**“The Little Horn of Daniel 7” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 23**

**The Little Horn of Daniel 7**

Before making any comments on the “little horn” of Daniel 7, we wish to complete the notes on the “little horn” of Daniel 8, which was the subject of last week’s lesson. By reference to the notes of last week, it will be seen that we proved conclusively that the “little horn” of Daniel 8 represents the Roman Empire. This proof cannot be repeated, but one or two additional proofs will be given. It will be remembered that the third kingdom-Grecia-represented by the goat with the notable horn, was divided into four parts after the death of Alexander, the four divisions being represented by the four horns which “came” after the great horn was broken. The prophet then introduces the fourth kingdom-Rome-as follows:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.1}

“And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed *exceeding great*, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” Daniel 8:9. This seems to some to be an objection to calling this little horn Rome; for how, they ask, could Rome be said to come forth from one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire? In point of fact, this is no objection at all; but on careful consideration is just what we might expect; for if Grecia was a universal empire, which is affirmed by both sacred and profane history, then any power which should rise up against it, must naturally come forth from some part of it. That Alexander’s dominion was universal, extending even to Rome, is attested by the following statements: {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.2}

“The Lucanians and Bruttians [inhabitants of Italy] are especially mentioned as having sent embassies to Alexander at Babylon.” “‘The Tyrrhenians also,’ said Aristobulus and Ptolemaeus, ‘sent an embassy to the king to congratulate him upon his conquests.’” “There is every reason to believe that among the Tyrrhenian ambassadors mentioned by Alexander’s historians, there were included ambassadors from Rome.... History may allow us to think that Alexander and a Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work, and to found a wider and still more enduring empire.”-*Arnold’s History of Rome, chap. 30, part. 1 and 2*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.3}

But there is still more direct evidence to show the propriety of speaking of Rome as coming out of one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire. We quote and abridge from Prideaux, who relates the history in a very entertaining manner. First, however, we will state that the four divisions represented by the four horns, were Macedon, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt. In the year 168 B.C., Antiochus Ephiphanes, then king of the Syrian division, determined to make himself master of Egypt, which was then governed by his nephew and niece, who were very strong, and incapable of successful resistance. Says Prideaux:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.4}

“This he most certainly would have accomplished, but that he met a Roman embassy in his way, which put a stop to his further progress, and totally dashed all the designs which he had been so long carrying on for the making of himself master of that country.”-*Connexion, Vol. 2, Book 3, “An. 168, Ptol. Philometer 13.”* {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.5}

The embassy was one which the Roman Senate had sent in response to the request of the young Egyptian monarch for assistance against Antiochus. The reader will not fail to note that only three ambassadors, and not an army, were sent by the Romans to command Antiochus to desist from his intended war on Egypt. These ambassadors met Antiochus when he was only four miles from Alexandria, when he was on his way to be besiege that city. The chief ambassador was Popillius, with whom Antiochus had been intimate while he was in Rome as a hostage. On seeing Popillius, Antiochus reached for his hand to embrace him as an old friend. “But Popillius, refusing the complement, told him that the public interest of his country must take the place of private friendship; that he must first know whether he were a friend or an enemy to the Roman State, before he could own him as a friend to himself; and then delivered in his hands the tables in which were written the decree of the Senate, which they came to communicate to him, and required him to read it and forthwith give him his answer thereto. Antiochus, having read the decree, told Popillius he would consult with his friends about it, and speedily give him the answer they should advise; but Popillius, insisting on an immediate answer, forthwith drew a circle round him [Antiochus] in the sand, with the staff which he had in his hand, and required him to give his answer before he stirred out of that circle; at which strange and peremptory way of proceeding, Antiochus, being startled, after a little hesitation, yielded to it, and told the ambassador that he would obey the command of the Senate; whereupon Popillius, accepting his embraces, acted thenceforth according to his former friendship with him.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.6}

But the point of all this is found in the next two sentences of Prideaux. Says he: “That which made him [*i.e.*, Popillius] so bold as to act with him after this peremptory manner, and the other so tame as to yield thus patiently to it, was the news which they had a little before received of the great victory of the Romans, which they had gotten over Perseus, king of Macedonia. For Paulus Æmilius, having now vanquished that king, and thereby added Macedonia to the Roman Empire, the name of the Romans after this carried that weight with it as carried a terror in all the neighboring nations; so that none of them after this cared to dispute their commands, but were glad on any terms to maintain peace, and cultivate a friendship with them.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.7}

Now since it was the conquest of Macedon which gave Rome its prestige among the nations, and made it virtually a universal empire, having the power to dictate to other kingdoms, and to stop their projects by a single word, it is evidently very proper to speak of it as “coming out” of one of the horns of goat, viz., the Macedonian horn. The historian, in describing the rise of the Roman Empire, could not well employ a more fitting expression than that used by the prophet, 370 years before the occurrence. The quotation given above shows the immense superiority of the Romans over Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus of itself effectually demolishes the theory held by some that that pusillanimous king was the “exceeding great” power represented by the little horn. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.8}

Now we must turn our attention to the present lesson, “The little Horn of Daniel 7.” The student must be careful not to confound this little horn with that of Daniel 8. The little horn of Daniel 8 represents the Roman Empire as a whole; the little horn of Daniel 7 represents the Roman Empire only under one phase, the whole empire being represented by the fourth beast, of which the little horn was only a part. We quote the description of the beast and of the little horn, as given by the prophet. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.9}

“After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, 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. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.” Daniel 7:7, 8. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.10}

When Daniel was troubled over the explanation of this vision, an angel gave him the interpretation, and in beginning said: “These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.” Daniel 7:17, 18. So the beasts represented the four universal kingdoms that cover the history of the world till the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms have already been named, and therefore we well know that the fourth beast represents the Roman Empire. See the further description in Daniel 7:23. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.11}

But Daniel was not satisfied with the first answer given by the angel. From his connection with Nebuchadnezzar’s dream he must have known the main features of these four kingdoms; but there were some particulars upon which he desired more light. “Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast [answered again verse 23].... and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.” Daniel 7:19, 20. The answer to this request was given as follows:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.12}

“Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth.... and the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings.” Daniel 7:23, 24. The fourth beast was the fourth kingdom-Rome-and the ten horns, it is plainly stated, “are ten kingdoms that shall arise,” that is, ten parts into which the Roman Empire should be divided. This division is mentioned in Daniel 2:41. It was effected by the incursions of the barbarous tribes which dismembered the Roman Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, so graphically described by Gibbon. The division was complete, and the undivided empire of Western Rome had ceased to exist, before the close of the fifth century B.C. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.13}

After the division of Rome into ten parts another power was to arise, diverse from the others, and having the characteristics mentioned in Daniel 7:8, 20, 21, 25. These characteristics are met in the papacy, and in no other power. It uprooted three powers to make room for itself, and as if to identify the papacy as the power here referred to, the pope’s tiara is a triple crown; such a crown is worn by no other ruler. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.14}

“And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.” Daniel 7:25. If we find that these three specifications apply to the papacy, then it will be useless to look further for an application for the little horn. We can give to each specification only a brief notice. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.15}

1. “He shall speak great words against the Most High.” It is a notorious fact that the pope is styled the “Vicar of the Son of God,” indicating that he fills the office of Christ. Paul, speaking of the papacy, which he calls the “man of sin” (2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4), says that he “exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped.” This is parallel to Daniel 7:25. It is fulfilled in the pope’s claim to have power to grant indulgences, a thing which God himself has never promised to do. Further, it is fulfilled in the papal dogma of infallibility. This dogma was ratified by the Council of 1870, and the following is a portion of the decree: {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 662.16}

“And since by the divine right of apostolic primacy the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal church, we further teach and declare that he is the *supreme judge of the faithful*, and that in all causes the decision of which belongs to the church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may re-open the judgment of the apostolic, than whose authority *there is no greater*, nor can any lawfully review its judgment.”-*The Vatican Decrees, by Dr. Philip Schaff.* Although this dogma was ratified in 1870, it has been held for centuries, as is shown by the following monstrous assertion in one of the Roman decretals:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.1}

“If the pope should become neglectful of his own salvation, and of that of other men, and so lost to all good that he draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps into hell, and plunge them with himself into eternal damnation, yet no mortal man may presume to reprehend him, for as much as he is judged of all, and to be judged of no one.”-*Quoted by Wiley, History of Protestantism, Book 4, chap. 10*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.2}

2. “And shall wear out the saints of the Most High.” When we come to this particular, the evidence is overwhelming. Both time and language would fail to do justice to the matter. Prominent among papal atrocities is the massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day. On the 24th of August, 1572, was begun in Paris one of the most horrible cold-blooded massacres that history records,-that of the Huguenots. The king himself, Charles IX., took part in it, shooting down many of those who were attempting to escape the fury of his soldiers. The number slain throughout France on this occasion is placed by the best authorities at 70,000. To show Rome’s connection with the massacre, we quote:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.3}

“At Rome, when the news arrived, the joy was boundless. The messenger who carried the dispatch was rewarded like one who brings tidings of some great victory, and the triumph that followed was such as old Pagan Rome might have been proud to celebrate.... Through the streets of the Eternal City swept, in the full blaze a pontifical pomp, Gregory and his attendant train of cardinals, bishops, and monks, to the church of St. Mark, there to offer up prayers and thanksgivings to the God of Heaven for his great blessing to the See of Rome and the Roman Catholic Church.... On the following day the pontiff went in procession to the church of Minerva, where, after mass, a jubilee was published to all Christendom, ‘that they might thank God for the slaughter of the enemies of the church lately executed in France.’”-*History of Protestantism, Book 17, chap.16, par. 15*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.4}

