**“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 20**

1. Where do you find the story of the rich man and Lazarus? Luke 16:19-31. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.1}

2. What description is given of the rich man? Verse 19. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.2}

3. What is said of Lazarus the beggar? Verses 20, 21. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.3}

4. What happened to them both? Verse 22. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.4}

5. Throughout the narrative, in what condition are they both represented as being? Verses 30, 31. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.5}

6. What further shows that they are not considered as being alive? Verse 25. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.6}

7. What is cited in the narrative as sufficient authority concerning the future? Verses 29, 31. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.7}

8. In the Old Testament, what do we learn as to the condition of the dead? Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.8}

9. What becomes of their thoughts? Psalm 146:3, 4. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.9}

10. How much interest are they able to manifest in the affairs of their friends who still live? Job 14:21. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.10}

11. Where is the rich man represented as being after his death and burial? But 16:22, 23. (See Revised Version.) {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.11}

12. What does the word “hell” (*hades*) signify? 1 Corinthians 15:55. (See marginal reading of the word “grave.”) {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.12}

13. What have we learned as to the dominion of death and the grave over mankind? Psalm 89:48. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.13}

14. To what place did Christ go when he died? Acts 2:29-32. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.14}

15. What kind of a place is the grave? Job 10:20-22. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.15}

16. What can you say concerning the activity of the wicked in the grave? Psalm 31:17. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.16}

17. Why should people not put off that which they find to do in their life-time? Ecclesiastes 9:10. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.17}

18. In view of this state of things, what kind of a land is the grave called? Psalm 88:10-12. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.18}

19. In the narrative before us, where is the beggar represented as having been taken? Luke 16:22. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.19}

20. What does the inspired record say of Abraham and his death? Genesis 25:8. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.20}

21. Can this mean that he went to Heaven? Joshua 24:2. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.21}

22. What is meant by “being gathered to his people’? Genesis 15:15. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.22}

23. Was any different disposition made of Abraham than of the rich man in our lesson? Compare Genesis 15:15; 25:9, with Luke 16:22. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.23}

24. Then must not all of these persons, if all of them ever really existed, have gone to the same place? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.24}

25. What is the place to which all the dead go? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.25}

**LESSON FOR DECEMBER 27**

1. Relate what is stated in the 16th of Luke concerning the rich man and the beggar. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.26}

2. What happened to them both? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.27}

3. To what place have we learned that they both went? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.28}

4. Do you know of any people who are exempt from going into the grave? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.29}

5. What does the psalmist say about all men going into the grave? Psalm 89:48. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.30}

6. Of what was “man” formed? Genesis 2:7. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.31}

7. What did he afterward become? *Ib*. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.32}

8. What was imparted to him to bring about this change? *Ib*. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.33}

9. Does the breath have life and consciousness in itself? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.34}

10. How does the wise man describe the death of man? Ecclesiastes 12:7. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.35}

11. Since there is nothing to man but that which is formed of the dust, and the breath, can there be any conscious entity when the dust returns to the earth? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.36}

12. Give a brief summary of the Scripture statements concerning the dead-their place and condition. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.37}

13. Since both Lazarus and the rich man are represented in Luke 16 as dead, could the conversation ascribed to them have been real? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.38}

14. What other instances can you cite of inanimate objects represented as talking? Genesis 4:10; Habakkuk 2:10; James 5:4. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.39}

15. What are such representations called?See Webster’s definition of “apologue.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.40}

16. What important lesson is taught by this apologue? {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.41}

17. With what precious statement of Christ is it in harmony? Luke 16:11-13. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.42}

18. What action of the Pharisees made its recital necessary? Luke 16:14. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.43}

19. Why is human judgment as to the comparative worth of man liable to be at fault? 1 Samuel 16:7. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.44}

20. When will every man be judged according to his real merit? 1 Corinthians 4:5. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.45}

21. What will the righteous Judge give to those who love his appearing? 2 Timothy 4:8. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.46}

22. How will the despised, humble poor man stand then? James 2:5. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.47}

23. When will the angels actually take the righteous to the mansions of rest? Matthew 24:30, 31. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.48}

24. When will the wicked be tormented? Matthew 13:40-42. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.49}

25. When the separation is thus made, what fixes the gulf between the righteous and the wicked? Revelation 22:11. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.50}

That which forms the basis of these two lessons, is the story of the rich man and Lazarus, as found in Luke 16:19-31. It is given in the lesson under the general heading, “Immortality,” although the Scripture has really nothing to do with that subject. The condition of the dead, or the final reward of the righteous and the wicked, was not the subject under consideration, and Christ did not design by this passage to teach anything concerning either of those things. The only object, then, in considering it as bearing on the subject of immortality, is to show what it does *not* teach, rather than what it does, and to make it the means of refreshing our minds on certain plain declarations of Scripture already learned. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.51}

The idea that has become popular in regard to this passage of Scripture, is that a real occurrence is described-that the soul, or spirit, of Lazarus, and his death, was borne a way to a place called Abraham’s bosom, in the full enjoyment of unutterable bliss, and that the disembodied soul, or spirit, of the rich man, as conscious as when it inhabited the body, was cast down to hell, there to suffer the torments of the damned. So firmly fixed is this idea in the minds of the majority of people, that it will be necessary to show its inconsistency before stating what the text is really designed to teach. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.52}

Let us, then, for a moment suppose the passage to be a plain narration of fact. “And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom.” Verse 22. The other is the law of language by which it can be made to appear that that which “was carried” is not the same thing that “died.” Popular theory would have it that the *body* of Lazarus died, and that his *soul*, or *spirit*, was carried to Abraham’s bosom. But the language forbids any such construction. “The beggar died and [the beggar] was carried.” If only the body died, then only the body was carried; if it was the soul or spirit that was carried, then it was only the soul or spirit that died. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that a man is describing a hurricane and its effects. Of a certain building, he says: “The house trembled to its foundation, and was blown down.” Now if, when you inquire the amount of the loss, he should say, “Oh, the house was not blown down, it was the people who were in it,” would you not think that he needed to learn how to use the English language? So we think concerning those who would argue from this passage that one part of Lazarus died and another part was carried to Abraham’s bosom. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.53}

Again, we meet with the same difficulty in the case of the rich man. “The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes.” In this case the language plainly says that that which died was the same that was buried, and this again was the same that is next said to be in hell. If it was only the body that died and was buried, then it was only the body that was in torment. If it was the soul that was in torment, then was the soul that died. It will be noticed that throughout the narrative, all parties are represented as possessed of all the organs and faculties of ordinary living beings. These things are sufficient to show that the popular idea is inconsistent with itself, and that we cannot look upon this scripture as containing the relation of an natural occurrence. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.54}

This conclusion is still further sustained by a consideration of the fact that both parties in this narrative are represented as dead. It is said of both that they died; Abraham says to the rich man, “Son, remember that thou in thy *life-time* receivedst thy goods things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but *now* he is comforted, and thou art tormented.” Here is a direct contrast between their present condition and their life-time. Now when we remember that “the dead know not anything;” that when man’s “breath goeth forth and he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish;” that they perceive not when their friends are exalted or abased (Job 14:21), we conclude that this passage must partake of the nature of a fable. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.55}

