**“Is It a Violation of the Sabbath?” The Signs of the Times, 9, 14.**

E. J. Waggoner

From a gentleman in Iowa what we have received the following:- {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.1}

“Several of my Adventist neighbors claim to conform to all the teachings of Bible, and still they tend to a great many horses, cattle, and hogs, and hitch up and drive their horses some nine miles to meeting on Saturday; I claim that every one of these acts is in direct violation of passages and the Bible. I refer to the fourth commandment, Exodus 23:12; 31:15, etc. F. C.” {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.2}

In answering this we will leave the hogs out of the question, and consider the stock merely as horses and cattle,-animals that are useful to man. The hog was an unclean animal long before the time of Moses, and his nature remains the same under the gospel dispensation. Man may be purified by the gospel; the hog never can. He is simply a scavenger, and should no more be raised and eaten than should the vulture or the buzzard. If the Sabbath is ever desecrated by the care of animals, it is certainly done when that care is bestowed upon the filthy swine. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.3}

But, hogs aside, is it a violation of the Sabbath to take care of stock on that day? The answering of another question will go far toward settling this. Is it right to keep stock at all? Most certainly it is, will be the reply of everybody. The commandment itself recognizes that cattle will be kept. They are necessary to man’s existence. Then we answer that the person who has such a Pharisaic regard for the Sabbath that he will let the dumb brutes which are dependent on him suffer for food and water, would do well to “go and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.” The Scribes and Pharisees accused Jesus of breaking the Sabbath, because he healed the sick on that day; but he showed them, Luke 13:11-17, that to relieve the sick of their infirmities was as proper as to lead their dumb animals to water in order that they might not suffer. Both are acts of mercy, and as such may be done on the Sabbath-day, upon which it is lawful to do good. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.4}

Of course judgment must be used. We have simply stated the bare fact that it is proper to care for stock on the Sabbath. But we are aware that unnecessary work is performed on the Sabbath; many things are done that might have been provided for the day before; but this does not disprove the truth of our statement. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.5}

Now as to hitching up a team and driving to meeting. Whether or not this is a violation of the commandment depends on the purpose for which we go to meeting. The commandment says of “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all *thy* work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” It forbids the doing of *any work*, and yet, by the express command of God, the priest did manual labor on the Sabbath-day, in preparing in changing the showbread, and making extra offerings, and were of course blameless. See Leviticus 24:5-8; Numbers 28:9, 10; Matthew 12:5. Why were they blameless? Because they were doing the Lord’s work. Then we learn that when the commandment says that we shall not do any work it means that we shall not do our own work. So if we go to meeting simply for a pleasant drive, or to exchange gossip with acquaintances whom we cannot conveniently meet on any other day, it is undoubtedly a sin; but if we go to worship God, it is pleasing to him. This will answer the objection on Exodus 23:12. If men may do certain work (the Lord’s work) on the Sabbath without violating the commandment, then it is evident that they may use their beasts whenever it is necessary to the accomplishment of that work. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.6}

“It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day.” This means not merely that we are permitted to do good on the Sabbath-day, but that we are under obligation to do so; “lawful” means, “conformable to law; constituted by law.” If we do not too good on the Sabbath-day, then we are Sabbath-breakers. To lie in bed the greater part for the whole of the Sabbath, unless on account sickness or to lazily lounge about the house, is most emphatically a violation of the fourth commandment. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.7}

We do not know our friend’s religious opinions, but we judge him to be one who does not keep the Sabbath, and who seeks to justify himself in his course by magnifying the real or imaginary faults of others. This is a very frequently done. But if this be his position he has condemned himself, for if he means what he says when he criticizes the action of his neighbors, he believes that the Bible teaches the observance of the seventh day. Then we would tell him in all kindness that their misdeeds will not justify him. If his neighbors are doing wrong, that will not excuse him for doing wrong too. If his neighbors do violate the Sabbath, that will not take away a particle of his guilt if he breaks it also. His only course is to set them an example of well-doing. But let him be careful not to base his action on a distorted view of a single passage. The Bible is not divided against itself, and no one can go astray who follows its teachings as a whole. As the gospel is of no force without the law, so the law cannot be understood without the gospel. “See that ye refuse not him that speaketh” both in the Old Testament and in the New. E. J. W. {SITI April 5, 1883, p. 164.8}

