**“No Probation after Death” The Signs of the Times, 11, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks the SIGNS to give an exposition of 1 Peter 3:18, 19; 4:6. He says that he has met a man who bases his believe in the immortality of the soul, on these two texts, the argument being that the dead spoken of are those that died previous to the promise to Abraham; that before Abraham’s time there was no promise of the redeemer, and that to those who lived before that time, Christ went and announced the good news of salvation. The brother is not troubled on his own account, but wishes to know how to present the case to another. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.1}

In the first place, a man’s opinion is no consequence whatever, unless he can offer some evidence in its support. When the objector says that there was no promise of the Messiah, until the time of Abraham, he must show proof, or else his theory is not worthy of consideration. That the Messiah was promised before our first parents were driven from the Garden of Eden, is susceptible of the clearest proof. Thus:- {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.2}

1. It was the devil himself who attempted Eve. With Genesis 3:13 and 2 Corinthians 11:3, compare Revelation 12:9, which says that the serpent is the devil and Satan, and that it is he that deceiveth the whole world. There can be no controversy over the statement that it was the devil under the guise of a serpent, who caused our first parents to fall. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.3}

2. In the garden God said to the serpent, the devil, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Genesis 3:15. Here is the statement that the seed of the woman should destroy Satan; and when we read (Hebrews 2:9, 14) that Jesus died in order that “he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil,” we know that Jesus Christ is the “seed” mentioned in Genesis 3:15. So then, not withstanding what may be said to the contrary, we know that the Messiah was promised before the days of Abraham. More evidence could be given if it were needed. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.4}

But, it being true that the promised Messiah was known from the time of the fall, the supposition that Christ, between his crucifixion and his resurrection, went to preach the gospel to those who lived before the time of Abraham, or before the flood, amounts to nothing. There is absolutely no ground for the position that the people before Abraham were not on probation; therefore the only loophole for those who will have it that Christ, after his crucifixion, went and preached to some dead persons, is the more common position that certain ones, especially of the antediluvians, “did not have a fair chance,” and that justice required that after death they should have the chance of which they were deprived during their life-time. This is the position taken by Canon Farrar, and by all who, with him, adopt the theory of a probation after death. But this view is unscriptural and wicked, as we shall show. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.5}

It is wicked, because it presents God as a tyrant, changeable, and careless of the welfare of his subjects, instead of the God of infinite mercy, love and justice, and with whom is “no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” Take notice. If it were true that immediately after his crucifixion Christ went and preached to some who had lived before the flood, there could be no other reason for it, than the one usually given, namely, that they had not had “a fair chance,”-opportunity to hear and repent. Then we have presented to us the spectacle of God visiting his terrible wrath, as in the flood, upon men whom he had not given a chance to repent! No earthly tyrant was ever accused of greater cruelty and injustice than this. And then they would have us believe that the unchangeable God, as if to atone for his error, sent his Son to announce a pardon to those who had once been the subjects of his ill-advised wrath! We marvel how any who profess to love and reverence God, can countenance a theory that so degrades his character. It cannot be denied that the picture here presented is the legitimate and only result of the objector’s position on 1 Peter 3:18-20. This alone is more than enough to stamp that position as erroneous. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.6}

That position is also wicked because it is unscriptural. The word of God says: “The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.” Psalm 115:17. Then even supposing that God had unjustly cut off some of the antediluvians, it would have been a hopeless mission for Christ to go to the grave to preach to them, for it would have been an impossibility for them to repent and give glory to God. More than this, allowing that Christ could and did go to the grave to preach to them, it would have been impossible for them to take any action whatever, for the inspired word says, “there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave.” Ecclesiastes 9:10. It would have been impossible for them to hear the message, for, while the living may know many things, “the dead know not anything.” Ecclesiastes 9:5. Of man it is said that “his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm 146:4. And the grave is called, a “land of forgetfulness” (Psalm 88:11, 12), “a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness.” Job 10:22. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.7}

Moreover, that position would have it that Christ did not really die, and that is not only unscriptural, but subversive of the whole plan of salvation. “Christ died for the godly.” Romans 5:6. He was “put to death” in order “He that might bring us to God.” 1 Peter 3:15. If, therefore, the divine Son of God did not die, then there is no salvation for sinners. But Christ did die; “poured out his soul unto death” (Isaiah 53:12), and his soul, thus poured out unto death, was as “an offering for sin” (Isaiah 53:10), and consequently there is hope for sinners. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.8}

