**“The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 5” The Signs of the Times, 9, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST - MAY 19. ACTS, CHAPTER 5.  
Daily reading in Connection with the Lesson.**

**NOTES ON THE LESSON**

There are probably very few who really comprehend the crime for which Ananias and Sapphira were punished. It has been customary to refer to them and to their punishment as an example of what an awful thing it is to lie, and of the terrible consequence of lying. Now while it is impossible to exaggerate or even to fully comprehend how heinous a sin lying is. It is a fact that simply lying is not the sin for which these unfortunate persons suffered. Their sin was hypocrisy of the worst kind. They wished to have a reputation for generosity and benevolence, without the necessary self-denial. In the high priest’s palace, Peter himself had told an open lie, and had added profanity to his lying. In his case it was unpremeditated; he fell under the temptation almost before he was aware of it. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.1}

But in this case there was design; Ananias and his wife had agreed together to practice this deception, and they dared to persist in it even in the place of solemn prayer. They lied to the Holy Ghost. If Peter had not questioned them, they would have simply handed in a part of the money and said nothing; but there sin would have been the same. Their lying words to Peter were wicked, but the enormity of their crime consisted in their desire to appear better than they really were. From this we may learn how God regards the hypocrite. There are many ways in which we act the same part. God does not punish every case of this sin as he did in this instance, but he takes notice of it none the less, and at the last day, “will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” 1 Corinthians 4:5. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.2}

But even hypocrisy was not the whole of their crime. The text says they “kept back” part of the price of the land. The original word occurs elsewhere but once in the New Testament, Titus 2:10, where it is rendered “purloining.” Greenfield defines it, “to keep back anything unlawfully, secrete, purloined, and embezzle.” The case, then, was this: It was understood that those who at that time sold property, did it not for gain, but for benevolent purposes. Whether they had made a formal vow or not, the act of selling the land was evidence of at least an outward consecration of it to the cause of God. And yet so lightly did they regard their vow that they dared to appropriate a portion of the property to their own use. But this was simply stealing, for as soon as the decision was made to devote the proceeds of the sale to the cause, the land belonged to God. Then we may also learn from this how serious a matter it is to vow to the Lord and then neglect to pay our vows. It is a terrible thing to refuse to help support God’s cause, but it is still worse to vow and not pay. No wonder the question is asked in astonishment, “Will a man rob God?” Let each one ask himself this question. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.3}

The signal manifestation of the wrath of God upon the dissemblers was a check which Infinite Wisdom knew was needed. The church would have been disgraced, if, in the rapid increase of professed Christians, there were persons professing to serve God, but worshiping mammon. There are many Ananiases and Sapphiras in our day, whom Satan tempts to dissemble because of their love of money. By various plans and the excuses they withhold from the treasury of God the means entrusted to them for the advancement of the cause of God. Should the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira be visited upon this class there would be many dead bodies in our churches requiring burial.-*Spirit of Prophecy*. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.4}

“And of the rest durst no man join himself to them, but the people magnified them.” Verse 13. This passage is rather obscure, and various fanciful opinions are given by different commentators in regard to it. The following seems to us the most reasonable explanation of it: There is a contrast between “the rest” and “the people,” the former term being used with reference to the wealthy class, to which Ananias evidently belonged, and the latter term being applied to the common people. We learn from this verse, then, that the judgment upon Ananaias and Sapphira accomplished just what was intended,-it kept the young church free from those who would use its growing popularity as a means of gaining honor for themselves. The church of God was never intended to be used as a means of gaining access to “good society.” {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.5}

“Ye intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.” These wicked rulers had no fear of God before their eyes, but they feared the people. Verse 26 says, “They fear the people lest they should have been stoned.” The people had been healed in the name of Jesus; but every sermon of the apostle showed that the Jewish rulers had crucified him. The rulers did not by these words intend to deny that they had put Jesus to death; they simply showed that they feared the consequences if the people should have the matter set before them in its true light. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.6}

“We ought to obey God rather than men.” This is a truth which is recognized by all, and acted upon by but few. A writer in the *Christian at Work* truly says: “In all human things it is our duty to be submissive, as Paul shows, to the government under which we live; but in divine things, where God speaks and his voice is against the decree of government, we are justified in disobedience.” But who cares to disobey a decree of men, that he may obey God? There are few, but the majority of those who read of and approve the apostle’s course, dare not take their stand upon an unpopular truth, against which there is no positive law. The most weighty excuse that can be urged against the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord is that it is peculiar and inconvenient. It is easier to approve of the good deeds of men in past ages than it is to follow their example. But if we approve of their course, we condemn ourselves if we do not do likewise. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.7}

“But,’ some will say, “we are commanded to be ‘subject unto the higher powers,’ and are told that ‘whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;’ so then, if the Government should command us to observe the first day of the week, it would be our duty as good citizens to obey.” But the example of Peter and John, of Paul himself, of Daniel and the three Hebrew children, is sufficient to teach us that Paul in Romans 13 refers simply to ordinary, human affairs, and not to matters of conscience, for which a person is answerable to God alone. The saying, “The voice of the people is the voice of God,” is one of Satan’s lies; “The carnal mind is enmity against God.” {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.8}

While we cannot obey earthly governments when they come in conflict with the law of God, we need not resist them. This point is well put by Dr. Lyman Abbott, as follows:- {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.9}

“The church may impose the creed or the ritual against which the conscientious judgment of the individual revolts; the State may call upon the Quaker to bear arms in war; and thus not merely the opinion or taste of the individual, but his conscience, may be brought into collision with the judgment or even the conscience of the community or the family. What then? The answer of the Scriptures to this question is plainly *submission, but not obedience*. The individual is not even then to set the community at defiance by resistance; neither is he to yield to the community by acquiescence. He is simply to disobey the law, act on his own conscience, and accept the consequences. Thus Daniel, forbidden to pray, raised no revolts against the palpably unjust decree, but prayed and bore the penalty. Thus the apostles, forbidden to preach, organized no resistance to the probably illegal decree of the Sanhedrin-for freedom of speech was a constitutional right in the Jewish Commonwealth-but went on with their preaching and submitted to arrest and trial.” {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.10}

“And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name.” The apostles had been beaten-a punishment that carries with it more disgrace than anything else. And yet they rejoiced. As we study the lesson, it is easy for us to see why they should rejoice; but how would it be if we were in similar circumstances? If we think that we would do as they did, we can easily test the matter. If we endure the little trials that befall us, uncomplainingly; if we are patient under abuse or ridicule, then it may be that we could rejoice in persecutions. It is not a hardship, but a privilege, for the Christian to suffer for Christ. It is accounted as much a blessing as it is to be allowed to believe on him. Philippians 1:29. See also 1 Thessalonians 3:3; 2 Timothy 2:12; Matthew 5:10-12. E. J. W. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 209.11}