**“The Sabbath-School. Acts 1:11-26; 2:1-21. Pentecost” The Signs of the Times, 9, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

**Pentecost**

This was one of the three feasts of the Jews, at which all the males were required to appear before the Lord, at the place of the sanctuary. Exodus 23:14, 17; Deuteronomy 16:16. The name is the English form of the Greek word *pentekostos*, meaning *fiftieth*. The feast received this name because it was celebrated on the fiftieth day from the second day of the Passover. It was also called “the feast of weeks.” Exodus 34:22; Deuteronomy 16:10. The particulars in regard to the time and object of this feast, and the ceremonies connected with it, are given in Leviticus 23:15-21; but in order to understand it thoroughly it must be studied in connection with the Passover, the time from which the fifty days are reckoned. And since some have a difficulty in tracing this connection, from a misunderstanding of the use of the word “Sabbath” in this chapter, we will refer to the points in regard to these two feasts. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.1}

1. The Passover commenced at the close of the fourteenth day of the first month. Leviticus 23:5; at this time the paschal lamb was slain. Exodus 12:6. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.2}

2. The feast of unleavened bread commenced the next morning, the fifteenth day of the first month, and continued seven days. Leviticus 23:6; Exodus 12:15, 18, 19. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.3}

3. This first day of unleavened bread was to be a holy convocation, and which no servile work was to be done. Leviticus 23:6, 7; Exodus 12:15, 16. It was a sabbath (a rest) because they did no work in it; but it was entirely distinct from the weekly “Sabbath of Lord” (Leviticus 23:38), for it came only once a year, and on a fixed day of the month, and consequently would not fall on the same day of the week for two years in succession. The people were also allowed to prepare food upon this annual sabbath, a thing which they were forbidden to do on the weekly Sabbath. Compare Exodus 12:16 with Exodus 16:23, etc. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.4}

4. On the second day of unleavened bread, the day following the “holy convocation,” the priest waved a sheaf of the first-fruits of the harmless, before the Lord. Leviticus 23:10, 11. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.5}

5. It was from this second day of the feast-“the morrow after the Sabbath”-that the fifty days were counted. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.6}

From these points will be readily seen that the feast of Pentecost was a movable feast, being celebrated each year on a different day of the week from what was the year before. It will also be seen that Pentecost fell on the same day of the week as the second day of unleavened bread, but fifty days later. So when the fourteenth day of the first month fell on Monday, the Passover sabbath would come on Tuesday. Wednesday would be the second day of the feast-“the morrow after the Sabbath”-and Pentecost would come on Wednesday, fifty days later. Thus, knowing what day of the week the Passover began in any given year, any one can tell on what day of the week Pentecost came up that same year. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.7}

To avoid all confusion, it should be remembered that the word “sabbath,” in Leviticus 23:15, 16, is used with two different significations. In the first instance, where we read, “the morrow after the Sabbath,” the Passover sabbath is referred to-the first day of unleavened bread. In the second instance, where it says, “seven sabbaths shall be complete,” the word means “week,” viz., “seven *weeks* shall be complete.” On this passage, Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, says: “Sometimes *a sabbath* is nearly equivalent to *a week*.” Then he quotes verse 16, and says: “Here the *seven complete sabbaths* are parallel to the *seven weeks* of Deuteronomy 16:9.” {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.8}

First-day writers give as one of their chief reasons for Sunday observance the supposed fact that the Pentecost of our lesson came on the first day of the week. Whether it did or not is a matter of no special importance, and we will not take space to discuss the question. There is, and doubtless always will be, a difference of opinion in regard to it, because there is a disagreement as to the time when the Passover commenced that year. Some claim that the lamb was slain on Thursday night, thus making Friday the first day of the feast, in which case Pentecost would have occurred on Sabbath. Others claim that Friday was the fourteenth day of the month, the proper time for slaying the lamb, in which case Pentecost would have fallen on Sunday. If any one is curious to form an opinion for himself, let him decide from the Bible account, on what day the Passover began, and count forward. If it could be prove that it fell on Saturday, it would not add one whit to the sacredness of that day. The Sabbath depends on no such inference for its sacredness, but on the direct commandment of God. If it fell on Sunday, that day gains nothing by it, in the utter absence of any Scripture testimony for Sunday sacredness. After giving different opinions as to when this Pentecost came, Dr. Barnes says: “It is impossible to determine the truth on this subject. Nor is it of much importance.” And this is the truth. Rev. C. H. Parkhurst, commenting on this point, artlessly says: “There is not an agreement of opinion as to whether the Pentecost of our chapter fell on Saturday for on Sunday. There is in the church an old tradition that it fell on Sunday. It certainly would be pleasant to suppose that such was the case.” Before any argument for Sunday observance can be reasonably based on the Pentecost, if must first be proved beyond a doubt that Pentecost fell on Sunday, and then it must be shown from the Bible that the descent of the Holy Ghost made the day on which it occurred a holy day. As neither of these can be shown, the sacredness of Sunday exists only in the imagination of its devotees. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.9}