Now let us read 1 Peter 3:18-20, and see just what it does teach. The apostle after the exhortation to meekness under unjust accusation, says:- {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.9}

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.” {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.10}

Examine this text, and you will find the following simple statements:- {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.11}

1. Christ, the just one, suffered for the sins of the unjust. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.12}

2. He did this that he might bring us to God. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.13}

3. He was put to death in the flesh. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.14}

4. He was made alive by the Spirit. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.15}

5. This Spirit was the same by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.16}

6. This preaching was “when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah.” {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.17}

It is the Spirit that convinces of sin (John 16:8), and the Spirit was striving with men in the days of Noah. Genesis 6:3. So they did have a “chance,” but it was only while their days continued-in their case one hundred and twenty years. We see, then, that the preaching, spoken of in 1 Peter 3:18, was done, not by Christ in person, but by the Holy Spirit; not in the Christian era, but before the flood; not to disembodied, conscious spirits confined in some part of *hades*, but to living men in the flesh, who were in the bondage of sin. See Romans 7:14; Galatians 4:3. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.18}

But what shall we do with 1 Peter 4:6? Just believe it. Let us read it, together with the two preceding verses: “Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you; who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.” {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.19}

This has been done many times in our experience. We have often heard the gospel preached to men that are dead. But they were not dead at the time the gospel was preached to them, and the Bible nowhere says that the gospel was ever preached to men who *were* dead when the preaching was done. Peter, however, says that it was preached to them that *are* dead, and that statement effectually shuts off the infidel argument for a second probation, that some men have “never had a chance.” The reason why the gospel was preached to them, is that both living and dead must be judged, and God is just. “It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the Judgment” (Hebrews 9:27), and not another probation. Before death comes, all have an opportunity to repent, so that if the Judgment finds them void of righteousness, they will be speechless. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.20}

This is the simple truth concerning the oft-perverted words of Peter. They are easily understood, and give no warrant whatever for the idea of a life in the grave. E. J. W. {SITI August 6, 1885, p. 473.21}

**“The Sabbath of the Decalogue” The Signs of the Times, 11, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the third article by Dr. Dobbs, on the Sabbath question, we find the following:- {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.1}

“The Sabbath of the Sinaitic decalogue was essentially and designedly a ceremonial institution of the Mosaic law, and as such was given and confined to that people whom the Lord their God had brought out of the land of Egypt. It was a sign between God and Israel only.” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.2}

In the next paragraph, he says:- {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.3}

“Some good brethren, while assenting in the main to my proposition, have thought the use of the word “ceremonial” unfortunate and misleading. I class the Sabbath institution with the other positive rites of Judaism. *To my mind*, the Sabbath is no more spiritual or moral than are the Passover and the new moon festival observances, commanded in the law of Moses. It, as well as they, was but a part of the ‘shadows’ which were to ‘pass away’ when the ‘body’ should come.” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.4}

In answer to the Doctor’s statement that to *his* mind there is nothing spiritual or moral about the Sabbath, we would quote the words of Paul, in 1 Corinthians 2:14: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” This Scripture has direct application in this case, for the apostle plainly declares that the one who refuses submission to the law of God, is not spiritual, but carnal. Romans 8:7. The same apostle plainly declares that “the law is spiritual;” that “the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good.” Romans 7:12, 14. If the law is spiritual, then the fourth precept of the law is spiritual. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.5}

It is impossible to separate the fourth commandment from the rest of the decalogue. It is, as a whole, the moral law. The psalmist was speaking of the law as it was pronounced from Sinai, when he declared that it “is perfect” (Psalm 19:7), and he certainly referred to the words which were spoken amid the thunders of Sinai, when he said, “Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.” Psalm 119:160. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.6}

Is the decalogue ceremonial and shadowy? If the fourth commandment is, the whole must be. When God said, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” what did that typify? When God said, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain,” what portion of the work of Christ was shadowed forth? Can any one tell? The truth is, there is not a single one of the ten commandments which has in it anything whatever of a ceremonial nature. Think a moment, reader. Did you ever hear anybody mention anything in the life, sufferings, or death of Christ, of which the Sabbath was typical? No one ever attempted to show in Christ’s work the antitype of the Sabbath. The antitype of every portion of the ceremonial law may be traced in the work of Christ, but not so with the moral law. That is not a shadow, but the *substance* which, when trampled upon, made it necessary for Christ’s work to be performed. The apostle says, “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.” 1 Corinthians 7:19. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 488.7}