**“Visit to Healdsburg” The Signs of the Times, 9, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The meeting at this place was in many respects one of the most important that has ever been held in the State. Many advanced steps were taken; and the plans adopted, if properly carried out, cannot fail to have an influence on the cause for good, until the close of time. These things will appear more fully in the official reports of the business meetings, and in special report. We design to simply speak of the general features of the meeting, and give some items in regard to the work here, in which all our people on the coast have, or should have, an interest. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.1}

Friday afternoon was devoted to a meeting of the stockholders of the College. On entering the building we were struck with the floral decorations of the school-room. The busy hands of students had been at work, and the doors, chandeliers, rostrum, organ, and clock had been neatly ornamented with roses and evergreens. We are pleased with this, not so much for the decoration itself, as for the evidence it afforded that the students have a love for the school-room, which can only come from a love of the studies there pursued. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.2}

The favorable impression thus received was deepened by a brief visit to the school on Monday. About ninety students were present, and quiet study seemed to be the order of the day. The professors have naturally felt a little discouragment because as yet there are no students in the higher branches; but we could see no reason for discouragement. The recitations showed that the students have already received a discipline of mind that will not readily be lost; they are forming correct habits of study, which is the essential thing. These things would be more readily noticed by a visitor than by one closely connected with the school. We can most heartily recommend the Healdsburg College; and we feel assured that the improvements and contemplation by the professors, who are devoted to the work, will add a hundred-fold to its usefulness. Opportunities for mental and spiritual culture are here afforded, which it would be a sin for our people to neglect. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.3}

We were much pleased to note the interest manifested in the Sabbath-school. This is now the second school in size in the State, and with the influx of students will doubtless soon be the first. The school will be, from the nature of the case, the most important school in the State. An increase in numbers will bring increased responsibility in far greater measure than in ordinary cases, for as the students go to their homes, the influence of the school will be felt on all the schools on the coast. We believe that the officers of the school realize this responsibility, and will do all in their power to make the school what should be. We hope that all who attend will second their efforts. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.4}

There has been a vast improvement in this school since we were there last. The organization of the school is good, and there seemed to be a feeling of harmony present. At the teachers’ meeting Monday evening twenty-one of the twenty-five teachers were present, and a good degree of interest was manifested. So long as an interest is kept up in the teachers’ meeting the school cannot fail to prosper. But it should not be forgotten that united prayer is one great object of this meeting. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.5}

There is but one thing now lacking, and that, unfortunately, is not peculiar to the school. The same lack exists in Oakland, and we believe it exists in all our schools, and among our people generally. There is a lack of appreciation of the importance of the Sabbath-school work as supporting discipline of mind and a thorough education, in the things of God. There is a lack of thoroughness in Bible study. The Sabbath-school has been regarded as different from the day-school, and that it was not expected that the lesson should be learned *perfectly*. There has been such an apparent fear of formalism, and a desire to be able to generalize and state things in our own language, that we have neglected that accurate knowledge of the Bible which alone can enable us to generalize. The particular is before the general. Before we venture to state a Bible event or truth in our own words, we must be familiar with the words of the sacred text; then, if necessary we can paraphrase. But the instances where it is necessary or proper to change the expression in the least, in order to convey its exact meaning, are more rare than is commonly supposed. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.6}

This thoroughness of work depends on the individual members of the schools. The officers and teachers cannot demand a perfect recitation, as they would in ordinary schools, however much they may desire the result; but if each member of the school will realize the importance of being able to think and talk in the language of the Bible, especially in these last days, our schools will be improved a thousand-fold. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.7}

The sermons during the meetings were by Elder Haskell, Elder Waggoner, and Sister White. They were all of a practical nature, designed to show us the necessities of our present position. Sister White’s two sermons were mainly on the subject of the atonement, especially Christ’s closing work in the heavenly sanctuary. Christ will soon cease his pleading, and probation will close for all mankind. We know not how soon our individual cases may come up for decision. As on the typical day of atonement the people were to afflict their souls, so in this most important time, there should be an absence of lightness and frivolity, and, in their stead, the searching of heart and entire consecration to the work. The cause of God is all-important, and we should learn to attend to its once in preference to our own work or pleasure. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.8}

Elder Waggoner spoke Sabbath afternoon from the fifth chapter of Peter’s first the epistle. We are commanded to be sober and vigilant, because the devil as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. The inference is plain that those who are not thus watchful will be devoured. We are helped in this by casting all our care on God, who cares for us. Too often we feel great confidence in God in times of comparative safety, but foolishly attempt to care for ourselves when we see trouble and danger. He dwelt much on the text, “Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility.” A failure to comply with this injunction is because of all the church difficulties that exist. Many persons quit the service of God because of some grievance, oftener imaginary than real, which they have received from their brethren. The wickedness and absurdities of such a course was vividly illustrated as follows: “I have a father who is kind and loving, lavishing on me every gift that heart could desire. Nothing that is good is withheld from me. He studies my needs, and anticipates my slightest want. But I have a brother who is selfish, and who slights and even abuses me, contrary to my father’s will. Now because of this petty slight from my brother, I will turn my good father out of doors, and refuse to have anything more to do with him!” We believe that many made a profitable application of this sermon to themselves. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.9}

Friday afternoon Elder Haskell spoke briefly of the Waldenses, whom he visited on his recent trip to Europe. He spoke of the persecutions which they had suffered for their unswerving devotion to the truth of the Bible. Their children were instructed from the Bible, and were taught to love it. The Bible was their text-book, and their characters were molded by it. The result is seen in their descendants, who are characterized by a sturdy simplicity and uprightness that is in marked contrast to the morality that prevails in Southern Italy, where Catholicism has borne sway, and the Bible is almost an unknown book. These people are already to receive the whole truth of God, but where are the men who have the knowledge, the missionary zeal, and enough of the Spirit of sacrifice to go and instruct them in the way of life? A strong appeal was made, and both speaker and congregation were deeply affected. His sermon Sunday morning was on the subject of faith applied especially to labor in the cause of God. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.10}

These plain testimonies and earnest appeals were not without effect. As one brother remarked, “Any one who could go through these meetings and not be stirred with a desire to labor in God’s cause, is in a hard case.” Eight or ten students volunteered to spend their vacation in the missionary field, in active service. With most of them this is their first attempt. Others, who are not able to go into the field, will engage in the work at home. If the students spend their vacation in earnest, conscientious labor, they will not only be a great blessing to the cause in this State, but their own souls will be watered, and they will enter upon the work of the next college year with clearer minds and enlarged ideas, much better prepared than now to profit by the instruction which they will receive. We hope to soon see the number of earnest missionary workers who shall go out from the college largely increased. E. J. W. {SITI May 10, 1883, p. 211.11}

**“The Sabbath-School. Advantages of Bible Study” The Signs of the Times, 9, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

**Advantages of Bible Study**

One great benefit to be derived from the study of the Bible is mentioned by Paul, when he says 2 Timothy, “from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make the wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” This is why the Bible was given. It is the revelation of God’s will to man. Nowhere else can man learn his duty to God and his fellow-men. Those nations that have not the Bible are sunk in degradation and crime. In ancient Greece and Rome, although there was culture and wisdom of a certain kind, which are the admiration of the world to-day, the greatest crimes were openly committed, and even protected by the laws. There is nothing that will teach men what they ought to do in order to live happily and peaceably here, and worthy of a life hereafter, except the Bible. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.1}

