**“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. The Promise to David” The Signs of the Times, 11, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG 1**

**THE PROMISE TO DAVID**

1. Relate the circumstances which led to the rejection of Saul as king of Israel. See 1 Samuel 15. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.1}

2. Where is this narrative recorded? *Ib*. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.2}

3. When Samuel said that the Lord had taken the kingdom from Saul, to whom did he say it had been given? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.3}

“And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou.” 1 Samuel 15:28. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.4}

4. Who was the one whom the Lord chosen the place of Saul? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.5}

“And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul.” 2 Samuel 12:7. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.6}

5. From what occupation was David taken to be made king? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.7}

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel.” 2 Samuel 7:8. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.8}

6. Where do we have an account of the choosing and the anointing of David? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.9}

“And the Lord said unto Samuel.... Fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Beth-lehemite; for I have provided me a king among his sons.... And Samuel did that which the Lord spake.... And he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called them to the sacrifice. And it came to pass, when they were come, that he looked on Eliab, and said, Surely the Lord’s anointed is before him. But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him; for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart. Then Jesse called Abinadab, and made him pass before Samuel. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Then Jesse made Shammah to pass by. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Again, Jesse made seven of his sons to pass before Samuel. And Samuel said unto Jesse, The Lord hath not chosen these. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children? And he said, There remaineth yet the youngest, and, behold, he keepeth the sheep. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Send and fetch him: for we will not sit down till he come hither. And he sent, and brought him in. Now he was ruddy, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to. And the Lord said, Arise, anoint him: for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward. So Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah.” 1 Samuel 16:1-13. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.10}

7. When the Lord placed David over his people, what did he do for him? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.11}

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel; and I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.” 2 Samuel 7:8, 9. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.12}

8. What did he make him? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.13}

“And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.” 2 Samuel 7:9. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.14}

9. What did the Lord say he would yet do for David? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.15}

“Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house.” 2 Samuel 7:11, last clause. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.16}

10. To whom did the Lord say he would establish the kingdom? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.17}

“And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.” 2 Samuel 7:12. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.18}

11. For how long a time did the Lord say that David’s house and kingdom should be established? {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.19}

“And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.” 2 Samuel 7:17. E. J. W. {SITI July 2, 1885, p. 406.20}

**“Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Promise Concerning the Kingdom of Israel” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 8**

**PROMISE CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL**

1. Why was Saul rejected from being king of Israel? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.1}

“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. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.2}

2. Who was chosen in his stead? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.3}

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel.” 2 Samuel 7:8. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.4}

3. By whom was David chosen to be ruler? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.5}

4. Where do you find the record of his anointing? 1 Samuel 16:1-13. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.6}

5. Repeat the promise which the Lord made to David concerning his house and kingdom. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.7}

“And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.” 2 Samuel 7:16. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.8}

6. What promise did the Lord make yet the same time concerning his Israel? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.9}

“Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.” 2 Samuel 7:10. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.10}

7. What did he say he would appoint for them? *Ib*. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.11}

8. Where should they dwell? *Ib*. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.12}

9. From what should they be free? *Ib*. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.13}

10. From 2 Samuel 7:10, quoted above, what conclusion must be draw concerning the promises made to Abraham, and to the Israelites at Sinai? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.14}

We must conclude that those promises were not fulfilled in the possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites. If they had been, we would not at this time find the Lord renewing the same promise, when they were already in the land that the Lord had given to them. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.15}

11. In what condition was the kingdom of Israel when the Lord made the promise recorded in 2 Samuel 7:10? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.16}

“And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies.” 2 Samuel 7:1. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.17}

12. Then what must we conclude concerning that promise of rest and peace? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.18}

Since the Israelites were already dwelling in the land that the Lord had given them by Joshua, and were at peace with all around them, it follows that the promise of a land of their own, and of rest and peace, must refer to something in the future, something far greater than anything yet known. This can only be found in that perfect inheritance when the “kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.” Daniel 7:27. This will be the perfect rest that remains for the people of God, for when the meek inherit the earth they shall “delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” Psalm 37:11. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.19}

13. Who was David’s immediate successor? 1 Kings 1:32-39. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.20}

14. What had the Lord said concerning him? {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.21}

“And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.” 2 Samuel 7:12, 13. E. J. W. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 422.22}