We find, moreover, that the word here translated “hell,” is *hades*, and this, we are told, is the Greek word signifying the place of all the dead. If we turn to 1 Corinthians 15:55, we find that “hell” (*hades*) is placed in the margin as the equivalent of “grave” in the verse. Now in Psalm 89:48 we learn that there are none who can deliver their souls from the power of the grave; and in harmony with this, we find that both righteous and wicked go there. Genesis 37:35; Job 14:13; Psalm 31:17. Still further, we find that this place where all go is a “land of forgetfulness” (Psalm 88:10-12); a “land of darkness, as darkness itself,” “where the light is as darkness” (Job 10:22); and that in it “there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom” (Ecclesiastes 9:10). Since all the dead go there, this narrative concerning those who are expressly declared to be dead, could not have been an actual occurrence. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.56}

This narrative may then properly be called a fable or an apologue. But the latter, Webster defines as “a story or relation of fictitious events, intended to convey useful truths; a moral fable.” It differs from a parable, in this respect: a parable relates things which do take place among mankind, and which therefore *might* occur in the case supposed; but an apologue relates the supposed actions and words of brutes and inanimate things. Of this figure of speech there are many instances in the Bible, as in Genesis 4:10, where Abel’s blood is said to cry; in Habakkuk 2:11, where the stone and the beam are said to speak together; in James 5:4, where the hire of the laborers is said to cry; and an extended instance occurs in Judges 9:8-15, where the trees are represented as talking among themselves, and choosing a king. In all of these cases, some truth is designed to be conveyed in a striking manner. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.57}

In order to understand what this fable is designed to teach, we must observe the connection. The chapter opens with the parable of the steward. He was commended because he prudently provided for the future. From this, the Saviour showed the necessity of using the wealth with which God may intrust us, in his service, so that he may commit to our trust true riches. Said he, “Ye cannot serve God and mammon.” “And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him.” They regarded riches as a mark of God’s especial favor, and poverty as indicating his displeasure. He therefore, by a fable drawn from their own tradition, showed that if a man has all his good things in this life, he can expect nothing more. He may *seem* to be far above his poverty-stricken but pious neighbor, but when things are seen as they really are, as God sees them, it will appear that there is indeed a great gulf between them, but that the advantage is all in favor of the poor man. Death ends the probation of every man, and thus *fixes* this gulf, so that there can be no changing of positions. E. J. W. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 726.58}

**“The Salvation Army” The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

Several weeks ago we copied from an editorial in the *Holiness Evangelist* a few sentences descriptive of an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army. The editor, although expressing a mild doubt as to the strict necessity for all their antics, was very enthusiastic in his praise of the meeting, telling how much good he had received, and advising everybody to attend the next one. One has just been held in San Jose, and a delegation of about seventy-five went down from Oakland. From the report of it in a paper published in Oakland, by members of the Salvation Army, we make the following extracts:- {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 728.1}

“On the way down the drums and brass instruments, the tambourines, and the human lungs and voices were strained to their utmost. The psalmist, if he had been there, would have been reminded of his old days when men rejoiced before the Lord with all their might.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 728.2}

If incoherent screeches, and a jargon of confused sounds constitute praise to God, then a minstrel show must be a very pious place, and a gang of hoodlums must be devout beyond all computation. Lest any should think that our comparisons are unjust, we quote from their own description of what took place after they reached the place of meeting in San Jose:- {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 728.3}

“The Salvationists filled the platform full. Then commenced a meeting that is perfectly inconceivable to those who haven’t seen it,-a meeting into which is brought into combination all the amusing features of a minstrel show, and the earnestness and solemnity of the day of Judgment. There was levity without license; unbounded fun, without a thought of sin in it; faces laughing in every feature with unmeasured glee, yet all radiant with the glory of God. Here was war in Heaven sure enough. Any one who has the idea that fighting sin is going to be a long-faced business had better go to an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 728.4}

That one of the participators could be serious and write stuff like the above, is sufficient evidence of the terrible delusion into which these people have fallen. To imagine that the solemnity of the Judgment can be associated with fun, levity, and the amusing features of a minstrel show, argues an amount of moral blindness that would be incomprehensible in professed Christians, were it not for certain texts of Scripture to be noticed hereafter. If any think that we publish such things for the purpose of holding them up to ridicule, they greatly mistake our purpose. It is too serious a matter for ridicule. We do it simply to call attention to the nature and tendency of the Salvation Army, and kindred organizations. We have held that the Salvation Army, and the so-called “Holiness Bands,” which are the same thing only less boisterous, are but feeders for Spiritualism; that they are, in fact, forms of Spiritualism; and that the leaders are simply in training, unconsciously, for Spiritualist mediums. Before we give a Scriptural reason for this judgment, we will present two or three paragraphs more, which may, perhaps, cause some to read with more interest and attention that which follows. In defending the statement that there is a Spiritualist gate to the heavenly city, the paper says: {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 728.5}

“Every Christian must see that Spiritualism has in it a great truth mixed with much error. This truth is the resurrection of the dead, but the Spiritualists are not out half far enough yet. This work cannot be complete till they can materialize the dead, and keep them materialized, so that they shall put on incorruption.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.1}

Again, in another article we find this:- {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.2}

“When God shall have prepared us, and when we ‘know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of the sufferings, being made conformable unto his death’ (Philippians 3:10), then shall we attain the resurrection of the dead, that is, we shall have power to call forth the dead, and, by virtue of the God power in us, assist them to put on incorruption.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.3}

One specimen paragraph from an article, “The Vail Taken Away,” will suffice to show to what extent some who profess Christ, or even now given over to a “mind void of judgment:”- {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.4}

“Through the past dispensation men have preached ‘Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness’ (1 Corinthians 1:23), but this stumbling block, this vail, is to be taken away.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.5}

These extracts indicate the tendency of this movement. If it should be urged that no respectable number of people will ever accept such foolishness and error, we reply that there are tens of thousands of Spiritualists who seriously hold to error even worse than that which we have quoted. What is to hinder *all* members of the “Salvation Army” and the “Holiness Bands” from accepting the same and worse, even if they do not at present go to such great lengths? In their present attitude there is nothing to hinder it, but everything to favorite. Let us examine the guide book and see. In Romans 1:28, the apostle speaks of the heathen, whom God gave over to a “reprobate mind,” or, as the margin has it, to “a mind avoid of judgment.” The reason for this was “when they knew God they glorified him not as God,” and “did not like to retain God in their knowledge.” Again, in the 2 Timothy 3:8, the same apostle speaks of others who are “of *no judgment* [margin] concerning the faith.” These are not heathen, but professing Christians, men who have “a form of godliness.” In their case, also, their lack of judgment concerning spiritual things, is due to the fact that, though they are “ever learning,” they are “never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” and the reason for this is that they “*resist* the truth.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.6}

Such a condition of mind as this,-the individual being unable to judge correctly concerning the truth,-is the legitimate result of resisting it. The Saviour said: “Yet a little while is the light with you.Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness *knoweth not whither he goeth*.” John 12:35. From this we can learn nothing else than that light will not remain with the person forever, unless used. “The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day;” but if one rejects light, darkness comes, and then he will not know whither he goeth. “If the light that is in thee be darkness,” said Jesus, “how great is that darkness.” Matthew 6:23. The greater the light of man has, the greater will be the errors into which he will fall if he turns away from it. The case of Saul is an illustration of this. Called of God to rule over his people, and enjoying the favor of God, he rejected the word of the Lord, and was left to himself. The consequence was that he deliberately went for counsel to a woman who was in league with the devil, although he had previously strongly condemned all such practices. Numerous other instances might be cited to show how enlightened Christians may, by rejecting certain truth, fall to a condition where an outrageous sin will appear to them to be an act of righteousness. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.7}