Some men *claim* that the Sabbath was given as a type of the saint’s eternal rest. We have never seen any proof of such a thing, and we do not accept the statement as true; but if it were true, it would show that the Sabbath is still binding upon mankind, for the saints have not yet received their eternal rest, and the shadow can never stop until it reaches the substance. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.1}

The declaration of our Saviour, in Matthew 5:17, 18, is of itself sufficient to show that the law of God is not typical or shadowy: “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.” Till all what be fulfilled? Till all the prophets be fulfilled. Christ’s coming to earth was, as he said, in fulfillment of prophecy, for unto him all the prophets gave witness. Acts 10:43. But Christ did not at his first coming fulfill all that the prophets had spoken, for David, prophesying of him, said: “My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make [to endure] for ever, and his throne as the days of Heaven.” Psalm 89:28, 29. Here is a prophecy that cannot be completely fulfilled as long as the days of Heaven exist-in other words, it reaches to eternity;-and therefore since not a jot nor a tittle can pass from the law until *all* be fulfilled, it is evident that the ten commandments will exist in full force, without the slightest change, as long as eternity endures. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.2}

Now what about the statement that the Sabbath was given because God brought the Jews out of Egypt? The falsity of that assertion has already been shown, by the fact that the Sabbath was given to man in Eden. If it was given in Eden, and was kept centuries before the Egyptian bondage, as we have already shown, then it was not given to commemorate the deliverance from that bondage. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.3}

There was something given which, while it served as a shadow of something good to be done for the race, commemorated the deliverance from bondage. This was the passover, described in Exodus 12. But the passover was eaten in the night, and therefore Moses said: “It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt; this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations.” Exodus 12:42. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.4}

The objector, as he reads this, will think of Deuteronomy 5:15, which reads thus: “And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.” That passage can afford no help to the opposers of Sabbath observance. Mark it well. It does not say that the Lord *gave* them the Sabbath day because he brought them out of Egypt, but that for that reason he commanded them to *keep*. There is quite a difference. The Sabbath was given to men at creation. When the children of Israel were in hard and cruel bondage in Egypt, they had grievous tasks placed upon them, and their taskmasters would not allow them any respite. They were not allowed to keep the Sabbath. Moses demanded of Pharaoh that he should let the people go, so that they might serve the Lord. Pharaoh refused, and the Lord compelled him to let them go. When God, with a wonderful exhibition of his power, have brought them out of bondage, that they might serve him, what could be expected but that he would command them to do so. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.5}

The fact that God at that time *commanded* them to keep the Sabbath is no evidence that a previous command had not been given to do the same thing. If it were, then it would appear that it was never wrong to steal, nor do any other thing forbidden in the ten commandments, until the deliverance from Egypt, for we read in Leviticus 19:36, 37, as follows:- {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.6}

“Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them.” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.7}

Even Dr. Dobbs would scarcely claim that there was anything shadowy or ceremonial in dealing justly, or that the obligation to do so has passed away. Then why should he make that assertion in the case of the Sabbath? The Sabbath was in no sense a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt; but the fact that God had miraculously delivered his people so that they might serve him, made it eminently proper that he should renew his command to them to keep an already existing institution. E. J. W. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.8}

**“‘Who Was Melchizedek?’” The Signs of the Times, 11, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

How many times this question has been asked, and how many quires of paper have been used up in vain attempts to answer it! The number almost equals the number of those who have ever thought about the matter. Some, in answer to the question, will have that he was Shem, and others insist that he must have been our Lord in disguise. And, strange to say, when a person has one of these ideas in his mind, it is almost impossible for anyone to rid him of it. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.9}

Now to us the discussion over this question has always seemed something strange. We cannot yet conceive how it is possible for anybody with even a slight knowledge of the Scriptures, to be bothered over the matter, for the Bible tells us who Melchizedek was, in just as plain terms as could be desired. For the benefit of all who are troubled over the question, “Who was Melchizedek?” we will give a direct answer from the Bible. Turn, if you please, to Genesis 14:18-20. There you will read:- {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.10}

“And Melchizedek *king of Salem* brought forth bread and wine: and *he was the priest of the Most High God*. And he blessed him [Abram], and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all.” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.11}

