**“The Four Kingdoms of Daniel 7” The Signs of the Times, 11, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

“In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.” Daniel 7:1. The exactness of the Bible narrative is worthy of note. “In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon.” Concerning Belshazzar as king of Babylon, and the time of his reign, we extract the following from Rawlinson:- {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.1}

“Nebuchadnezzar expired at Babylon in the forty-fourth year of his reign, B.C. 561, after an illness of no long duration. He was probably little short of eighty years old at his death. The successor of Nebuchadnezzar was his son Evil-Merodach, who reigned only two years, and of whom very little is known.... He had been but two years upon the throne when a conspiracy was formed against him; he was accused of lawlessness and intemperance; his own brother-in-law, Neriglissar, the husband of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, headed the malcontents and Evil-Merodach lost his life with his crown. Neriglissar, the successful conspirator, was at once acknowledged king.... Neriglissar reigned from B.C. 559 to B.C. 556, and, dying a natural death in the last-named year, left his throne to his son, Laboroarchod, or Labossoracus. This prince, was a mere boy, and therefore quite unequal to the task of governing a great empire in critical times, was not allowed to retain the crown many months.... On the death of Laboroarchod the conspirators selected one of their number, a certain Nabonadius, or Nabannidochus, and invested him with the sovereignty.... It is probable that one of his first steps on ascending the throne was to connect himself by marriage with the royal house which had preceded him in the kingdom.... Very shortly after the accession of Nabonadius (B.C. 555) he received an embassy from the far northwest.... At the earliest possible moment-probably when he was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government, his son, Belshazzar, or Bel-sharuzar, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar.”-*Fourth Monarchy, chap. 8, part. 38-50.* {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.2}

This gives us the Babylonian succession from Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the monarchy. The monument contains the names of both Nabonadius and Belshazzar, and for a long time historians thought they referred to the same person. Further research has shown their true relationship. As Belshazzar was left in Babylon, never leaving it, so far as known, he is very properly termed king of Babylon, the more so, as he really held that title, in conjunction with his father. Cyrus, king of Persia, is in one place (Ezra 5:13) called the king of Babylon, because that was his capital. As will be noticed, the date in the margin of Daniel 7:1, agrees with the historian, in placing the first year Belshazzar in B.C. 555. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.3}

“Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.” Daniel 7:2, 3. The Scriptures never put a man under the necessity of guessing at anything that is intended for him to know—and whatever is revealed is designed for us. Deuteronomy 29:29. So we find in this same chapter the clew to unravel the whole thing. In verse 17 we are told in plain words that “these great beasts which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.” And then, showing us that not individual kings but kingdoms are meant, the next verse continues: “But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.” {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.4}

Another thing is shown by verse 17. We learn from it that these four kingdoms terminate with the kingdom of God, of which the saints are heirs, and in which they are to dwell for ever. We found that this was the termination of the four kingdoms of Daniel 2. Now when we note that these beasts came up one after another (see verses 4-7), and that they represent kings that bear rule over all the earth (see verse 25), we know that the four kings of Daniel 7 must be identical with the four kings of Daniel 2. For it is an utter impossibility that two series of universal kingdoms should exist in the earth at the same time. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.5}

There are two other symbols in this prophecy, but they are easily explained. We know that the winds and the sea are symbolical, for the beasts are symbolical, and literal winds and waters do not produce real kingdoms. Winds blowing on the ocean produce commotion; and since it is as the result of the commotion thus produced that the four kingdom arise, we must conclude that by the blowing of the winds on the sea, wars are indicated, since it is through strife and bloodshed that kingdoms arise. We shall find that prophecy bears us out in this conclusion. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.6}

It must be accepted as a fact that when a symbol is once used in a prophecy, with a certain meaning, it must have the same meaning in whatever other prophecy it is found. If this were not so, we would have no harmony in the Bible. By following this principle, all is harmonious. In the 17th of Revelation, John speaks of a woman that he saw, sitting on many waters (verse 1), and the angel told him (verse 15) that these waters were “peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and kings.” Then the great sea of Daniel 7, represents the people of the earth. See also in Isaiah 8:7, where the king of Assyria is called “the waters of river.” If the sea means people, then of course the stirring up of the sea, by winds, denotes the stirring up of the people-strife. In harmony with this, we find in Jeremiah 25:32, 33, that as a result of a great whirlwind in all the earth, the slain cover all the earth. In Revelation 7:1-3 the wind,-the fierce passions of men-are represented as being held so that the earth may not be hurt. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.7}

The prophecy, then, simply brings to view the four universal empires,-Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome,-each arising as the result of the ungoverned passions of the people. The first, Babylon, with its power and glory, was represented by a lion, with eagle’s wings. Daniel 7:4. It was described as follows: “For, lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation... Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen shall spread themselves, and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat.” Habakkuk 1:6-8. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.8}

But the prophet beheld until the wings wherewith it was lifted up from the earth, were plucked, and it was made to stand on its feet as a man. Instead of flying over the country, in conquest, it came to a full stop. Then the second, Medo-Persia, was represented by a bear with three ribs in its mouth, indicating its ferocious disposition. Calmet, a Catholic commentator, in reference to this passage, says that the Persians have exercised the most severe and the most cruel dominion that we know of. The cruelty of the Medes is described in Isaiah 13:17, 18. The third kingdom, Grecia, was represented by the leopard with four wings. Nothing could more fitly represent the Grecian empire under Alexander, whose very name is a synonym for celerity of movement. Says Rollin (Book XV, sec. 2. last part.), “Alexander, in less than eight years, marched his army upwards of seventeen hundred leagues, without including his return to Babylon.” And he conquered enemies as he went. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.9}

But the fourth beast was the one concerning which Daniel wished information. He knew what they all represented, but the fourth was “dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.” Daniel 7:7. It needs no further argument to show that this represents Rome, for the 23rd verse says: “The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth.” For the more full proof that the fourth kingdom is Rome, see note in preceding number of the SIGNS. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.10}

“And the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise.” Verse 24. This does not refer to ten *successive* kingdoms, because, “Another shall arise after them, and he shall subdue three kings.” When the little horn arose, he plucked up three of the first horns by the roots. Verse 8. If the ten came up one after another, then there would simply have been eleven kings; and he could not have plucked up three out of the ten as he came up, if all had not existed at once. The ten horns refer to the ten divisions of Western Rome. While different commentators have differed slightly as to the names of these divisions, all agree that they were formed, and that they exist to-day as the various States of Europe. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.11}