**“Camp-Meeting in Portland, Oregon” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

The details of this meeting have been sufficiently reported by Elder Loughborough, but we would add a few thoughts. First, we were made to realize more than ever before the necessity of progress in meetings of that kind. If the work of the Biblical Institute was in its general features the same as the one in Milton, but it did not have the lifting influence on the meeting that it would have had if those attending had had time to devote to study. The truths of the word cannot be absorbed by the simple contact; if we would make them our own we must search for them as for hidden treasure. All the powers of the mind, aided by the Spirit of God, must be brought to bear, and by this means they will be strengthened. There is no discipline of mind equal to the study of the Bible. Although our circumstances were somewhat unfavorable, the institute was by no means a failure. Those present received new ideas as to how to study the Bible; the familiar truths were seen in a new light, and above all, the great central, elevating a truth-God’s love for mankind-was realized by many as never before. He returned to their homes rejoicing in a hope and confidence to which they had hitherto been strangers. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.1}

One interesting feature was the children’s meetings. These were held every day, beginning when the Institute was about half over. The aim in these meetings was to tell the gospel story in language suited to the comprehension of the youngest, and to lead them to the study of the word for themselves. It is a mistake to suppose that to reach the minds of children one must talk in a childish manner, or in any degree to lower the dignity of the subject. Familiar illustrations, both to the eye and the ear, should be freely used, but no word should be uttered that would lead any to think that the way of salvation for a child is different from that for the adult. The “deep things of God,” if properly presented, are more readily grasped by young minds, than by those of mature years. The plan of salvation is so simple in its greatness that the average man overlooks it. Like Naaman, we find the thing required of us very difficult because it is so simple. But in childhood everything is real; the simplicity of childhood was given by Christ as the pattern for Christians. There is, therefore, every encouragement in teaching the children the way of life. There were no meetings held on the ground that were more full of interest than those held with the children. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.2}

In these meetings, as well as in all others, much prominence was given to the subject of reverence for God’s word, and for the places where he is worshiped. As the result of this teaching, we had as quiet and orderly a camp-ground as I ever saw. The children were made to feel that the entire camp was a sacred place, and there was scarcely any running and playing or loud talking even during intermissions. Care was taken to have all enter the tent where meetings were held, in a reverent matter, with head uncovered. Surely we should not come into God’s house with less indication of respect than we would into a neighbor’s parlor. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.3}

We believe that as outward marks of respect were shown, reverence was increased in the heart, and God added his blessing. If the parents will now carry out the lessons which they learned, and will also seek to deepen the impressions made upon the children, and endeavor to instruct and interest them in sacred things, they will find their own souls watered, and will see their children growing up to strengthen the church, and may God help them, and abundantly bless the North Pacific Conference. E. J. W. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.4}

**“The Sabbath in Eden” The Signs of the Times, 11, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our constant aim to avoid controversy as far as was possible. Believing that the coming of the Lord is here, and that the strict observance of the ten commandments (with divine assistance) is necessary to a complete preparations for that event, we design to get these truths before the people in the most direct manner possible. While, therefore, we deprecate debate, we dare not lower the standard of truth because it is opposed. Whenever we make strictures upon those who teach differently, we do so, not because they have assailed “our position,” but because they oppose what we firmly believe to be Bible truth. We do not consider ourselves as standing in opposition to anybody, but as simply lifting up the truth, which is being trodden down. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.5}

Quite frequently newspaper articles and reports of sermons in opposition to the Sabbath, are sent to us, with the request that we reply to them. Of course these articles contain no argument for objection that has not been met and answered hundreds of times, and our first impulse is usually to throw them aside as unworthy of further notice. But we recollect that the old objection which to us seems so flimsy, is to many a new one, and a real stumbling-block. Therefore we feel constrained to give them notice. If that notice be often extended, it is not because we fear that truth itself will suffer by the opposition, but that honest minds that have not been accustomed to think upon Bible themes, may not be entangled in error. It is for this reason that we begin to briefly notice a series of articles on the Sabbath question, by C. E. W. Dobbs, D. D., recently published in the *Indiana Baptist*. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.6}

The writer takes the position throughout, that Sunday (invariably called by him the “Lord’s day”) is not the Sabbath, and that its observance, although the obligatory upon Christians, derives no force from the fourth commandment; that it is purely a “gospel institution, and that the fourth commandment, enjoining the observance of Saturday, has, with the rest of the Decalogue, entirely passed away.” {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.7}