Now how is it with these people? Do they exalt the law of God, and require their “converts” obedience to it? By no means. The law of God is the last thing thought of. The quotations made above show the looseness of their teaching. The “holiness” people, who are more conservative than their brethren of the “Salvation Army,” also repudiate the law. Nearly three years ago a “holiness” paper published in this city, stated that one of the most effectual methods of checking the spread of holiness among the people was to “imbue them with the idea that they are to be holy by striving to do right, to keep the law of God.” We have never seen this statement repudiated by any so-called “holiness” paper, and we have kept close watch of those published on this coast. It was only recently that the editor of the principal Pacific Coast “holiness” paper, and the leader of the movement in this city, when asked concerning the duty of man to obey the law of God, and keep his Sabbath said that he had no patience with anybody that would ask such a question. Of course not. His mission is to spread “holiness,” and obedience to the law would checking it entirely. For our part we profess no sympathy with “holiness” that is opposed to God’s law, and we shall do all in our part to check it. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.8}

We have said that this movement leads directly into the follies and wickedness of Spiritualism. We repeat the statement. Give this thought careful attention: There is no intermediate ground between truth and error. Said Christ: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” Matthew 12:30. If a man does not believe the truth, he must believe its opposite-error. But ever, owing to the natural deceitfulness of the human heart, rapidly propagates itself. As one falsehood leads to another, so one error accepted leads to the acceptance of another, and this, too many more. This is in harmony with the words of Christ, that if light be not accepted, darkness will come in its stead, and the unfortunate one will not know where he is going. By his own acts he places himself where he cannot control himself, and is led captive by Satan at his will. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.9}

The Bible, however, speaks plainly on this point. We read (2 Thessalonians 2:9-12) that just before the coming of the Lord, the devil will work among certain people with “all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” This indicates nothing less than complete satanic possession. How is it that Satan acquires such complete control them? “Because they received not the love of the truth.” “Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie,” is allowed to come upon all “who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.” Now when we remember that the law of God alone is truth and righteousness (Psalm 119:142, 151, 172, etc.), and that these “holiness” people do not *profess* to believe it nor have pleasure therein, how can we doubt that they are opening the door for Satan to take possession, or, in other words, running into Spiritualism? As a matter of course, they all hold to that foundation doctrine of Spiritualism, natural immortality, or, the conscious existence of the dead. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.10}

We would not be understood as saying that all members of these “bands” and “armies” have so fully rejected truth that they cannot be reclaimed. We only show a tendency of the movement. Many of them have never seen the light in its clearness; all such will have ample opportunity to accept it if they will. There is great danger, however, that these will become too infatuated to even see the light when it comes. They are educated to believe that feeling is faith, and that self-satisfaction is the evidence of the approbation of God. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.11}

We write in no spirit of harsh criticism. We pity the poor souls who are ensnared by this terrible delusion. But we feel that we would be recreant to duty if we did not sound a note of warning to those who may be looking upon the movement with favor. We make no apology for plain words concerning Spiritualism itself, and we know not why we should not be equally zealous in warning people against its advance guard. To all those not yet deluded, we would say, Give no countenance, either by word or by presence, to this counterfeit religion. You cannot afford, for the sake of gratifying your curiosity, to run the risk of falling under its power. Do not be misled by loud professions, and fervent prayers and exhortations, while the power of the “truth,” and even the profession of it, are wanting. Remember that the Lord has said: “To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and *trembleth at my word*.” E. J. W. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.12}

**“The Lord’s Day. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued.*)

From the Bible we have fully identified the Lord’s day. Following is a brief summary of the means by which it is done: The title Lord is applied to both Christ and the Father. Since these two are one, that which belongs to one must be the property of the other also; there can be no division between them. In Isaiah 58:13 we learn that the Lord’s day is holy, and that it is the Sabbath; and this at once caused us to turn to the fourth commandment, where we found that the seventh day is declared to be the Sabbath. Since the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord (Exodus 20:10), and the Sabbath is the Lord’s holy day (Exodus 20:10, 11; Isaiah 58:13), it necessarily follows that the seventh day is the Lord’s day. Lest any one should think that this is not definite enough, we have it stated that the women who rested on the “Sabbath day, according to the commandment” (Luke 23:56), did so upon the day before the first day of the week, or in other words, upon the *seventh day of the week*. In the naming of the days of the week, the name “Saturday” was given to the seventh day (see Webster’s Dictionary, Cyclopedias, etc.), and since the names are now used more frequently than the numerals, it may be more clear if we say that from the Bible we find that the day now called Saturday is the Lord’s day. So confident are we of the correctness of our deductions that we defy anybody to show from the Bible that any other day than Saturday is entitled to the designation “Lord’s day.” {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.13}

Although the fact that the seventh day-Saturday-is the true Lord’s day has been established, we will carry our investigation further, and show that there is no chance for even the supposition that any other day was elevated to the position of Lord’s day. In the second chapter of Mark, we find that on a certain occasion the Pharisees reproved Christ for allowing his disciples to satisfy their hunger on the Sabbath day, by eating the wheat which they plucked as they walked through the field. It will not be disputed that the day here called “the Sabbath day” was the seventh day of the week,-Saturday,-because it was the day which the Pharisees recognized as the Sabbath. Let this be borne in mind while you read the words of Christ, “Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” Mark 2:28. In the face of this, can anyone deny that the seventh-day Sabbath is the Lord’s day? The fourth commandment plainly declares that it is so, and Christ has added his testimony to the same effect. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 729.14}

It is sometimes claimed that the text last quoted, “The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,” shows that, as Lord of the Sabbath, Christ had the authority to do with it as he pleased, even to changing it, or dispensing with it entirely. We will not discuss the question of his right or power; the only question that can affect the case is, Did he, as Lord of the Sabbath, violate it, or give any individuals license to do so? He did not, as we shall see; then, of course, his being Lord of the Sabbath day, does not alter our relation to it. He was its Lord from the beginning, and we cannot show our allegiance to him as our Lord, without honoring the day which he especially claims as his own. We will now examine some texts to show how Jesus regarded the Sabbath day. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 730.1}

In Luke 4:16 we read as follows concerning an act of Christ very soon, after his baptism: “And he came to Nazareth, where he was brought up; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.” Webster’s definition of the word “custom” is this: “Frequent repetition of the same act; way of acting; ordinary manner; habitual practice; usage.” So we learn that it was his habitual practice to observe the seventh-day Sabbath as a day of public worship. This is in perfect harmony with his declaration in John 15:10: “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” If he kept his Father’s commandments, He must have kept the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week; and so we learn from Christ’s own statement, made the very night of his betrayal, that he had always kept the Sabbath. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 730.2}