These divisions are also indicated by the toes of the image. We know this from the statement that “in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed.” Daniel 2:44. The expression, “these kings,” could not by any possibility refer to the four kingdoms, for the kingdom of God could not be set up in the days of all of them, since one succeeded the other. It could not have been set up in the days of Babylon, and also in the days of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Not until after the division of Rome, which took place in the fifth century, was that kingdom to be set up. When it is set up, it will fill the whole earth, to the exclusion of all human governments. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.12}

Comments on the kingdom represented by the little horn, must necessarily be reserve for other lessons. E. J. W. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 582.13}

**“The Lord’s Sabbath Definite” The Signs of the Times, 11, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

“The great majority of Christians believe that the [fourth] commandment only requires the observance of one day in seventh, and that it believes the children of God at liberty to select the day, and they accordingly accept the first instead of the seventh day, because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.”-*Christian Union.* {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 584.1}

We quote these words simply because they do express the belief of the “great majority of Christians,” and therefore in what we say it may not seem that we are beating the air. We wish to call attention to the fourth commandment, and to the popular belief concerning it, in such a way that all who desire truth may be able to discern it. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 584.2}

1. What reason have the great majority of Christians, or any class of people, whether few or many, to believe that the fourth commandment requires the observance of one day in seventh, and not a definitely specified day? Is not the commandment plain enough in its declarations and injunctions? Let us read it and see. “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” Literally it reads, “Remember *the day of the Sabbath*.” That certainly carries the idea of definiteness. Our attention is called not to “the Sabbath institution,” but to “the Sabbath *day*.” It is “*the* Sabbath day,” indicating that there is only one, just as we say *the* Lord, for a while there be “lords many,” to us “there is but one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.” Different people may have Sabbaths of their own, but the Bible knows but one Sabbath. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 584.3}

Having indicated that there is but one Sabbath, and that it is a definite day, the commandment goes on to tell what day the Sabbath is. “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 shall not do any work.” Here is a definiteness. The Sabbath is “the seventh day.” Note that it is not said, nor are we warranted in saying that the Sabbath comes, or did come, on the seventh day, but that the Sabbath *is* the seventh day. The seventh day and the Sabbath are inseparable. When God said, “Remember the Sabbath day,” it was the same as though he said, “Remember the seventh day.” And after it has been stated that “the seventh day is the Sabbath,” when it is said that “God blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it,” we know that God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed *it*. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 584.4}

This point is made emphatic in Genesis 2:3, to which the command of refers: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created in made.” If anyone thinks there is any doubt as to which day of the week the seventh day is, let him consult the almanac, the dictionary, or the first man he may meet on the street. Ask your neighbor some Sunday morning, “What day of the week is to-day?” and without an instant’s hesitation he will answer, “The first.” Read the extract at the beginning of this article, where it is said that “the great majority of Christians” observe the first day of the week *instead* of the seventh; and knowing that “the day called Sunday” is the popular day of “rest and recreation,” you can have no trouble in accounting and determining which is the seventh day. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 584.5}

That there may be no possibility for doubt, we will state another point, which has often been noted. The crucifixion of Christ, as is generally conceded, was on Friday; the record says, “And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.” Luke 23:54. “And the women... followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.” Luke 23:55, 56; 24:1. No first-day advocates ever dreams that these events did not occurs in order on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; and concede that the day on which the women rested was *the seventh day of the week*, because it immediately preceded the first day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as a mathematical demonstration that the fourth commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath. Now then, we ask, What right have “the great majority of Christians” to believe that the commandment requires simply one-seventh portion of our time, and not rest on a definite day? What right has anybody to so believe? None whatever. There is no excuse for such a belief on the part of one who can read the commandment. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 585.1}

2. Suppose that the commandment did leave it optional with us, as to which day we would observe, what would be the result? Nothing but confusion. If the commandment does not specify any day to be observed, then one person has as much liberty of choice as another. If it were so, then no man would have any right to require another for differing with him. Every man would be a law unto himself. It is a fact, however, that the majority of people do not believe that the commandment leaves to individuals the choice of selecting the day upon which they will rest; if they did so believe, they would exercise their right, and there would not be the uniformity which we now see. If there is uniformity of practice, some one must be recognized as competent to declare which day must be observed. This leads directly to popery, and it is a fact that Roman Catholics are the only Sunday-keepers whose practice is consistent with their profession. Given these two things, definiteness in the commandment, and the desirability of uniformity of practice, and a pope is an absolute necessity. For ourselves we will accept no pope, nor the dogmas of a pope, and the commandment does not lay us under any such necessity. It is as plain and definite as Infinite Wisdom could make it. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 585.2}

3. The people have accepted the first day, “because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.” And that is indeed all the hallowing that the first day of the week has ever received, and that is just none at all. Can the custom or decision of any man determine the sacredness of a day? No. Can the custom and decision of *two* men hallow the day. No; and so all will say. Then the question arises, How many men does it take to reverse the decrees of God, and make wrong right? If in comparison with God the inhabitants of the earth “are as grasshoppers” (Isaiah 40:22), and all “the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance,” yea, even as “less than nothing, and vanity” (verses 15, 17), then the custom and decision of a majority of the people of the earth, or even of *all* of them, are of themselves of no more account then the custom and decision of a single man. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 585.3}

Man is sinful; he cannot hallow anything. Even if he were perfect, his power to hallow anything would be no greater. The mightiest angel in Heaven could not hallow any day which God had not hallowed. “God hath spoken one; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God.” Psalm 62:11. The “tradition and the habit of the church,” when contrary to the word of God, are of no more consequence than the tradition and habit of infidels or pagans. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 585.4}

Compare the two days. Of the seventh day of the week it is said that “God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.” The most that can be said of the first day of the week, is that “tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it.” God hallowed the seventh; man “hallowed” the first. Reader, which will you choose? Whom will you obey? “Choose you this day whom ye will serve;” whether the Lord Jehovah, or the apostate church of Rome. May God help you to remember that under *all* circumstances “we ought to obey God rather than men.” E. J. W. {SITI October 1, 1885, p. 585.5}

**“The Sure Foundation” The Signs of the Times, 11, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

“If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” Psalm 11:3. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.1}

Every structure that is of any account must be built upon a foundation. In the close of the sermon on the mount, our Saviour graphically but accurately describes the consequence of building without any foundation. When “the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house,” it fell, because it was built upon the sand. The same thing would have happened to the house which was built upon a foundation, if the foundation could been removed. The tendency of the present age is to superficiality, but a good, solid foundation is nevertheless as necessary as it ever was. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.2}

We believe that “the foundations,” to which the psalmist refers in the text just quoted, are nothing else than the law of God-the ten commandment. To demonstrate this is the object of this article. The psalmist continues in the next verse: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” This shows that there is an intimate connection between “the foundations,” and the throne of God and the temple in heaven. What this connection is, we proceed to show. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.3}