One word concerning the idea that the Sunday-sabbath is a gospel institution. If this were so, then it must stand upon the same plane as other gospel ordinances,-baptism and the Lord’s Supper. No Christian, whatever denomination, thinks of allowing unbelievers to participate in these ordinances. If the Sunday-sabbath be a gospel institution, then no unbeliever must be allowed, much less compelled, to observe it. But Dr. Dobbs does not believe this theory any more than do his Baptist brethren. This is proved by their own actions. A Baptist father would not invite his unconverted children to partake of the Lord’s Supper, nor would he allow them, while still unconverted, to be baptized, yet he would require them, while they were subject to his authority, to observe Sunday. Notwithstanding what men may say, their actions show that they do not really believe that Sunday is a Christian ordinance. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.8}

We most heartily agree with the Doctor in his claims that Sunday observance finds no authority in the fourth commandment. But, knowing that there is no Bible authority outside of the fourth commandment for the observance of any day as sacred, we conclude that the Doctor’s admission rules Sunday out of the question. By the side of that admission, we wish to place a few others. In its issue of March 1, 1882, the *California Christian Advocate* said:- {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.9}

“When we plead for a law for it [Sunday] as a day of rest, we can justify that only on the ground that it is according to the law of nature, and necessary to man.... We cannot sustain it before the people, if we claim its sanctity as a religious institution.” {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.10}

Very true, only it would be difficult for the *Advocate* to show how to rest on Sunday meets the wants of man’s nature, anymore than rest on Saturday. The *Christian at Work*, in its issue of April 19, 1883, said:- {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.11}

“Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an exquisite injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as a holy day unto the Lord.... The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scrpta* [*i.e.,* the plain reading] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument.” {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.12}

Again, its issue of January 8, 1885, the *Christian at Work* says:- {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.13}

“We rest of the designation of Sunday on the church having ‘set it apart of its own authority.’ The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment, as it is written in every tissue and trembling fiber of the human frame. The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis and *none other* does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest.” {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.14}

All true; but if the observance of Sunday was brought about by the “gradual concurrence” of the church, then of course it was not instituted by Christ; and if it was not instituted by Christ, then it is obviously not a Christian institution; and therefore, although “the church” did gradually effect this change, it was to that extent at least unchristian. But now for the argument against the Sabbath. We quote:- {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.15}

“Some find evidence of the Edenic institution of the Sabbath in Genesis 2:3: ‘God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work.’ This is supposed to be the enactment of the Sabbath law for the race. But it is an exceedingly frail support for such an institution. The language is only the historian’s statement that the Sabbath, instituted two thousand years afterwards, had a commemorative relation to creation. It is barely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the divine determination to sanctify the seventh day, and to constitute it a religious rest day in the future ceremonial law.” {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.16}

How does the Doctor or anyone else find so much in Genesis 2:3? Those who say that Genesis 2:3 records what the Lord designed to do two thousand years in the future, seem to be wise above that which is written, for there is not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the text. Just as reasonably might we affirm that “there was no marriage institution until two thousand years after the creation, the statement in Genesis 2:24, that a man ‘shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh,’ being only the historian’s statement that the marriage relation, instituted two thousand years afterward, had a commemorative relation to the union of the first pair. It is merely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the divine determination to sanctify the marriage relation, and to constitute it the sacred ordinance in the decalogue,” which, by the way, is in no sense a ceremonial law. But no sane man would accept such an interpretation, or rather *perversion*, of the Scriptures in regard to marriage; and no unprejudiced person can for a moment regard such reasoning as just when applied to the Sabbath. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.17}

What, then, may we will learn from Genesis 2:3? The text is plain: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” This immediately follows the statement that God “rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.” Now we submit it to any candid person, that in Genesis 2:1-3 events are mentioned in historical order. From the reading of the text, no one would imagine that the third verse refers to something two thousand years after the event mentioned in the second; and there is nowhere in the Bible any intimation that such is the case. It is a fact, then, that the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day immediately followed God’s resting upon it, after the six days of creation were ended. To deny this is simply to make an *assertion* contrary to a plain declaration. Now we will find out what was comprehended in that act of sanctifying, and then we shall see upon what foundation the Edenic Sabbath rests. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 425.18}

To sanctify means “to set apart for a sacred or religious use; to make holy.”-*Webster*. Its use, as applied to inanimate objects, may be learned from the following instances: When the Lord was about to come down on Mount Sinai, he said to Moses, “And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death.” Exodus 19:12. In verse 23 we read, “And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it.” The mountain was sanctified, or set apart for a sacred use, and a barrier was built around it, so that none need be in doubt as to how far they might go. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 426.1}