Here we are told, not only who he was but an incident in his life. He was both king of Salem and priest of the Most High God, and in that capacity he blessed the patriarch Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the five kings. He also received from Abraham a tenth part of all the spoil. See also Hebrews 7:1-4. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.12}

If this does not satisfactorily answer the question, we do not know what would. Take other instances! Who was David? Answer, He was king over Israel, and a prophet of God. Who was Moses? He was a prophet, and the leader and commander of the children of Israel. In the wilderness of Sinai, he went up into the mount; and God spoke to him face to face. Who was Paul? He was an apostle, called of God to carry the gospel to the heathen. All must admit that these answers tell plainly who David and Moses and Paul were. And in like manner, to say that now Melchizedek was king of Salem, and priest of God, fully answers the question, “Who was Melchizedek?” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.13}

Suppose that in answer to the question, “Who was Moses?” I should say, “He was John the Baptist;” or that if some one should ask, “Who was David?” the answer should be given, “He was Hezekiah;” or that if when speaking of my neighbor Mr. Jones, I should be asked who he is, and should answer, “He is Mr. Brown;” what would be thought? People would think that my mind was wandering. To us it seems just as absurd to say that Melchizedek was Shem, or that he was Christ, as it would be to say that David was Paul, or that Mr. Jones is Mr. Brown. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.14}

To be sure, we have a more full record of Moses and David and Paul, than we have of Melchizedek, but what of that? We have by no means a complete record even of their lives. It is not necessary that we should know all of a man’s history, in order to know who he was. Of Enoch we only know that he walked with God and was translated; yet no Bible student ever raises the question, “Who was Enoch?” {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.15}

“But,” some one will say, “we the parents and descent of these men, and of Melchizedek’s parentage we know nothing.” How many are there who can tell who Elijah’s parents were? or who were his descendants, and how old he was when he was translated? No one knows. We are told only his office and some of the incidents of his life, just as in the case of Melchizedek. The schoolboy, in his reading, chances to find references to a man by the name of Paulding. He will ask, “Who was Paulding?” His teacher, or the Biographical Dictionary, will answer, “He was one of the American soldiers who, in 1780, captured Major Andre.” We know nothing of his parentage, and are told only one incident of his life, yet we do not straightway conclude that he must have been Anthony Wayne. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.16}

“Yes,” says the objector, “but the Bible says that Melchizedek had no parents.” If that were so, it ought to put a stop to the folly of calling him either Shem or Christ, for we know who Shem’s father was, and we know the age of Shem when he died. Likewise, of Christ, we know that as to his earthly life he was born of the Virgin Mary, and that before he came to earth he was known, as he still is, as the “only begotten of God.” But the Bible does not say that Melchizedek had no parents. King James’ version reads, “Without father, without mother,” but this, in the Revised Version is correctly rendered, “without genealogy,” thus agreeing with the margin of the old version, “without pedigree.” His ancestry is not given, and in this he differs from the Levitical priests, in that their descent must be traced to Aaron. This was that which made his priesthood a type of Christ’s. Christ has no predecessor nor successor in his priestly office, and therefore he is set forth as the antitype of Melchizedek, who stands as the sole representative of his order. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.17}

The type and the antitype, the shadow and the substance, cannot be identical. Christ is a priest “after the order of Melchizedek,” and therefore it is impossible that they two should be one. Every attempt to go beyond the record and show the origin, descent, etc., of Melchizedek, is in reality an attempt to show that his priesthood was not a type of the priesthood of Christ. Let us give ourselves wholly to “those things which are revealed,” and not waste time in vain attempts to be wise above that which is written. E. J. W. {SITI August 13, 1885, p. 489.18}

**“The Sabbath a Sign” The Signs of the Times, 11, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we quoted a paragraph which stated that the Sabbath was a ceremonial institution, given to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, and that it was only a sign for the Jews, a distinguishing mark. The first statement we considered, showing its fallacy; this week we have briefly to consider the Sabbath as a sign. We shall quote the texts referred to by Dr. Dobbs. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.1}

Exodus 31:13: “Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.2}

Ezekiel 20:12: “Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.” {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.3}

Ezekiel 20:20: “And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.” {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.4}