And the Bible is a complete rule of faith. As Paul further says, it “is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be *perfect*, *thoroughly furnished* unto all good works.” It contains, then, all that is absolutely necessary to be understood by mankind. A little thought will convince anyone that this is so. All will agree, in answer to our Saviour’s question, that it will profit a man nothing to gain the whole world and lose his soul. All the wealth, honor, and wisdom that this world affords, cannot for a moment be compared with that which eternity offers. A man may have all that this world can give, yet if he is not “wise unto salvation,” he loses it all, and is as though he had never acquired anything. But though he be destitute of worldly riches, and ignorant of the things which the world calls wisdom, if he only has the “wisdom that comes from above” (James 3:17) he will finally be admitted into “a better country,” where, with unclouded intellect, and the angels of God for teachers, he can in a few years learn more than his unbelieving neighbor did in a life-time. And then he has a whole eternity before him, in which to explore new fields, and increase in knowledge. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.2}

It is only through the Bible that we learn of Christ, without whom we cannot hope for eternal life. The Bible is the instrument through which the Holy Spirit works, and guides us into the ways of truth and knowledge. It is the Bible alone that teaches us the fear of God,- which the wise man tells us is the beginning, or rather, the principal part, of knowledge. Surely, then, the Bible, of all books, is the one that should be the most studied. The only reason why we study it so little, is because we underestimate “the things that God hath prepared for them that love him,” and which can be gained only by careful study of, and obedience to, his word; we appreciate the things that we see, more than those which are unseen. If we could obtain a glimpse of the glories of Heaven, I believe we would take the course necessary to gain it, even at the expense of everything else. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.3}

But this is not all the benefit we gain from the study of the Bible. We do not mean that anything more or better can be gained than that of which we have just spoken, but that we do not have to wait till we get to Heaven, before we begin to reap the benefit of Bible study. The apostle Paul says of godliness that it “is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.” So the Bible, besides showing us the way to eternal life, gives wisdom and a culture that can be obtained from no other book in the world. The psalmist says: “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a *good understanding* have all they that do his commandments.” This also is susceptible to proof, as we shall show. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.4}

What is education? It is simply the development of the mind. Webster says: “Education is properly to draw forth, and implies not so much the communication of knowledge, as the discipline of the intellect, the establishment of the principles, and the regulation of the heart.” To educate is “to lead out and train the mental powers.” According to this, any one can get a thorough education from the Bible alone. Children go to school, and men go to college, not for the few facts that they may learn, but for that development of mind that will enable them to think correctly, and to reason soundly, and to judge correctly of things. In order to gain this, years are spent in the study of what is called the classics-the productions of the great minds of earth. By closely studying these models, the student almost unconsciously makes them his own. By unraveling the deep sayings of the wise men, he becomes able to think deeply for himself. By daily reading the writings of the best authors, he learns how to use language, and acquires a good style of expression. Continued application increases his ability to receive ideas and make them his own, and to think for himself; it expands his mind; in other words he is educated. A man who has the will to apply himself in this manner may become as truly educated as though he had every advantage of the schools. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.5}

But will the study of the Bible furnish this culture of mind? It certainly will, and more. Let us reason upon it. Sin has brought disease and death into the world, and causes not only physical ailments, but mental weakness. Mankind has degenerated mentally as well as physically. The men from whose writings thousands gain their mental discipline, were weakened mortals. They were subject to the curse. Although we speak of them as having “giant intellects,” they were dwarfs beside what they would have been had their ancestors never transgressed moral or physical laws. Many of them were themselves wicked men, men who were slaves to their appetites and passions. And yet from these men the culture of the world is derived. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.6}

Now consider the Bible. It was not written by sinful men, but “holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” 2 Peter 1:19. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” God is the source of all knowledge. These men of whom we have spoken were dependent upon God even for the mind with which they acquired their wisdom. Now is it possible that we can obtain more education from them than from the Fountain-head? Most assuredly not. Peter says that the Spirit of Christ was in the men who wrote the Bible, and that even angels desire to look into the things that were revealed to them. Surely, the Bible contains enough to draw out the mind of man to an unlimited extent. We repeat, then, without any fear of successful contradiction, that if a man were to study no other book but the Bible, and would apply himself to it as closely as men do to their ordinary studies, he would have a discipline of mind far greater than those would have who took the ordinary course of study. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.7}

In the Bible we have many varieties of style, as the Spirit worked through different minds. A complete code of laws is open to the student. All human laws are derived from this source. If we wish to develop the reasoning faculties, Paul’s epistles afford an ample field. If we wish to cultivate the memory, there is an abundance of history for us to learn. In short, whatever we desire in the line of knowledge may be found in the Book of books. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.8}

This mental culture is not the primary object of studying the word of God. The Bible was given that we might learn God’s will; but in studying to learn that which is of the greatest importance, we necessarily acquire that for which so many in the world strive, often in vain. And thus it is that God withholds no good thing from them that walk uprightly. If we seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, all things necessary will be added unto us. We serve ourselves best by serving God. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.9}

Let no one, then, complain of meagre opportunities, or waste of time in vainly wishing for knowledge. If we wish to obtain treasures we must dig for them. All have the Bible. It is God’s gift to man. It was not designed for a few favored ones, but for all. Its pages are open to all. And here the unlearned man may be on a level with his more favored neighbor, if he only has sincere love for its Author; for “if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine.” And help is given that the ordinary student knows nothing of. “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.10}

In conclusion, it is not merely our privileged to avail ourselves of the wisdom and a culture which the Bible affords, but it is an imperative duty. We are commanded to “search the Scriptures.” Every individual must arm himself with “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.” And this is the object of the Sabbath-school,-to educate us in the things of God. The lessons given us there to study, form a nucleus around which we may gather vast stores of Biblical knowledge. How many are there who think that the Sabbath-school as well as the day school affords opportunity for mental training? There are possibilities in the Sabbath-school of which few of us have even dreamed. May God help us to avail ourselves of them in so faithful a manner that they will not condemn us in the final day of accounts. E. J. W. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 221.11}

**“Baptism.—A Review” The Signs of the Times, 9, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent in the East sends us a copy of the *Christian Intelligencer* of April 11th. with the request that we notice an article which it contains, entitled, “The Mode of Baptism,” as it has troubled some honest investigators. We accordingly quote the principal part of the article and notice its statements in detail. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.1}

The writer begins by expressing his regret that a certain writer of Sunday-school notes “should seem to countenance the idea that Philip baptized the eunuch by immersion, as is done in his remarks on Acts 8:38, where ‘into the water’ is emphasized by being printed in italics, and within quotation marks.” He then says:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.2}

