjoyment of religion, and think that they are enjoying much of the Spirit of God, because nothing happens to mar their complacency. As soon as something occurs, of the nature to rouse them to a sense of responsibility, they are sure that something is wrong, and equally sure the fault is not with themselves. {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.9}

An instance of this Spirit came under our observation some time ago. A member of the United Brethren Church was questioned rather closely by his pastor, as to his faithfulness in the performance of certain duties. The implied rebuke was not exactly welcomed, but it was well-deserved. But the self-righteous brother did not take kindly. In conversation with a friend soon afterwards, he expressed his determination to leave the church to which he belonged, and join the Methodists. Said he, “I want to go where I can feel at home and enjoy myself. I have not had real enjoyment since I belonged to this church.” We thought that his estimate of the Methodist Church was anything but complementary. {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.10}

If a person’s sole object is to enjoy himself, why not leave the church altogether? If the state of feeling constitutes religion, then the unthinking the devotees of fashion and vice are truly pious. The devil does not trouble his servants; he is pleased to have them enjoy themselves. Not so the Lord. “Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.” If we have wandered from the narrow path (and who is not in danger of stumbling?), we should rejoice that God does not leave us alone. It is an evidence that he loves us; that he has not cast us off as worthless branches. Is it wise to spurn the very proofs which God gives us of his love? No; rather let the language of Paul be ours: “Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or stored? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as if sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors for him that loved us.” E. J. W. {SITI March 8, 1883, p. 116.11}

**“Time of Christ’s Resurrection.—Questions” The Signs of the Times, 9, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following questions have been received from a subscriber who does not agree with the position taken in a short article a few weeks ago-that Christ rose from the grave on the first day of the week:- {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.1}

“1. What are we to understand by Daniel 9:27: ‘and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease’?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.2}

The time mentioned in this chapter is prophetic time-one day standing for a year. The one week of verse 27 then, is seven years, and the seventy years, and the seventy weeks of verse 24 are 490 years. This period is divided into three portions-seven weeks, sixty-two weeks, and one week. The first two portions (sixty-nine weeks, 483 years) were to reach to the Messiah. Verse 25. They ended when Christ commenced his work as the Messiah, the Anointed, at his baptism. It was to this period that he referred when he went into Galilee proclaiming, “The time is fulfilled.” Mark 1:15. But there yet remained one week (seven years) of the seventy weeks of years; and it was in the midst of this that Christ was to be cut off, *i.e.*, crucified. In fulfillment of this, Christ was crucified just three and one-half years from his baptism. This is the interpretation given by all commentators; with it the prophecy is the strongest proof of the Messiahship of Christ; without it, the prophecy cannot be explained. We would ask our friend to give an explanation of this entire chapter, and tell us where the seventy weeks apply, if they are only 490 literal days. An attempt to prove from this chapter that Christ was crucified on Wednesday, will involve the person making it in hopeless confusion. For an explanation of this prophecy in detail, see “Thoughts on the Book of Daniel,” for sale at this Office. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.3}

“Question is stated so obscurely that it is impossible to tell what is meant. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.4}

“3. Did the Passover that year come on fifth-day?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.5}

It undoubtedly commenced at the close of the fifth day, or what we now term Thursday night. It was at this time that the Passover supper was eaten. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.6}

“4. Were their feast days ever termed Sabbaths? Leviticus 23:2.” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.7}

Yes; read the remainder of Leviticus 23, especially verse 32, and you can see for yourself. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.8}

“5. Could the women that saw where he was laid have had time to prepare spices before the weekly Sabbath, if it was sixth-day at sunset that he was laid in the tomb?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.9}

“*If* it was sixth-day at sunset” that Christ was laid in the tomb, of course nothing could have been done after that before the beginning of the Sabbath, as it would have been already Sabbath. But where did you learn that it was sunset when the burial took place? The Bible does not intimate such a thing. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 127.10}

“6. Did not the earthquake happen at sunset (in the end of the Sabbath), the same time of day that he was laid in the grave? Matthew 28:1, 2.” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.1}