But the saints were to be *worn out*. This implies more than outright slaughter. We quote one paragraph from the account of the imprisonment of the Waldenses, when, at the command of Louis XIV., who was the obedient servant of the pope, they had been driven from their valleys:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.5}

“We know not if ever before an entire nation were in prison at once. Yet now it was so. All of the Waldensian race that remained from the sword of the executioners were immured in the dungeons of Piedmont.... And how were they treated in prison? As the African slave was treated on the ‘middle passage.’ They had a sufficiency of neither food nor clothing. The bread dealt out to them was fetid. They had putrid water to drink. They were exposed to the sun by day, and to the cold at night. They were compelled to sleep on the bare pavement, or on straw so full of vermin that the stone floor was preferable. Disease broke out in these horrible abodes, and the mortality was fearful. ‘When they entered these dungeons,’ says Henri Arnaud, ‘they counted 14,000 healthy mountaineers, but when, at the intercession of the Swiss deputies, their prisons were opened, 3,000 skeletons only crawled out.’”-*Hist. Protestantism, Book 16, chap. 13, par. 18*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.6}

In the above instance, we see how an entire nation was literally worn out, yet we have scarcely more than hinted at the atrocities visited upon the innocent Waldenses. In the following brief extract from the account of the martyrdom of Cranmer, we see a sample of how Rome proceeded to “wear out” individuals:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.7}

“The fire was lighted, and then withdrawn, and lighted again, so as to consume him piecemeal. His scorch and half-burned body was raised on the pikes of the halberdiers, and tossed from one to the other to all the extent of his chain would allow; the martyr, says the martyrologist, ‘lifting such hands as he had, and his finger ends flaming with fire, cried unto the people in these words, “None but Christ, none but Christ,” and so being let down again from their halberds, he fell into the fire, and gave up his life.’”-*Wiley, Book 23, chap. 10*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.8}

Certainly more is not needed to identify papal Rome as the little horn that was to “wear out the saints of the Most High.” Rome has more than met the demands of the prophecy. And the one who reads the history from which these extracts are taken, must of necessity exclaim, Surely the Roman Catholic power is the woman whom the seer of Patmos saw “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” Revelation 17:6. Happy would it be for the saints of God if they could be assured that she is sated with blood. But such assurance cannot be given; for says the prophet, “I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” Daniel 7:21, 22. E. J. W. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 663.9}

**“What Is the Use?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is called a practical age. Men always ask before engaging in any business, Will it pay? And this is correct. It is useless to work to no profit, and so we have Scripture warrant for counting the cost before beginning any enterprise. But men are not always wise in their estimates. Sometimes, indeed in the majority of instances, the results will showed that the entire cost has not been counted. Some factor has been omitted, or else the individual has not looked far enough ahead. We might cite two instances:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.1}

It is generally considered a prudent thing for men to amass wealth. “Men will praise thee, when thou doest well to thyself.” Psalm 49:18. Indeed, so fixed is the idea that to get rich is the one thing essential, that few, before praising the prosperous men, stop to inquire by what means he obtained his wealth. But according to the Bible standard, the gathering of great wealth may be the most foolish thing a man can do. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.2}

The wise man says: “He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor.” Proverbs 28:8. If people knew that men who are toiling and planning night and day in order to accumulate property, were simply working for someone else, and that they themselves should enjoy none of their savings, they would say, “How foolish to work so hard for nothing.” Well, that is just what the Bible says. “He that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his day, and at his end shall be a fool.” Jeremiah 17:11. How many foolish people there are, who by the world are counted wise. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.3}

All this exposes another shortsighted calculation that is very common, viz., that it is safe to do anything which is done by the majority of people. Precedent is a thing that has great weight, both in court and public opinion, oftentimes to the exclusion of justice. But numbers can never make wrong right, nor will the Lord remit the punishment due for the commission of crime, because very many are engaged in it. “Though hand show in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished.” Proverbs 11:21. And the truth of this statement has often been demonstrated. In the days of Noah, “the earth was filled with violence,” because “every imagination of the thought” of man’s heart “was only evil continually.” Genesis 6:5, 11. Only Noah was found righteous. Yet the Lord preserved Noah, and destroyed all the wicked, “bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.” 2 Peter 2:5. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.4}

In the days of Lot, “the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly.” Genesis 13:13. In all that city, careful search was made (Genesis 18:23-33; 19:12-14), and, besides Lot, not a righteous man was found. But the Lord had no respect to numbers, “and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, *making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly*.” 2 Peter 2:6. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.5}

There was also a time when a single man, Elijah, stood out against the whole kingdom of Israel. He was not content with simply disagreeing with the majority, but he was earnest in reproving both monarch and subject. Baal-worship was popular, and was, moreover, the State religion. How presumptuous that one man attempt to teach the priests and rulers! How was it possible that he alone of all the people should have the truth? And even allowing his claims, what headway could one man hope to make against a nation? What was the use of his engaging in such an unprofitable task? Thus, the doubt, many reasoned at that time. But God vindicated the faithfulness of his servant. The prophets of Baal were slain; the wicked king and queen had the death of a dog; the apostate nation was carried into captivity; and he Elijah, who was not afraid to engage in an unpopular and seemingly unprofitable work, was taken to heaven in a chariot of fire. Who will now say that his work was to no profit? Not one. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.6}

But why is it that men can now approve Elijah’s course? Simply because the sins which he particularly denounced are not now popular. For proof of this assertion, we quote from the *Friend*, a religious journal published at Honolulu, H. I. It says:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.7}

“We have for a year or more had a couple of good brethren who among us, who have been devoting their time and strength, and the means of the organization that sent them, to the task of disseminating the idea that Saturday instead of Sunday should be observed as the day holy until Lord. We have often wished that the two brethren might see their way clear to engage in a worthier and more promising enterprise. One of them, Brother Scott, we think has gone back to whence he came, and we wish him well. The other brother still tarries among us, and we would not have him depart; but we hope in his behalf for more useful employment.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.8}

And then it quotes as follows from an exchange, concerning those were working in behalf of the Lord’s Sabbath:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.9}

“We are sorry to see such a waste of time and pain. If the past shows anything, it shows that the vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest by divine appointment. Can this judgment be reversed? Is there the remotest possibility that it ever will be? It seems to us that there can be but one answer to these questions. If so, then all the good intentions and conscientious convictions of our brethren do not hinder their efforts from being thrown away. Besides, there is the injurious effect of turning men’s thoughts away from the due observance of the day to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.10}

Not one hint of a question do we find in the above, as to whether those who educate the observance of the seventh day are really in the right, but only the consideration of popularity. “The vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest.” “And since there is no probability that this verdict will ever be reversed, what is the use of trying to show its fallacy?” So the people might have talked in the days of Noah. “We are fully persuaded that the course which to us seems good is right, and you might as well quit your preaching. Better come and join us.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.11}

Likewise when Lot went out to warn the inhabitants of Sodom, “he seemed as one that mocked.” No doubt he was called an old fool for his pains. And in both of these cases it was found that there was not any possibility of changing the universal verdict. Will the *Friend* say that they ought to have ceased preaching? What does the Lord say? {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.12}

“Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.” Isaiah 58:1. “Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me; they and their fathers have transgressed against me, even unto this very day.... And thou shalt speak by words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear; for they are most of rebellious.” Ezekiel 2:3-7. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.13}

The question to be asked, then, is not, “Is the prevailing sentiment favorable to my message?” or, “Is there any hope of changing the general opinion?” but, “What is truth?” As a matter of fact, the majority of people have never been in the right, in spite of all efforts to lead them in the right way, and there is indeed no hope that they ever will be. Let us cite two authorities. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.14}

Luther, as a reformer, was very much like Elijah. In reality he was more alone than was the prophet. But the strongest arguments brought against his work was that the pope, bishops, divines, counsels, and universities were against him, and that he could not hope to convince them that they were in error. The majority never were convinced, but Luther replied as follows:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.15}

“Moses was alone when the Israelites were led out of Egypt; Elijah was alone in the time of King Ahab; Ezekiel was alone at Babylon. God has ever chosen for his prophet either the high priest, or any other person of exalted rank; he has generally chosen men of a mean and low condition,-in the instance of Amos, even a simple shepherd. The saints in every age have been called upon to rebuke the great of this world,-kings and princes, priests and scholars,-and to fulfill the office at the peril of their lives.... I say not that I am a prophet; but I say that they have the more reason to fear *because* I am alone, and they are many. Of this I am sure, that the word of God is with me, and that it is not with them.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.16}

“But it is further objected that men high in station pursued me with their censures. What then! Do not the Scriptures clearly show... That the majority has always been on the side of falsehood, and that the minority only on the side of truth? It is the fate of truth to occasion an outcry.”-*D’Aubigne’s Hist. Reformation, Part 1, Book 7, par. 168, 173*. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.17}

The second authority, we have only to refer to the overwhelming wickedness in the times of Noah and Lot, and then read these words of Christ, which brings the matter home to our own day:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.18}

“And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” Luke 17:26-30. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.19}

These illustrations are sufficient to show us that instead of appealing to common custom for proof of the correctness of any practice, that very fact ought to cause us to doubt. “The customs of the people are vain.” Jeremiah 10:3. And it will not do to say that, in the instances mentioned, those who were in the majority, and wrong, were heathen, while, in the matter of Sunday observance, the majority are Christians. In Elijah’s time it was the house of Israel-the church-that had taken Baal in preference to Jehovah. Ezekiel was sent with his warnings to the church of God; and in order that he might perform his thankless task, it was necessary that his face should be made “harder than flint.” Moreoever, he was plainly told that the house of Israel would not listen to him. Ezekiel 3:4-9. Isaiah was commanded to show God’s people their transgression. John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness against the sins of the very leaders of the church. And it was solely on account of the corruption of the church that Luther began to preach the reformation. Since our reverence for God is measured only by our obedience, and not by our profession, all those who persist in violating any of God’s commandments are termed heathen. Throughout the Bible, the judgments of God are pronounced only against the heathen; and many who say, “Lord, Lord,” will receive those judgments. So in this matter, if it can be shown that God has commanded us to keep the seventh day of the week, those who work to that end are engaged in a profitable business, even though the professed church will not hear. Those who do his commandments shall have right to the tree of life. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.20}