Among the multitude that assemble on the day of Pentecost there were two classes of hearers placed in strong contrast. First, there were “devout men;” men who were not merely pious, but were thoughtful, cautious, and circumspect. They were full of reverence toward God, and desirous of serving him; yet they would not jump at conclusions. When they served the Lord they did it understandingly. So when they saw the wonderful manifestations of the Holy Spirit, they inquired, “What meaneth this?” there was in this question nothing of ridicule or of obstinate doubt; but there was a spirit of earnest seeking for truth. There can be no question but that they were among the three thousand converts, for the Saviour said, “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine.” {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.10}

But “others mocking said, these men are full of new wine.” These persons are fairly represented by the seed sown by the wayside. Matthew 13:4, 19. Satan caught away the seed almost before it fell on the hard ground of their hearts. They were unthinking persons, whose strongest argument was a coarse jest. Their representatives are very numerous to-day. They oftener frequent barrooms than churches. Sometimes like Ingersoll, they are found in high positions, but they rarely lose the characteristics of their class. They have little influence over sober, thoughtful, intelligent people; yet they are active agents for Satan, for there is a large class who are deceived by them, thinking that their light, flippant way of treating things is a mark of superior wisdom. They themselves imagine that they have a logical mind, too great to stoop to entertain for a moment so foolish a thing as religion. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.11}

To carefully and candidly weigh a matter is a mark of a truly great mind. When a man stoops to ridicule and cast slurs upon that which he does not understand, he stamps himself at once as a man of feeble intellect. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.12}

There are some points in the portion of the prophecy of Joel quoted by Peter, that are worthy of note. It proves conclusively that we are living in the last days, for if it was in the last days when Peter was preaching, how much more applicable must the term be now? The “last days” may include many days before the last day; that we are now in the very last days may be learned from other Scriptures. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.13}

It proves also that the gifts of the Spirit will be manifested, to a greater or less degree, even until the end of time; for the “last days” must include the last day. If it is true, as some claim, these peculiar manifestations of the Spirit ceased at the death of the apostles, then the Scripture has failed; but “the Scripture cannot be broken,” we may still look for the out-pouring of the Spirit. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.14}

We must then expect prophesying and visions even until the end; and this is just what Paul brings to view in Ephesians 4:8-13. It is not said that everyone shall prophesy, or see visions, or dream dreams, but the Spirit will operate this way upon some, “till we all come into the unity of the faith.” There will always be many, as there were then, who will jeer and ridicule; but the “devout,” candid persons will search to know what these things mean. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.15}

Others mocking said, “These men are full of new wine.” There is a difference of opinion among authorities as to whether or not this “new wine” was intoxicating. Those who claim that it was, seem to derive their argument from Peter’s defense-that they were not drunk. If it were true that the wine mentioned was of an intoxicating nature, the charge of drunkennes was most successfully refuted by Peter; for (1) it was not customary to be drunk in the daytime. See 1 Thessalonians 5:7; and (2) it was a regular practice with the Jews not to eat or drink *anything* until after the third hour of the day, on the Sabbath, and on all festival occasions. Sometimes they abstained from food and drink even till noon. So then it was impossible that they were drunk. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.16}

But the weight of evidence favors the idea that the wine of which they spoke was the unfermented juice of the grape. See article on page 177. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.17}