No one can tell the time of the earthquake, since it is not revealed. The words, “In the end of the Sabbath,” referred to the time when the woman came to the sepulcher, and the earthquake had occurred when they made their visit. See margin of verse 2. Now are we to understand that the women came to the sepulcher on the Sabbath? Not if we have any regard for the harmony of Scripture, for the testimony of the most imminent critics. We regard it as beyond dispute that the accounts of this event as told by Matthew and Mark must agree. Mark says plainly that the visit of the women was “when the Sabbath was past.” The best authorities translate Matthew 28:1 in harmony with this. This is done, not to strain the text to make it agree with a preconceived idea, but because it more clearly expresses the real meaning of the original. Thus Dr. Clarke says on this text: “‘*After the end of the week;*’ this is the translation given by several eminent critics; and in this way the word *ophse* is used by the most eminent Greek writers.” He quotes several passages from Greek authors, in which the word *ophse*, here translated “end,” is used in the sense of “after.” Campbell and McKnight’s version of the text is, “Sabbath being over, and the first day of the week beginning to dawn.” Dr. Barnes says, “The word *end* here means the same as *after* the Sabbath-that is, after the Sabbath was fully completed or finished.” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.2}

We see then, from the combined testimony of the evangelists, that the visit to the sepulcher was made on the first day of the week; that Christ rose on the same day will be briefly shown in answer to the next question. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.3}

“7. Was Jonah three days and three nights in the whale’s belly? If so, may we not conclude that Jesus was three whole days and nights in the heart of the earth?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.4}

Yes; if you will first prove that Jonah was “three whole days and nights” in the whale’s belly. You assume the very thing that ought to be proved in order to make your argument sound. But that *cannot* be proved, as the Bible makes no such assertion. It does say that “*as* Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, *so* shall the Son of man the three days in the heart of the earth.” Matthew 12:46. This gives us no more light than we had before; but by collating the texts which speak of Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection, we shall have an inspired comment on the expression, “three days and three nights.” In addition to the one already quoted, we give the following:- {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.5}

“From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go if unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again *the third day*.” Matthew 16:21. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.6}

“And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and *the third day* he shall rise again.” Matthew 20:17-19. See also chap. 17:23. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.7}

“And he began to teach them, that the Son of man, suffer many things, and the rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and *after three days* rise again.” Mark 8:31. See also Mark 9:30, 31. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.8}

“Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted upon; and they shall scourge him, and put him to death; and *the third day* he shall rise again.” Luke 18:31-33. See also chap. 9:22. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.9}

We have given all the different expressions used concerning this event. Remember that these texts are the language of our Lord himself, and that in all of them he is speaking of only the one thing. Now since we cannot allow that Jesus would contradict himself, or that he would state the case differently on one occasion from what he did on another, we must admit that the expressions, “three days and three nights,” “after three days,” and “the third day,” all designate precisely the same period of time. Let this be borne in mind. Now one more text will show what Christ meant by the expression, “the third day.” When told that Herod would kill him, he replied, “Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold I cast out devils, and I do curse to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.” Luke 13:32. This text cannot be made plainer by comment. No one would think that by it he meant to include more than a part of two days, with one whole day intervening. But remember still that the expressions, “three days and three nights,” and “after three days,” are used of the same period of time. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.10}

One step more concludes this brief argument. Christ was crucified on Friday, and was buried toward the close of that day. We learn this from Luke 23:53, 54: “And he [Joseph] took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulcher that was soon in stone, where in never man before was laid. And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.” From verse 56 we learn that this was the weekly Sabbath, as it is distinguished as being the Sabbath of the commandment.” See Exodus 20:8-11. Keeping in mind the fact that Christ was not to rise till *the third day*, we readily see that he could not have risen on the Sabbath, as that would have been only the second day. So we are forced to conclude that he rose on first-day; and this exactly fulfills his prediction, as we have already proved. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.11}

“8. Do not the Scriptures affirm that these things happened as he said before his crucifixion?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.12}