Again, in Joshua 20 we find that the Lord told Joshua to appoint six cities to which men who had accidentally slain a man might flee for refuge. “And they appointed [margin, *sanctified*] Kedesh in Galilee in mount Naphtali,” etc. Joshua 20:7. Here the same word is used as in Genesis 2:3. In what did the sanctification of these cities consist? In setting them apart for the use for which they were designed, by letting everybody know which cities were the cities of refuge. Without thus informing the people, the sanctification would have been a farce. Indeed, that is just what the sanctification was,-a public setting apart. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 426.2}

So with the Sabbath. First, God rested on the seventh day; then he blessed it, or spoke well of it; and lastly, he sanctified it, that is, he appointed that it should be preserved sacred. Just as Moses set bounds around the mount, so the Lord placed around the Sabbath the sanctions of his law. Now as we have seen that the sanctification immediately followed the resting and the blessing, we know to whom the Lord made the statement that the day was to be kept holy;-it was to all who were then living-Adam and Eve. But this pair represented all the inhabitants of the earth, for they had been commanded to “be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.” We find, then, that Genesis 2:3 teaches, in the most unmistakable language, that the seventh-day Sabbath was instituted at creation, and that it was designed for and given to all mankind. We may add, however, that in Genesis 2:3 we do not find the enactment of the Sabbatic law before the race, but the statement, as a fact of history, that such a law was made in creation. This point, borne in mind, removes the next objection, which shall be noticed next week. E. J. W. {SITI July 16, 1885, p. 426.3}

**“Human Ignorance vs. Divine Knowledge” The Signs of the Times, 11, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, in the article entitled “The Sabbath in Eden,” we showed that Genesis 2:3 is an explicit declaration that the seventh day was sanctified immediately following God’s rest upon it at the close of creation, and that to sanctify means to set apart, to appoint; so that we have the inspired record that, in Eden, God decreed that men should observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. We cannot be so sure that George Washington commanded the American army during the war of the Revolution, as we are that in Eden God appointed the seventh day to be kept by all mankind. For the knowledge of that we are dependent on human evidence, while this fact is made known to us “by inspiration of God.” {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.1}

But Dr. Dobbs says of Genesis 2:3:- {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.2}

“To make the passage of any value as proof in this matter, it must be assumed that Genesis was an historic book, coming down from patriarchal times.” {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.3}

It makes no difference when the book of Genesis was written, so far as this case is concerned. The Doctor might as well have said that we cannot know that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, because Moses was not there to see it done, and to make the record on the spot. The reader must remember that Genesis 2:3 is not the commandment for Sabbath observance, but is simply the inspired record that such a command and had been made. The patriarchs were not dependent on the record in Genesis, for their knowledge of the Sabbath, any more than the early colonists were dependent on “Ridpath’s History of the United States,” for their knowledge of the wars with the Indians or with Great Britain. We do need a history to inform us of that in which we are actors. {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.4}

The lives of three men-Adam, Methuselah, and Shem-reach from the creation to Isaac. Methuselah was two hundred and forty-three years old when Adam died, Shem was ninety-seven years old when Methuselah died, and Isaac was fifty years old when Shem died. There certainly was opportunity enough for the patriarchs to know of the appointment of the Sabbath in Eden, even though no records were kept. Dr. Cunningham Geikie, in his “Hours with the Bible,” vol. 1, chap. 20, paragraph 9, speaking of the call of Abraham, says:- {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.5}

“No details are given of the creed of Abraham, but, in addition to his confession of the one only living God, it must have included all that was true in the popular beliefs of Chaldea. This would imply his knowledge of the Sabbath; for the seventh day, by a tradition handed down from Eden, was ‘holy,’ in his Eastern native land, and was honored by the cessation of all work on it.” {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.6}

Dr. Geikie says that even the heathen had at that time preserved the tradition of the Sabbath from Eden; but whether they did or not, it is beyond controversy that the patriarchs knew all about the sanctification of the Sabbath in Eden. But even if it were possible that they did not, their ignorance would not in the least affect the fact, for we have the word of the Lord for it, that the seventh-day Sabbath was set apart in Eden. Our relation to the Sabbath of the Lord must be regulated by his commandment concerning it, and not by somebody else’s knowledge or lack of knowledge, nor by the time its institution was recorded. {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.7}

Again we quote from Dr. Dobbs:- {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.8}