These three verses tell us plainly what purpose the Sabbath served as a sign. Strange to say, it was not a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles, not a mark of national distinction, but that the people might know the God of Heaven. Each one of these verses tells the same thing. It was a sign by which they might know the Lord. But mark: It was the Sabbath when *hallowed* that enabled them to know the Lord. The Sabbath institution, a mere theory, could have no such effect; but when they *kept* the Sabbath, they could know the true God-the God that would sanctify them. Heathen gods could not sanctify; and since the people could not know the true God unless they kept the Sabbath, it follows that keeping the Sabbath was necessary to sanctification. And this is just as true now as it was then. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.5}

Right here we have one strong evidence that the Sabbath was designed for all men. Thus: It is very certain that God wants all men to acknowledge him and to give him, the reverence and homage which is his due. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture proof of this, since none will deny it. We will refer to one or two. “Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.” Revelation 4:11. Paul also said that God “commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” Acts 17:30. This repentance is to be “toward God.” Acts 20:21. Now if all men everywhere are called upon to show repentance toward God, it is evident that it is the duty of all men to know and serve him. Again, those who know not God are to be punished with everlasting destruction. 2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9. It is evident, then, that is the duty of all men to know God. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.6}

But the text above quoted, says that it was only by keeping the Sabbath that the children of Israel could know who was God. If it was the keeping of the Sabbath that caused them to know the true God, it must be the keeping of the Sabbath that insures a knowledge of God to other people. Therefore since God wants to be known by all, he wants his Sabbath to be kept by all. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.7}

But how is it that the keeping of the Sabbath can perpetuate the knowledge of the true God? Read the words of the Lord concerning the Sabbath, in Exodus 31:17: “It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.” Now we have it. The keeping of the Sabbath causes our thoughts to turn to the creation, and thus we remember the true God, for it is his creative power that distinguishes him from false gods. “For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens.” Psalm 96:5. “Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.” Jeremiah 10:11, 12. Now the only thing whatever to keep this truth prominently before the minds of men is the Sabbath. That and that alone is the memorial of the creation. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.8}

Some may say that the works of creation are ever before us, and that we can ever keep the Creator in mind. But God foresaw that without the Sabbath man would not remember him, and the result has demonstrated his wisdom, for the people who disregard the Sabbath, very soon forget God. Without the weekly rest, in which they can meditate upon God’s great power, they will soon cease to think of him at all; but the proper keeping of the Sabbath insures continual remembrance of God; for the Sabbath, to be kept properly, must be remembered throughout the week. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.9}

“But,” says one, “the Sabbath, after all, was a sign only to Israel.” This brings us to a brief consideration of why the Israelites are especially mentioned, and why it was that only the Israelites were gathered about the base of Sinai, to hear the law. Two reasons may be given:- {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.10}

1. Of all the people on earth, the Jews alone retained the knowledge of the true God. Abraham had been called to separate from his heathen relatives, in order that he and his descendants might not, by heathen associations, be turned from their allegiance to him. God called Abraham for the same reason that four hundred years before he had chosen Noah,-because He alone was righteous. The people of the country in which he and his descendants were sojourners, were those who had sold themselves to the devil, and the Egyptians, to whom the Israelites were in bondage, were gross idolaters. In all the earth there was but one people, and that was Israel, that could have been induced to hearken to the voice of God. The law was therefore intrusted to them, with repeated injunctions not to forget it, in order that the knowledge of God might not become wholly extinct. Their duty was to hold up its light so that the nations might see it, and thus some be led to glorify God. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.11}

2. Because Israel alone had preserved the knowledge of the true God, he made a special promise to them, on condition that they should continue in his law. This was the first covenant, and when that was broken he made another, not with the Gentiles, but with the same people-the house of Israel and Judah. Jeremiah 31:31-34. The promises of God are to none but the Israelites (Romans 9:4), and therefore all who are saved must be of Israel. Romans 11:26. The heavenly city, into which the redeemed shall enter, has but twelve gates, and on these gates are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel. Revelation 21:12. We can readily see the reasonableness of this, when we remember that “Israel” signifies, “one who prevails,” for none but the overcomers, those who prevail, can expect a place in the kingdom of God. And in this we find the strongest proof that God designed the seventh-day Sabbath to be kept by his people in all ages, because it is to be a sign between him and his people Israel *forever*. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.12}

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” Exodus 20:8-10. E. J. W. {SITI August 20, 1885, p. 505.13}

**“Sabbath and Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are only a few more things in Dr. Dobbs’ Sunday article which we wish to notice at present, and these are all of a favorable nature, that is, favorable to the Lord’s Sabbath. In article five, we find the following statement, every clause of which he thinks is worthy of emphatic iteration:- {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.1}