Yes; see answer to question 7 for proof that they did. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.13}

“9. Do we gain or lose by compromising this question with our opponents?” {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.14}

We always lose by compromising with the error, and we lose just as much, and even more, by denying a fact, no matter how important the truth which we are trying to sustain. Indeed, the greater the truth for which we are arguing, the more necessary is it that we make no false assumptions. Those who hold the view that our friend does, seem to think that it is impossible for an opponent to have *any* truth on his side. The Sabbath cause is not strengthened by such an assumption. There is probably no error that has not some truth in its composition. The reason why so many err in regard to Bible doctrine is not because they hold to no truth, but because they draw false conclusions from the truth that they do hold. Now we must reject their error, but we must not with it throw away the truth. Deadly poison may be carried in a silver cup; but we need not throw away the cup in order to get rid of the poison. Many persons argue most zealously that the fourth commandment is still in force, and binding upon all men, and claim that it enjoins the observance of the first day of the week. Shall we, in order to refute their claim, deny the fourth commandment? By no means; we simply show that their conclusion is unwarranted from their premises. So in regard to the question before us. First-day keepers, driven to extremities for a warrant for their practice, claim that the fact that Jesus rose on the first day of the week sanctifies that day. But their conclusion is unsound, for it has nothing to support it. The resurrection of Christ had no effect whatever on the Sunday. If anyone tells us that it did, we shall simply ask him to give us Bible proof of the fact. If he had risen on Sabbath it would not have added one whit to the sacredness of that day. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.15}

It is strange that our friends cannot see that by attempting to prove that Christ rose on Sabbath instead of on Sunday, they virtually admit that first-day keepers are correct in their argument. It is they, and not we, who are compromising with our opponents. By the course which they pursue, they proclaim their belief that the day on which Christ rose became in consequence of that action, the Sabbath. Now as you cannot convince a Sunday-keeper, or indeed anybody who carefully considers the matter, that Christ did not rise on Sunday, you lose all power to convince them that the seventh day is the Sabbath. You can do nothing further with them. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.16}

These questions might have been considered at much greater length. If all the conflicting opinions had been given, one issue of the SIGNS would not have contained them. But, having considered them all, we have tried to state as clearly and briefly as possible the view that harmonizes with the Bible narrative. We have treated the subject at some greater length, not because we think the subject itself worthy of such consideration, but because we know that Sabbath truth is in danger of being brought into disrepute by the injudicious course of some of its friends. Truth differs from error in that it does not depend on technicalities. We are not obliged to resort to “doubtful disputations” in support of the Sabbath. God has spoken plainly in regard to it; and we can find no stronger evidence than the unchanging word of God. The Sunday lacks the support, as can be easily shown. God has made ample provision for the support of his truth; we do not need to manufacture evidence. It is a trick of the enemy to cause those who would defend the truth, to turn aside from the main point and discuss unimportant questions. Do not be thus deceived. We have an important truth to present to the world. Let us do it faithfully and understandingly, using the arguments that God has provided for us, and not those which the enemy would put into our hands. E. J. W. {SITI March 15, 1883, p. 128.17}

**“The Complete Evidence for Sunday-keeping” The Signs of the Times, 9, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is often the case when our ministers present the truth of the Sabbath question in a place where it has not before been preached, that they are met with this rejoinder from those who cannot but admit that their argument is sound, “That is *your* side of the question; now we want to hear our ministers present *their* side, and perhaps your position will not appear so strong; we want to hear both sides of the question.” The desire to hear both sides of any subject is commendable, and our ministers usually gratify this desire by giving all the Sunday arguments themselves. But this often does not satisfy. The people want to hear the Sunday case presented by its own friends, so that they can feel assured that it is done in the best possible manner. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.1}