“The Greek preposition *eis* signifies motion toward, and never indicates the actual going into a place unless it is repeated, once in composition with the verb, and *once* governing the noun. When Peter and John ran together to the sepulcher, after our Lord’s resurrection, John outran Peter, and came first to the sepulcher, *eis to mnemeion*, yet when he not in, *ou mentoi eiselthen*. The phrase, if completed, would read *ou mentoi eiselthen eis to mnemeion*, as it does when Peter is described when arriving, and actually going into the sepulcher, *kai eiselthen eis to mnemeion*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.3}

“The same remark applies to the preposition *ek*, which signifies motion from, and never indicates actual coming from within a place, unless it is repeated, as before noted, in composition with the verb, as well as governing the noun. Here also a single example may suffice. Luke 4:22, ‘the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth,’ *tois ekporeuomenois ek tou stomatos autou*. This form of expression is invariable. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.4}

“Now in the account of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, if Luke had meant that they actually went into the water, still more that they went under the water, he would have twice used the preposition *eis*. But he does not. The phrase is *katebesan eis to hudor*, the exact meaning of which is they went down to the water. So if it had been meant that they actually came out of the water, the phrase would have been *exebesan ek tou hudatos*. But it is not. It is *anebesan ek tou hudatos*, and means exactly they came up, or back, from the water. The Revision, with all its pretensions to scholarship, has failed to note this point.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.5}

There is but one fault that can be found with this criticism, and that is that it is not true. There is an old saying that “one swallow does not make a spring.” The author of the above should have remembered this and pushed his investigation is further, before he made such sweeping assertions. Because a thing occurs in a certain way once, we are not justified in saying that it will be so every time. That is the most foolish kind of reasoning. It is as if a man who had never before seen a horse, should see a span of white horses, and should then stoutly maintain that all horses are white. This is just the condition of the writer of this article: he has found that sometimes the preposition is repeated when motion *into* or *out of* a place is meant, and makes the rash assertion that “this form of expression is invariable.” We shall see. If it can be shown that *eis* unrepeated ever indicates “the actual going into a place,” then his whole argument, or assumption, falls to the ground. Turning to the lexicons we find the following in reference to the preposition *eis:* {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 223.6}

“The radical signification is, direction toward, motion to, into, for all on; into;” etc.-*Pickering*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.1}

“1. Of Place. Which is the primary and most frequent use, *into, to*, viz.:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.2}

“(a) After verbs implying motion of any kind, *into,* or also *to, towards, upon* any place or object.”-*Robinson*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.3}

“Preposition. *On, into*, upon,” etc.—*Greenfield*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.4}

“Direction towards, motion to, on, or into...... In composition *eis* retains its chief signification, *into.”*-*Liddel & Scott*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.5}

These definitions from standard authorities are alone sufficient to settle the matter; but to make assurance doubly sure, we will quote a few examples. In all the following instances the construction is precisely the same as in Acts 8:38; the preposition occurs but once, and is not compounded with the verb:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.6}

Matthew 2:11: *Kai eithontes eis oikian*, “and when they were come *into the house*.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.7}

Matthew 2:12: *Anechorecesan eis teen choran autou*, “they departed *into their own country*.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.8}

Matthew 2:14: *Anechorecesan eis Aiguptou*, “they *departed into Egypt*.” Our critic would have us read in this instance, “he went toward, or near to, Egypt.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.9}

Matthew 2:22: *Anechorecesan eis ta meree tees Galilaias*, “he turned aside into the parts of Galilee.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.10}

In this last instance let us try our author’s statement that *eis* unrepeated always means “toward,” and never “into,” and see how it will work. We would then have it, “he turned aside *toward* Galilee,” did not go into it. This is another point which “the Revision, with all its pretensions to scholarship has failed to note.” But, unfortunately for the *newest* version, the next verse says that “he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth,” which is a long distance inside the borders of Galilee. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.11}

Passing by many similar instances, we come to Matthew 8:31, 32, another good text on which to test the definition of our new lexicographer. In the sentence, “If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away *into the herd of swine*,” the preposition *eis* occurs but once. Perhaps, however, it will be claimed that the demons did not actually go *into* the swine, but went *toward* them, and drove them along toward the sea. Very well, we will try the next verse, and see how it fared with the swine. We read, “and, behold, the whole herd of swine ran violently down to a steep place *into the sea*.” The Greek is, *ormeesen eis teen thalassan*, the preposition occurring but once. Then according to the *newest* version, we must understand that the swine simply ran *toward* the sea, but did not go *into* it. The only trouble with this explanation is that the next clause says that “they perished in the waters.” Then they must have gone *into* the water, after all. We are strongly reminded of the proverb: “The legs of the lame are not equal.” Proverbs 26:7, first clause, only. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.12}

If the reader wishes to examine other texts where *eis* is used alone, he can try the following, and see if he thinks that “toward,” or “near to,” would improve the sense: Matthew 4:1, 12; 5:25, 29, 30; 9:1; 12:9; 13:36, 47, 54; 14:22; Acts 22:4, 10, 11, 25, 24; 1 Peter 3:22, and many other passages. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.13}

Now for the other preposition. We have seen that Philip and the eunuch could go *into* the water, even though though the narrative contains only one preposition. But having seen them in the water, we shall be obliged to leave them there, if it is true that *ek* never means “out of” unless it also occurs twice. Again we refer to the lexicons to settle the matter. Of the preposition *ek* we read:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.14}

“1. Of motion *out of, forth, from the forth or out of*.... with all verbs of motion such as express *taking away, separating.”*-*Liddel & Scott*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.15}

“Its primary signification is from, and out of, away from... from among, etc.”-*Pickering*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.16}

“A preposition governing the genitive, with the primary signification *out of, from, of*; spoken of such objects as before were *in* or *within* another, but are now separated from it..... {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.17}

“1. Of PLACE, which is the primary and most frequent use, *out of, from*, viz.: {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.18}

“(a) After verbs implying motion of any kind *out of*, or *from* any place or object.”-*Robinson*. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.19}

Following are a few instances of its use. We give only the English, simply stating that in every case the preposition occurs but once, as in Acts 8:38. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.20}

Matthew 2:15: “Out of Egypt have I called my Son.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.21}

Matthew 24:17: “Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing *out of* his house.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.22}

Mark 9:7: “And a voice came *out of* the cloud.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.23}

John 4:54: “When he was come *out of* Judea into Galilee.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.24}

John 13:1: “When Jesus knew that his our was come that he should depart *out of* this world.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.25}

We quote again from the article:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.26}

“But if it be admitted that the criticism on the use of the preposition, as above, is correct, it is impossible that the inspired writers should have had at all in their minds the idea of going into, or going under the water.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.27}

But it is not admitted, for the good reason that the criticism is no criticism at all; and so we say that it is not only possible but certain that the inspired writers had in their minds the idea both of going *into*, and going under, the water. Even so zealous an advocate of sprinkling as Dr. Clarke, admits that the eunuch was plunged under the water. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.28}