In the 25th chapter of Exodus we find directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. The sanctuary was to be a dwelling-place for God. See verse 8. From the 26th chapter we learn that it was an oblong building, and inclosed on three sides with boards, and on the fourth by a cloth curtain, and that by a similar curtain it was divided into two apartments-the holy place and the most holy place. In the holy place there was an altar of incense, a golden candlesticks, and a table of show-bread. Exodus 40:22-27. In the most holy place was the ark of the testimony (Exodus 26:37), and it is to this that we wish to call especial attention. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.4}

This ark was a wooden box overlaid and lined with pure gold. Its cover was termed the “mercy-seat,” and was of solid gold, having on each end a cherub beaten out of the same piece of pure gold. “And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubim. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.” Exodus 25:20, 21. Read carefully the preceding verses. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.5}

What this “testimony” was, we easily find by the comparison of a few texts of Scripture. In Exodus 24:12 we read: “And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them.” Moses went up, and was there forty days and forty nights, during which time he received the instructions found in chapters 25-31. After noting these instructions, the sacred narrative continues: “And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.” Exodus 31:18. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.6}

We notice that the tables of testimony were tables of stone. Tracing them further, we find (Exodus 32:15-19) that when Moses came down from the mount, with the two tables in his hand, he broke them at the foot of the mount, in his righteous anger at the idolatry of the people. This experience is detailed by Moses in the 9th of Deuteronomy, and in the 10th chapter he proceeds with the narrative as follows:- {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.7}

“At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in mine hand. And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me.” Deuteronomy 10:1-5. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.8}

We have now positive assurance that the “testimony” that was placed in the ark was the ten commandments, and that it was on this account that the ark of was called “the ark of the testimony.” Now note again in Exodus 25, that the cover to the ark was called the “mercy-seat,” and that upon it were two cherubim, one on each end. The Lord said: “And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.” Exodus 25:21, 22. God dwelt between the cherubim upon the mercy-seat above the testimony, and it was this that made it necessary for the high priest to burn incense when he ministered in the most holy place. The cloud of incense veiled the glory of God, which obscured, would have caused his death. Leviticus 16:3, 13. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.9}

Now to the point of all this. The Jewish tabernacle, and all things connected with it, were patterned after something that Moses had seen in the mount. Exodus 25:9, 40. They were “patterns of the things in the heavens;” and “the holy places made with hands” were only “figures of the true” holy places in Heaven. Hebrews 9:23, 24. There must be, then, a real tabernacle in Heaven, and this is plainly stated in Hebrews 8:1, 2: “Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.10}

“A minister of *the sanctuary*.” There is but one, since that built by Moses was only a miniature representation of the true tabernacle in the heavens, which the Lord pitched. This temple in Heaven has been seen by mortal eye. The beloved disciple says: “And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his Testament.” Revelation 11:19. This temple in Heaven is the special dwelling-place of God. “The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him.” Habakkuk 2:20. “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in heaven.” Psalm 11:4. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.11}

We already noted that not only the tabernacle, but all its furniture, was modeled after things in the heavens. Said the Lord to Moses: “According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.” Exodus 25:9. After giving directions concerning the ark, the table, and the candlestick, he repeated the injunction: “And look that thou make them after their pattern, which we showed the in thee mount.” Exodus 25:40. Accordingly we find (Revelation 11:19) that the ark of the testament is one of the things in the temple in heaven. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.12}

Now remember that in the earthly tabernacle God’s dwelling-place was above the ark, between the cherubim that were upon the mercy-seat. Exodus 25:21, 22; Leviticus 16:3, 13. Then since the earthly tabernacle was a type of God’s real dwelling-place,-the temple in Heaven,-it must be that the ark of the testament was a figure of God’s throne in heaven. To corroborate this conclusion, we read that God’s real dwelling-place is between the cherubim. Says David, in prayer to God: “Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth.” Psalm 80:1. Again: “The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved.” Psalm 99:1. Here the fact that God *reigns* is connected with his sitting between the cherubim, showing conclusively that when reigning upon his throne he is between the cherubim. God sits between the cherubim; he reigns; therefore the people should tremble. When Hezekiah was in trouble, he “prayed for the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubim, thou art God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth.” 2 Kings 19:15. And the Lord, speaking of Satan under the figure of the king of Tyre, said: “Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.” {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.13}

These texts show plainly that the cherubim upon the mercy-seat, from between which God spoke to the people, were representations of the cherubim that cover the throne of God in heaven, and that therefore the mercy-seat, supported by the ark, was a figure of God’s throne. This is why the most holy place and the ark were considered so sacred. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.14}

But if the ark and the mercy-seat were a representation of God’s throne, then the tables of testimony-the ten commandments-which it contained must be considered as showing the relation existing between the real throne of God in heaven and the original copy of the ten commandments. The ark existed for the sole purpose of holding the law, and therefore the ten commandments must be considered as forming the foundation of God’s throne. David says: “The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne.” Psalm 97:1, 2. Now when we read (Psalm 119:172) that God’s commandments are righteousness, and further, that they are God’s righteousness (Isaiah 51:6, 7), we are assured that the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, and which were copied on tables of stone, form the foundation of God’s throne. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.15}

A throne is the symbol of royal power and authority. We speak of “the throne of England,” meaning the Government of England; therefore we state the literal fact, that the ten commandment are the foundation of God’s throne, it is equivalent to saying that they formed the basis of God’s Government; that all of God’s judgments are in harmony with them, and that they cover every act of his in the government of his creatures. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.16}

From these facts thus briefly stated, the following conclusions are evident:- {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 601.17}

1. The law of God-the ten commandments-is the law of the universe. “The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.” Psalm 103:19. Not only this earth, but all the world and the Heaven of heavens are subject to his authority, and amenable to his holy law. The highest angel in Heaven, and the lowest saint on earth; the arch deceiver and the most simple of his deluded victims, are alike judged by that perfect law. No righteous act or thought is outside of its sanctions, and no evil can be conceived that it does not condemn. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.1}

2. The law of God was in existence before the creation of the earth. When the foundations of the world were laid, “the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.” Job 38:4-7. The “sons of God” were the subjects of his righteous Government, and therefore subject to the law of God, which is the basis of that Government. In proof of this, and also of the preceding proposition, read Psalm 103:20: “Bless, the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harkening unto the voice of his word.” Since the ten commandment law is *perfect* contains, as we have seen, all the principles of God’s Government, there can be no other commandments for the angels to obey. All commands of God are comprised within the precepts of Sinai. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.2}