We have in our hands that which will certainly satisfy these anxious ones. It is nothing less than “the fullest authority” for Sunday-keeping. This means both that it is all the authority there is, and all that is needed. We advise all who have to meet the objection stated above, to carry this summary of the Sunday case with them, as it will be of value. Then they can give “the other side” as stated by one of its strongest supporters. The statement is found in the “Dictionary of the Bible,” by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, and one of the members of the International Revision Committee. So it is no novice whose testimony we are giving, but one eminently qualified to present the case fairly. Here it is:- {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.2}

“The Christian Church keeps the first day of the week, which celebrates the close of the spirituals creation just as the last day celebrated the close of the physical creation. We have the fullest warrant for this change. Upon the first day of the week Christ arose from the dead. We find the disciples, before the ascension, assembled on that day, and Jesus appeared to them. John 20:26. According to tradition, which is confirmed by every probability, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost was on Sunday. Paul preached at Troas on the first day of the week-evidently, among those Christians, the day of religious service. Acts 20:7. Paul tells the Corinthians every one is to lay by him in store upon the first day of the week as he is prospered. 1 Corinthians 16:2. It was upon the Lord’s day-and by this name he calls it-that John on Patmos saw through the opened door into Heaven. Revelation 1:10.” {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.3}

We agree with the author that this is “the fullest warrant” for the change, in as much as it is all that can be produced; but we think even many observers of the Sunday, when they think seriously of the matter, will decide that the “warrant” is not full enough to warrant any one in putting confidence in it as the command of God. “Warrant” is defined by Webster as follows: “That which warrants or authorizes; a commission giving authority, or justify the doing of anything; an act, instrument, or obligation, by which one person authorizes another to do something which he has not otherwise a right to do.” But it would puzzle the most acute lawyer to discover in the above simple statements anything having the nature of a commission, or act authorizing anybody to keep Sunday. If we may venture to criticize so great a man, we will examine the items of his statement one by one. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.4}

First. “Upon the first day of the week Christ arose from the dead.” True, and we may also add that he was crucified on Friday. Both are interesting items of information, and that is all. His resurrection on first-day no more makes it the Sabbath than his crucifixion on sixth-day makes that they one. To make it a “warrant” for Sunday-keeping, a statement, or commandment to that effect is needed, from one having authority to issue commands. The changed commandment would necessarily read something like this: “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, having first rested on the first day, for the first day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.... For Christ rose from the dead on the first day; wherefore the Lord blessed the first day and hallowed it.” It would not do to say, as the commandment does, that he blessed the Sabbath day, for since the first day had never been rested upon, it was not a Sabbath. But, no such commandment exists; not even a reference to it. And by the way, is it not singular that none of the apostles refer to the day of Christ’s resurrection? They speak of his resurrection, and of the hope that we have through it; but they had not learned that the time of the event was of any significance whatever. That was reserved for men of more modern times. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.5}

Second, “We find the disciples, before his ascension, assembled on that day, and Jesus appeared to them.” Admitted; but where is the “warrant”? We may add that they were also assembled on Thursday, the day of his ascension, and Jesus met with them and blessed them. Did that make the fifth day the Sabbath? It does, if all that was required to make a Sabbath was for Jesus to meet with his disciples. There is precisely as much warrant in the Bible for keeping first day as there is for keeping Sunday. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.6}

Third, “According to tradition, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost was on Sunday.” And so our “warrant” depends on tradition after all. This would hardly be accepted as evidence in court. Moreover the tradition is not unquestioned, for many eminent commentators claim that Pentecost came that year on Monday; others claim that it was Sabbath. And most of all, it is of no earthly consequence on what day it came, since the day is not mentioned, and no intimation is given that it was henceforth to be a Sabbath. In order to furnish even a inferential evidence that it was to be a Sabbath, our friends must prove (1) that the day was Sunday; (2) that the Holy Ghost always was manifest upon Sunday; (3) that it never came upon any other day; and (4) that the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon a company of people sanctifies the day on which it occurs. But none of these things can be proven, and if they could, the important thing-a commandment-would be lacking. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.7}

Fourth, “Paul preached at Troas on the first day of the week.” True; and we also find that the inspired apostles, fresh from the baptism of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, continued “daily with one accord in the temple,” and that the Lord added souls to the church “daily.” What an array of sabbaths there are for which we have “the fullest warrant.” {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.8}