“The Holy Spirit never calls the first day of the week the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New Testament, is the name of the Jewish institution, and refers to the seventh day-Saturday. We ought not to be wiser than the Scripture.” {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.2}

Amen. With the exception of the term “Jewish institution,” as applied to the Sabbath, we could heartily say to the above, amen and amen. We need not stop to argue concerning the objectionable term, for all our readers know that the Sabbath is the Lord’s, that he claims it as his own (Exodus 20:10; 31:13; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28); and that it was observed in Eden, centuries before there was a Jew, and while “the whole earth was of one language and of one speech.” With the exception of that single expression, the above quotation would seem to be the language of an earnest Sabbatarian. No one would suspect that is from one who hates the Sabbath of the Lord. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.3}

Our readers will of course understand that the Doctor’s emphatic statement concerning the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Bible, is not because of any love for the Sabbath, nor disregard for Sunday, but simply because he would have Sunday called the “Lord’s day,” and would not have men observe any day as a *Sabbath*. Now let us see how his theory and practice agree. He is a Baptist preacher, and therefore whatever we find in the Baptist “Confession of Faith” may be quoted as his own words, since they have his endorsement. Following is the first article of that document:- {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.4}

“*The Scriptures*.-We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly construction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.” {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.5}

The twelth article reads as follows:- {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.6}

“*The Law and the Gospel*.-We believe the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen man to fulfill all its precepts, arises entirely from love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is the one great end of the gospel, and of the means by grace connected with the establishment of the visible church.” {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.7}

Doctor Dobbs, having subscribed his name to these articles, says that according to the Scriptures, the seventh day,-Saturday,-and that alone is the Sabbath, yet refuses to obey the commandment which says, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;” “in it thou shalt not do any work.” Now if we accept him as our guide in matters of religion, how shall we know which of his utterances we are to be guided? Our Saviour said: “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not.” Matthew 23:2, 3. He could say this with safety, for whatever their practice, the scribes always taught that the strictest obedience was to be rendered to the law. But we cannot save this of our modern teachers, for they do not always “say;” they give an uncertain sound, sometimes teaching strict conformity to the Bible, and again teaching that it is not to be obeyed. In such a case, we prefer to listen to the Bible alone. “We ought not to be wiser than the Scriptures.” {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.8}

We cannot refrain from noting one other point, to show the inconsistency of calling the seventh day “the Jewish Sabbath.” As correctly stated above, the Holy Spirit never called Sunday the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New Testament, it refers to the seventh day Saturday. Now it is not only admitted, but zealously claimed, that the New Testament was written for the purpose of teaching Christianity. Its language is the language for Christians to use, and those who accept it indeed, are Christians. (We also believe the same in regard to the Old Testament.) Then it necessarily follows that the Sabbath is just as much a Christian as it is a Jewish institution. As a matter of fact it is neither Jewish nor Christian; it belongs to no race nor age; it is the Sabbath of the Lord. But the law of God, which the Baptist “Confession of Faith” justly calls “the eternal and unchangeable rule” of God’s moral Government, says, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work” (Exodus 20:8-10), and the Holy Spirit teaches emphatically in the New Testament that there is no Sabbath day but the seventh day. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.9}

In the same paragraph we find the following, from the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, quoted with approval; “The Lord’s day [Sunday] then was *not a continuation* of the Jewish Sabbath, which was at first also observed, but a *substitute* for it.” This is a fact, Sunday, improperly called Lord’s day, was *substituted* for the Sabbath of the Lord, just as the bishop of Rome was substituted for the Lord, and sprinkling was substituted for immersion. We have the same authority for substituting sprinkling for baptism, or regarding the pope as the vicar of Christ, that we have for substituting Sunday for the Sabbath. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.10}

One more quotation, from Dr. Dobbs sixth article:- {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.11}

“It cannot be repeated too often that there is no Scripture authority for the transfer of the Sabbatic obligations and from the seventh day to the first day. Of such ‘change of day,’ not only the New Testament, but also the Christian literature of the early centuries, is absolutely silent. It was several hundred years after Christ before Christians began to identify the Lord’s day [Sunday, not the Lord’s day] with the Sabbath, and to adduce the authority of the fourth commandment in support of its sanctity. Surely it is suggestive that such is the case.” {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 521.12}