But if the “new wine” was not intoxicating wherein lay the force of the charge? Bear in mind that no formal charge of drunkennes was made against the disciples. “Others *mocking* said,” etc. The original word occurs but in one other place in the New Testament, Acts 17:32. It means, to jest, to joke, to jeer, to ridicule, to laugh at. In this case the ridicule consisted, as Prof. Isaac Hall says, in the implication that the new wine would be too much for the weak heads that were turned with the new doctrine. The Syriac version favors this view, rendering the passage thus: “Others however ridiculed them, saying: They have drunken new wine, and are intoxicated.” This would indeed be ridicule; but if we understand that they really charged the disciples with being drunk, then it ceases to be ridicule, and becomes a serious matter, especially as this was a solemn feast-day. But there is no reason to suppose that these persons meant to make any charge against the disciples; they were merely light-headed fellows who were unable to resist the temptation to a joke, in order that they might laugh at their own cheap wit. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.18}

Why, then, did Peter proceed to gravely refute the implied charge? Why did he not pass it by, or treat it as a joke? Because he was “filled with the Holy Ghost,” and it did not become him to answer a fool according to his folly. The time was too solemn for jesting. Besides, the merest jest is often taken in earnest, and repeated as a fact. Their words might reach some who were not present, and seriously prejudice them against the apostles’ work. So with becoming dignity, Peter settles the matter beyond dispute, and then goes on with his discourse. Preachers in modern times, who are handling sacred themes, may safely follow Peter’s example on this occasion. E. J. W. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 173.19}

**“Establishment of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 9, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Exodus 20:8-11. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.1}

If there were no other facts given concerning the Sabbath than those contained in the above commandment, we would still have everything that is needed to guide us to its proper observance. Indeed, since it is the law on the subject, we should expect as much, even without reading it, for a law concerning anything must contain within itself all the affirmation necessary to enable one to obey it understandingly. This is the case with the other precepts of the decalogue. They are explicit, allowing no chance for differences of opinion. The only difference between the fourth commandment and the rest is that it is more full and explicit than any of them. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.2}

But the wise man has truly said, “God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions;” and for no purpose have “inventions” been more persistently sought out than for the purpose of the evading the plain import of this fourth commandment. Many are not satisfied with the simple reading of the law, vainly thinking that somewhere in the record of God’s dealings with men, they will find that which will warrant them in disregarding his spoken word. It therefore is necessary to consider everything that has a bearing on the subject. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.3}

It is evident that a law can never mean anything more or less than it did when first pronounced. If the conditions on which the law is based change, or the will of the law-giver changes concerning these conditions, then the law itself may be changed; but such change must be clearly indicated. The terms of the law must be changed, for another law enacted with the express declaration that it is to supersede the first. Until this is done, the original law remains in full force, even though the will of the law-making power should change; for how can the people know the will of the power having authority, unless that will is plainly expressed? {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.4}

Again, if any change in a law is made, the new law must not only be expressed in as clear language as the old, but it must be as widely circulated. All who are subject to the law and are expected to keep it, must be informed of the change, or else they cannot keep it. To punish a person for the violation of a law with which he had been allowed to become familiar, would be an act of injustice. God does not so deal with his creatures. In every instance when the execution of his judgments is recorded, we are plainly informed as to the command which was violated; and a penalty is never threatened in the Bible without an explicit statement being made of what course of action will make one liable to that penalty. With these statements, we proceed to dissect, as it were, the Sabbath law, to see if it really means what it appears to; and we will also see if it has in any way been modified, or been superseded by another law. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.5}

It is evident from the reading of the fourth commandment that the Sabbath did not originated at Sinai, for we are referred to the creation of the earth, and told that at the conclusion of that work God “blessed” and “hallowed” the Sabbath day. It must, therefore, have been in existence at that time; a thing that has no existence cannot be blessed, neither can it be hallowed. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.6}

This will be still more evident when we consider the meaning of the word “hallow.” Webster defines it thus: “To make holy; to set apart for holy or religious use; to consecrate.” The word in the original is defined similarly. It is the same word that is rendered “sanctified” in Genesis 2:3, and “appoint” in Joshua 20:7. The fourth commandment, then, tells us plainly that God commanded the Sabbath to be kept holy in the beginning. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.7}

Turning to the first chapter of Genesis we read the record of the first six days of time, in which the heavens and the earth, and all that they contain, were created, the work of each day being specified. At the close of the sixth day God looked over the whole of his creation “and behold, it was a very good.” He was satisfied with his work, because it was perfect. The record continues:- {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.8}