“Just here it may be well to state that the Jewish Talmud, so scholars tell us, knows nothing of any ante-Mosaic Sabbath. Their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic institution, generally referring its commencement to Exodus 15:25: ‘There he made a statute,’ etc.” {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.9}

We have never read the Talmud, so we, with Dr. Dobbs, must depend for a knowledge of its content, on what “scolars tell us.” Grant that the Talmud knows nothing of an Ante-Mosaic Sabbath, and what does it prove? Nothing. Whether the Talmud knows anything about the Sabbath either before or after Moses, or whether it does not, matters not one whit. The Bible knows all about it, and it tells us in unmistakable language. We desire our knowledge of our duty to God, not from the Talmud, but from the Bible. If one honest man bears witness on a given point, the fact that a dozen other men know nothing about it does not overthrow his evidence. In other words, one man’s knowledge of the fact, cannot be made of no effect by another one’s ignorance. If all the man-made books in the world ignored the Sabbath, or knew nothing about its institution, it would make no difference; God’s book remains unchanged. {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.10}

But what of the statement that “their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic legislation, generally referring its commencement to Exodus 15:25: ‘There he made a statute,’ etc.” The preceding paragraph answers this statement also. If it were true that “their doctors” referred the institution of the Sabbath to the time when the Israelites were at Marah, that would not make it true, when the inspired record plainly tells us that it was instituted at creation. It is not an unheard-of thing for “doctors” to be mistaken. We have known doctors to say, in the face of the statement in Genesis 2:3, that God never blessed the seventh day; and we were presumptuous enough to believe the Bible in preference to the doctors. Whatever the Talmud may or may not say concern an ante-Mosaic Sabbath, Josephus says:- {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.11}

“Accordingly Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein was made; and that the seventh day was a rest, and a release from the labor of such operations;-whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath.”-“*Antiquities,*” *Book 1, chap.1, section 1.* {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.12}

It is a matter for curiosity, however a man who can see no proof whatever for Sabbath observance, in Genesis 2:3, which speaks directly on a point, can find in Exodus 15:25 evidence of its institution, when the latter text makes no hint of the Sabbath. But the human mind, when controlled by prejudice, is not subject to laws. {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.13}

We have space in this article for just one more quotation:- {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.14}

“It is worthy of remark also that no Christian ‘Fathers,’ among the writings which have come down to us from the first three centuries, ever based the observance of the Lord’s day [by this term the Doctor means Sunday] upon either the fourth commandment or a primeval and patriarchal Sabbath law.” {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.15}

And it is worthy of remark that that indicates the good sense of the “Fathers,” more than anything which they did write. They did well not to base Sabbath observance upon the fourth commandment, nor upon any other commandment found in the Bible. It would be well if some of their successors in the Christian church would be as discreet. It is true that the “Fathers” did not base the observance of Sunday on the fourth commandment, but that need not hinder us from facing the observance of the seventh day, Saturday-the true Lord’s day-upon the commandment. The reader will notice that thus far all of Dr. Dobb’s argument against the Sabbath has been negative-consisting of what certain ones do not know about the Sabbath. In our next we shall examine what he claims to know about it. E. J. W. {SITI July 23, 1885, p. 441.16}

**“The Sabbath at the Exode” The Signs of the Times, 11, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that in last week’s review of Dr. Dobbs, we noticed his position that the Sabbath was first instituted at the waters of Marah (Exodus 15:25). Whether he had some doubts of that, or whether it was simply because he is determined to prove that it is not commanded at creation, we do not know, but in his second article he takes the position that it was instituted in the Wilderness of Sin (Exodus 16). On this point he says:- {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.1}

“The first mention of the Sabbath is in Exodus 16:23, ‘To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath’-where, by the way, the Hebrew has no definite article, reading ‘*a* rest of *a* holy Sabbath.’ The first intimation of this rest is verses four and five, where Jehovah tells Moses of the double rate of manna to be gathered on the sixth day. In verse 22 we find the people doing this, and the rulers of the congregation, apparently not having heard, or at least not remembering the injunction given in verse five, came to tell Moses. He explains to them: ‘It is that rest which Jehovah hath spoken of, *a* rest-*a* holy Sabbath-is to-morrow.’ It is only in verse 29 that we have the definite article ‘*the* Sabbath.’ ... Everything in the whole narrative seems to point to this as the first knowledge of the Sabbath. Careful study has convinced me that the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation places the beginning of the institution just here.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.2}