3. The ten commandments can never have any end. Since they are the foundation of God’s throne, they must endure as long as it endures, and it must endure as long as God himself exists, for if he were not Supreme Ruler he would not be God. Now listen to the sublime words of the psalmist: “Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.” Psalm 90:1, 2. More emphatic language could not be used. But since it is impossible for God to exist apart from his Government, that must also be to everlasting, and the ten commandments, the basis of that Government, must have an equal duration. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.3}

4. The law of God, is unchangeable. Not only can it not be abolished, but not one of its precepts can undergo the slightest alteration. We speak not of mere verbal changes which do not affect the sense, but of changes in the force or application of law. Since the law is the foundation of God’s throne, its 1en precepts may be considered as the ten pillars constituting the foundation. It was doubtless with this idea in mind that Bishop E. O. Haven named his book which contained his ten sermons on the law,-one sermon on each commandment,-“The Pillars of Truth.” When workmen wish to make any repairs in the foundation of a building, they put up a prop underneath, to take the place of the defective foundation while repairs are being made. But what can be placed under the throne of the universe to uphold it while repairs are being made in any of its corner-stones? Nothing. Men may theorize about a change in the fourth commandment, but such a change is an impossibility. To make it would be to make a revolution in the Government of Heaven. It may be urged that God has power to make such a change, but one thing God cannot do: He cannot deny himself. “If we believe not, yet he abide faithful; He cannot deny himself.” 2 Timothy 2:13. God’s law is his will (Romans 2:17, 18); it is his righteousness; a transcript of his own nature; a photograph of his character. Therefore for God to make a change in the law would show that his character had undergone a change, and that is an impossibility. With him is “no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” James 1:17. If his law was the truth in the days of David (Psalm 119:142), it could not be changed without becoming a lie, and it is only the enemies of God who seek to do this. These facts absolutely prove the proposition that God’s law is absolutely unchangeable. They enable us to better appreciate the words of the psalmit: “Thy word is truth from the beginning; and everyone of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever.” Psalm 119:160. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.4}

5. It follows as a necessary conclusion, that the saints through all eternity will yield obedience to the law. To do otherwise would make them no more saints, but traitors. Some people tell us that a righteous man has no need for the law of God. But the psalmist thought otherwise, for He said: “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” Psalm 11:3. To say that because God’s people are all righteous, therefore they have no need of the law, is like saying that because no one falls over a precipice at the top of which a strong barrier has been erected, therefore the barrier is unnecessary. None are more interested than the righteous, in having the law of God preserved intact through the ages of eternity. It alone attests their loyalty to God. It is to them a sure pledge that no power in the universe can endanger their rights as subjects of the God of Heaven. It shows them that it is not in vain that they make the eternal God their refuge, and that he who in his excellency rides upon the heavens to the help of his people, is abundantly able to protect all who put their trust in him. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.5}

May the Lord hasten the day when his kingdom shall come; when his will shall be done in all the earth even as it is now done in Heaven (see Psalm 119:20); when his children shall all be righteous; when “his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads.” E. J. W. {SITI October 8, 1885, p. 602.6}

**“Tributes to the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 11, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

Quite frequently we have received articles which contain quotations from some eminent men, perhaps an infidel, who has been compelled to testify to the simplicity and beautiful consistency of the Bible, and of the Christian religion. At almost regular intervals we see such tributes in certain religious journalists, prominent among these tributes being Napoleon Bonaparte’s testimony concerning our Lord, which he gave while on the island of St. Helena. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.1}

Perhaps some of our readers may have noticed the absence of such quotations from the columns of the SIGNS. There is a reason why they do not appear. That is, we do not believe that the Bible stands in any need of such tributes, or that it gains anything from them. Says Paul, “And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.” Hebrews 7:7. Therefore for men to give their solemn indorsement of the Bible and of Jesus Christ, is a reversal of the correct order of things. Especially is this so when those men are, or have been as long as they had opportunity, notoriously wicked men. If the Bible commends a man, it is the highest honor that can be given to human kind; it is more than all else in the world, and all that any man needs. To have any man commend the Bible, adds not one whit to its authenticity or force; and to quote such commendation seems to us to be ridiculous. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.2}

Further than this, we do not believe that the Bible needs to be “defended.” Even if it did need to be defended, who shall defend it? Is it not rather turning things around to speak of a man defending the Bible? May it not be truly said of the Bible: “For thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall”? Is it proper to speak of *defending* that from which we derive our sustenance, and upon which we depend for our lives? {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.3}

The Bible is abundantly able to defend itself. We may expound it, and draw from the depths the wonderful truths which alone are capable of overthrowing error, but that is simply letting the Bible speak for itself. All the arguments that can be drawn from outside sources to meet the assaults of skepticism, are worthless when compared with a plain statement of some Bible doctrine. When the most profound argument in proof of the divine origin of the Bible have utterly failed to convert an infidel from the error of his ways, a clear exposition of the prophecies, and that the teaching of the Bible on the nature of man, the fate of the wicked, and the reward of the righteous, have often proved successful. And we will here say that if this latter method will not cause an infidel to see the folly of his position, no other method need be tried. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.4}

Said Jesus: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth shall be damned.” That is all. “Preach the word.” Let the light from the sacred word shine forth in all its clearness, and the word which is “quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow,” will surely convict every soul that is not hopelessly entangled in the snares of Satan. That word carries with it its own defense; it bears the indorsement of heaven. To those who will not accept it *entirely*, there is but one alternative. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.5}

“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?” Jeremiah 23:29, 29. E. J. W. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.6}

**“One Cause of Unbelief” The Signs of the Times, 11, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

A long letter has just been receivedhat this office, from a man in the State of New York. We have not read the letter, and do not know that we shall find time to read it before the holiday vacation, but we have read a part of the first page. We gather from what we have read, that the writer has some views on the Bible which differ from those of his brethren. Now we do not wish to discourage investigation, or to shut out new light, yet we consider ourselves justified in condemning this writer’s views without reading them. Perhaps if we quote a part only of what we have read it, the reader will not charge us with making a hasty decision. Here it is:- {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.7}

“I will first try and tell you the reason why I have not exactly agreed with the church; I shall by the Lord’s help try to tell the truth.1. Because most of them, and especially the rulers, have, as I have yjought, slighted me,” etc. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.8}

We have no need to read further. We have heard his story dozens of times. “My brethren have slighted meet, therefore I cannot agree with them in points of faith.” We meet a man whom we used to know as a brother, and learn that he has left the church, and renounced his profession. What is the reason? “Well, brother—did not use me well, and the rest of them got to thinking that they were better than I; so I left.” Brother A or Elder B has slighted me, therefore I do not believe that “the seventh day is the Sabbath.” I think my brethren feel above me, therefore it is evident to my mind that the Bible is not true. Is not that profound logic? Yet it is the only basis there is for a large portion of the turning away from the faith. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.9}