Next week we shall continue this subject, and show that the “numerical designation” of the day is not a “subordinate question,” and that whatever “injurious effects” may follow the preaching of truth, no blame can be attached to the few who thus labor against the majority. E. J. W. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 664.21}

**“The Best Argument for Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

From the *Review* of October 27th, we learned that Sabbath-keepers in Arkansas are being put to serious trouble on account of their faith. Formerly there was provision made in the Sunday law of that State, so that those who conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week were not liable to arrest for working on the first day of the week. Last spring, however, this provision was repealed, and now all who do any work on Sunday are liable to heavy fines and imprisonment. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.1}

As a natural consequence of the law as it exists at present, quite a number of Sabbath-keepers have been arrested, and Elder Wood, who is laboring there and knows the state of feeling, thinks that there will be scores of arrests before the holidays. The brethren in Arkansas are poor, and can ill afford the expense and loss of time incident to court proceedings, even should they not be convicted; any persons wishing to aid them in their time of need can forward money for that purpose to F. N. Elmore, Springdale, Ark., and it will be thankfully received and properly applied. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.2}

The leaders of the so-called National Reform party have been constant in their assurances that no harm was intended by them to the conscientious observers of the seventh day. They have often seemed to feel grieved and indignant because we have said that persecution would be the necessary result of their efforts to enforce Sunday observance. But, in spite of their pacific assurance, it has happened that, at every time the law would allow, Seventh-day Adventists have been promptly indicted for working on Sunday. If this is not a persecution because of religious convictions, then the popes of Rome never conducted such persecution. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.3}

None of our brethren need be surprised when such persecution comes. For years we have been suspecting it, knowing that it would come, because the “sure word of prophecy” plainly said that it would. The fulfillment of this prophecy is only a warning that the end is near, and an admonition to us to redouble our diligence. Here in California we have had an opportunity to see how quickly the spirit of persecution becomes rampant as soon as there is the slightest prospect of enforcing a Sunday law. And we shall watch with prayerful interest the proceedings in Arkansas. Whatever the immediate result, we are certain that God will make the wrath of man to praise him. E. J. W. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.4}

**“Where Shall the Line Be Drawn” The Signs of the Times, 11, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Weekly*, after making a statement that polygamy is not the only evil of Mormonism, says:- {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.5}

“Its unrepublican hierarchy, that exalts the church above the Government, and demands unconditional obedience to its requirements, whatever may be the law of the land, makes it a dangerous institution in a country where the ballot box should be free from each ecclesiastical domination.” {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.6}

With the truth contained in the above quotation, there is also a very popular error. It is a truth that cannot be too often repeated at the present day, that the ballot box should be free from ecclesiastical domination. We say that this truth cannot be too often repeated at the present day, because there is not an influential and rapidly increasing party (not Mormons) whose great aim is to have the State legislate on matters pertaining to religion; or, in other words, to place the ballot box under the control of the church. When this state of things shall be brought about, the liberaties of American people will be at an end. We protest, therefore, against the ecclesiastical domination in political affairs, whether it be by Mormons or by Christians; with either class the results would be the same, for no matter how pure a church may be, if it has civil power it will persecute just as quickly as will the corrupt church. So Mormon domination of the ballot box is to be objected to, not simply because it is Mormon domination, but because it is ecclesiastical domination. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.7}

The error in the quotation is in supposing that it is wrong in principle to obey the requirements of the church, “whatever may be the law of the *land*.” We are no apologists for the Mormonism, but we say that this principle is not the one at issue. The question for individuals to settle is, Are the teachings of the church in strict harmony with the Bible, making unperverted Bible truth the sole standard? If fair and candid investigation shows that these teachings are in perfect accord with the Bible, then he should obey them, whatever may be the law of the land. “The powers that be are ordained of God.” Then certainly they have no right to contravene the laws of God. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.8}

As a matter of fact, the Mormons are guilty of a sin, not against God alone, but against man as well. Murder, adultery, and theft are sins which destroy the well-being of society. If these things were allowed to be practiced with impunity, human governments, which God has ordained, would be overthrown. Therefore they must not be tolerated. On this ground, and this alone, the pet abomination of the Mormons should be suppressed by the Government. But a practice which is in strict accord with God’s word, will not be detrimental to society; and against such a practice the Government has no right to enact a law; if it should, the people would be in duty bound to break that law. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.9}

No one need be confused over this matter. The Christian’s duty is plain: “We ought to obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29); and if people would always remember this, and live accordingly, they would never make laws to suit their own inclinations or propensities, and try to palm them off on the people as the laws of God. E. J. W. {SITI November 5, 1885, p. 665.10}

**“The 1260 Days” The Signs of the Times, 11, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 5**

**The 1260 Days**

Our lesson this week is confined to the last clause of Daniel 7:25: “And they shall be given into his hands until a time and time and the dividing of time.” The “they” of course refers to the “saints of the Most High” and the “time and times and the dividing of time,” then, indicates the period of papal supremacy; for we have already seen that the little horn symbolizes the Roman Catholic power. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.1}

In the first place we may notice that in the Douay Bible, as well as in the Revised Version, “time and times and the dividing of times,” is rendered, “time, and times, and *half* a time.” We have no need to conjecture what this means, for the Bible is its own interpreter. In Revelation 12:14 we find the same period of time mentioned: “And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.” Now in verse 6 of the same chapter the same event is brought to view in these words: “And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.” From these two verses we learn that “a time, and times, and half a time” is only another expression for twelve hundred and sixty days. Then the little horn of Daniel 7 was to have supremacy for twelve hundred and sixty days. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.2}

But the question now arises, “Is it possible that only twelve hundred and sixty days, three years and a half, covers the whole time which the prophecy allows to the papacy?” We answer, No; and the explanation is simple. The prophecy is symbolic; four mighty empires are represented by beasts; the Roman Catholic power is represented by a little horn of one of the beasts. It is obvious, then, that the prophecy would not be consistent if it should express the duration of those powers in literal years. The time would be out of proportion to the nature of the symbol representing the power. Therefore it is evident that the time must also be symbolic. We inquire, then, What is the standard of time when used in symbolic prophecy? In Ezekiel 4:4-6 we read the answer:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.3}

“Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it; according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; *I have appointed thee each day for a year*.” {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.4}

The next question to be settled is, When does this period of time begin and end? There are several dates given by various authors to mark the rise of papal supremacy, but 538 A.D. seems to be the one that has the only just claim to consideration. The prophet in describing the rise of the little horn, says “He shall subdue three kings.” Daniel 7:24. This is in explanation of the fact that three horns were to be plucked up before it. Of course the only powers that would be rooted up to do make room for the Catholic power would be those were all opposed to it. Now long before 538 A.D., paganism, as a State religion in the Roman Empire, was dead. Since the time of Constantine, and had been nominally Christian. The barbarous tribes by which the empire was divided into the ten parts, also embraced the Christianity of the empire. Says D’Aubigne:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.5}

“Already the forests of the North poured forth the most effectual promoters of the papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and a half heathen state of mind at the feet of their chief priest Rome.”-*Hist. Reformation, Book 1, chap. 1, part. 31*. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.6}

But not all of these tribes were favorable to the pretensions of the bishops of Rome. Some of them, especially the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths, were Arian in faith. The contest between the Catholics and Arians was bitter and unrelenting, and so long as these powers held Italy and the adjacent country, no Catholic bishop could rule in Rome. In the year 494 A.D., the power of the Heruli was annihilated by the death of one Odoacer. From that time it is impossible to trace them in history. In 534 the Vandals were conquered by Belisarius, the general of Justinian; and in 538 A.D., Rome, which until that time had been in possession of the Arian Ostrogoths, was occupied by the Roman army, and the Catholic religion was established. These conquests are described in detail in the 39th and 41st chapters of Gibbon. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.7}

When these Arian powers were overthrown (A.D. 538), previous imperial decrees concerning the bishop of Rome could go into effect. Speaking of the way in which the fallen bishop gradually usurped power over other churches, D’Aubigne says:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.8}

“To silence the cries of the churches, Rome found new allies. Princes who in those troublesome times often found their thrones tottering, offered their adherence to the church in exchange for her support. They yielded to her spiritual authority, on condition of her paying them with secular dominion. They left her to deal at will with the *souls* of men, provided only she would deliver them from their enemies. The power of the hierarchy in the ascending scale, and of the imperial power which was declining, leaned thus one toward another, and so accelerated the twofold destiny. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.9}

“Rome could not lose by this. An edict of one Theodosius II. and of Valentinian III. proclaimed the bishop of Rome ‘ruler of all the churches.’ Justinian issued a similar decree. These decrees did not contain all that the popes pretended to see in them. But in those times of ignorance it was easy for them to gain reception for that interpretation which was most favorable to themselves.”-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 29, 30*. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.10}

To show plainly the object of these wars against the Arian powers, and what was gained by them, we make two brief quotations from Gibbon. After having rehearsed the defeat of the Vandals and the capture of Carthage by the Romans, the historian speaks as follows concerning Justinian:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.11}

“He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness, and confessed in silence the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, he proceeded without delay to the full establishment of the Catholic church. Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the most essential part of the episcopal religion, where restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worshipe was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred and seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 41, par. 11*. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.12}