“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Genesis 2:1-3. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.9}

We have here the record of the first Sabbath commandment. That in Exodus 20:8-11 is the same in every respect, being simply a renewal of the commandment as given at creation. In the institution of the Sabbath there was a three-fold act on the part of God. First, he rested on the seventh day. This made that day Sabbath, for Sabbath means rest. Because the Lord rested, it is called the Sabbath, or rest, of the Lord. But this act did not place man under any obligation to rest on that day. If the record stopped here, we would have no interest in it except as a matter of history. Second, God pronounced a blessing upon the day. It was thus exalted above other days in that it was a Sabbath, and blessed; still these two acts were not sufficient to make its observance obligatory on man. Third, he sanctified the day, that is, set it apart for holy or religious use: he appointed that it should be regarded holy. This was the crowning act which placed man under obligation to keep it. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.10}

Let it be remembered that it required these three acts to institute the Sabbath in the beginning. It certainly can take nothing less to institute a new Sabbath, should there be such a thing; and therefore whenever we find men claiming that some other day is entitled to recognition as the true Sabbath, we have only to apply these tests: Did God ever rest upon it? Did he ever pronounce a blessing upon it? Did he ever pronounce it holy, and set it apart for sacred observance? If these three questions in regard to any other day cannot be truthfully answered by a simple affirmation, then that day does not approach in honor and sacredness to the original Sabbath of the Lord. Man may rest upon any other day, and that day will thus become his rest, or sabbath; but man cannot pronounce a blessing upon the day, thus elevating it above other days, neither can he sanctify the day; he cannot make it holy, and he has no right to command anybody else to rest upon it. And since there is no record that God ever did these three things for any other day than the seventh, that day stands alone, distinguished above all other days as being the Sabbath of the Lord. E. J. W. {SITI April 12, 1883, p. 175.11}

**“Extent of the Sabbath Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 9, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

Although there is no indication either in the Sabbath commandment as spoken from Mount Sinai, or as recorded in Genesis 2:1-3, the fact that many claim that it was limited in its application, makes it necessary for us to consider the question. For whom was the Sabbath sanctified? or, in other words, who were commanded to keep the Sabbath holy? When we consider that the day was sanctified, *i.e.*, appointed or commanded, in Eden, there can be but one answer: The commandment was given to those then living. It is not possible that it could have been otherwise; that the account here is anticipative, and that the Sabbath was then sanctified for the use of some future generation. For to every command there must be two parties: the *one* commanding and the *one* commanded. A command cannot be made unless some one is present to receive it. In this case God issued the command, and Adam and Eve were the ones to whom it was directed. But they represent all who should afterward live upon the earth. See Genesis 3:20. It follows, then, that the Sabbath commandment embraces the whole world; all who have descended from Adam and Eve. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.1}

In harmony with this conclusion we have the words of our Saviour, in Mark 2:27: “The Sabbath was made for man,” this can be nothing less than the whole human race, for the word “man,” when used without any limiting word, means “mankind; the totality of men.” When the word is limited it means man to the exclusion of women; and no one will claim that women are not under obligation to keep the Sabbath, to whatever race or class of people the commandment is directed. No one will be found old enough to claim that the word “man” has a different meaning from what it has in Genesis 1:27; 2:7. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.2}

This being the case, it is manifestly improper to speak of the Sabbath as the “Jewish Sabbath,” for it belongs to no special class of men. It belongs to no man at all, but is the property of God; he claims it as his own. See commandment, also Isaiah 58:13, etc. If men, regardless of the commandment, choose to rest on some other day, they may call it *their* Sabbath, or give it the name they please; but the Bible speaks of only *one* Sabbath, and that is the one that the Lord claims as his own; to apply to that day any other term than that which the Lord gave it, is sacrilege. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.3}

We see that the commandment as given at creation and renewed on Sinai furnishes no warrant whatever to the idea that the Sabbath was to be local, or was given simply to the Jews. Not only this, but even in the Old Testament it is expressly stated that the Sabbath was not designed for the Jews alone. Thus we read: “Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil.... Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.” Isaiah 56:2, 6, 7. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.4}