The first case of an apostasy for such a cause was that of Satan. He felt slighted, and therefore he would not accept the fundamental truth that God is Supreme Governor. And whenever we hear people preface their objections with the statement, “I have been slighted,” we naturally think that they are actuated by some of the same spirit which caused the great rebellion in heaven. Such persons have cause to tremble lest their case becomes as hopeless as that of the first grumbler. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.10}

When people begin to imagine that they are slighted, and are not rated according to their abilities, they may be sure that they are thinking of themselves more highly than they ought to think. Their brethren, no doubt, have not changed their behavior toward them, and rate them at their true worth. It is very seldom that a man’s opinion of himself is more correct than that of all his brethren. But whether the slight be real or fancied, it is certainly the lamest excuse for unbelief that was ever invented; and when any man wants us to give a hearing to his new ideas, he must not make, as a cause for holding them, the statement that he has been slighted by the church. E. J. W. {SITI October 15, 1885, p. 617.11}

**“Some Facts about Roman Catholicism” The Signs of the Times, 11, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received the following letter from a gentle man in Livermore, Cal., with an accompanying request that it be published at our convenience. Accordingly we give it publicity, as a matter of interest to our readers:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.1}

“EDITOR OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Having received a few numbers of the SIGNS from a friend here, I have been reading some of Mrs. E. G. White’s articles, and had begun to think that much good would accrue to Christians, as argued from her religious stand-point. But when, in the issue of August 20, in an article entitled ‘Protestantism and Catholicism Uniting,’ that lady assailed that ancient ark of truth, the Church of Rome, I must say that the writer stepped ‘down and out’ of her sphere of usefulness, and lowered pen to the trickery of Pixley and the fiction of Eugene Lawrence; and, moreover, I charge her with violating one of God’s commandments. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.2}

“Another charge that stands against such writings is that of desiring to menace the peace of our country by stirring up the demons of religious prejudice and bigotry. It is insulting to the intelligence and liberality of the age we live in, for Protestant writers to use such methods of argument against that large body of Christians who acknowledge and follow the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. What does the writer mean by the following rather mysterious sentence in the article I refer to: ‘The people of our land need to be aroused to resist this dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty’? I challenge the writer for an explanation of how, when, and wherein is Catholicism a foe to civil and religious liberty. Facts, not fiction, are wanted. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.3}

“Another sentence that may well bring the blush to the cheek of intelligence: ‘A prayerful study of the Bible would show Protestants the *real character* of the papacy.’ The truth, Mr. Editor, needs not the support of dark insinuation and mysteriously clouded sentences. It is an easy matter for these Protestant writers to erect an imaginary gibbets, and manufacture imaginary instruments of persecution and torture, and array them as the work of the dim and distant ages of the past, with which to terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world; but for the earnest seeker after truth, nothing but the naked facts and the ever-unchanging truth will stand the test of investigation. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.4}

“I agree with the writer when she says that ‘*Rome never changes*.’ Her principles, founded on the Holy Scriptures, never change. The truth does not change. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.5}

“In regard to the Bible, there is another charge made frequently against the Roman Catholic Church, that of ‘banishing the Bible from the Christian world.’ What a preposterous idea! Comment is unnecessary, since the Bible can be seen in every Catholic house,-the only pure and unadulterated word of God. I would ask Mrs. E. G. White, Who is responsible for the recent revision of the Bible? Was this Rome’s doing? Why is the sacred book curtailed, perverted, assailed, and, I may say, torn asunder leaf by leaf? Is the pope doing this? Why is even the definitive Christ being denied in your modern Protestant pulpits? and even [it is taught that] the ten commandments are to be disobeyed. The charge I lay at the doors of your modern Protestantism.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.6}

The above is the entire letter, with the exception of the last paragraph, which contains no new statement. We have given it, in order that we may have the opportunity of once more showing the reason why we are uncompromisingly opposed to Catholicism. But first we would say that the writer cannot have given Mrs. E. G. White writings a very careful reading, or he would not charge her with using “dark insinuations and mysteriously clouded sentences.” As a rule, her writings are characterized by clearness and directness of expression, and concerning the Catholic Church she has given most decided utterance. Now to a consideration of the letter. The point over which the writer seems to be aggrieved is, that Catholicism is a foe to the civil and religious liberty. We therefore quote a few facts, not fiction. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.7}

On Dec. 8, 1864, Pope Pius IX. published the Papal “Syllabus of Errors.” This document, also issued by his sole authority, became in an especial manner the utterance of the Catholic Church, when, less than eight years later, Pius IX. still being pope, the doctrine of papal infallibility was declared. In this Syllabus there are eighty distinct propositions, but each of which is held by the Catholic Church to be an error. We quote two of them:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.8}

“77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of other modes of worship. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.9}

“78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.10}

To men who love liberty these propositions seem just, but the Catholic Church declares them to be errors, and thus plainly teaches that no Catholics ought to be allowed to enjoy public worship. If this does not show that the Catholic Church is the foe of religious liberty, what would? {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.11}

In the reign of Hildebrand, the priests were bound by an oath of obedience to the pope, of which the following are a few clauses:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.12}

“I will be faithful and obedient to our lord the pope and his successors.... In preserving and defending the Roman papacy and the Regalia of St. Peter, I will be their assistant against all men.... Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our same lord, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power.”-*Decretum Greg. IX., lib.2, tit. 24.* {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.13}

That certainly does not bear the stamp of liberty. That the Roman Church is a foe to liberty is also shown by its enmity to the Bible. This charge the gentleman calls a falsehood, but we repeat it, and offer *facts* for proof. After Luther had posted up his famous “Theses,” directed especially against the sale of indulgences, Tetzel, the agent of the pope, came out with some counter propositions, among which is the following:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.14}

“Christian should be taught that there are many things which the church regards as certain articles of the Catholic faith, although they are not found either in the inspired Scripture or in the earlier Fathers.”-*Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran., lib., 1, sec.12.* {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.15}

If the Catholic Church is a friend to the Bible, how is it that, previous to the Reformation, not only the laity, but also the vast majority of the clergy, had never seen a Bible? Why was it so sedulously kept from the people that even very few priests had ever seen a copy of it? The fact is, that Wycliffe was condemned as a heretic and a sacrilegious man, simply because he gave the Bible to the people of England; and in 1408, an English council, with Archbishop Arundel at its head, enacted and ordained “that no one henceforth do, by his own authority, translate any portion of Holy Scripture into the English tongue, or any other, by way of book or a treatise, nor let any such book or treatise now lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe aforesaid, or since, or hereafter to be composed, be read in whole or in part, in public or in private, on the pain of the greater excommunication.” Thus this popish council decreed that not only should Wycliffe’s translation be taken from the people, but that in no coming age should they have any portion of the Bible in any living language. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.16}