The victory of Belisarius over the Ostrogoths (A.D. 538) is thus described:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.13}

“The Goths consented to retreat in the presence of a victorious enemy; to delay till the next spring the operations of offensive war; to summon their scattered forces; to relinquish their distant possessions, and to trust even Rome itself to the faith of its inhabitants. Leuderis, an aged warrior, was left in the capital with four thousand soldiers; a feeble garrison, which might have seconded the zeal, though it was incapable of opposing the wishes, of the Romans. But a momentary enthusiasm of religion and patriotism was kindled in their minds. They furiously exclaimed that the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Cæsars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter the city, whose gates would be thrown open for his reception.... The first days, which coincided with the old Saturnalia, were devoted to mutual congratulation and the public joy, and the Catholics prepared to celebrate, without a rival, the approaching festival of the nativity of Christ.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 41, par. 22, 23*. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.14}

These quotations show most conclusively that in A.D. 538 the bishop of Rome did become literally “the pope,” *i.e.*, the father, or head and ruler, of the churches. The last opposing horn had then been plucked up, and the papacy was free to enter upon that career of ecclesiastical tyranny which it had long been preparing for. And since this career was to continue 1260 years, it is evident that it must have been stopped in the year 1798 A.D. Let us see if at that time anything happened to justify this conclusion. From “Chambers’ Cyclopedia,” art. “Pius,” we quote:- {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.15}

“At length the [French] Directory ordered the invasion of Rome; Berthier entered the city February 10, 1798, took possession of the castle of St. Angelo. Pius [VI.] was called on to renounce his temporal sovereignty, and on his refusal, was seized, February 20, and carried away to Siena, afterwards to the celebrated Certosa, or Carthusian Monastery, of Florence. On the threatened advance of the Austro-Russian army in the following year, he was transferred to Grenoble, and finally to Valence on the Rhone, where, worn out by age and by the rigor of confinement, he died in August, 1799, in the 82nd year of his age, and the 24th of his pontificate.... After the death of Pious VI., Cardinal Chiaramonte was chosen his successor (March 14, 1800). Rome, which up to this time had been in the occupation of the French, was not restored to the papal authority, and the July of that year Pious VII. entered into his capital.” {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.16}

Thus we see that from 538 to 1798 A.D. there were 1260 years of unbroken power. Plainly fulfilling the prophecy. It would be interesting to study the position of papal Rome before and after this period of supremacy, but that will have to be deferred till another time. E. J. W. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 678.17}

**“Which Is Evangelical?” The Signs of the Times, 11, 43.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following is a portion of an editorial note in the *Pacific* of June 10-: {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 680.1}

“The election of the Rev. Edward White to the chairmanship of the Congregational Union of England and Wales is sure to be noted as indicating the tendencies of belief among the Independent there. Mr. White is by far the most pronounced and prominent advocate of the doctrine of ‘eternal life only in Christ.’ Of course, he was not elected because of his advocacy of that tenet. He is a man of great energy and ability, and has done yeoman service for the Free Churches of England. He is also a thoroughly Evangelical minister, if we act except this particular divergence.” {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 680.2}

And “evangelical minister,” according to Webster, is one who is “earnest for the truth taught in the gospel; fervent and devout; strict in interpreting Christian doctrine;” and the *Pacific* says that one who believes that we have a “eternal life only in Christ,” is not, in that particular, evangelical. Let us see whether Mr. White or the *Pacific* is evangelical on the immortality question. The New Testament must, of course, decide the matter. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 680.3}

To start with, we take that most wonderful of texts, John 3:16: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” What do we learn from this verse? {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 680.4}

1. That God’s love for the world was so great as to cause him to send his Son for their rescue. We can judge something of God’s love for his Son, when we remember that Christ was the brightest of the Father’s glory, “and the express image of his person,” that he was “heir of all things,” the one by whom the worlds were made (Hebrews 1:2, 3); and that “in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Colossians 2:9. God is infinite in all his attributes and therefore his love for his Son was infinite. And since he gave his Son for the world, we know how great was his love for the world. It was infinite. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.1}

2. The worth of the sacrifice shows the extent of the need. God would not lightly give his Son to suffer and die; it must be that without that gift there was no possibility for man to be rescued from his condition, and to receive that which was offered to him. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.2}

3. We are plainly told that this wonderful sacrifice was made that those who would believe in Christ might not perish, but that they might have everlasting life. Men can believe in Christ and have everlasting life, or he can disbelief and perish. There is no other alternative. The choice is not between happiness and misery, but between life and death. With eternal life in the presence of God, happiness must necessarily be associated, but it is secondary. Eternal life is what Christ says we get by believing on him. To deny that we get to eternal life only through Christ, is to deny the words of Christ. Mr. White accepts the words of Christ; the *Pacific* says, Not so. Which is evangelical? {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.3}

Let us imagine that Nicodemus held to the doctrine of inherent immortality, as advocated by the *Pacific* and many others. Then when Christ said, “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life,” Nicodemus would have recorded, “Well, he needn’t have gone to all that trouble, for we shall have the eternal life any way. If that’s what you came for, you came to no purpose.” Do you say that such language would be insulting? We admit it, but how many are saying the same thing to-day! {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.4}

The doctrine of “eternal life only in Christ” is not evangelical, says the *Pacific*. Then the author of the gospel must be declared unevangelical; for he says, “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 3:36. Is not this eternal life only in Christ? {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.5}

Other texts are simply a repetition of the statement already made. Says Christ, “I am come that they might have life.” John 10:10. Says the Pacific, “You are too late; we have it already.” {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.6}

Again the Saviour said to the unbelieving Jews: “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.” John 5:40. We can imagine the pitiful tone in which he spoke these words, and the sorrow of his heart, as “he came unto his own, and his own received him not.” And then to think that he knew all that this coming implied,-the agony in the garden, the brutal insults and cruel scourging in the judgment hall, and the shameful death on the cross, what for? “That they might have life.” Was Christ deceived? Was his anxious solicitude for man called a mistake? and was his sacrifice a useless waste of life? Evidently so, if men could have life outside of Christ. But he was not deceived; none so well as he could know man’s terrible need, and the eternal destruction that must follow if the sacrifice was not made. Then how terribly deceived must those be who, in response to Christ’s pathetic appeal, virtually say, “We don’t need to come to you that we might have life; we can get it without your assistance.” Fatal delusion! What an insult to the Son God! {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.7}

Once more. Said Christ, in that wonderful prayer which was not for the apostles alone, but for them who should believe through their word: “Father, ... glorify thy Son, ... as thou hast given him power over all flesh, *that he should give eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” John 17:1-3. Would the Pacific say that Christ was “thoroughly evangelical, if we except this particular divergence”? {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.8}

Perhaps the *Pacific* has another standard of evangelicalism. But for “this particular divergence,” Mr. White would be “a thoroughly Evangelical minister.” Divergence from what? Not from the Testament and the teaching of Christ, as we have clearly seen. What then? Ah, now we have it. The Rev. Edward White is a Congregationalist, and in general holds to the doctrines which the Congregationist body holds in common with the great mass of professed Christians. But this same mass of professed Christians does not accept the doctrine of “eternal life only in Christ,” and it is in “this particular divergence” that Mr. White is unevangelical. If it were not for that, he would be “thoroughly evangelical.” Then it is evident that, according to the *Pacific*, popular belief, and not the New Testament, is the standard of evangelical principles. Popularity seems to be the accepted standard; but in spite of the great number on the popular side, we can’t help believing that the Bible is true, and that Jesus meant what he said. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.9}

What is a record? “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” 1 John 5:11, 12. Is not this “eternal life only in Christ”? It certainly is, and it is evangelical doctrine, too. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.10}

“For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life of Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. “No, no,” says the *Pacific*, “Paul is mistaken; eternal life doesn’t come ‘through Jesus Christ our Lord;’ or, even if it does sometimes come through him, we can get it without him just as well.” Again we ask, Which is evangelical? {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.11}

Sometimes people say, “Well, it is of no practical importance what you believe concerning the immortality of the soul.” We think that the intelligent reader can see that it is of a great deal of importance. It is a question of whether we shall give Christ the honor that is his due, or whether we shall withhold from him all his honor. One of his titles is “our life.” See Colossians 3:4. Nowhere in the Bible can we find that he came for any other purpose than to give life to those who would believe on him. His sole object in coming to earth to suffer and die, was to give life. And now if we say that Christ did not bring “life and immortality to light through the gospel,” but that Socrates or Plato brought it to light, then we exalt a heathen philosopher above Christ, and rob the Lord of glory of his crown. The work of Spiritualism to-day is to convince men that they have life in themselves, instead of in Christ; and thousands who profess to be evangelical, and to abhor Spiritualism, are doing their best to help along that delusion of Satan. And this popular doctrine, which is so flattering to the pride of the human heart, that man is not dependent for eternal life on any source outside of himself, is that which will eventually sweep millions of professed lovers of the Lord into the ranks of those who openly blaspheme his name. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.12}

Reader, where do you stand? Do you profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ? Then do not any longer refuse to acknowledge that which will constitute his crown of glory and rejoicing. “My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.” 1 John 3:18. E. J. W. {SITI November 12, 1885, p. 681.13}

**“The Little Horn of Daniel 8” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 12**

**The Little Horn of Daniel 8**

In a previous lesson we have had mentioned of the little horn of Daniel 8, and we there took occasion to state that this little horn must not be confounded with that of Daniel 7. The latter, as we of seen, refers to the papacy only, to Rome during only a part of its career; the former refers to the whole duration of Rome, both in its pagan and papal forms, and covers the same ground as the fourth beast and all of its horns. The truth of this may be verified by an examination of the prophecy. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.1}