John 5:18 is sometimes quoted as proof that Christ did not regard the Sabbath as sacred. His own testimony should certainly be taken in preference to that of the Pharisees. They said that he had broken the Sabbath; he said, some time after the events recorded in John 5, “I have kept my Father’s commandments.” We must believe, then, that he did not break the Sabbath. It is true he went directly contrary to some of the Rabbinical traditions, but that amounts to nothing. Had he followed their traditions, he could not have kept the law, for by their traditions they transgressed the law. Matthew 5:3. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 730.3}

What had Jesus done that the Pharisees accused him of Sabbath-breaking? He had on the Sabbath day healed a man of an infirmity of thirty-eight years’ standing, and had told him to take up to little mat upon which he was lying, and walk. John 5:1-9. Now was this a good act? Most certainly it was. Well, Jesus himself declared, on another and similar occasion, that “it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days.” Matthew 12:12. He is the Lord of the Sabbath, and, as such, was competent to declare the law of the Sabbath. The charge that Jesus broke the Sabbath comes now, as it did then, from a narrow and mistaken idea of the Sabbath commandment. He said that his act was lawful, and so it was, but the fourth commandment forbids only *our own*, or secular work. Work that is done in the service of God, as was that performed by the priests in the sanctuary, work that does not in any way benefit the worker, but is solely for the glory of God, is not forbidden by the commandment. Thus the Saviour is vindicated from the charge of Sabbath-breaking. How serious a charge this is, and how blindly wicked are those who make it, will be shown next week. E. J. W. {SITI December 4, 1884, p. 730.4}

**“Ancient Spiritualism. Saul and the Witch” The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 3.
Ancient Spiritualism.**

**SAUL AND THE WITCH**

1. When on a certain occasion the Philistine host came against Israel, how was King Saul affected? 1 Samuel 28:4, 5. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.1}

2. To whom did he seek for guidance? Verses 7, 8. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.2}

3. How had Saul previously treated such people? Verses 3, 9. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.3}

4. By what authority had he done so? Exodus 22:18; Leviticus 20:27. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.4}

5. Why had the Lord given such instruction concerning the diviners, consulters of familiar spirits, etc.? Deuteronomy 18:10-12. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.5}

6. With what people were such abominations common? Verses 9, 12. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.6}

7. What had the Lord said it would be the result to those who should seek after such persons? Leviticus 19:31. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.7}

8. Since Saul had obeyed the Lord in putting away those who had familiar spirits, why did he now consult one? 1 Samuel 28:6. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.8}

9. When he went, for whom did he ask? Verse 11. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.9}

10. Why did he not go directly to Samuel? Verse 3. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.10}

11. What can you say concerning the part which the dead are able to act in earthly affairs? Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.11}

12. Give other Scripture testimony concerning the state of the dead. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.12}

13. Then could it indeed have been Samuel himself who carried on the subsequent conversation with Saul? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.13}

14. Was Saul at this time in favor with the Lord? 1 Samuel 28:6. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.14}

15. Why had the Lord rejected Saul? 1 Samuel 15:22, 23. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.15}

16. When people reject the word of the Lord, what are they left to believe? 2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.16}

17.Then since Saul had rejected the word of the Lord, what must his supposed interview with Samuel have been? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.17}

18. Who is the author of the illusions and lies? John 8:44. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.18}

19. Whom did he then worship? 1 Corinthians 10:20. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.19}

20. When the Israelites turned from the Lord, whom did they worship? Deuteronomy 32:16, 17. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.20}

21. Then what sort of a spirit was it which Saul consulted? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.21}

22. How is the devil able to make himself appear? 2 Corinthians 11:14. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.22}

23. If he can appear as an angel light, would it not be easy for him to assume the appearance of persons who have died? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.23}

24. How could Saul hath kept from being deceived? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.24}

The lesson this week is based on the account of Saul’s visit to the witch of Endor, recorded in the 1 Samuel 28. In order to keep the connection, the entire chapter should be carefully read. It may not be amiss to say that many good people suppose that Samuel did really come and talk with Saul, and thus they are strengthened in their belief of the conscious existence of the dead. We shall follow the subject in the order of the questions in the lesson, and see what we find. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.25}

The scene opens with the Philistine host prepared to fight against the Israelites. So great was the number of the Philistines, as compared with that of the Israelites, that Saul was very much alarmed. As it is forcibly expressed in the text, “his heart greatly trembled.” When David was surrounded by enemies, he said to the Lord, in his prayer, “What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee;” but Saul was in a pitiable condition, for when he would seek the Lord, he received no answer. In his extremity he had his servants find a woman that had a familiar spirit, and, disguising himself, he went to her for information. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.26}

It was necessary for him to disguise himself, else he could not have gained admittance to the witch’s abode; for in time past, “Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land.” This was in accordance with the command of God, and does not mean simply banishment, but death. Thus: “Thou shall not suffer a witch to live.” Exodus 22:18. “A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard shall surely be put to death.” Leviticus 20:27. In Deuteronomy 18:9-12 we learn that witchcraft, and consulting with familiar spirits, was very common among the heathen that inhabited Canaan and before it was conquered by the Israelites. Under direction from the Lord, Moses said to Israel: “When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.” The woman at Endor was one who had, by some means, escaped the proscription. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.27}

In order to a perfect understanding of this incident, it is very necessary to know the relation that existed between Saul and the Lord. Why would not the Lord listen to Saul? The answer is founded 1 Samuel 15. The Lord had given Saul a commission, and he had not fulfilled it. He deliberately disobeyed the Lord. And this was only one of a long series of disobedient acts. So the prophet Samuel announced the will of the Lord, in these words: “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” 1 Samuel 15:23. From that time, we learn that Samuel came no more to see Saul. So we see that Saul’s rejection by the Lord was due to the fact that he himself had first rejected the Lord. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.28}

When Saul came to the witch, he said, “Bring me up Samuel.” Why did he not seek directly to the prophet himself? Because “Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city.” 1 Samuel 28:3. In response to this request the woman told him that she saw an old man, covered with a mantle, coming up out of the earth. Verses 13, 14. The reader will notice that in this case Saul did not seek the apparition at all, but “perceived that it was Samuel,” from the woman’s description. Notice, also, that the pious Samuel was called “up,” and came up “out of the earth,” instead of down from heaven. Saul knew nothing about the doctrine of the good going to Heaven at death, and the heathen, one of whom he was consulting, it had all souls, good and bad alike, in the lower world-in *hades*. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.29}

Now what reasons have we for saying that Samuel did not converse with Saul on that occasion, and was not there at all? 1. It is not reasonable to suppose that, if Samuel would not during his life-time listen to Saul, whom he loved, when personally urged do so, he would come to him after death, at the solicitation of a despised heathen. 2. It is the height of absurdity to suppose that God, who had rejected Saul, and had refused to answer him in his own appointed way,-by dreams, by Urim, or by prophets,-would communicate with him through one whom he had said should be put to death as an abominable thing. 3. That which settles the matter beyond all controversy, is the word of inspiration: “The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything.” “Also their love, and their hatred, and there envy, is now perished.” “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.” Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, 10. Man’s “breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm 146:4. Satan has the power of *death;* but the Lord alone has *life*. Satan can seize men, and shut them up in his prison house, the grave; but Satan cannot liberate them; Christ alone has the keys of the grave; he alone can set Satan’s captives free. For these reasons, we say we *know* that Samuel had no more to do with the occurrence narrated in 1 Samuel 28, than the stones under their feet. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.30}