But Bibles were printed in spite of papal anathemas, and soon the land was filled with them. Now what did the Roman Church do? It would have brought upon itself the condemnation of all virtuous people if it had continued its outspoken denunciations of the Bible, so, while pretending to exalt that book, it began to weaken its influence. Any one who possesses a Catholic catechism will find there a plain statement to the effect that common people are at full liberty to read the Bible, provided they do so in the original! That is, the farmer and the hod carrier, the brick layer and the errand boy, may read the Bible in Greek and Hebrew! This amounts to actual prohibition. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.17}

But this is not all. The Catholic Church gives her children a version of the Bible, but in it she has not scrupled to alter the text to suit her own dogmas. As an instance we quote Genesis 3:15 as it stands in the Douay Bible, and also in the Vulgate: “And I will put enmity between thee the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; she shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise her heel.” In this matter a prophecy concerning Christ is made to uphold the Catholic worship of the Virgin Mary. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.18}

Speaking of the Virgin Mary, we will notice one or two points which show the papal disregard for the Holy Scriptures. In Deuteronomy 27:15, we read these plain words: “Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place.” In the face of the second commandment, in this curse, a book entitled “Glories of Mary,” published with the approval of the Archbishop of New York, on page 658 contains the following:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.19}

“Father Thomas Sanchez never returned home until he had visited some church of Mary. Let us not be weary, then, of visiting our queen every day in some church or chapel, or in our own house, where it would be well for that purpose to have in some retired place a little oratory, with her image, adorned with drapery, flowers, tapirs for lamps, and before it also the litanies, the rosary, etc., may be said.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.20}

Again, the apostle Peter, speaking of Christ, said: “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 4:12. But in the “Glories of Mary,” page 279, among other blasphemous things we find the following:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.21}

“In the Franciscan chronicles it is related of Brother Leo, that he once saw a red ladder, upon which Jesus Christ was standing, and a white one, upon which stood his holy mother. He sought persons attempting to ascend the red ladder; they ascended a few steps, and then fell; they ascended again, and again fell. Then they were exhorted to ascend the white ladder, and on that he saw them succeed; for the blessed virgin offered them her hand, and they arrived in that manner safe in Paradise.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.22}

Again, on page 177:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.23}

“St. Bonaventure, moreover, says that Mary is called the gate of heaven, because no one can enter into heaven if he does not pass through Mary, who is the door of it.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.24}

And again, we read on page 17:- {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.25}

“If the assertion is true and incontrovertible, as I believe it to be, and as I shall prove in the fifth chapter of this book, that all races are dispensed by the hand of Mary alone, and that all those too are saved, are saved solely by the means of this divine Mother; it may be said as a necessary consequence, that the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary and confidence in her intercession.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.26}

We might quote pages to the same effect, but these quotations are sufficient to show that Catholicism is essentially an anti-Christian religion. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.27}

How about those “imaginary gibbets” and “imaginary instruments of persecution and torture” with which Protestant writers are said to “terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world.” Since *facts* are wanted on this point, we have selected the article on page 635, entitled “Tortures of the Inquisition.” The instruments there mentioned are not imaginary; and, since “Rome never changes,” and this very year Monsignor Capel has repeatedly defended (not apologized for) the Inquisition, and has contended that the heretic is as worthy of punishment as the thief or murderer, we are fully justified in saying that the papal church would as readily torture heretics to-day and as did three hundred years ago. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.28}

It is a matter of fact, not of fiction, that on the 23rd of August, 1572, thousands of the Huguenots were brutally murdered in Paris, by order of the Catholic king, Charles IX., who himself joined in the massacre, and that the massacre received the sanction of the pope. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.29}

It is a *fact* of history that on the 18th of October, 1414, the Emperor Sigsmund sent to John Huss a safe-conduct to attend the Council of Constance and to return. The honor of the empire was pledged for his security. Yet on the twenty-sixth day after the arrival of Huss, he was seized, in flagrant violation of the safe-conduct, carried before the pope and the cardinals, thrust into a filthy prison, and afterwards burned at the stake, without being allowed to speak in his on defense, simply because he denounced the iniquities of the papacy. This was done by order of the council, and the conscience of the emperor was pacified by the decree that “no faith is to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the church.” This was the doctrine of the third Lateran Council, which affirmed that, “Oaths made against the interest and benefit of the church are not so much to be considered as oaths, but as prejudices.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 633.30}

Is a fact that the “true character” of the papacy may be learned from a study of the sacred Scriptures. Its character is especially portrayed in Daniel 7:21, 25; 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4; Revelation 13:1-7, and 17:3-6. The Scriptures, together with the *facts* of history, compel us to coincide with the declaration of Luther, that “the papacy is a general chase led by the Roman bishop [pope] to catch and destroy souls.” {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 634.1}

In writing thus, we have not the slightest personal feeling against any Catholic, and we can readily believe that a large proportion of them are sincere in their devotion. That many of the clergy are honest, is shown by the fact that we frequently hear of priests who are abjuring the Catholic faith. We expect to see many more honest souls leave that communion. It is a fact that comparatively few Catholics are acquainted with the real character and history of their church. These things are kept from them. And so our attack is not on any individual Catholic, but on Roman Catholicism-“the mystery of iniquity”-the monster of organized deception, superstition, and crime. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 634.2}

We wish also to inform our correspondent that we have no apology to make for the perversions and curtailments of Scripture by modern Protestants. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 634.3}

“Modern Protestant pulpits” are very different affairs from those of three hundred years ago. A great deal that is called Protestantism is not worthy of the name-it is so much like Catholicism. This is the great danger of the day. Professed Protestants, who laud the work of Huss, Jerome, Luther, and Knox, will call a man a bigot if he presumes to speak against the Catholic Church, forgetting that that church has the same character to-day that it had when Luther so boldly assailed it. A temporary loss of power is all the difference there is between the papacy now and the papacy then. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 634.4}

It is impossible for us to recount the evils of Romanism every time we speak of that communion, and therefore the reader will please take these few quotations, which might easily be multiplied a hundredfold, as evidence that we know whereof we speak when we warn people against the papacy. We do not design to use “mysterious sentences,” but we hope ever to have grace and courage enough to speak boldly against the enemy of all civil and religious liberty-Roman Catholicism-and against all that savers of it, even though it sails under the banner of Protestantism. E. J. W. {SITI October 22, 1885, p. 634.5}