Verses 20, 21 of chapter 8, plainly tell us that the ram and the goat, the two powers that preceded the little horn, represented Medo-Persia and Grecia. But these two empires were the second and third in a series of four universal empires which cover the entire history of the world from about 625 B.C., beginning with Babylon. The prophecies of Daniel 2 and 7 show that there were to be but four kingdoms. Then since there was but one to come after Grecia, whatever universal empire we find after that empire must be the one. From Luke 2:1 we have seen that Rome filled the specifications as a universal empire; and therefore it must be represented by the little horn, for that was to be greater than any of its predecessors. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.2}

We will now notice a few of the characteristics of this little horn, and show their fulfillment in the Roman power. Verses 23 and 24 described it best: “And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of *fierce countenance*, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.” Compare this with Deuteronomy 28:49, 50: “The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young.” Note the similar expressions in the two passages. Fierceness of countenance may well be applied to a power that in Daniel 7:7 is represented by a beast, “dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly;” and its destructive propensities, as brought out in the two passages, correspond to the statement in Daniel 7:7. “Understanding dark sentences,” said the angel to Daniel; “whose tongue thou shalt not understand,” said Moses. This also applies to the Romans, whose language, in the Latin, was entirely different from the Hebrew. With the languages of the neighboring countries, Assyria, Babylon, etc., the Hebrew tongue was closely related, but it had no connection with the Latin. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.3}

Read carefully the whole of Deuteronomy 28:49-57, which, as has been shown above, refers to the power mentioned in Daniel 8:23, 24, and then compare with it the following from the account by Josephus of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans:- {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.4}

“Now, of those that perished by famine and the city, the number was prodigious, and the miseries were unspeakable; for if so much as the shadow of any kind of food did anywhere appear, a war was commenced presently; and the dearest friends fell a-fighting one with another about it, snatching from each other the most miserable supports of life. Nor would men believe that those who were dying had no food; for the robbers would search them when they were expiring, lest anyone should have concealed food in their bosoms, and counterfeited dying, nay, these robbers gaped for want, and ran about stumbling and staggering along like mad dogs, and reeling against the doors of the houses like drunken men; they would also, in the great distress they were in, rush into the very same houses two or three times in one and the same day. Moreover, their hunger was so intolerable, that it obliged them to chew everything, while they gathered such things as the most sordid animals would not touch, and endured to eat them; nor did they at length abstain from girdles and shoes; and the very leather which belonged to their shields they pulled off and gnawed; the very wisps of old hay became food to some; and some gathered up fibers, and sold a very small weight of them for four Attic (drachmae). But why do I describe the shameless impudence that the famine brought upon men in their eating inanimate things while I am going to relate a matter of fact, the like to which no history relates, either among the Greeks or barbarians!-it is so horrible to speak of it, and incredible when heard! I have indeed willingly omitted this calamity of force, that I might not seem to deliver what is so portentous to posterity, but that I have innumerable witnesses to it in my own age; and besides, by country would have had little reason to thank me for suppressing the miseries that she underwent at this time. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.5}

“There was a certain woman that dwelt beyond Jordan, her name was Mary; her father was Eleazar, of the village Bethezob, which signifies *The House of Hyssop*. She was eminent for her family and her wealth, and had fled away to Jerusalem with the rest of the multitude, and was with them besieged therein at this time. The other effects of this woman had been already seized upon; such I mean as she had brought with her of Perea and removed to the city. What she had treasured up of besides, as also what food she had contrived to save, had been also carried off by the rapacious guards, who came every day running into her house for that purpose. This put the poor woman into a very great passion, and by the frequent reproaches and imprecations she cast at these rapacious villains, she had provoked them to anger against her; but none of them, either out of the indignation she had raised against herself, or out of commiseration of her case, would take away her life; and if she found any food she perceived her labors were for others, and not for herself; and it was now become impossible for her any way to find any more food, while the famine pierced through her very bowel and marrow, when also her passion was fired to a degree beyond the famine itself; nor did she consult with anything but with her passion and the necessity she was in. She then attempted a most unnatural thing; and, snatching up her son, who was a child sucking at her breast, she said, “O thou miserable infant! for whom shall I preserve thee in this war, this famine, and this sedition? As to the war with the Romans, if they preserve our lives, we must be slaves? This famine also will destroy us, even before that slavery comes upon us; yet are these seditious rogues more terrible than both the other. Come on; be thou my food, and be thou a fury to these seditious variets and a by-word to the world, which is all that is now wanting to complete the calamities of us Jews. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.6}

“And soon as she had said this she slew her son; and then roasted him, and ate the one half of him, and kept the other half by her concealed. Upon this the seditious came in presently, and smelling the scent of this food, they threatened her that they would cut her throat immediately if she did not show them what food she had gotten ready. She replied that she had saved a very fine portion of it for them; and withal uncovered what was left of her son. Hereupon they were seized with a horror and amazement of mind, and stood astonished at the sight; she said to them, ‘This is mine own son; and what hath been done was mine own doing! Come, eat of this food; for I have eaten of it myself! Do not you pretend to be either more tender than a woman, or more compassionate than a mother; but if you be so scrupulous, and do abominate this my sacrifice, as I have eaten the one half let the rest be preserved for me also.’ After which, those men went out trembling, being never so much affrighted at anything as they were at this, and with some difficulty they left the rest of that meat to the mother. Upon which the whole city was full of this horrid action immediately; and while everybody laid this miserable case before their own eyes, they trembled, as if this unheard-of action had been done by themselves. So those that were thus distressed by the famine were very desirous to die; and those already dead were esteemed happy, because they had not lived long enough either to hear or to see such miseries.”-*Wars of the Jews, Book 6, chap.8*. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.7}

If only one more point can be noted concerning this little horn, and that is to show the change from pagan to papal Rome, for that is expressly noted. We quote: “Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host [evidently referring to Christ, see verse 25, last clause], and by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practice, and prospered.” Daniel 8:11, 12. In this quotation we have purposely omitted the word *sacrifice*, because it is superfluous. There is nothing in the original that gives even the slightest hint of such a word. From verse 13 we learn what should be understood after “daily.” “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation?” The daily what? Why, the daily desolation, of course. So then we have in this chapter a mighty desolating power brought to view under two phases,-the daily desolation, and the transgression of desolation. These two expressions can refer to nothing else but the two great phases of Rome, paganism and papacy. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.8}

“By him the daily was taken away.” The change from pagan to papal Rome was effected by Rome itself, and not as a measure forced upon her by an outside power. It was the Roman emperors themselves, who, influenced by the bishops, decreed that Christianity should be the religion of the empire. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.9}

“And an host was given him against the daily.” Although the change from paganism to papacy was begun and consummated within Rome itself. It was not without help. The hordes of barbarous tribes came from the North and overran the Roman Empire, became identified with it, accepted its religion, and were active agents in converting (by force of arms) others to that religion. Says D’Aubigne:- {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.10}

“But already the forests of the North had poured forth the most effectual promoters of papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West, and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and half heathen state of mind at the feet of the chief priest of Rome. At the same time the people of the West also submitted to him. First the Vandals, then the Ostrogoths, a short time after the Burgundians and the Alains, then the Visigoths, and at last the Lombards and the Anglo-Saxon came bowing the knee to the Roman pontiff. It was the sturdy shoulders of the idolatrous children of the North, which elevated to the Supreme throne of Christendom a pastor of the banks of the Tiber.”-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 51*. E. J. W. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 694.11}

**“Making Trouble” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

“And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel?” 1 Kings 18:17. This question was asked when Elijah met Ahab as he and his servants were searching for water. What had Elijah done, that he should be accused of troubling Israel? He had rebuked them for their idolatry, into which they had been led by Ahab and his father. In consequence of the almost universal wickedness, Elijah had declared, from the Lord, that there should be no rain. For three years there had been no rain, and yet idolatry did not cease, nor did Ahab abate his wickedness. To some people it would seem that Elijah’s preaching was in vain, and that, since no one heeded it, it would have been better to leave the people to worship their idols in peace. And no doubt Ahab voiced the sentiment of the people, when he accused Elijah of being the author of all their trouble. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.1}

But what did Elijah say? “And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandment of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.” Here Elijah threw the entire responsibility upon Ahab and his family, because they have led the people into idolatry. How could that be, when the people were enjoying the peace and quiet until Elijah came with his stern message? The reason is, the people were violating God’s commandments, a thing which always brings his displeasure. The judgments of God will be visited upon those who persist in violating his law. But God never punishes any people until he has faithfully warned them of their sin. This was the part which Elijah had performed. He was God’s messenger. After he had warned them to no purpose, a slight manifestation of God’s wrath against ungodliness was made. But who was responsible for this manifestation of wrath? Was it Elijah? All will agree, with Elijah that the responsibility rested upon those who had done the wrong. The case against them is clear. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.2}

Now another point. Since even the people of Israel could not be induced to leave their idols and serve Jehovah (for although they acknowledge that the Lord is God, they went back into idolatry, and were destroyed as a nation in consequence), would it not have been better to leave them alone? If they were determined not to serve Jehovah, was it not wrong for Elijah to cause them to lose confidence in Baal, by showing his lack of power? Who will say yes? Not one. Baal-worship would do no good, and they might better worship nothing. There was no power in Baal to reward them for worshiping him, or to protect them from the wrath of Jehovah, and therefore they might as well be atheists as to serve Baal. No person will have the hardihood to say that the worship of Baal was any improvement on no worship at all. Now for the parallel. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.3}

In these days we find that a large majority of the people professing Christianity call the first day of the week the holy rest-day-the Lord’s day. But God says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” Moreover, as he commanded the people anciently to break their images, so he commands people to trample upon Sunday as a day of rest, saying, “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work.” “Six days thou shalt work; but on *the* seventh day thou shalt rest.” Exodus 34:21. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.4}