But it may be asked, “Since the preposition *eis* does sometimes mean ‘toward,’ as well as ‘into,’ is it not possible that it means ‘toward’ in Acts 8:38?” We reply, no; and for reasons that we shall proceed to give. If we did not know the meaning of the word “baptize,” or if this were the only place where baptism was mentioned, we might allow the claim; for, let it be distinctly understood that we do not base the argument for immersion on the preposition in the Acts 8:38, or in any other place. That is only corroborative evidence; our direct proof is more to the point. And let it also be distinctly noted that the so-called argument for sprinkling is all of this nature; it is all negative. Even if the article that we have noticed were true, and allowing that Acts 8:38 should read “they went down to the water,” and “came up from the water;” it would not prove that they did not also go in. The advocates of sprinkling, like our critic, labor hard to prove a point that would profit them nothing even if it were established. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.29}

In conclusion we offer a few points of direct evidence:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.30}

1. Our Saviour did not coin the word “baptize;” it was in use before the time of his first advent. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.31}

2. When he used the word baptize, to indicate an ordinance in the church, he must have used it in the sense in which it was generally used; for if he had not, no one would have known what he meant, unless he had given a new definition, which he did not do. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.32}

3. The authors of the lexicons do not make the meaning of words to suit themselves; they simply tell the meaning with which the word is used. If it be a word from a so-called “dead language,” the lexicons give the meaning which it had when that language was spoken. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.33}

4. The Greek lexicons define baptizo, of which baptize is the English form, untranslated, “to dip, to plunge,” etc. Liddell & Scott give it, *to dip repeatedly, to dip under*, and give as examples of its use, “over head and ears in debt,” “*overwhelmed* with questions.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.34}

5. The idea of sprinkling does not attach to the word at all, except as it is forced upon it in support of a practice inherited from the Catholic Church. Whenever the idea of sprinkling is conveyed, a different word is employed. Here we can say of a truth, “this form of expression is invariable.” {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.35}

6. The signification of the ordinance shows plainly the meaning of the word. Paul says: “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ or baptized into his death? Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism*,” etc. Romans 6:3, 4. That is, we show our faith in the death and resurrection of Christ, and our determination to be dead to sin, and to live in newness of life, by being “buried” in water as a symbol of Christ’s burial in the earth. Christ was completely hidden from sight in the tomb; so we must be completely submerged in the water, in order to have the symbol fit the reality. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.36}

7. This idea is established beyond cavil in the next verse: “For if we have been *planted together in the likeness of his death*, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” The text is too plain to need comment. A seed is not planted unless it is covered up. The disciples of Christ did not carelessly throw a few handfuls of earth on his body, but reverently laid it in the ground, completely covering it from view. Then unless we are likewise completely buried, planted, submerged in the watery grave, we are not in the likeness of Christ’s death. Sprinkling has no likeness whatever to the burial and resurrection of Christ. And therefore it necessarily follows:- {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.37}

7. That baptism is immersion and nothing else, and one who has not been immersed has not obeyed the command of Christ to be baptized. We are sure that this conclusion cannot be honestly evaded. We shall have more to say about the importance of this matter hereafter. E. J. W. {SITI May 17, 1883, p. 224.38}

**“The Sabbath-School. Acts 6; 7:1-16” The Signs of the Times, 9, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JUNE 2. Acts 6; 7:1-16.**

**Notes on the Lesson**

“There arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.”-We should not confound “Grecians” with “Greeks;” a distinction is made between them in the Bible. The latter term applies to those who were natives of Greece; it is used also as synonymous with Gentile. Romans 1:16. The former term is used to designate those Jews who lived in foreign countries, and spoke the Greek language. The word occurs but two other places in the New Testament-Acts 9:29, and 11:20. In the latter instance the preceding verse clearly shows that this distinction is made. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.1}

The Assyrian and Babylonian captivity had scattered the Jews into various countries. Alexander, it will be remembered, settled many of them in Egypt. These spoke the Greek language, and it was for their use that the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament, was made. The Revised Version gives them their proper title-“Grecian Jews.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.2}

Between the native and foreign Jews there would naturally exist some of that jealousy that existed between Jews and Gentiles. This adds force to the statement in the second chapter, that “all that believed were together,” and in the fourth chapter that “the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul.” The religion of Christ had broken down all sectional differences; and all classes, both native and foreign Jews, rich and poor, were as one in the belief in a crucified and risen Saviour. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.3}

“The daily ministration” refers to the daily distribution to the poor, for the common fund. Up to this time the apostles had had charge of this business, Acts 4:37, although we cannot suppose that they attended to it in person, as in that case they could hardly have had time for anything else. The fact that the murmuring was against the “Hebrews” instead of against the apostles, shows that others were deputed to do the work. The “neglect” of which the Grecians complained might have happened in one of two ways: The national jealousy between the two parties may have caused some partiality to be shown, perhaps not from deliberate design, but from long habit. But it is probable that this neglect was unintentional. The number of Grecian Jews must have been small in comparison with the natives of Judea, and their widows would be easily overlooked. The fact that they spoke a different language would add to their natural timidity, and would prevent them from coming forward to claim that which was their due. This unintentional neglect of their widows was quickly noticed by the Grecians, and they began to complain. This murmuring would soon have caused a division in the church, if left unchecked. The apostles did not claim the power to “lord it” over the believers, but called “the multitude of the disciples together,” and proposed a remedy for the difficulty. They were not willing that there should be even the appearance of injustice to any one. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.4}

“It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.”-The apostles did not intimate that it was inconsistent with their dignity for them to perform this service. They were not above even physical labor, and they remembered the words of Christ, “Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.” But they saw that the care of these matters would detract from their usefulness as ministers of the word. There were others who could do this work, who did not have the important work of preaching to do. The minister of the gospel has to do with high and exalted themes; and while he should be willing to perform any service, he should not allow a round of petty cares to distract his mind. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.5}

The seven who were chosen to have the charge of this business are usually termed “deacons,” although they are not called by that name in the Bible, but are designated as “the seven,” Acts 21:8. And it is worthy of note that in the Greek there is no verbal difference between the “ministration” that was daily, and the “ministry” of the word. Both words are from the same Greek word, the one from which we get our word deacon; it means an “attendant” or “waiter.” The “twelve” and the “seven” had different duties to perform, but both were servants. And so well did the new arrangement work, so well did both classes serve, that “the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.6}

It is worth our while also to notice the order of the work which the apostles laid out for themselves: “But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.” First they would get from God, and then they would give to men. They felt the need of constant prayer in connection with their teaching. They had been filled with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, but that would not suffice for all time. They had a daily work to do, and needed to be continually filled with the Spirit; but as the Spirit was given at Pentecost only in answer to fervent and united prayer, so it was necessary that they should “pray always,” in order to keep it with them. And if this was necessary for them, how much more so for us! If the apostles could not teach without constant prayer, what can be expected of the Sabbath-school teacher who does not “pray without ceasing”? {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.7}