The position of the commandment in the law of God is also enough of itself to convince any one that it is binding upon all men. Even profane persons will admit that it is wrong to take God’s name in vain; and then claim that there is any privileged class who may swear with impunity. The fifth commandment is almost universally disregarded, yet no one thinks of asserting that its obligation does not extend to all mankind. The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth are admitted to be of universal obligation, yet they are no more emphatic than the fourth, and the penalty for disregarding them is no more severe than that for violating the Sabbath commandment. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.5}

It is true that the Sabbath rests solely on the commandment. This is urged by some as an objection. They say that it was always wrong to kill or to steal, but was not always wrong to break the Sabbath, since the Sabbath did not always exist. As they claim that the Sabbath is not moral. To this we reply (1) That the Sabbath has existed ever since day and night existed; (2) That God has always been the Supreme Being, and it has always been wrong to disobey him. Therefore whenever he issues a command it is man’s moral duty to obey. (3) The Lord claims the Sabbath as his own; he calls it “my holy day;” he has set bounds about it, and forbidden man to trespass upon it, he warns us not to venture to take it for our own use. Now if we violate this commandment, we take that which is not our own, and are guilty of that, a thing which is admitted by all to be immoral. Many other proofs might be adduced to show the morality of the fourth commandment. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.6}

There are some who, to get rid of the Sabbath, make the bold claim that none of the law is binding; that it is all done way, and that Christians are under no obligation to law. With such we have nothing to do at present. Even they bear witness to the fact that the fourth commandment is of as much importance as any of the ten, because they plainly see that in order to get rid of it they have to throw all away. The fact that law is a unit, that it stands complete as a whole, and cannot be divided, will be noticed hereafter. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.7}

But although “the Sabbath was made for man,” it to does not thereby become his property, to do with as he pleases. It was made for his use, not for his abuse. Paul, in 1 Corinthians 11:9, says that the woman was made for the man. He does not mean that she was made to be the slave of man, who could be taken or put away at his pleasure, as in heathen lands, but that she was made as a help, a blessing to man. So the Sabbath was made *for* man, *i.e.*, not against him; it was designed to aid him both spiritually and physically. A farmer who has hired servants may, in order to lighten their labor, buy certain tools for them. But no one would suppose that the servants would have any right to sell those tools which their employer had thus purchased. All would understand that he bought them for the servants to *use*, and to use in his service only. On this subject the “Speakers Commentary” uses the following forcible language:- {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.8}

“On what principle of legislation can be maintained that, because laws are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with by the subject at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards all laws of man; still more as regards the laws of God.” E. J. W. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 187.9}

**“Faith and Presumption” The Signs of the Times, 9, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

A religious journal thinks that the following by a Sunday-school boy is the best definition of faith that it ever saw:- {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.1}

“As near as I can make out, it is feeling perfectly sure of a thing when you have nothing to back it up.” {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.2}

But that is not a definition of faith at all. It is more nearly a definition of presumption; in fact, it is an exact definition of presumption. We have known persons to whom the truth of the Sabbath question had been presented, and who had tried in vain to find even an excuse in the Bible for Sunday-keeping, to settle down complacently into their old habits, expressing their firm faith that God would not punish them, because they had so much love for him. Now their condition is exactly expressed by the above definition; they felt perfectly sure of a thing when they had nothing to back to give up. They were positive that Sunday is the Sabbath, although they could not bring a scrap of evidence to support their belief. They had strong faith that God would not punish them for violating his law, although he has plainly declared to the contrary. They had no faith at all; they were simply presumptuous. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.3}

No doubt the man whose case is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Numbers felt “fully assured” that he was all right. He did not believe that God was going to punish a man for so small a thing as picking up a few sticks on the Sabbath-day. He had too much faith in God and his goodness to think he would do such a thing. And yet his case is left on record as a typical case of presumption. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.4}

But “faith is the substance of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things not seen.” That is the inspired definition of faith. It cannot be that our contemporary ever read the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. There can be no faith without evidence. The Christian religion requires the exercise of less credulity than any other system of religion known. There are no men on earth who are so “perfectly sure” of a thing when they have “nothing to back it up” as modern infidels. They are always positive in their opinions, while at the same time they have literally “nothing” upon which to base them. According to the definition given, infidels would be men of the greatest faith; but they are simply terribly presumptuous. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.5}