“If Samuel was not there, who personated him so successfully as to deceive Saul?” Satan, or one of his evil angels. And this also is susceptible of Bible proof. First, we learn that “Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.” 2 Corinthians 11:14. It was as an angel light, his true form and character concealed, that he came with his temptations to Christ in the wilderness. Had he come as the chief of the powers of darkness, he could not have hoped to make any impression on the Saviour. He hoped to deceive Jesus into thinking that he was an angel sent with a message from heaven. The Lord, however, saw through the disguise at once. But the point is, if Satan may appear as an angel light, how much more may he not personate a human being. To successfully personate another is nothing more than many *man* are able to do. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.31}

Second, Saul had put himself on the devil’s ground. Long before he had first cast off, and then been cast off by the Lord. Now there is no neutral ground between the Lord and Satan. As soon as Saul was entirely out from under the influence of God, he passed under the influence of Satan. His frenzied attacks on the innocent David showed the influence under which he had fallen. Then what more natural than that he, being under the influence of the devil, should go to the devil for help? A “familiar spirit” is “a demon or evil spirit supposed to attend the call.”-*Webster*. “Witchcraft” is “intercourse with evil spirits.” See also the definition of “sorcery,” and “enchantment.” This was what the heathen practiced. Their worship was devil worship. “But I say, that the things which the Gentile sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils.” 1 Corinthians 10:20. Whenever the Israelites forsook the Lord, they engaged in devil worship. See Deuteronomy 32:16, 17; Psalm 106:34-37. No wonder that they were an abomination to the Lord. Therefore, since Saul had voluntarily put himself under the devil’s power, we are forced to conclude that the devil deceived him in this instance. Deceived him, indeed he did; for if space permitted, we could show that Saul did not die on the morrow, as was intimated to him. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.32}

“How could Saul have kept from being deceived?” By heeding the word of the Lord. “Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie” (2 Thessalonians 2:9-12), is not sent to men until they reject the truth. And in that case, how could it be otherwise? If a man does not believe the truth, what is there but lies for him to believe? Remember, also, that it is an “evil heart of unbelief” that first leads men away from God, and under the devil’s power. And now we will give a sure rule for detecting all evil spirits. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20. Christ at once detected Satan’s attempted imposture because he acted contrary to the written word. So when we hear of men who pretend to communicate with the dead, we may know that there is no light in them, because the Bible says “the dead know not anything.” If we strictly adhere to God’s word, we cannot be deceived; if we cast any portion of it aside, we need not hope to stand. E. J. W. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 742.33}

**“The Lord’s Day. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued.*)

At the close of our article last week, we were considering the charge made against Christ, that he violated the Sabbath. Those who make this charge are doubtless not aware of its real import, and we will therefore show them. The Sabbath commandment is one of the ten precepts of the law of God. It enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. Whoever breaks that commandment is guilty of sin, “or sin is the transgression of law.” 1 John 3:4. To say, therefore, that Jesus broke the fourth, or any other of the ten commandments, is equivalent to saying that he was a sinner. It is hardly necessary to quote Peter’s assertion that he “did no sin,” for we do not know of any one that would claim in a direct manner that he did; but it is no worse to say openly that Jesus was a sinner, than it is to charge him with the violation of one of the commandments. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 744.1}

Read once more Christ’s words in John 15:10: “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” From this we understand that those who do not keep his commandments cannot abide in his love; and the idea which he conveys is that his abiding in his Father’s love was due to the observance of his commandments. It will be said that it is impossible to conceive of such a thing as that Christ should not abide in the Father’s love; this is love, and the reason is that it is impossible to conceive that Christ should in any degree deviate from the will of a Father. See John 6:38. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 744.2}

The words of Christ, in Matthew 5:17, 18, while they vindicate him from the charge of commandment-breaking, establish most firmly our conclusion that the seventh day-Saturday-is still the Lord’s day. Remembering that the fourth commandment of the law enjoins the observance of the seventh day, declaring that it is the Lord’s holy day, we read: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” As Christ said on another occasion, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. There is no possibility of mistaking these words. While heaven and earth endure, the law of God cannot be changed to the extent of the mutilation of a single letter. Then the seventh day must be the Lord’s day as long as heaven and earth remain. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 744.3}

Lest some one should cavil at John 15:10, and say that we are now to keep the commandments of Christ, and not those of the Father, we repeat that since Christ and the Father are one, their commandments must be the same. Jesus himself answered this objection in advance, not only in Matthew 5:17-19, but in John 6:38: “I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me;” and also in John 7:16: “My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.” Thus we have again proved that the seventh day is now the Lord’s day, and must remain so until the end of the time. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 744.4}

We now turn once more to trace its course through the New Testament. In the 24th of Matthew we have an instance of Christ’s tender regard for his own sacred day. In telling his disciples of the future destruction of Jerusalem, he warned them that when they should see Jerusalem compassed with armies they should flee from the city, and from all Judea. “But pray ye,” said he, “that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.” Verse 20. On this verse Olshausen says: “In interpreting this it must be observed that Jesus regards the law of the Sabbath as divine, and part of the moral law, yet without sanctioning the rigid notions which prevailed among the Jews concerning the Sabbath law as correct.” Here, again, there can be no doubt that the day to which Christ referred was the seventh day of the week-the day which the Jews kept as the Sabbath. So, then, he recognized the fact that the seventh day would be the Sabbath forty years after his ascension. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 744.5}

After the ascension of Christ, when the disciples when about their work of preaching the gospel, we find frequent mention of the Sabbath. Thus Paul and his companions went out of Philippi on the Sabbath to a place of prayer by the river-side, and he spoke to those who assembled there. Acts 16:13. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they “went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.” Acts 13:14. After Paul had concluded his discourse, and the Jews had gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles “besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.” “And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God.” Acts 13:42, 44. Again, at Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews, “Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and *three Sabbath days* reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.” Acts 17:2. When Paul arrived in Corinth, he made his home with a Jewish family, “And he reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.” Acts 18:4. This practice was kept up as long as he remained there, a year and six months, at least. Verse 11. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.1}

These texts show the custom of Paul and his companions, but it is not for that purpose that we quote them. We do not plead “apostolic example” in behalf of Sabbath observance or any other good act. That is to say, we do not keep the Sabbath *because* the apostles did. We know that they did keep the Sabbath, for the same reason that they refrained from worshiping idols, and from theft, because they had regard to regard to the law of God, which enjoins the first act, and prohibits the others, and we do the same for the same reason. Our object in quoting these references to “the Sabbath day,” is to call attention to the use of that term in the New Testament. There can be no question but that in every one of these instances the seventh day is referred to. Now the New Testament, as well as the old, was written by inspiration of God. That is, the Holy Ghost was really the author of the instruction there given. We find, then, that the Holy Ghost calls the seventh day of the week “the Sabbath day,” just the same as when the Old Testament was written. The New Testament was written by Christians and for Christians; and whatever name it uses to designate anything, must be the proper term for Christians to use, and the *only* proper term. Therefore the proper appellation for the seventh day of the week is “Sabbath,” or “Lord’s day,” for both refer to the same thing. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.2}