“The seven” were also men of prayer, for they were “full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.” Their business was not merely to act as clerks, to distribute food and clothing, but to visit the poor, especially the sick and afflicted, and to give relief to them whenever it was in their power. Although all the seven were full of the Holy Ghost, Stephen had the pre-eminence in this respect. He was “full of faith and power.” He had unbounded confidence in the willingness of God to answer prayer, and as a consequence, like Jacob he had “power with God.” As he sought the afflicted ones, his heart was drawn out in sympathy for them, and by means of his faith and power, he performed by the miracles. From this we may learn that even those whose duty it is to “serve tables” may attain the greatest piety, and that God can work through any one, the only requisite being that he shall be “full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.8}

This work in which Stephen engaged naturally attracted much attention. As was the case when Peter and John healed the lame man, the people would naturally inquire by what power these miracles were done, and this gave Stephen an opportunity to teach the resurrection of Christ. The foreign Jews who still clung to their traditions “disputed” with him. This does not imply an angry dispute, but simply a discussion of the truth which Stephen taught. But Stephen spoke with wisdom from above, and the Spirit of God. This they could not answer. They were put to silence and forced to confess to themselves that Stephen was right. But there is always one resource left for those who are honestly beaten in argument yet are too set in their ways to yield to the truth, and that is treachery and force. This they used in the case of Stephen. First they “suborned men;” that is they privately caused the idea to go forth that Stephen was a blasphemer. This they did, not by direct means, but in an underhanded manner, by perverting his doctrine. It is very easy to set and evil report afloat. This report stirred up “the people and the elders and the scribes” to bring Stephen before the Sanhedrin. Then to complete their work they hired false witnesses to testify against him. With their testimony before the bigoted members of the council, Stephen was virtually condemned to death before he had uttered a word. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.9}

Stephen’s sermon, while it contained nothing that would show a spirit of fear, was admirably adapted to disprove the charges that were made against him. He spoke of God with the utmost reverence, and proceeded to rehearse the history of the Jewish nation, a history which no Jew ever tired of hearing. And here is a point worth noting, in regard to all these sermons; and that is the use the speakers made of the Old Testament. If they had been as fearful of seeming to indorse all that it said as some of our modern preachers are, they would have been in a bad condition, for they had nothing else from which to preach. Another thing worthy of note is that when these early teachers were put on trial for their lives, they invariably preached Jesus. Their own safety was a secondary matter with them. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.10}

Verse 5 of chapter seven is a very important one. Stephen has told how God called Abraham out of his own country to go into the land of Canaan, and that he finally came into it. But he says, “And he [God] gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promise that he would give it to him for a possession, and to seek after him, when is that he had no child.” God did not forget his promise to Abraham; and Abraham was not disappointed because he did not receive a land. It will not do to say that the promise was fulfilled in giving the land to his descendants, for the promise was that Abraham himself should inherit it; and besides, the land was never fully owned by the Jews. The subject is made plain when we read in Romans 4:13 that it included not merely Palestine, but the world; that the “seed” to whom the promise was made was Christ (Galatians 3:16); and that if we are children of God, then we also are heirs. See also Galatians 3:29; James 2:5. Abraham did not expect to see the promise immediately fulfilled; he received the inheritance through faith. He looked forward to the time when the earth should be made new (Isaiah 65:17); and we are to look forward to the same time for our reward. Till that time, if we are really heirs, we will be content to be merely “strangers and pilgrims on the earth.” We expect that “all the earth will yet be filled with the glory of the Lord,” and that the Lord will rule as “Governor among the nations;” but it will not be until he has dashed in pieces the wicked nations of the earth like a potter’s vessel. The Lord will see to this part of the work himself, and will not ask any assistance from men, in the way of votes for political influence. E. J. W. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 233.11}

**“The Day of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 9, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Remember the Sabbath *day* to keep *holy.* Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but THE SEVENTH DAY is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in IT thou shalt not do any work; ... for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested THE SEVENTH DAY; wherefore the Lord blessed *the* Sabbath day, and hallowed IT.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.1}

Language could not be framed so as to express more clearly the fact that the Sabbath of the Lord was permanently fixed upon a definite, specified day. The last charge to be brought against the fourth commandment is that of indefiniteness. If it is not definite, then language cannot be made to convey ideas. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.2}

But among the “inventions” that men have “sought out” is the theory that the commandment does not prescribe the observance of a certain day recurring at regular intervals, but that it enjoins the observance of one-seventh part of our time. The term “sought out” is fitly applied to this intervention, for no trace of this theory appears in the commandment. It was brought to light about two hundred years ago as the only alternative to those who wished to persuade themselves and others that they were keeping the commandment, while at the same time they were observing a day of their own choosing. But this is one of the thinnest disguises ever invented. It is a very easy matter to show its absurdity, as we will demonstrate. Notice carefully the following argument:- {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.3}

If God sanctified an indefinite seventh part of time, he must of necessity have left it optional with man to choose which day he would keep; the only thing commanded with the rest; man could suit his own convenience as to time. It would then follow that whenever a man should choose to rest upon, *that* would be the portion of time sanctified; and thus the act of the Creator would be dependent on the act of the creature. But it is not at all consistent with the dignity of even a human lawgiver to make the meaning of his enactment contingent on the caprice of the people; much less would such a course reflect honor upon the Government of God. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.4}

But this is not the worst result that would naturally follow. If an indefinite seventh part of time were sanctified, then not only would it be left to men to choose the day for rest, but each individual would be at liberty to rest upon the day which might please his fancy. One man might take the seventh day, and another might take the fourth, and then, according to this theory, not one-seventh but two-sevenths of the time would be sanctified. Or, to suppose a case which would be very likely to happen if men should actually try to put their theory into practice, every day in the week might be kept by different individuals, and then it would appear that in the beginning God had sanctified or set apart *all* time! But in that case what would become of the theory that he sanctified only a seventh? We submit to any one that this is not a forced conclusion; if the conclusion is absurd, it simply proves that the theory in question is absurd. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.5}

But before men reach this point in their endeavors to evade the law of God, they usually recover their reasoning faculties to some extent, and say that it is necessary for all men to keep one and the same day. The exigencies of business require it. Then we ask, Who shall appoint the day? What man is there whose judgment all will follow? There is no man or class of men whose authority even if a majority of persons will acknowledge, so as to defer to it. In a case that is left open, every man is on an equality with every other. There is positively no way out of this dilemma but to admit what the commandment plainly declares,-that God, in the beginning, decided definitely which day of the week should be observed. So we see that the one-seventh-part-of-time theory is an impossibility when reduced to practice. And even if it were possible for all men to agree upon some day of their own choosing, that day would be *their* sabbath and not the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment enjoins. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.6}

But some will still say, “Granting that a definite day was set apart, how can we tell which one it was?” This must be an easy question to answer, else it were useless to have a definite day appointed. The commandment says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath.” Mark, *the* seventh day, not *a* seventh day. The seventh day of what? Not of the month, for that would not meet the demand for a rest after six days of labor. For the same reason it cannot mean the seventh day of the year. It must mean the seventh day of a period of time of which seven days is the sum. But this is the week; and we therefore are shut up to the conclusion that the commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. The really candid, thoughtful person could not decide otherwise. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.7}