**“The Fourth Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSONS FOR PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 14 AND 21**

**The Fourth Kingdom**

In order to catch up, so that the notes may be of service to Sabbath-school scholars in the East, it is necessary this week to furnish notes on lessons 9 in 10. This may be done without any break in the notes, since the subject begun in the ninth lesson,-The Fourth Kingdom,-is continued through the tenth. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.1}

The fourth kingdom is described in Daniel 2, 7, and 8. It will therefore be our work to quote these several descriptions, to show that they all apply to the same power, and to show beyond question the name of that power. The basis of the whole is found in the second chapter of Daniel. In that chapter, as already learned, four universal empires are symbolized by the four different metals of which the image was composed. The fourth division of the image was the legs of iron, and the feet and toes of mingled iron and clay. Of this division the prophet said: “And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise.” Daniel 2:40. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.2}

This fourth kingdom is the only one that is not somewhere in the prophecy directly named; but by the data given we may identify it as readily as though it were called by name. Thus: There are to be but four universal monarchies from the time of Daniel’s prophecy, since the fourth closes with the setting up of God’s everlasting kingdom, which is to take the place of all others. See Daniel 2:34, 35, 44, 45. From Daniel 2:37, 38 we learn that Babylon was the first of these universal monarchies. Daniel 5 relates the history of the last night of Babylonian rule, and verses 28, 30, 31 tell what power succeeded. Ezra 1:2 shows that the Medo-Persian Empire, like its predecessor, was a universal dominion. In Daniel 8:3-7, 20, 21, we are plainly told that Grecia was to overthrow the Persian Empire, and fill its place; and history bears witness that such was the case. The Grecian Empire, especially under Alexander the Great, did “bear rule over all the earth.” Daniel 2:39. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.3}

Thus we have identified three of the four universal kingdoms that were to reach from the prophet’s time till the end of the world. Now if we can find any mention of the universal monarchy, other than Babylon, Persia, and Greece, we shall *know* that it is the fourth kingdom, the one represented by the legs of iron. This is as evident as it is that three from four leaves one. Now in Luke 2:1 a universal dominion is brought to view; for we read: “And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar of Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed.” But everybody recognizes Cæsar as a Roman name, and Cæsar Augustus is the first Roman emperor. Then since his dominion extended over all the world, it follows that Rome was the fourth universal empire,-the one represented by the legs of iron in Daniel 2:33. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.4}

Profane history coincides with sacred history in declaring Rome to be universal. Says Gibbon:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.5}

“A modern tyrant who would find no resistance either in his own breast or in his people, would soon experience a gentle restraint in the example of his equals, the dread of present censure, the advice of his allies, and the apprehension of his enemies. The object of his displeasure, escaping from the narrow limits of his dominions, would easily obtain in a happier climate a secure refuge, a new fortune adequate to his merits, the freedom of complaint, and, perhaps, the means of revenge. But the empire of the Romans *filled the world*; and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. The slave of imperial despotism, whether he was compelled to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the Senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Seriphus or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly. On every side he was encompassed with a vast extent of sea and land, which he could not hope to traverse without being discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers his anxious gaze could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable desert, hostile tribes of barbarians of fierce manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the emperor’s protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. ‘*Wherever you are,’* said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, ‘*remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror.’”-Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 3, paragraph 37.* {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.6}

The same historian, in another place, in recording the universal conquest of Rome, makes unmistakable reference to Daniel 2:40, in the following words:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.7}

“The ambitious design of conquest, which might have been defeated by the seasonable conspiracy of mankind, was attempted and achieved, and the perpetual violation of justice was maintained, by the political virtues of prudence and courage. The arms of the republic sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid strides to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the *iron* monarchies of Rome.”-*Decline and Fall, chap.38, par. 44*. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.8}

In the seventh of Daniel, four beasts are seen coming out of the sea. These beasts denote four kingdoms. Verse 17. These four kings are universal; for it is expressly said of the fourth: “Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.” Daniel 7:23. Then the four beasts must represent respectively Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The description of the fourth kingdom, as given in verse 23, tallies exactly with the character of Rome as described by Gibbon. So we find that the “dreadful and terrible” beast of Daniel 7, is identical with the legs of iron of Daniel 2. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.9}

Again, in the eighth of Daniel we find the same succession of universal kingdoms referred to. The prophecy begins with the Medo-Persia, represented by the ram, and shows its conquest by Grecia, which was represented by the goat. The Great War between its eyes, represented the first king of Grecia as a universal monarchy, viz., Alexander the Great. When this horn was broken, four notable ones came up in its place (Daniel 8:8), indicating that at the death of the first king, Alexander, four kingdoms should “stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.” Verse 22. Alexander died B.C. 323, and the history of the kingdom after his death is just briefly summarized by Dr. Barnes in his notes of this passage:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.10}

“Though the kingdom was not by him [Alexander] divided into four parts, yet, from the confusion and conflicts that arose, power was ultimately concentrated into four dynasties. At his death, his brother Aridaeus declared king in his stead, and Perdiccas regent. But the unity of the Macedonian power was gone, and disorder and confusion, and a struggle for empire, immediately succeeded.... In 305 B.C. the successors of Alexander took the title kings, and in 301 B.C. there occurred the battle of Ipsus, in which Antigonus, who reigned in Asia Minor, was killed, and then followed in that year a formal division of Alexander’s empire between the four victorious princes, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander, and Lysimachus. In the division of the empire, Seleucus Nicator obtained Syria, Babylonia, Media and Susiana, Armenia, a part of Cappadocia, Celicia, and his kingdom, in name, at least, extended from the Hellespont to the Indias. The kingdom of Lysimachus extended over a part of Thrace, Asia Minor, part of Cappadocia, and the countries within the limits of Mount Taurus. Cassander possessed Macedonia, Thessaly, and a part of Greece. Ptolemy obtained Egypt, Cyprus, and Cyrene, and ultimately Coele-Syria. Phenicia, Judea, and a part of Asia Minor and Thrace. Thus the dominions of Seleucus were in the West; those of Ptolemy in the South; and those of the Lysimachus in the North.” {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.11}

The entire history of these four divisions of the Grecian Empire is given by Rollin under the head of “Alexander’s Successors,” thus showing that each one of the divisions, and all the kings of each division, are considered still forming a part of the goat,-Grecia,-and not as forming a kingdom which should take the place of Greece. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.12}