The last statement, that “the weight of a critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation” places the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, gives us opportunity to quote from some critical scholars. The “Bible Commentary,” by a company of “Bishops of the Anglican Church,” has the following on Genesis 2:3:- {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.3}

“The natural interpretation of these words is that the blessing of the Sabbath was immediately consequent on the first creation man, for whom the Sabbath was first made (Mark 2:27).... Moreover, it appears that, before the giving of the commandments from Mount Sinai, the Israelites were acquainted with the law of the Sabbath. In Exodus 16:5 a double portion of manna is promised on the sixth day, that none need be gathered on the Sabbath. This has all the appearance of belonging to an acknowledged, though perhaps neglected, ordinance of divine service; not as if then for the first time the Sabbath were ordained and consecrated.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.4}

The same authority says that Exodus 16:23 “is at once a statement and an injunction. The people knew it as the Sabbath, they were to observe it as a great festival.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.5}

Dr. Scott, in his comment on Genesis 2:3, says:- {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.6}

“The sacred writer here both records the appointment of the Sabbath, and assigns the reason for it: ‘Because that in it the Lord rested from all his work.’ This is evidently *historical*, and not by *anticipation;* for the reason subsisted from the beginning, and was more cogent immediately than it could be at a distance of more than two thousand years, when the command was solemnly renewed from Mount Sinai, long after sin had marred the beauty of the great Creator’s work; and it concerns the whole human race, as much as the nation of Israel.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.7}

Other testimony to the same intent is given by Dr. Scott. Dr. Adam Clarke as an observer of the first day of the week, and a most critical scholar, yet he was not able to find, either in the Hebrew or in any translation of Exodus 16, any authority for supposing that the Sabbath was first given in the wilderness. On Exodus 16:23, he says:- {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.8}

“There is nothing either in the text or context, that seems to intimate that the Sabbath was now *first* given to the Israelites, as some have supposed; on the contrary, it is here spoken of as being perfectly well known, from its having been generally observed. The commandment, it is true, may be considered as being now *renewed;* because they might have supposed that in their unsettled state in the wilderness, they might have been exempted from the observance of it. Thus we find, (1) That when God finished his creation, he instituted the Sabbath; (2) When he brought the people of Egypt, he insisted on the strict observance of it; (3) When he gave the law, he made it a *tenth* part of the whole; such importance has this institution in the eyes of the Supreme Being.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.9}

It may be well to state that “the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly criticism,” which places the institution of the Sabbath at the exode, is found among those German theologians who throw overboard a large portion of the Pentateuch as of a doubtful nature, and attribute a large portion of the remainder to a later age than that of Moses. {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.10}

Concerning the statement that there is no definite article in the Hebrew of Exodus 16:23, but little need be said. In fact the Doctor makes no argument from it, but simply makes the statement. He has doubtless heard the statement made, or has read it somewhere, and thinks it must surely be an argument against the Sabbath, although he doesn’t know just how to make it, so he throws it in at random. As a matter of fact, although the definite article is not found in the Hebrew of Exodus 16:23, the word Sabbath is just as definite as it is in verse 29, where the definite article occurs. For instance, I may say “I went to church last Sabbath.” Now although I use no definite article, the word “Sabbath” is just as definite as it is possible to make it. Two paragraphs from a review of Armstrong’s Sunday book will be sufficient to put the matter clearly:- {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.11}

“There are two methods of determining whether or not a Hebrew substantive is definite. 1. By the presence of the article. 2. By ‘construction.’ A noun may be determined to be definite as certainly and as easily in the absence of the article as in its presence, if the construction demands it. The article is then understood.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.12}

“The word ‘Sabbath’ in Exodus 16, and in the decalogue, Exodus 20, is definite *in every instance* of its occurrence. It is made definite in chap. 16:29 and 20:8, 11 by the use of the article; it is equally definite in chap. 16:23, 25 and 20:10 by construction, in the absence of the article.” {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.13}

The reader will doubtless wonder what bearing the absence of the article from verse 23 and its presence in verse 29 has on the Sabbath question. It has just this bearing: Many people who know nothing of the Hebrew will read such a statement from a man who writes “D. D.” after his name, and although they cannot see any point to it, they think it certainly must mean something, and as that supposed something is in harmony with their prejudices, they rest content. The “reverend” men who make use of such “argument” know very well that a title, and a few phrases from, or allusions to, a foreign language, are wonderful conscience easers. E. J. W. {SITI July 30, 1885, p. 457.14}