For further proof that the seventh day of the week is meant, read Luke 23:54-56; 24:1. The sacred historian after describing the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says, “And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath *true* on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.*” Now if we can find what day it was on which they rested, we shall know beyond all doubt which day is “the Sabbath day according to the commandment.” The next verse says: “Now upon *the first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared.” To avoid any possibility of cavil, we turn to Mark 14:1, and there read that this visit took place “when the Sabbath was past.” Luke, then, has given us in consecutive order the record of three days, as follows; Christ was crucified on “the preparation day;” the day following was the Sabbath, upon which the women rested “according to the commandment;” and the next day was *the first day of the week*. This proves unmistakably that the Sabbath of the commandment is the seventh day of the week. E. J. W. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.8}

**“Contrasts That Do Not Exist” The Signs of the Times, 9, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a prominent religious journal of recent date, we find the following:- {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.9}

“It is at once the peculiarity and the glory of the New Testament that it enunciates principles, not arbitrary laws. No Sabbath-day’s journey is here laid out, which man may not exceed; his duties are not prescribed in rigid forms or gauged by a yard-stick. Instead, two underlying principles are laid down-love to God first, love to man next. On these two hang *all* the law and the prophets.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.10}

The meaning of the preceding paragraph, so far as it has any meaning, is that while the Old Testament binds men to the performance of special duties, the New Testament deals only in vague generalities, leaving men to draw their own conclusions as to what they may and may not do. Such a view as this would commend itself quite readily to the world, who would not find it very difficult to conform to a religion that had no fixed rules. When the development of principles is left to men, there are few things which they may not be made to include. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.11}

But the references which are brought forward in proof of this assertion are very unfortunate. Tit is said of the New Testament that “no Sabbath-day’s journey is there laid out, which men may not exceed;” by which it is implied that such a thing is marked out in the Old Testament. But the fact is that instead of a “Sabbath-day’s journey which men may not exceed” being laid down in the Old Testament, such a thing is not mentioned. The term does not once occur in the Old Testament. The only place in the Bible in which it is found is in the New Testament, in Acts 1:12. So much for that attempt to depreciate the Old Testament. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.12}

Again, of the New Testament it is said that in it man’s duties “are not prescribed in rigid forms, or gauged by a yard-stick. Instead, two underlying principles are laid down-love to God first, love to man next.” What a pity it is that the one who wrote that did not read the Old Testament through at least once, before contrasting it with the New. Had he done so, he would have found in Deuteronomy 6:5 these words: “And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.” There is love to God in its fullest extent. Again in Leviticus 19:18 he would read as follows: “Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” How much that sounds like Testament language. We hope that none who despise the Old Testament will reject that text when they find that it is original in that book. For our part we do not know of any more appropriate motto to be hung up for constant reference. If a copy were in a conspicuous place in every house, and read carefully every day, it would improve the manners and customs of this world wonderfully. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.13}

Any attempt to find antagonism between the Old and New Testaments, will prove a failure. A house and its foundation are not more closely joined then they. In fact, that is just the relation they bear to each other. The Old Testament is the foundation; the New is the superstructure. There is not a principle laid down in the New Testament that is not in the Old. These statements about love to God and love to man are direct quotations from the Old Testament. See Luke 10:25-28. Our Saviour and the apostles quoted continually from it. Indeed, there was nothing else from which they could quote. If all the references to, and quotations from, the Old Testament were taken out of the New, there would be but little left. The New Testament is the Old Testament explained. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.14}

And now let us make a little investigation to see if it is true that simple principles alone are laid down in the New Testament; to see if it is true that the Old Testament contains only threatenings of judgments against sin, while the New has only mercy and love. In the preaching of the gospel we find a command at the very outset: “Repent and be baptized every one of you.” This is as plain as anything could be. The decalogue itself is nearly all repeated, and instead of any of its provisions being made less definite, they are enlarged and made to appear more strict than ever. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.15}

And then as to the idea that the New Testament contains only love and mercy. The threats against the sinner are as terrible as any in the Old Testament. In Romans 2 we read that God will render “unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil.” Again Paul says that “the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction.” Some of the strongest threatenings in the Bible come from the lips of our Lord himself. In Revelation 14:9-12, which is the revelation of Jesus Christ (chap. 1:1), we read that they who worship the beast, and receive his mark, “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.” {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 235.16}

On the other hand, we find in the Old Testament some of the most tender expressions of mercy that are to be found in the Bible. Even in the decalogue itself we learn that God shows mercy to those that keep his commandments.What expression of love could be stronger than this: “Like as if a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him”? Again, “The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting.” Psalm 103:17. “The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy.” Psalm 103:8. Nehemiah says that he is “a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness.” Nehemiah 9:17. And, finally, we have this broad principle laid down as the sum of all duty: “What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.” Micah 6:8. Here is as broad a principle as is found in the New Testament. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 236.1}

We do not exalt the Old Testament above the New, but we would place them on a level. They are one; and this is why we protest against decrying the Old. Undermine the confidence of the people in that, and reverence for the Bible and Bible truth will be a thing of the past. And it would not be to the glory of the New Testament if it could be proved that specific duties are not there prescribed. We need rigid rules, that our lives may be correct. When man is left to himself, he invariably goes wrong; now if the Bible dealt in vague terms, leaving us to interpret them to suit ourselves, we would be no better off than if we had no revelation at all. If we but have the principle of love to God in our hearts, we will love all his word, so that we can say with the psalmist: “Thy word is true *from the beginning;* and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.” E. J. W. {SITI May 24, 1883, p. 236.2}

**“How to Study the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 9, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have already spoken of the benefits to be derived from Bible study; that by it we not only gain a knowledge of our duty, but strengthen the intellect. We believe that this matter can scarcely be put in too strong a light. The Bible is not appreciated by any of us as it should be, and the reason why it is not is because it is not studied. It is a wonderful book. But a casual glance at the Bible, or the reading of one, two, or even five chapters a day, in a mechanical manner will not give us the insight into the Bible that we should have. It is not the quantity of ground that we cover in our reading, but the manner in which we do it, that makes us Bible students. Now the Bible itself tells us just how we should study it. In Deuteronomy 6:5-9 we have directions as to our duty in regard to the Bible. We will quote it in full:- {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 245.1}

“And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might and these words which I commend thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou and liest down, when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt break them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates.” {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 245.2}