But now it comes to pass when the truth on the Sabbath question is preached, while very many acknowledge, and many more are convinced at heart, that the seventh day-Saturday-is the Bible Sabbath, very few have the courage of their convictions, and walk in obedience to the commandment. Still further, the most of those who are convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and do not keep it, having seen the utter absence of any Bible proof to sustain the Sunday-Sabbath, very naturally lose much of their respect for that day. And on this account it is often said that the preaching of the seventh-day Sabbath has an injurious effect; it unsettles the faith of many in regard to their present practice, while few make a radical change. We now ask, Is this an injury? and if it is, who is responsible for the injurious effects. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.5}

Is it more pleasing in the sight of God to keep Sunday than to regard no day as holy? To keep the first day and violate the seventh, is direct disobedience to God’s law. Any transgression of the law is sin. To break the Sabbath, and keep no day at all, is also direct violation of the law. This also is sin. Who can say that the latter sin is worse than the former? And if it be decided that the second is the greater sin, what is the advantage, since both are sins? God does not tell us to choose the smaller of two sins, but to put away all sin. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.6}

Question: Is it simply a spirit of worship that is required by the first commandment, or is it the worship of a special object? You say, It is the worship of one particular Being,-the Lord of heaven and earth. Then the design of the commandment can in nowise be met by worshiping some other object? Of course not; for that commandment particularly forbids the worship of anything except the true God. Well, the fourth commandment requires the observance of a special day of the week-the seventh-and forbids the observance of any other. The commandment does not simply require rest in the abstract, but rest of the day which he has appointed. To offer him any other day, is simply to ask him to be satisfied with a counterfeit. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.7}

When a laborer goes to his employer’s office to receive his wages, he confidently expects to receive the amount before agreed upon, in good coin. Will he be satisfied with counterfeit money? By no means. But will not the counterfeit money be better than nothing? Not a bit; indeed, it may prove to be worse than no money; for while he cannot purchase a morsel of bread with it, he may get into serious trouble if he attempts to pass it. We think the illustration will hold good in every particular when applied to the Sabbath question. The seventh day is the genuine Sabbath; it has God’s stamp upon it. The Sunday is only a base counterfeit; it bears none of the marks of genuineness. Now while this counterfeit Sabbath is worth nothing, it may get us into serious trouble if we persist, in attempting to pass it instead of the genuine. See Revelation 14:9-12. As with the counterfeit coin, so with the counterfeit Sabbath,-*honest* ignorance that it is counterfeit may be accepted as an excuse; but when the man is told, or has an opportunity to know, that the coin is counterfeit, what excuse can he make? His unbelief will not save him. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.8}

The one who detects a counterfeit coin, and informs the one who holds it that is of no value, is not called a troublesome fellow, although he materially mars the peace of the possessor of the coin. The one who made the base coin, and they who persist in circulating it, are the real enemies of their fellows. So those who make known the truth concerning the Lord’s Sabbath and its counterfeit are the friends, not the enemies, of their fellow-men. They are obeying the command of God: “Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.” {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.9}

The man who detects a counterfeit coin in his neighbor’s possession does not offer a good one in its place; but those who show the worthlessness of the Sunday-sabbath, offer in its stead the Sabbath which bears the stamp of Jehovah, and which will be accepted at the gate of Heaven. If men refuse to accept the genuine, and go without any, it is their own fault. When the true Sabbath is presented, “Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil.” Isaiah 56:2. E. J. W. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.10}

**“‘Numerical Designation’ in the Sabbath Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

In an article recently quoted from the *Friend*, was the statement that the agitation of the Sabbath question tends to turn men’s thoughts “away from the proper observance of the day, to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation.” In that sentence the writer expressed a very popular idea, one which we regard as a grave error, namely, that the “numerical designation” of the day is a minor affair in Sabbath observance. It seems to be the general idea that the main question concerning the Sabbath is, *How* should it be kept? and not, *When* should it be kept? We consider both questions highly important, but think their order should be reversed. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.11}

What is impossible to say that one of two things is more important than the other when both are absolutely essential, we may readily determine which of them must first be considered. We have therefore no hesitation in saying that the “numerical designation” of the day is the first thing of importance in considering the question of Sabbath observance. If a man is told, “You ought to keep the Sabbath day,” the first question he would ask, if he knew nothing at all about the subject, would be, “What is the Sabbath day?” {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.12}

Now if we read the commandment we shall find that this is indeed the first point considered. “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, 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, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.13}

We see that in the commandment the Sabbath is introduced as an institution already well known. Then the first thing after the commandment proper, which is contained in the first clause, is the “numerical designation” of the day. “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” So important did the Lord regard the “numerical designation” of the day, that he fixed that the very first thing. Then come directions for the proper observance of the day: “In it thou shalt not do any work.” That is, any of *thy* work, which must be performed in the preceding six days. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.14}

There are but seven days in a week, and the first day is the one commonly called Sunday. Every calendar and dictionary bears witness to this. More than this, the chief and indeed the only reason given for Sunday observance is that it commemorates the resurrection of Christ. But the resurrection of Christ was on the first day of the week; and thus Sunday observance everywhere and always record their belief that Sunday is the first day of the week. To deny that fact would be to overthrow their only argument for Sunday observance. But just as surely as Sunday is the first day of the week, Saturday is the seventh day. Well, the Lord says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” If the “numerical designation” of the day is a matter of minor importance, will our friends please explain the fourth commandment? {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 696.15}

We repeat that before we can consider the “proper observance of the day” of the Sabbath, it is absolutely necessary that we determine what particular day of the week the Sabbath is. For no matter how strictly we observe a day, abstaining from our own labor on it, and devoting its hours to the worship of God, that cannot constitute a “proper observance of the Sabbath,” if the day itself is not the Sabbath. This fact seems so self-evident as to make argument useless. Moreover, if the rest and worship mentioned above be upon some one of the six days which God has devoted to labor, then that rest is not a proper observance of that day. We do not say that Sunday or Monday or any other day of the week may not be used, on occasions, for religious worship, but we do say that for a regular practice, the only “proper observance” of Sunday, as well as of the five days following, is labor. And the only “proper observance of the Sabbath” is rest and worship on the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday. And this we say “by the word of the Lord.” See Exodus 16:22-30; 20:8-11; Luke 23:54-56. E. J. W. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 697.1}

**“How It May Be Done” The Signs of the Times, 11, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

Says the Portland *Baptist*: “Let our ambition be *first* to make men Christians, *then* Baptists.” And the *Herald of Truth* says: “All genuine denominational feeling responds to this, Amen.” We confess that we cannot understand such expressions. Is a Baptist more or less than a Christian? Neither of the papers referred to will claim that a Baptist is *more* than a Christian. To be a *Christian* is the highest point to which sanctified ambition can look. Well, then, is a Baptist *less* than a Christian? If so, why should the good brethren who conduct these papers wish to lower the standard of any who are in such a desirable position? We know that they would not, and therefore we conclude that according to their idea a Baptist *is* a Christian. We have no disposition to deny this; but if it is so, why do they not say directly that their ambition is to make men Baptists? {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 697.2}

There is a spirit which, for want of a better name, might be called “denominational cowardice.” It makes men fear to seem to place their own denomination above any other. We confess that we have no sympathy with such a spirit. We like to see people have decided convictions. If a man unites with a certain denomination, it should be because that denomination is, so far as he can learn, more nearly correct than any other; because it has more truth. And if it has more truth than any other, it certainly is better than any other; and if that is so, why should he be afraid to say so? And why should he not strive earnestly to bring into it both worldlings and members of those bodies that have not so much light? {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 697.3}

We are strongly of the opinion that the true reason for this “undenominational” talk that is so common, is the underlying belief that there is really no vital difference between different religious bodies, the name being the chief one. The points of divergence are called “non-essentials.” Well, then, this shows the weakness of the “National Reform” assertion that their work cannot result in a union of Church and State, because the men who are in the movement are representatives of all denominations, and of course would not single out any one for prominence to the exclusion of the rest. So we say, of course they would not; but, singing party names and “non-essentials,” they would all unite as members of one body, for the enforcement of the “essentials” which they hold in common. And when we inquire for the points held by all denominations in a common, and which are regarded as the *essentials*, we find simply, Natural Immortality and Sunday. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 697.4}

If any one says that a union of one Church and State cannot be effected on this basis, and that it is not imminent, he certainly is blind to the things that are taking place all around him. E. J. W. {SITI November 19, 1885, p. 697.5}

**“Pagan and Papal Rome” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel begins with the supremacy of Medo-Persian dominion, B.C. 538, and covers the remaining portion of the world’s history till the close of time. The 25th verse says that the power represented by the little horn, Rome, “shall the broken without hand.” This evidently refers to the same thing that is mentioned in Daniel 2:34, 44, 45, where the stone cut out without hands is represented as smiting the image on the feet and breaking up the entire image-all the kingdoms of earth-in pieces. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.1}

Paganism was the prevailing religion during the Medo-Persian and Grecian rule, during the first portion of the Roman Empire. In the vision of the second chapter of Daniel there is no distinction made between pagan Rome and Rome papal, but in every other prophecy the distinction is clearly marked. In the seventh chapter, pagan Rome is represented by the “dreadful and terrible” beast with teeth of iron and nails of brass. Papal Rome is represented by the “little horn” which came out from this beast. In reality, the beast, after the rise of the little horn, is papal Rome, *i.e.*, Rome under the popes. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.2}