One point more. The New Testament does not recognize any day as the Sabbath, except the seventh day. This may easily be shown. James, in addressing the council at Jerusalem, said: “For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues *every Sabbath day*.” Acts 15:21. And Paul, in his discourse at Antioch said: “For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets *which are read every Sabbath day*.” Acts 13:27. Paul and James are both speaking of Jewish worshipers. No one questions the fact that it was conducted on the seventh day of the week, and no one would make the claim that it was ever conducted, excepting occasionally an annual festival, on the first day of the week. Therefore when those inspired apostles said that Moses and the prophets were read in the Jewish synagogue “*every* Sabbath day,” they most effectively restricted the use of the term “Sabbath” to the seventh day of the week. If something that is read on every successive seventh day, is read on *“every* Sabbath,” there is certainly no possibility that any other day of the week can be the Sabbath. But the Lord says that the Sabbath is his holy day; therefore every seventh day of the week,-every Saturday, if you please,-is a “Lord’s day.” This statement is made without the slightest fear of successful contradiction. E. J. W. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.3}

**“Who Is Responsible?” The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

The first number of the *Western Churchman*, a neat, well-printed eight-page paper, published in Denver, Col., has just come to our table. As its name indicates, it is devoted to the interests of the Episcopal Church in the West. We wish it well, and have no doubt that it will succeed. That which the most attracted our attention, however, was something not peculiar to the journal, but an extract from the catechism. In the Sunday-school lesson occurs the following:- {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.4}

“*Q*.-What did your Sponsors then for you? {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.5}

“*A*.-They did promise and vow three things in my name: {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.6}

“First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life.” {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.7}

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great it is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, “in newness of life;” or, as the catechism has it, to “renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh,” and “keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same,” all the days of his life. Now it is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God’s holy will and commandments. This is well understood and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make a promise for him. These persons are then called that child’s sponsors. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.8}

The question now arises, Suppose that the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted “the pomps and vanities of this wicked world,” and revealed in “all the sinful lusts of the flesh.” It is barely possible that they nominally believed the “articles of the Christian faith;” but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of “God’s holy will and commandments.” Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them-“sponsors”-indicates that they are. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.9}

A sponsor, according to Webster, is “one who binds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default.” Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, “I bind myself as surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself, or will suffer the consequences of such failure.” But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.10}

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child approves faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: “When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.” Luke 17:10. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.11}

2. “The wages of sin is death;” and since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves. (*a*) What is to become of the one in whose stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for he has never accepted Christ, and “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 4:12. Then to men must die for the offense of only one. This would be injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (*b*) The sponsor has, no doubt, lived a life of humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then according to the promise (Romans 10:9; Revelation 22:14), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.12}

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: “Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die.” “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.” Ezekiel 18:4, 20. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.13}

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for “every idle word that man shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment,” how much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.14}

The conclusion which any one can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. God never requires men to make promises that involves such contradictions, and that cannot be fulfilled. “But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?” Wait until he is able to make his own choice. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he cannot know what sin is, and therefore needs no baptism. “But the Saviour says, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me,’ and how dare we disobey that command?” You need not. “*Suffer*,” that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come; but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.15}

These remarks apply to all who practice what is called infant baptism. The inconsistencies herein shown up, should convince them of the folly of such a practice. We have not begun to enumerate the evils that grow out of it; their name is legion. For all of these, we ask, Who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall ask, “Who hath required this at your hands?” E. J. W. {SITI December 11, 1884, p. 745.16}

**“The Sabbath-School. Spiritualism” The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 10.
Spiritualism.**

1. What did Paul say should come in the last days? 2 Timothy 3:1. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.1}

2. What causes these perilous times? Verses 2-5. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.2}

3. What sort of persons are they who do these things? Verse 6. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.3}

4. What all-important requirement do they lack? Verse 7. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.4}

5. How do they resist the truth? Verse 8. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.5}

6. How was it that the magicians of Egypt withstood Moses? Exodus 7:10-12. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.6}

7. For what purpose will miracles be performed just before the Lord’s coming? Matthew 24:23, 24. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.7}

8. By what power did the heathen magicians perform their miracles? 1 Corinthians 10:20. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.8}

9. Then must we not expect, from the words of Paul and Christ, that by the aid of devils, miracles will be performed in the last days? Revelation 16:13, 14. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.9}

10. For what purpose do these spirits of devils work miracles? *Ib*. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.10}

11. What immediately follows their deceitful miracles? Verse 15. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.11}

12. What did Paul say the coming of Christ would immediately follow? 2 Thessalonians 2:8, 9. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.12}

13. Among other things what do these wonder-working spirits profess to be? Matthew 24:23, 24. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.13}

14. What is the specific work of Christ? John 5:40; 10:10. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.14}

15. What has Christ brought to light? 2 Timothy 1:10. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.15}

16. Then if the spirits claim to be Christ, what will they claim to have demonstrated? {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.16}

17. By what is this now fulfilled? {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.17}

18. Who originated the doctrine of the natural immortality of man? Genesis 3:4. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.18}

19. Who is this serpent? Revelation 20:2. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.19}

20. What effect does this doctrine have upon the wicked? Ezekiel 13:22. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.20}

21. How is it that people are deceived by these lies? 2 Thessalonians 2:9-12. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.21}

22. When we are urged to seek unto them that have familiar spirits, to what should we turn? Isaiah 8:19, 20. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.22}

23. How is it that we can resist the adversary? 1 Peter 5:8, 9. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.23}

24. In order to successfully resist the devil, where must we have the word of God? Psalm 119:11. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.24}

“This know also, that in the last days perilous time shall come.” Reference is here made to the time immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. The reason why the times are then so perilous, is contained in the first clause of the second verse: “For men shall be lovers of their own selves.” The sins that are afterward enumerated are simply different forms of the one great sin-supreme love for self; men will love themselves, and pleasures, more than they love God. There is no form of idolatry that is any more debasing than this. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.25}

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” Those who commit these crimes are professed followers of God. Here, then, we find that there are heathen who have a knowledge of the true God, and who profess to worship him. The sins that are imputed to them are of the same class exactly as those which are common among the ancient heathen. See Romans 1:28-32. How is it that they deny the power of godliness? By their evil practices. Paul elsewhere speaks of certain unbelieving ones, who “profess that they know God, but in works they deny him.” Titus 1:16. The apostle does not say that these persons have no power; but it is the power of *godliness* that they lack. They are of the class that the prophet speaks of, who take delight in approaching to God, who fast, and afflict themselves, and are very fervent in their devotions, yet the Lord sees them not. These are they of whom the Lord speaks in Matthew 7:22: “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?” Surely, such zeal and power must indicate true Christianity; but the Saviour says he will say to them, “I never knew you.” They will be told to depart from him. Why? Because, with all their profession, they “work iniquity,” or do unlawful deeds. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.26}

One sin seems to especially characterize this class. Not content with saying that they are “without natural affection” and “incontinent,” the apostle continues. “For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts.” From the fact that they are “ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” we conclude that these people do not regard their wicked practices as sinful. They have not that “knowledge of the truth” which would enlighten them, and so they “call evil good, and good evil.” They are “despisers of those that are good,” and in their blindness they “resist the truth.” {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.27}