This is a complete model for Bible study. It was not intended to be local, for the Jews merely but is for all persons, in all time. Not that we are to wear phylacteries as the Jews did; this passage does not command that. The first part explains the last. The word of God is to be studied and meditated upon so much that it will have a controlling influence over every act that our hands perform. We should work so that all that we do will bear the impress of the word. Thus it will be for a sign upon our hands. In like manner the forehead stand for the mind, which is to be stored with the truths of God’s word. They are ever to be before our eyes. But we wish to call a special attention to the 6th and 7th verses. We are commanded to talk of the word when we sit in the house, and when we walk by the way, and when we lie down, and when we rise up. Now how can this be done? Must we carry a Bible with us continually? That would be very inconvenient, and almost impossible. We could not use it while we were at work, nor in the night. The previous expression explains the whole thing: “And the words, which I command thee this day, shall be *in thine heart*.” That is the secret of Bible knowledge. The Bible must be read so carefully that the words will be indelibly fixed in our mind. Then we can meditated upon them wherever we are, or whatever we are doing. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 245.3}

It used to be the custom to learn portions of the Bible “by heart,” as it was called. Unfortunately it is one of the good practices that is going out of date. People are afraid of being formal. They are so afraid of having a mere intellectual knowledge of the Bible, that they run the risk of having no knowledge at all. We may make the study of the Scriptures a mechanical act, whatever way we study them, but committing portions of it to memory is no more liable to be a mechanical art than simply reading it. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 245.4}

And even if we do not sit down with the express purpose of learning a certain portion, if we read the Bible as much as we ought, and give earnest, prayerful heed to that which we read, it will become fixed in our minds almost unconsciously. And who can estimate the good that would result from such a course? The Bible becomes our constant companion. We can meditate upon the word wherever we are. And by thinking upon it, and having our minds filled with it, evil thoughts will be crowded out. It is like being in the company of pure and good men. Such company molds us; we become like the company that we keep. If we have the Bible for our constant companion, as we may have, our characters will be molded by it. The Spirit of the Lord can then the more easily make impressions on our hearts, for it works through the word. And we cannot be influenced by the Bible unless we do make it our own, and become permeated by it. Nothing will atone for neglect of God’s word. Shall we not, then, *search* the Scriptures, instead of hastily running through them? E. J. W. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 245.5}

**“When Did They Worship” The Signs of the Times, 9, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Much stress is laid by the advocates of Sunday observance, upon the statement made by some modern historians that the early Christians met for worship on the first day of the week. This argument is their stronghold; in fact, it is the only hold they have, for, as many of them will admit, the Bible does not command or authorize the observance of that day. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.1}

Now we do not regard it as the slightest consequence, as far as our duty is concerned, whether some of the early Christians met on Sunday or on Monday, or whether they refrained from meeting at all. We do not remember that the Bible sets up any men or set of men as patterns for the rest of mankind. In short, we depend for the knowledge of our duty upon what the Bible says, and not upon what some one did. “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked,” says the prophet; and another inspired writer says that “there is none that doeth good; no, not one;” but we know that “the words of the Lord are pure words,” and that man is to live by “every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” There is no man who is not liable to err; the Bible alone is infallible. In regard to the Scriptures, we hold to the faith of the primitive Methodists, and the *published* beliefs of the later Methodists, that “whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” This is why we do not keep Sunday on the authority of tradition. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.2}

But this does not answer the question at the head of this article. If, therefore, we were asked to give a definite answer to the question, “Upon what day did the earliest Christians meet to worship?” We would say without hesitation that the Bible Christians worshiped, and kept holy, the seventh day of the week, commonly known as Saturday-the day which the Jews have observed since they existed as a nation. That there were some who did not keep the Bible Sabbath but yielded to the custom of the heathen around them, and partially observed Sunday, we have not the slightest doubt. There are always those who want to have religion popular; those who are glad to make themselves believe that what the majority does is right. It was in this way that Sunday observance was instituted; it is largely in this way that it is maintained. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.3}

We say that it would make no difference as far as our duty is concerned, whether some of the early Christians met on Sunday or not. So long as the Bible says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work,” we are under obligation to keep the seventh day. The fact that others do wrong will not justify us in a wrong course. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.4}

But we are far from believing that the apostles taught their converts, either Jewish or Gentile, to observe any other than the seventh day of the week. We derive this opinion from the Bible; but a little incidental testimony has lately come under our notice, that may be of interest to some. We were reading in Coneybeare and Howson’s “Life and Epistles of Paul,” the account of his labors at Corinth, as told in Acts 16:1-18. It will be remembered that when the Jews rejected Paul’s teaching, he left them, and went to the Gentiles. Being driven out of the synagogue, “he entered into a certain man’s house, named Justus, one that worshiped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue.” Of this act the book above mentioned says:- {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.5}

“Whatever we may surmise concerning the motive of this choice, certain consequences must have followed from the contiguity of the church and the synagogue, and some incident resulting from it may have suggested the mention of the fact. The Jewish and Christian congregations would often meet face to face in the street, and all the success of the gospel would become more palpable and conspicuous.” {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.6}

Mark well this sentence: “The Jewish and Christian congregations would often meet face to face in the street.” Did the Jews congregate for worship? On the seventh day, as did everybody. So well settled is this fact that the seventh day is very commonly spoken of as the “Jewish Sabbath,” or, to indicate the contempt felt for it, “The Old Jewish Sabbath.” Then on what day must the Corinthian Christians have met for worship, in order to meet Jewish congregations face to face in the street? On the seventh day, of course. Here we have the opinion of these historians, themselves first-day men, as to the day on which Christians were accustomed to worship. To be sure the testimony is incidental, but it is all the more forcible on that account. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.7}

Our opponents usually say, when confronted with such texts as Acts 13:42, 44; 16:13; 17:2, and 18:4, that the apostles preached on the Sabbath in order that they might reach the Jews, who assembled on that day. But in this case Paul had ceased to labor for the Jews, and was preaching only to the Gentiles, in the house of a Gentile. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.8}

“But,” some one will now say, “this testimony that you have quoted is not Bible; it is only the opinion of fallible men.” And is it the case, then, that testimony of men is good when it favors Sunday observance, and worthless when it is unfavorable to that custom? When men come to such a conclusion, testimony or argument is useless. We admit that the paragraph which we quote is only the opinion of a man, but it is the testimony of a man who is not a believer in the seventh-day Sabbath, and as such is entitled to far more credence than are the mere opinions of first-day men in favor of Sunday observance. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 247.9}

In conclusion we will briefly state a point from the Bible, which will prove that this opinion is correct; that Paul did worship on the seventh-day Sabbath. Sometime after Paul’s labors in Corinth, he returned to Jerusalem, where he was seized by the Jews, and put on trial for his life. He was accused of sedition, and of seeking to overthrow the customs of the Jews. In his reply he expressly stated (Acts 24:14), that he believed “all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.” Then certainly he believed that the seventh day is the Sabbath, for that is a very prominent part of the law and the prophets. And Paul was not a man to act contrary to his belief. In a later discourse he said: “I have committed nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers.” One custom of the “fathers” among the Jews, was to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. Now when Paul says that he had done nothing contrary to those customs, who dare dispute his word, and say that he violated the Sabbath? We never lay any stress on “apostolic practice,” nevertheless we are content to follow their practice in regard to Sabbath observance. E. J. W. {SITI May 31, 1883, p. 248.1}