In the 12th and 13th of Revelation the Roman power is brought to view. It is not difficult to identify the red dragon with seven heads and ten horns. It is represented as standing ready to devour a certain child as soon as it was born. This child we know is Jesus, from the fact that he is to “rule all nations with a rod of iron” (verse 5, compared Psalm 2:7-9), and he was “caught up to his throne.” These particulars will apply to no one but Jesus. And Rome, through Herod as its representative, stood ready to slay Jesus when he was born. See Matthew 2. The dragon, represents Rome. The question is, Does it represent the whole of Rome, or only a part? This can be answered when we have identified the next beast. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.3}

“And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.... And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.4}

Compare this description with what we are already familiar in Daniel 7, and there will be no difficulty in deciding that it also represents Rome. What! two symbols in succession representing the same thing? The answer must be that they represent two phases of Rome. Now we know that Rome in the time of Christ was pagan; therefore this second phase, represented by the leopard beast, must be papal Rome. Notice its blasphemous words, and its work of persecuting saints, and compare with the description of the little horn of Daniel 7. Notice also a time during which it was to have power to continue-“forty and two months.” This, at thirty days to the month, is just 1260 days (as prophetic symbols, years), which we have already learned was the period of papal supremacy. Here, then, as in the seventh of Daniel, the prophecy marks a change from pagan to papal Rome. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.5}

Once more we turn to the Roman power as brought to view in the eighth of Daniel. The little horn that waxed “exceeding great,” we have already seen to be Rome. There is no possibility of its representing any other power. But it is to be “broken without hand,” which shows that the little-horn power covers the whole of Roman history, reaching even to the coming of the Lord. This being the case, it is evident that here also we must have the two phases of Rome,-pagan and papal. How are these two phases indicated? First, we repeat that the word “sacrifice” which occurs in verses 11, 12, and 13, is not found in the original, and there is nothing in the text that gives any idea of sacrifice. In the face of this, the Revision Committee, as if to get as far as possible from the true meaning of the passage, have placed “burnt-offering” in the Revised Version, in the place of “sacrifice.” This is simply making a bad matter worse. They could have used the word “persecution,” or “prophesying,” or “dreaming,” with just as much reason. Some one will ask, If there is no word in the original where the translators have placed “sacrifice,” why did they place any word there at all? It would have been better if they had not, for then no one would have been misled. Try it in verse 13: “Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?” A very slight examination will convince anyone that the only word that can be properly supplied after “daily,” is ‘desolation;’ thus, “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily desolation and the transgression of desolations?” By supplying a word that is already in the text (and we have no right to go outside of the text for a word), we make harmony, and get rid of the real sense of the passage. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.6}

Rome, then, is here termed to a desolating power. Examine Matthew 24:15, 16, and Luke 20:21, 22, and you will find the Roman armies spoken of as the “abomination of desolation.” And this term, “desolation,” is a very fit one to apply to a power that shall “break in pieces and bruise,” and “shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.” Then we have two forms of desolation, at the “daily” and the “transgression.” Rome in its pagan form was well indicated by the term “daily,” or “continual,” because paganism had been the main religion of the world from almost the beginning. A few people worshiped the true God; but these were so very few that it might well be said that paganism have always been the religion of the world. But under the Roman dominion a change was to take place. Paganism in the civilized world was to receive its death blow, and a form of worship professedly Christian was to take its place; yet this new form of religion was to be of such a character, as compared with paganism, that it was called the “transgression.” It is doubtful if the abomination of paganism for four thousand years equaled the crimes perpetrated by papal Rome in its twelve centuries of supreme power. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.7}

This same change is set forth by Paul in the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians. He told the Thessalonians brethren that the day of the Lord could not come until there had come an apostasy, and the “man of sin” had been revealed, and had accomplished his work of blasphemy and opposition to God and history. Said he, “Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” That it is, when he was in Thessalonica he preached to them from the book of Daniel concerning the rise of the papacy. “And now he know what withholdeth that he the man of sin might be revealed in his time.” That is, you know what now hinders the setting up of the papacy; it is paganism, which still has a controlling influence in the government. “For the mystery of the iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth hindereth will let hinder, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed.” Verses 7, 8. The apostasy had begun in Paul’s day. “Grievous wolves” had already begun to devour the flock, and men speaking perverse things had drawn many away. This spirit of the papacy-“the mystery of the iniquity”-was already existing; but it could not fully develop itself until paganism-the hindering power-should be “taken of the way,” and then “that Wicked” should stand forth undisguised. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.8}

Note the similarity in the terms used by Paul and the angel in describing the papacy. The angel calls it “the transgression of desolation;” Paul calls it “that Wicked,” just as though the papacy embraced all the wickedness in the world, and so it did. The papacy was to be so pre-eminently wicked that it could be sufficiently designated by the expression “*that* Wicked.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.9}

In Revelation 13:2, the change from paganism to papacy is noted in these words: “And the dragon [pagan Rome] gave him of [that is, the beast, papal Rome] his power, and his seat, and great authority.” If any one, however supposes that this change was an instantaneous one, accomplished by a sudden revelation, he is greatly mistaken. For several hundred years the papal power was growing almost unnoticed, before it succeeded in exalting itself above the ruins of paganism. Paul, 2 Thessalonians 2:6-8, brings this state of things to view, when he represents the “mystery of the iniquity” as working, but obliged to wait for its full development until paganism should be removed. We propose to give a few quotations that will indicate, as fully as is possible in our brief space, the rise of the papacy and the overthrow of paganism. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.10}

“In the last great persecution under Diocletian [A. D. 284-305], the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the Catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the Bishop of Rome emerged from the Catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The Bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indication of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishops drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed. The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud.”-*Historical Studies, pp. 17, 18.* {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 710.11}

Constantine became sole emperor of Western of Rome in 312 A.D. Shortly after (March, 313), he issued the famous Edict of Milan, which restored all forfeited civil and religious rights to the Christians, and it secured to them equal toleration with the pagans throughout the empire. This was an important step in advance. Gibbon, speaking of Constantine’s relation to Christianity, says: “By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto regarded the progress of Christianity.... The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the interest of the present as well as of the future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smile, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually filled the apartments of a palace.... As the lower ranks of society are covered by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any imminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by [the conversion of] dependent multitudes.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 18.* {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.1}

In his “History of Latin Christianity,” book one, chapter 2, Milman quotes a single paragraph from an ancient historian, which shows the advancement made by the bishop of Rome by the close of the fourth century: “No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the bishopric of Rome, then should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table,-these are of the rewards of successful ambition.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.2}

In the same chapter, Milman again says:- {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.3}

“The Pontificates of Damasus and Siricius [A.D. 367-398] beheld almost the last open struggles of expiring Roman paganism, the dispute concerning the Statue of Victory in the Senate, the succession of a large number of the more distinguished senators, the pleadings of the eloquent Symmachus for the toleration of the religion of ancient Rome. To such humiliation were reduced the deities of the Capitol, the gods, who, as was supposed, had achieved the conquest of the world, and laid it at the feet of Rome. But in this great contest the Bishop of Rome filled only an inferior part; it was Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, who enforced the final sentence of condemnation against paganism, asserted the sin, in a Christian emperor, of assuming any Imperial title connected with pagan worship, and of permitting any portion of the public revenue to be expended on the rites of idolatry. It was Ambrose who forbade the last marks of respect to the titular divinities of Rome in the public ceremonies.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.4}

The final triumph of the pseudo-christian religion was gained in the early part of the 6th century, when Pope Symmachus anathematized the Emperor Anastasius. See Cyclopedias, art. “Anastasius,” and “Decline and Fall,” chap. 47, par. 22. At the same time, paganism in the West was overthrown by Clovis, king of Franks, a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who had been converted to the Christianity that was then popular, by his wife, Clothilde, who was a Catholic. Clovix had promised her that if he were victorious in a battle which he was about to fight near Cologne, A.D. 496, he would turn Christian. After a severe struggle, he gained the victory, and soon after had and several thousand of his followers were baptized. He afterward, A.D. 507-8, by virtue of his superior skill and strength in battle, succeeded in “converting” the entire nation of the Visigoths, so that Christianity became the nominal religion of the entire Roman world. (See “Decline and Fall,” chap. 38, par. 1-30; Guizot’s “History of France,” vol., chap. 7.) Because of these Christian acts, he received from the pope the title of “Most Christian King.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.5}

Thus was the “continual desolation” taken away that the “transgression of desolation” might run its course. In A.D. 538, as previously shown, the papacy became supreme by the conquest of its rivals, and it pursued its career unchecked until 1798. Since then its temporal power has gradually become extinct, but its spiritual power, though seemingly limited, is greater than ever. Its opposition to “all that is called God, or that is worshiped,” has not diminished, nor will it cease until the Lord shall consume that Wicked with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of his coming. 2 Thessalonians 2:8. E. J. W. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 711.6}

**“Judged by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” Romans 2:12-16. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 712.1}

In the two verses here quoted, there is matter for our most serious consideration, which does not appear from a casual reading. In them are brought to view the Judgment. We speak of the day of Judgment as “The day of wrath, that dreadful day,” and it is doubtful if any one can really *think* of that day without feelings of awe or terror; yet no one can have any just appreciation of its awfulness unless he has carefully studied the law of God, by which men are then to be judged; and our sense of the terrors of that day will be exactly in proportion to our understanding of the far-reaching sanctions of that holy law. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 712.2}

The verses before us mention two classes,-those who have sinned without law, and those who, having sinned in the law, are to be judged by the law. The second class is the one with which we are specially concerned; but before we can fully comprehend what is said of it, we must briefly notice the class with which it is contrasted. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 712.3}

This text gives no authority whatever for the theory that there are any people in the world on whom God’s law has no claims. The term “without law” is fully explained in verses 14 and 15, which are parenthetical. “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature of the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of *the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 712.4}