But the Doctor says that this day was “*evidently* among those Christians the day of religious service.” That means that the fact that the church at Troas kept Sunday is evident, easily to be seen, plainly manifest, obvious, clear to the understanding, notorious. But such is not the case, since there is no evidence that they had ever met together on the first day before, or ever did again. Nevertheless, Paul preached on a Sunday once, and if that doesn’t make it the Sabbath, what would? Sure enough. Since Paul’s action is to decide the case, let us examine it further. In Acts 13 we are told that Paul preached at Antioch on the Sabbath day; that he also preached on “the next Sabbath day.” We also read in Acts 17:2 that at Thessalonica “Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.” Also that at Corinth “he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath day, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.” Acts 18:4. Is it not singular that our friends forget to mention these instances when they cite Paul’s single sermon on the first day of the week as authority for the sanctification of that day? But we pass on, for we find no “warrant” here. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.9}

Fifth, “Paul tells the Corinthians that every one is to lay by him in store upon the first day of the week, as he is prospered.” This laying by in store, was to be done at home, *i.e.*, each individual was to look over his accounts and deposit, in a drawer set apart for that purpose, a portion of the earnings of the preceding week. See Barnes, Scott, and others. So it seems that even business transactions make the day sacred. Or, perhaps the day is sacred to the transaction of business. At any rate we look in vain at this simple statement for any command to keep Sunday. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.10}

6. “It was upon the Lord’s day that John on Patmos saw through the open door into Heaven.” Well, and what day of the week was that? “Oh, we have decided that it was Sunday. To be sure it was never before called the Lord’s day, and the seventh day *was* so called; but that makes the difference. We are bound to keep Sunday, and want some warrant for it, so we call it the Lord’s day. What! you want proof that John applied the title Lord’s day to Sunday? Don’’ *we* do it? What further proof do you want?” Such, in substance, is the Sunday argument from Revelation 1:10. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.11}

We have analyzed our learned author’s statement, and find no “warrant” at all. In the whole of it there is nothing which can be construed into a commission, or an act giving authority. If it had been previously declared to be wrong to keep Sunday as a Sabbath (as it really is in the fourth commandment), no one could gather from this summary anything that would justify him in so doing; but that, according to Webster, is what is required in order to constitute a “warrrant.” Such is the foundation on which the Sunday rests. Our only apology for taking up so much space with this matter is that it is confessedly all the argument which our Sunday friends have, according to the best authority in the United States. As we pause, it seems like a waste of time to review such “arguments,” yet they are gravely put forth by a man who is doubtless not excelled in learning by any man in the country, and they are firmly relied on by thousands of intelligent and well-meaning persons. What is it that has so blinded the minds of the people? Dr. Schaff concludes his summary of evidence thus: {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 139.12}

“The first day of the week is there for the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest and worship.” So he rests his case fully upon the evidence presented. He continues, “And God has further confirmed the change by giving it his blessing, as he blessed the sabbath of creation week.” Where did he learn this? Where is it stated of the first day, as it is of the seventh, that God blessed it and hallowed it? Nowhere. Elihu, the friend of Job, said, “Great men are not always wise;” and we are reluctantly forced to add the statement that great men are not always honest. We do not take pleasure in speaking of the weakness or fault of any one, but we do take pleasure in being able to show that the Sunday Sabbath rests on simple assertions, and that the only one of these assertions which would in any way affect the nature of the day, is wholly false. It is in this way that the commandment of God has been made of none effect. We refer our readers to Ezekiel 22:26-31, quoting only verse 26, and leave them to make the application for themselves: “And her prophets have daubed with on tempered mortar, seen vanity, and devining lies unto them, saying, Thus saith the Lord God, when the Lord hath not spoken.” May the Lord give the people a willingness to look for themselves, and see what the Lord really has spoken. E. J. W. {SITI March 22, 1883, p. 140.1}