We repeat, there can be no faith without evidence. The Christian may have the “full assurance of faith,” and he has no lack of matter with which to “back up” his belief. We believe that there is a God, all nature declares the fact. “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork.” The “invisible things” of God, *i.e.*, “his eternal power and Godhead,” are clearly seen from the things that he has made. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.6}

We believe the Bible to be the true word of God, because the prophecies bear, beyond all cavil, the mark of inspiration, and their fulfillment cannot be denied. But the Bible is so harmonious, and all its parts are so closely interwoven that it all stands or falls together. Nothing within the range of human reason is so easily demonstrated, as that the Bible is what it purports to be,-one inspired word of God. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.7}

We can then rely on the testimony of the Bible as on first principles. So when it assures us that the Lord will come the second time, and that his coming is near, we know it; and we can point to the evidence. And when we are told that in order to enter into life we must keep the commandments, we dare not presume upon God’s mercy by walking in a way which he has declared leads to death. We must confess to having so little faith that we cannot feel perfectly sure of a thing when there is nothing to back it up. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.8}

It is true that the Christian often seems, to the outside observer, to be walking blindly; to be accepting things as true, without having any evidence. But this is only seeming. It seems so because the skeptic looks at things from a different standpoint. A picture will often present a vastly different appearance when viewed in one position, from what it does to a person standing somewhere else. So there are things connected with God and his truth which worldlings can never understand. “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” Many things that appear perfectly reasonable to the Christian, and for which a perfectly logical reason can be given, are foolishness to the skeptic. It is as true now as ever, that “if any man will to do His will, he shall *know* of the doctrine.” There is no guess-work about the religion of the Bible. E. J. W. {SITI April 19, 1883, p. 188.9}

**“Comment on 2 Thessalonians 2:9” The Signs of the Times, 9, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

A question has been raised in regard to a statement on page 170, No. 15, of the present volume of the SIGNS, on 2 Thessalonians 2:9. The statement was: “In Paul’s second epistle to the Thessalonians, he exhorts to be on guard, and not depart from the faith. He speaks of Christ’s coming as an event to immediately follow the work of Satan in Spiritualism, in these words: ‘Even him who’s coming is after the working of safe and with all power and signs and lying wonders,’” etc. the objection is that the word “after,” in this verse, does not convey the idea of time, but of matter, and that it means “according to,” as it reads in the Revised Version. In this case the “coming” in verse nine would refer to the Man of Sin; and the verse, instead of making a point in regard to Christ’s coming, would simply teach that the work of the Man of Sin would be characterized by the spirit of Satan. We think it can be clearly proved that this verse refers to the time of Christ’s coming, and not to the manner in which the Man of Sin does his work. The argument will consist of two points: First, that the word here translated “after,” is often used with reference to time, and second, that the context requires that it should be so used in this passage. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 199.1}

It will be no news to state that one word often has a variety of meanings. This is not peculiar to the Greek or Latin; any one who is not aware of it, will need only to consult Webster’s Dictionary to find that it is true of the English language. This very word “after” is a case in point. It is used, as in Acts 13:22, to express conformity with, in the sense of “according;” it is used to express difference in location, as, The books are placed one after another; also to indicate movement towards any object, as, The constable is after the thief; and it is very commonly used to express difference in time. No one has any difficulty in determining from the general tenor of the passage with which meaning is employed. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 199.2}

The word “after’ in this case is from the Greek preposition *kata* (*kata*), which is used, in different constructions with a variety of meanings. It is often used to denote likeness, similarity, conformity with; but it is not true, as is intimated by those who claim that it should be so used here, that it never expresses time. We quote from the Lexicons those definitions of its use in the same construction as in the verse under consideration. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.1}

“VII. Of periods of time, throughout, during, for, *kata ton palemon* (*kata tou polemon*), during the war. *Kata* *Amansin* (*kata Amansin*), about the time of Amasis.”-*Liddell and Scott*. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.2}

“(25) In definitions of time, during, *kata ton polemon*, at the time of the war.”-*Pickering*. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.3}

“2. Of time, *i.e.*, a period of time *throughout, during, in,* or *at* which anything takes place.”-*Robinson*. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.4}

Of the corresponding word in the Vulgate. “Andrews’ Latin Lexicon” says: “In time or succession, *immediately after*, after, *next to*. (Quite classical.)” {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.5}