In the first chapter of Romans, the heathen, here spoken of as those “without the law,” are described. There it is plainly shown that there ignorant blindness is due to their own willful disobedience. “Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but because vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.” Romans 1:21. There was a time when all men knew God; but now many have been given over to “a reprobate mind.” Notwithstanding this, every man who has not driven the Spirit of God from him forever, has as a legacy from Adam in his purity, some trace of the law of God in his heart. It was not alone in outward form, but in character as well, that Adam was formed in the image of God. Man in his first estate was like God, holy, because God’s law, which is the transcript that his character, was within his heart. When he fell, this image was marred. Each successive sin makes an additional blot upon that copy of the law in the heart, until, by a long course of sin, it is completely obliterated. Christ, the sinless One, said “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, I law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:8. The work of the gospel is to bring men back to their lost allegiance, to reconcile them to God (2 Corinthians 5:20), and write the entire law once more in their hearts (Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10), that thus they may be wholly conformed to God’s image,-“partakers of the divine image.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 712.5}

Paul says that the heathen, who have not the written law, give evidence of traces of the law written in their hearts, from the fact that when they do things that are commanded or forbidden by the law, their conscience bears witness, and their thoughts either accuse or else excuse the commission of those deeds. The contrast, then, between “without the law,” and “in the law,” is simply a contrast between no revelation and God’s written word; and the two classes brought to view are those who have not the Bible, and those who have the full light of the written word of God. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.1}

It is evident, then, that those who “perish without law,” are those who are punished for the sins which they have committed in face of the law which they had by nature. They had the law; for sin is imputed to them (verse 12), and “sin is not in imputed where there is no law.” Romans 5:13. But they did not have the written law; consequently the written law, in its wondrous breadth, is not brought against them in the Judgment; they are judged simply by as much of the law as they had, and this alone is sufficient to condemn them. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.2}

Now it is still further evident that this judgment of the heathen can go but little, if any, further than the bare letter of the law. That is, for instance, the law will take cognizance, in the case of the heathen, only of the actual murder which he committed when he knew that he ought not to kill, and will not bring before him the envy and jealousy, which, in the absence of the written word, he perhaps did not recognize as being wrong. But “*all* unrighteousness is sin” (1 John 5:17), and “the wages of sin is death” (Romans 6:23), and therefore “for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.” This, in brief, is what is meant by “not having the law,” and by perishing “without law.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.3}

Now what of those to having “sinned in the law,” are to be “judged by the law”? We have already seen that this class comprises those who have the light of the written revelation. Then since they are to be judged by what they have, it is evident that they are to be judged by all that may be learned from the word of God. Instead of being judged according to the mere letter of the law, *i.e.*, by that which may be understood by merely *reading* the law, they are to be judged according to the fullest intent of the law,-by all that may be understood by earnest, prayerful meditation in the law. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.4}

In Hebrews 4:12 we read that the “word of God 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, and is a *discerner of the thoughts and intents* of the heart.” From the sermon on the mount,-that sermon that moralists are so fond of quoting, we learn that he who is unjustly angry with another is in as much danger of the Judgment as he who takes another’s life; and John plainly declares that “whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” 1 John 3:15. Again our Saviour said: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commnit adultery.” Matthew 5:27. Here Christ quotes the seventh commandment as something known of old. All knew the penalty for violating it; but the scribes and Pharisees had taught that nothing but adultery as an actually accomplished fact could be considered a violation of the commandment. But Christ said of it, “But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.5}

These two instances, which are but samples of what might be said of all the commandments, serve to give us some idea of what the psalmist sought in the law when he said, “Ihave seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding brought.” Psalm 119:96. So broad is it that it takes notice of an unexpressed thought or a single glance of the eye. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.6}

We claim that it is the law in its depth and breadth, the law as it discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, to which Paul refers when he says of a certain class that they shall be “judged by the law.” This claim is sanctioned by the verse which says that this judgment shall take place “in the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men.” It is evident there is a difference between the judgment of those who sin “without law” and that of those who sin “in the law.” Now what can this difference be, since, as we have already seen, the law is the standard of judgment in both cases? The only difference can be that the latter class endure a more rigid test than the former. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.7}

Notice, further, that the phrase “in the law” refers to *all* who have the written word, and that therefore this rigid test, which is going to take into account the remotest thoughts of the heart, is to be applied to every one who has the Bible, that is, to all the inhabitants of so-called Christian lands. That is that which may well cause us all to tremble at the thought of “that dreadful day.” Multitudes who pride themselves on their strict morality will be found in that day to be but whited sepulchers, fair without, but full of corruption within. Thousands of professed Christians who stand high in the estimation of their brethren, perhaps also in their own estimation, will then be bidden to depart as “workers of iniquity;” “for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.8}

In this connection we also have another thought worthy of serious consideration. After enumerating the vices of the heathen (Romans 1:24-32), Paul continues: “Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest *doest the same things*.” Romans 2:1. Now there is not an individual who has ever read Romans 1:24-32 who has not decided that the things there set forth are exceedingly wrong. But the apostle says, “Thou that judgest doest *the same things*.” What! have we all committed murder and adultery? are we all guilty of all that list of outbreaking sins? Not openly; so far as the actual *deed* is concerned, we may have committed scarcely any of those acts. But we have all harbored the thoughts which, if cherished and allowed to pursue their actual course, would develop into those very sins. We have already seen that a wrong desire is counted as a violation of the commandment; but here we learn something further. We learn that the *evil thought* cherished by one who has the light of God’s word, is in the sight of God as great a crime as the actual deed is when committed by a heathen. The professed Christian who indulges in anger or harbors evil thoughts is as guilty before God as the benighted heathen who kills and eats his enemy. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.9}

We begin to see that the commandment is indeed “exceeding broad;” we may also feel a little less satisfied over the superiority above the heathen, which we fancy we enjoy. As we read of the Hindoo throwing himself before the car of Juggernaut, or perchance see the Chinaman bowing before his horrid-looking Joss, or think of the barbarous rites with which savage worship is accompanied, we shudder at the depth of wickedness revealed. But when we read that “rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry,” we may well turn upon ourselves the look of pity and scorn. How many professed Christians are there who are never stubbornly set upon carrying out their own plans, regardless of the wishes of their brethren? Comparatively few, we fear, always follow the directions laid down in 1 Corinthians 1:10 and 1 Peter 5:5. How many who profess to keep “the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,” never indulge any rebellious feelings? It may be rebellion against duty which God has made known through the spirit of prophecy, or against those placed in authority. Whatever it is, the rebellious or stubborn one is as vile in God’s sight as the one who “in his blindness bows down to wood and stone.” Is there not cause for us all to cry out, “God be merciful to me, *the* sinner”? {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.10}

And to give force to these thoughts we have the assurance that, “the great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and *hasteth greatly*.” The Lord is near, “even at the doors,” and when he comes, he will “bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” 1 Corinthians 4:5. And what weight against us those hidden and seemingly insignificant thoughts will have. How often we would gladly forget them; sometimes we succeed. But sooner or later they will be made known in all their terrible heinousness. What shall we do? Let us face them now. Let us pray in the Lord, “Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.” “Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord;” “let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts;” and we have the blest assurance that if we do this God will “abundantly pardon,” and will “cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” E. J. W. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.11}

**“Shifting Responsibility” The Signs of the Times, 11, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph we recently came across in a religious exchange:- {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.12}

“In a recent address Professor Drummond said that he was once conversing with an infidel, when a well-known gentleman passed them on the road. ‘That gentleman,’ said the infidel, pointing to the passer-by, ‘is the founder of our infidel club.’ ‘What,’ said Mr. Drummond, in startled tones, ‘why that is Mr. So-and-so, an influential man in such a church!’ ‘Yes,’ said the infidel, ‘we know he professes Christianity; but his inconsistencies have driven many of us into infidelity, and led to the founding of our club.’” {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.13}

From the above, which is undoubtedly true, there are two lessons to be learned. The first is that Christians, if they are not consistent in their life, are active agents of the devil. Says Christ: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” Matthew 12:30. Many professed Christians would be shocked to be told that they are doing missionary work for Satan, yet they can easily convince themselves that such is the case. Let them seriously ask, Am I doing my duty? Do I honor Christ and the profession that I make? Is my influence positive on the Lord’s side? Unless these questions can be answered affirmatively, they may know that they are driving men away from Christ. The name of God is blasphemed because of the lives of any of his professed followers. Romans 2:21-24. How terrible to think that there is more blasphemy than there would be if many who profess to love God were not in existence. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 713.14}

Some professors think to make amends by acknowledging their false position without correcting it. They will try to teach unbelievers, but will say, “Don’t take me for an example; you must not judge of Christianity by me.” But that is just what the world must do. Christians are here in order that this world may be able to judge of Christianity. Said Christ to his disciples; “Ye are the light of the world;” and he prayed that they might “be made perfect in one,” so that the world might know that he was from God. One of the first things the professor of Christianity should think about is that worldlings will watch him closely, and that they will know whether he is really a Christian or not. They can tell the genuine article every time. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 714.1}

And this brings us to the second lesson that may be learned from the paragraph quoted. It is this: The fact that professed Christians do not fulfill their obligations, is not the slightest excuse for anybody’s unbelief. Whenever worldlings criticize the inconsistencies of professed Christians, they at once condemn themselves; for by their criticisms they show that they know what ought to be done. And their punishment for evil-doing will be none the less because it was a professed Christian who led them astray. As for the professor, the Judgment alone will reveal the responsibility that attaches to him for his scattering influence. Taking it all together, neither Christians nor infidels have anything from which to derive comfort for a course of wrong-doing. E. J. W. {SITI November 26, 1885, p. 714.2}