Very suggestive indeed. Let every Baptist read the above paragraph, and then ask himself if he can consistently continue to keep a day which has no warrant from Scripture. The Doctor says that the fact that several hundred years after Christ, Christians began to adduce the fourth commandment in support of Sunday sanctity, is suggestive. Suggestive of what? It shows that they knew that the fourth commandment is of eternal obligation, and that being determined not to give up their Sunday for the Lord’s Sabbath, they found that the only way to satisfy people who wanted to be loyal to God, was to make them believe that the fourth commandment enjoined the observance of Sunday. This they largely succeeded in doing; but as the end approaches, the light cannot be hid; truth will be fully manifest to all the honest in heart; and soon every individual who holds the faith of Jesus will also keep the commandments of God. E. J. W. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.1}

**“Handling the Word Deceitfully” The Signs of the Times, 11, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend who is quite active as a canvasser for the SIGNS, tells us that in the place where he is now working there is among the people quite a deep interest on the Sabbath question. In consequence of this interest, the Presbyterian minister in that place, is troubled, feeling that some of his flock will keep “the Sabbath of the Lord” in stead of “the venerable day of the sun.” To satisfy the people that their previous custom of keeping Sunday is correct, and to make them believe that the seventh day is no longer the Sabbath, he resorts to a trick that is worthy of a Jesuit. He tells them that, in the original, the word in the New Testament for Sabbath, is an entirely different word from that which in the Old Testament is translated Sabbath, and that they do not have the same meaning. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.2}

To some, the sophistry and the falsehood contained in such a statement would be apparent at once, but many honest persons would be thrown into confusion by a statement concerning languages with which they have no acquaintance. We think that we can easily relieve the minds of such, so that if the objection of that clergyman is all that troubles them, they need have no hesitancy in obeying the commandment. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.3}

It is true that the word for Sabbath in the original of the New Testament is different from that translated Sabbath, from the original of the Old. How is this? Simply because the New Testament was written in Greek, and the Old Testament in Hebrew. As a matter of course, the word for Sabbath would not be identical in both languages. Yet the thing mentioned is the same. A parallel to that minister’s statement would be to claim that because the word for “horse” is not the same in France that it is in Germany, therefore the animal has an entirely different nature in the two countries. It is on a par with the statement of the late Spiritualist “Professor” Denton, that the word “resurrection” is not found in the Greek Testament. Of course not, for resurrection is an English word; but there is in the Greek Testament a word corresponding to it and having the very same meaning. Even so we would not expect to find the Greek word for Sabbath in the Hebrew Old Testament, nor the Hebrew word for Sabbath in the Greek New Testament. Yet both words have the same meaning that the English word Sabbath has. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.4}

When Martin Luther was before the Diet at Worms, he first made his defense in his native Germany, and afterward at the request of the emperor, who did not like the German, he repeated it in Latin. Does anybody suppose that his second speech had a different meaning from the first, because in the two languages things were called by different names? Of course not. These illustrations are sufficient to enable all to see through the trick to which the aforesaid clergyman resorted. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.5}

The lexicons will show that the Hebrew, Greek and English words for Sabbath have all one meaning. But one who knows nothing of either Hebrew or Greek may prove the fact for himself. The sacred historian, after describing the crucifixion of Christ, says “And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested *the Sabbath day according to the commandment*.” Luke 23:54-56. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.6}

The “commandment” is found in the Old Testament, in Exodus 20:8-11, and says the Sabbath on which the women rested was “according to the commandment,” we have a positive evidence that the Sabbath of the New Testament is identical with that of the Old. And the fact that the Sabbath mentioned by Luke, immediately preceded the first day of the week, shows that the Sabbath of the Old and the New Testament is the seventh day of the week. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.7}

The requirements of courtesy make it impossible to characterize the course of that minister as it deserves. To say the least, it is dishonorable, and should at once deprive him of the respect and confidence of the people who know of it. And what should they think of a cause that requires its advocates to stoop to such mean evasions of truth? They must certainly conclude that the cause itself is the opposite of truth. For a man to adopt such methods of argument, is to confess in advance that the cause which he defends is a weak one, but that he is determined to win by deceit where he cannot by fair means. The course which he adopted to uphold Sunday is eminently worthy of an institution which owes its existence to fraud. Thank God, the truth does not require its advocates to resort to the tricks of the pettifogger. E. J. W. {SITI August 27, 1885, p. 522.8}