Following are some of the instances of the use of the word in the Bible, to express the idea of time:- {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.6}

“Now *at* that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.” Mark 15:6. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.7}

“Now *about* that time Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church.” Acts 12:1. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.8}

“And *at* midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God.” Acts 16:28. See also Acts 27:27. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.9}

“And the same time there arose no small stir about that way.” Acts 19:23. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.10}

“For this is the word of promise. *At* this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.” Romans 9:9. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.11}

“*Upon* the first day of the week let everyone of you lay by him in store as God have prospered him.” 1 Corinthians 16:2. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.12}

“Thou, Lord, *in* the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth.” Hebrews 1:10. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.13}

We have now only to see if the word is used in this sense here. If we trace Paul’s argument through, we shall see that *time* is the thing. In the fourth chapter of the first epistle he speaks of those who are asleep, and says that they shall be raised when Christ comes. In the fifth chapter he says, “But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;” the brethren know of the times and the seasons. Again in the first chapter of his second letter, he refers to the second coming of Christ, and tells (verses 7-9) what shall then take place. Then he proceeds, in the second chapter, to correct the idea that some seem to have gained, that the day of the Lord was at that time near at hand. Before that day should come, he said, there would be a falling away, and the Man of Sin would be revealed. In verses 3, 4 he fully describes the nature of that power, and its manner of working, and says that it will continue until the Lord shall consume it with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of his coming. Then, with the idea of Christ’s coming still uppermost, and the reference to it fresh from his pen, he says, “Whose coming is after [or, at the time of] the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.” It must be evident to all that the word “coming” in verse nine refers to the same thing as the same word in verse 8, viz., the second advent of Christ; so the word “after” must refer to time, for the apostle would not say that the coming of Christ is according to the working of Satan. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.14}

That the connection between verses 8 and 9 is very close will be clearly seen when we understand that the words “even him” form no part of the original. They were supplied by the translators, for no reason except that they thought that the reference was to the Man of Sin, and wished to make that idea appear. There is absolutely nothing in the Greek, from which the words “even him” could be translated. Let anyone read these verses 8 and 9, leaving out these two supplied words, and he will at once see that the ninth verse refers to the time of Christ’s coming. Thus: “And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of is coming; who’s coming is after [at the time of or next to] the working of Satan and with all power and signs and lying wonders.” Or, to make the case still plainer, instead of repeating the noun, substitute the appropriate pronoun in its stead, and it would then read, “Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming, *which* is after the working of Satan,” etc. The apostle is simply carrying out the idea with which he started, and states an additional factor in regard to the time of Christ’s coming. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.15}

As corroborative proof we refer to Matthew 24:24, 27. The Lord there says that just before the second advent “there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” This harmonizes exactly with 2 Thessalonians 2:8-10. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.16}

Again, the thirteenth of Revelation brings to view a work which will immediately precede the second coming of Christ. It is the last great effort of Satan against God’s Government. The case is precisely the same as that in 2 Thessalonians 2. An attempt is to be made to enforce the mark of the beast (this beast in 2 Thessalonians 2, is called the Man of Sin) upon all men. To aid in the accomplishment of his designs, Satan brings to bear his masterpiece of deception,-Spiritualism-as shown in verses 13, 14, working wonderful miracles in order to beguile men into accepting a lie as the truth. Compare with this 2 Thessalonians 2:10-12. So wonderful are his miracles that, as Christ says, if it were possible, even the people of God would be deceived. But this is not possible; the conflict will be sharp and short: the decision between truth and error will be quickly made in the minds of men; and the Lord will quickly come to reward his own. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.17}

One more text: In Revelation 16 we have the same deceptive work brought to view, and, as already seen, it immediately precedes the coming of the Lord. “And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs, out of the mouth of the dragon and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirit of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief.” Revelation 16:13-15. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.18}

All these passages harmonize and show that the coming of the Lord will be the next thing after Satan has performed these deceiving miracles, which have not as yet taken place, but which cannot be far in the future. Thus the rise and progress of modern spiritualism is a most interesting study for those who are looking for their Lord’s return, since the rapidity with which that delusion spreads shows beyond a doubt that the great day of the Lord is at hand. E. J. W. {SITI April 26, 1883, p. 200.19}