How do they resist the truth? “As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these resist the truth.” 2 Timothy 3:8. This sheds a flood of light on the subject, for in Exodus 7:11, and onward, we learn that Pharoah’s magicians withstood Moses “with their enchantments.” They withstood him by performing, up to a certain point, miracles, the object of which was to make the king believe that his gods were as powerful as the God of Israel. Enchantment is the same as sorcery, and witchcraft; it is “intercourse with evil spirits.” Then the magicians, Paul tells us were Jannes and Jambres, resisted Moses by means of their intercourse with evil spirits. What evil spirits? The spirits of devils, for heathen worship was nothing but devil worship; when the heathen offered sacrifices, they offered them to devils. 1 Corinthians 10:20. Now since people in the last days will resist the truth just as the magicians did, we know that they will oppose the spread of the truth by means of miracles which, through the power of Satan, they are unable to perform. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.28}

This conclusion is verified still further by the prophet, who saw, just before the coming of the Lord, the “spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world.” Revelation 16:14, 15. Paul also tells us that the coming of Christ follows “the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders.” 2 Thessalonians 2:9. Christ spoke of these wonders as being signs of his coming, and said that they would be so great that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect. Matthew 24:23, 24. These verses also give us a clue to the nature of these deceptions. “For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets.” Now if certain people profess to be Christ, they must necessarily profess to do the work which the Bible says Christ alone has power to do. Christ says, “I am come that they might have life.” Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” Modern Spiritualists claim that Spiritualism alone demonstrates the immortality of the soul. They say that while Christians *believe* that man is immortal, they *prove* it. By their so-called materialization of dead persons, they *seem* to prove it, but this is the delusion against which we are warned. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.29}

Satan’s first recorded lie, the one which has formed the basis of all his deceptions, was the statement to Eve, “Ye shall not surely die.” There in the garden of Eden he proclaimed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. By this same doctrine he deceives the people in the last days. The great truth of the Bible is salvation in Christ alone; salvation from sin and its penalty, death; “He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.” John 3:36. Those who do not receive this true, who teach that there will be endless life for the wicked, and that the dead are not really dead, are open to this deception of Satan. The devils, personating individuals who have died, can appear to their friends who believe in the immortality of the soul, and thus “demonstrate” it to them. When people accept this as truth, the miracles which they perform will also be attributed to the Spirit of God. Then those who say anything against the doctrines taught by these wonder-working spirits, will be accused of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and will be persecuted. Thus these last-day apostates become “despisers of those that are good.” {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.30}

The only safety is in having the word of God *hidden* in the heart. If the word has been “engrafted” into life of the individual, he will always have wherewith to resist the devil. “And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the [the Spirit of prophecy; see Revelation 19:10] if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:19, 20. E. J. W. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 758.31}

**“The Lord’s Day. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded.*)

It would seem that the many Bible proofs that the seventh day of the week is “*the* Lord’s day” should be sufficient to silence all cavil among those who claim to regard the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. But some will say, “You have entirely ignored the claims of the first day of the week; if you examine the record concerning that day, you might find cause to change your mind.” We do not believe that we should; for when a thing is positively proved to be right, its opposite is, by the same argument, just as surely shown to be wrong. If the seventh day is “the Lord’s day,” then the first day cannot be. But in order that there may be no dissatisfaction, we will see what the Bible has to say about the first day. With the aid of a concordance we can easily find every text in the New Testament, which contains reference to the first day of the week. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.1}

The first text is Matthew 28:1: “In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher.” Simply an incidental mention of the day, so we will go on. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.2}

Mark 16:1, 2: “And when the Sabbath was passed Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him [Jesus]. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came under the sepulcher at the rising of the sun.” This is but a repetition of what we found in the other texts. One point, however, we would call attention to. The Sabbath is the Lord’s day, as we have proved at length. See Isaiah 58:13. Now the first day of the week did not come until after the Sabbath was passed; therefore these texts, instead of showing the first day to be the Lord’s day, prove positively that it is not. But we will look further. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.3}

Luke 24:1: “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they [the women, see chap. 23:55] came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.” Here again the evidence is damaging to the claims of Sunday to be the Lord’s day. First, we notice that the disciples took the first day of the week to do a work of love for Jesus, which they would not do on the day of his crucifixion, because “the Sabbath drew on.” Second, we find (chap. 23:54-56) that that Sabbath day immediately preceded the first day, and that they rested upon it “according to the commandment.” That says “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord” (Exodus 20:10); showing that the first day is not the Lord’s day. We will try again. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.4}

John 20:1: “The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher.” Simply a reiteration of the statement that on the first day of the week certain Christian women set out to perform a piece of work. We must evidently look elsewhere for our Sunday Lord’s day. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.5}

Mark 16:9: “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.” It would have been strange indeed, if Christ had not shown himself to his disciples as soon as he was risen, in order to comfort them, and to confirm their faith in him. It would be equally strange if the evangelists, whose great aim was to establish the fact of Christ’s resurrection, should not mention the particulars connected with it. In this text, again, we have only a simple statement of an incident that might occur on any day. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.6}

John 20:19: “Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.” The remarks on the preceding text will also apply to this. To the plea that the disciples were at this time celebrating the resurrection of Christ on the day which they had resolved to devote to his honor, we reply (1) That this was not a religious meeting, but that the disciples were in their own place of abode (see Acts 1:13, 14); (2) They were partaking of their evening meal (see Luke 24:33; Mark 16:14); (3) They did not yet believe that Jesus was risen from the dead. After Mary Magdalene had seen him, “she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.” Mark 16:10, 11. They continued in sorrow and unbelief throughout all that day (Luke 24:13-17; Mark 12:13), and did not believe until they saw him for themselves in their room, in the evening of the day of his resurrection. “Then where the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.” {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.7}

The six instances of the use of the term the first day of the week are all concerning the particular day on which Christ rose from the dead. If that day that were designed to have any effect upon the practice of the disciples, in regard to the day of rest, these texts must certainly have contained a statement of that fact; but they do not. The evangelists mention the first day of the week in their narrative as a matter of course, and state in the most matter-of-fact manner possible, that the day preceding it is the Sabbath, the Lord’s day. We will continue our search. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.8}

Acts 20:7: “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.” Here is a religious meeting on the first day of the week. Can it be that we have found what we are after? If you say “Aye,” and that the disciples evidently regarded this day as the Lord’s day, then we will venture to inquire, By what authority did they so regard it? We have no record of its being exalted to the honor of Lord’s day, and we dare not accept any custom without authority. As we have read the text again, however, our enthusiasm ebbs, as we find that it gives no intimation that the day on which they came together had any sacredness whatever. It is simply “the first day of the week.” It is true that they came together to perform a religious act-the breaking the bread-but this act was not confined to any particular day, but was done “every day.” Acts 2:46. Our Sunday friends are wont to comfort themselves not a little with the thought that the disciples did hold a meeting on the first day of the week; but they seem to forget that they also held meetings, and that, too, among the heathen, on the seventh day of the week. See Acts 13:42, 44; 17:2; 18:4, 11. Thus we have one instance, and *only one*, of a religious meeting on the first day of the week, and no less than eighty-four meetings on the seventh day of the week. “But,” says a friend, “the fact that the disciples woshiped on Saturday proves nothing for Saturday observance, because they held meetings on every day of the week.” Exactly so; but if the mere example of the disciples in regularly worshiping on the seventh day, does not prove that day to be the Sabbath, how in the name of reason can a single instance of Sunday worship prove the first day to be the Sabbath? {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 760.9}