“And out of one of them [*i.e.*, one of the four horns of the goat], came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” Daniel 8:9. The power here brought to view is described in verses 10-12 and 23-25. Before noticing any points in this description, we pause to state that from what we have already learned, we know that this little horn symbolizes Rome. We know it by the same means by which we determined that the legs of iron symbolized Rome. Four universal monarchies cover the world’s entire history, from the time of the prophet until the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms we have found to be Babylon, the Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The first three are named in the prophecy; the last one we determined by a mathematical demonstration. Well, in this prophesy we have Medo-Persia brought to view, with Greece succeeding it. These powers are respectively term “great” and “very great.” Verses 4, 8. Now immediately following Greece, we have a power represented by a little horn, which is said to wax “exceedingly great.” It must then have been more powerful than either Medo-Persia Greece, and consequently could not be less than universal. But if it was universal, it must have been Rome; for Rome was the only power, after Greece, which, as both sacred and profane history agree, was able to break in pieces and subdue all nations. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.13}

Lack of space prevents our noticing the further description of this little horn, and showing its exact fulfillment in the Roman Empire. These points will be noted next week, before commenting on the next lesson. E.J. W. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 646.14}

**“‘From Adam to Moses’” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother writes as follows:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.1}

“Do you think that in the expression in Romans 5:14, ‘Death reigned from Adam to Moses,’ the apostle had reference to the resurrection of Moses; that the reign of death was there broken, as is inferred from Jude 9?” {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.2}

ANS.-No; there is no hint of the resurrection of Moses in the fifth of Romans. We give, in brief, the following reasons for this statement:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.3}

1. The subject of the resurrection is not under consideration. The subject of discourse is justification by faith in Christ. In order to show the importance of this, the apostle shows that all are under condemnation of death through transgression of the law. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men.” Wherever there is death it is an evidence of the existence of sin; and since “sin is not imputed when there is no law,” the fact that “death reigned from Adam to Moses,” shows that during all that time God’s law was known and transgressed. It was necessary to show the extent of the need, in order to show how greatly the grace of God abounded. In such an argument, to branch off upon the resurrection of Moses would be manifestly out of place. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.4}

2. The phrase “until the law,” indicates what time in the history of Moses is referred to. “From Adam to Moses,” then, simply means, from the creation to the giving of the law upon Sinai. Of course the text itself, speaking of sin, which is not imputed when there is no law, shows that the phrase “until the law,” does not mean that the law did not exist before. But if the time indicated in the expression, “Death ranged from Adam to Moses,” reaches only to the giving of the law upon Sinai, it certainly could have no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since he did not die till forty years later. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.5}

3. There can be no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since the fact that Moses died shows that death reigned over him as well as over anybody else. A subsequent resurrection would not alter the fact that death had extended its reign over him, anymore than the general resurrection would alter the fact that death has reigned over all mankind. If the resurrection of Moses shows that death did not reign over him, then the final resurrection of all men will show that death never reigned over anybody. That which proves too much, proves nothing. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.6}

4. In order to have the expression of any force as indicating the breaking of the reign of death by the resurrection of Moses, it would be necessary to show that up to the time of Moses all men had died; but the case of Enoch entirely destroys that argument. The translation of Enoch was certainly more of a break in the reign of death than was the resurrection of Moses. But the fact is, there has not been a moment since the fall when death did not reign, although some, as Enoch and Elijah, and Moses and the saints at the crucifixion of Christ, have been rescued from its power, as pledges of the time when its reign will be forever broken. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.7}

The fact that “the dead know not anything,” but sleep, unconscious, in the grave (Ecclesiastes 9:5; Psalm 146:3, 4; 115:17; 88:10-12; Job 10:18-22, etc.), and that fifteen hundred years after his death Moses was seen by Peter, James, and John, is proof enough that Moses was raised from the dead. Jude 9, which speaks of the dispute between Michael (Christ) and the devil over the *body* of Moses, corroborates this fact. There is not the slightest doubt but that Moses was raised from the dead, but there is no more doubt that Romans 5 contains no reference to such resurrection. E. J. W. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.8}

**“Paul and the Revision Committee” The Signs of the Times, 11, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the eighth psalm, one of the most beautiful compositions ever written, occurs this passage, which has become familiar even to those not intimately acquainted with the Bible: “When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.” Verses 3-5. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.9}

In the New Version the 5th verse reads thus: “For thou hast made him but lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honor.” A religious journal, in noting some changes in familiar text, puts this text in a group of which it says: “The following changes have perhaps been necessary, but grate sadly against literary associations.” For ourselves, we can say that the change grates sadly against Scriptural associations, and we do not believe it to be at all necessary. We give the following reason why we dare disagree with the learned Revision Committee:- {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.10}

In the second chapter of Hebrews, the apostle, in showing how Christ, who had “by inheritance” a more excellent name than the angels, was made on a level with men, quotes the words of the psalmist concerning man, as follows: “But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor.” Hebrews 2:6, 7. Here the Greek word is *angelos*, the word invariably rendered “angel.” There is no question but that the apostle used the word *angeloi* (plural form) in quoting from Psalm 8:5, and the Revision Committee have agreed that it is correctly rendered “angels,” since it is so rendered in the New Version. But if “angels” is the proper word to use in quoting from Psalm 8:5, and the authority of an inspired apostle ought certainly to settle that point, why should not the same word be used in the passage itself? By what authority did the revisers use the word “God” in rendering the Hebrew word which Paul translates “angels”? {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.11}

It is true that the Hebrew word in Psalm 8:5 is eloheem, a word that is usually used with reference to a deity, either the true God or a false god, and there is no other place in the Old Testament where it is rendered “angels;” and therefore the revisers doubtless thought that consistency required them to render it “God” in this instance. But we are certain that consistency would require instead that the text should agree with the same text as translated by the inspired writer of Hebrews. In other words, even though the lexicons knew nothing about such a rendering of *eloheem*, Hebrews 2:7 would show that in one instance, at least, it undoubtedly refers to angels. And the Revision Committee, in retaining the word “angels” in Hebrews 2:7, while they rejected it in Psalm 8:5, have convicted themselves of inconsistency. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 649.12}

Such renderings go a long ways toward making some people doubt whether the New Version is a decided improvement on the Old. At any rate, we do not feel inclined to use it to the exclusion of the Old Version. While we find it very valuable as a commentary, we regard it in that light, and cannot rely upon it with that confidence that we do upon the version commonly used. A translator of the Bible needs, far more than the commentator, to be acquainted with the entire Bible, and thoroughly imbued with its spirit. We very much doubt if it is possible for any body of men to agree upon a version of the Bible that will be superior to King James’s version. E. J. W. {SITI October 29, 1885, p. 650.1}