In considering this text we have not thought it necessary to show that the meeting was on what is known as Saturday night, and that Paul and his companions traveled all the next day, he on foot, and they by sea, although that is the case, and is admitted by many first-day authors. The obvious fact that the day is given no sacred title, and just mentioned, and nothing more, is sufficient to show that we have not yet found what we seek. We will try once more. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.1}

1 Corinthians 16:1, 2: “Now concerning the collection for the saints, as that given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week led every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings but I come.” Well, what have we here? No Lord’s day, at any rate. The phrase, “lay by him in store,” indicates that the appropriation for the poor was to be done at home. The phrase, “as God hath prospered him,” shows that the individual was to look over his accounts to see what his gains had been during the previous week, a work suitable only for a secular day. The fact that it was to be done on a specified time-the first day of the week-shows the duty of system in our offerings to be poor. Dr. Barnes, who most sincerely believed in the sacredness of Sunday, said on this text: “Let him designate a certain portion; let him do this *by himself*, when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity. Let him do it not under the influence of pathetic appeals, or, for the sake of display when he is with others, but let him do it as a matter of principle, and when he is by himself.” {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.2}

“Nor ought we to leave unnoticed the method which he recommends of laying aside week by week what is devoted to God (1 Corinthians 16:2)-a practice equally remote from the excitement of popular appeals and the mere impulse of instinctive benevolence.”-*Conyebeare and Howson.* {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.3}

And now, what next? There is nothing more. We have examined every text in the New Testament (eight in all), which mentions the first day of the week, and with what success the reader has seen. Not the shadow of a hint have we found that would show that Sunday has any sacredness. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.4}

We have heard it stated from the pulpit, that Revelation 1:10 must refer to the first day of the week, because the term “Lord’s day” is not elsewhere in the Bible applied to the seventh day. As much as to say, “Revelation 1:10 cannot refer to Saturday, because that day is nowhere else in the Bible called *Lord’s day*; but it must refer to Sunday, because that day is uniformly called ‘the first day of the week.’” That is a fair specimen of Sunday logic. It is a simple fact, however, as we have already seen (Exodus 20:8-11; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28, etc.) that the seventh day of the week is called the Lord’s day. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.5}

And here we leave the matter. We have carefully and candidly considered the subject of the Lord’s day, in the light of the Scriptures. As a very brief summary of the whole matter, and to remind the reader of the necessity of making a correct decision, we beg him to read these three texts: {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.6}

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Exodus 20:8-10. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.7}

“If thou want to turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy* day; and call the Sabbath a delight, all wholly of the Lord honorable; and shalt *honor him* [by keeping the Sabbath as he directs], not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord.” Isaiah 58:13, 14. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.8}

“For them that honor me I will honor; and they that despise me [by disobedience] shall be lightly esteemed.” 1 Samuel 2:30. E. J. W. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.9}

**“Punishment of the Wicked” The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

**DIRECT TESTIMONY**

In the preceding articles on the punishment of the wicked, we have confined ourselves principally to a consideration of those texts which are popularly supposed to teach the endless existence of the wicked in torment. We have found that, on the contrary, they teach most emphatically their final utter extinction. Indeed, the strongest proofs in favor of the position which we have taken concerning the future destiny of the impenitent, is to be found in those texts which are generally used by the opponents of that doctrine. We will now proceed to the consideration of a few texts that are so plain that they of themselves should be allowed to settle the question. Some of these we shall quote without comment. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.10}

“Fret not thyself because of the evil-doers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For they shall soon be *cut down like the grass* and *wither as the green herb*.” Psalm 37:1, 2. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.11}

“For evil-doers shall be *cut off;* but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and *the wicked shall not be;* yea, thou shalt diligently considered his place, and it shall not be.” Psalm 37:9, 10. Compare this with Obadiah 16: “For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and *they shall be as though they had not been*.” We should like to know how these texts can be harmonized with the doctrine of the endless existence of the wicked. That theory cannot be held except by denying these texts, or, what is the same thing, ignoring them. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.12}

“For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be *cut off*.” Psalm 37:22. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.13}

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! ... which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore as *the fire devoureth the stubble*, and *the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness*, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” Isaiah 5:20-24. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.14}

“And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the craftsmen: they say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves. Therefore *they shall be as the morning cloud*, and *as the early dew that passeth away*, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as *the smoke out of the chimney*.” Hosea 13:2, 3. Dr. Scott, after quoting this text, says, “*i.e.*, violently and speedily made to banish and disappear.” The “Speaker’s Commentary” says of this passage: “The tone of indignant derision passes into that of stern wrath the inflexibility of the purpose to punish is expressed by the accumulation of four several images, all describing utter extermination.” That is just what the language signifies,-“utter extermination.” If it does not mean that, we do not see how it can be anything. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.15}

The preceding texts have compared the wicked to the most combustible material-stubble and chaff. In the following, the prophet makes the case stronger yet; the wicked are declared to be stubble:- {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.16}

“For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” “And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.” Malachi 4:1, 3. With this agree the words of John the Baptist: “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” Matthew 3:12. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.17}

We turn once more to the 37th psalm. In verse 20 we read: “But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lamb; they shall consume; *into smoke* shall they consume away.” The psalmist could have given no illustration of the final destiny of the wicked that would have been more forcible to the minds of the Jews. Every morning and every evening, according to the law, a lamp was placed on the altar and consumed. Beside this, the fact every sin-offering, whether it was a bullock, a goat, or a lamb (Leviticus 4), was burned upon the altar. They sought the fat of lambs continually vanishing into smoke, and in that column of the ascending smoke they had an ever-present reminder of the fate of the incorrigibly wicked. They knew that when the fat was placed in that sacrificial fire, it was not preserved, but was speedily destroyed; and so when the psalmist said, “The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; and the smoke shall they consume away,” they knew that the fate of the unrepentant sinners would be utter extinction. The last part of the verse only confirms the first clause: “The wicked shall perish;” for as we have already seen, the word “perish” means, “To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence.” {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.18}

“Why,” says one, “you are an annihilationist.” Our reply is, We believe what we have just been reading from the Bible; if that is what you call and annihilationism, all right; we shall not be frightened from our position, whatever name may be applied to us. This word “annihilation” is a great bug-bear to many. Say they, “It is impossible for a matter to be annihilated.” Now while we should not dare place any limit to God’s power, we do not believe that he will blot out of existence any of the matter which he has created; but that he will and does change the form or combination of parts of many things, we have the most abundant evidence. Webster defines “annihilate” thus: “1. To reduce to nothing; to destroy the existence of; to cause to cease to be. 2. To destroy the form or peculiar distinctive properties of, so that the specific thing no longer exists, as, to annihilate a forest by cutting and carrying away the trees, though the timber may still exist.” The Bible says that the wicked “shall not be;” that “they shall be as though they had not been.” There was a time once when they were not; they had no existence; but the matter of which they are composed was even then in existence. So likewise the matter of which they are composed will remain after they cease to be. When the fat was placed on the altar it was destroyed; no one removed it, yet in a little while there was no fat there. What had become of it? It had become smoke. The *fat* was annihilated, if you please; but the matter which had composed it was not. Thus, we are told, will it be with the wicked. If any one disagrees with the statements concerning the wicked, his quarrel is with the Bible, not with us. E. J. W. {SITI December 18, 1884, p. 761.19}