**“Vain Customs” The Signs of the Times, 11, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

In an editorial on “Infant Baptism,” in a recent number of the California *Christian Advocate*, we find, among others equally sound, the following ‘argument” for that practice:- {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 728.1}

“Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that infant baptism has no foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general through all the ages? Can it be possible that a small portion of the church has all the truth, and the rest of us, constituting a vast majority in every century, has [*sic*.] none at all?” {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 728.2}

Before answering this question, let us have a few figures. The population of the earth is not far from fourteen millions of people. Of this number about 480,000,000 are Buddhists and followers of Confucius; about 230,000,000 are barbarous tribes that practice fetichism,-the very lowest form of heathenism; something over 120,000,000 are Mohammedans, and about the same number are Brahminical Hindoos. Less than 400,000,000 our nominally Christian, of this number nearly 300,000,000 are members of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches, leaving only a little over one hundred million of so-called Protestants of all denominations, including infidels, etc. That is, over seven hundred million people, one-half the population of the earth, are heathen, and less than one-third of the inhabitants of the earth have even a knowledge of the religion which teaches that there is one God, and of Jesus Christ whom he sent. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 728.3}

Now we might answer the *Advocate’s* question by the Yankee method of asking another: “Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that” the worship of images “has no [Biblical] foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general throughout of the ages?” Can it be possible that a small portion of mankind has all the truth, and that the rest, constituting a vast majority in every century, has none at all? {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.1}

We have stated that of the so-called Christians, only one-fourth are Protestants. The rest believe in purgatory, prayers to and for the dead, and various other things which the *Advocate* considers pernicious. Is it not “an assumption almost amounting to impudence,” for a few Protestants to oppose the doctrine held by so large a body of “Christians,’ many of whom are skilled in all the learning of the schools? Hear what the Catholic Dr. Eck said, over three hundred years ago, to Luther, who was opposing the presumptuous claims of the pope:- {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.2}

“I am astonished at the humility and diffidence with which the reverend doctor undertakes to stand alone against so many illustrious Fathers, thus affirming that he knows more of these things than the sovereign pontiff, the councils, divines, and universities! .... It would no doubt be very wonderful if God had hidden the truth from so many saints and martyrs, till the advent of the reverend father.” {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.3}

Just compare this paragraph with the first one quoted. We might almost accuse the *Advocate* of plagiarizing from the learned chancellor of Ingolstadt. If the *Advocate’s* argument for infant baptism be sound, then Dr. Eck’s sarcastic remarks proved the fallacy of Luther’s position; and the same argument proves that paganism is the only true religion! We have no sympathy nor respect for that sort of argument. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.4}

Let us turn the tables. The Bible says, “He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.” Infants are not capable of belief; but since they have committed no sin, they are saved by virtue of Christ’s atoning blood, without belief. If they die in infancy, they never have any personal knowledge of sin. No one who does not or cannot is a subject for baptism, according to the Saviour’s testimony. Now we ask, Is it not an assumption which is even worse than impudence, for men to say that infant “baptism” is a Christian ordinance, when in the whole Bible there is not a syllable in favor of it? We claim that the presumption is all on the side of the seeming majority; for one man with the Bible to sustain him, may without presumption withstand the world. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.5}

If numbers and custom prove the correctness of any theory or practice, then all error must be correct. A few hundred years ago everybody believed that the earth was flat. According to the *Advocate’s* reasoning, the earth at that time *was* flat; but since the time of Galileo it has gradually been assuming a spherical shape, until, now that nearly everybody believes it to be round, it is quite round, being only a little flattened at the poles! And this is no more absurd than that the most common argument for infant “baptism” and Sunday-keeping. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.6}

So true is it that the majority of people are, and always have been, in the wrong, that whenever we hear a person quote custom in favor of any practice, we at once decide, (1) That he as nothing better to offer, and (2) That the practice is, without doubt, wrong. We so decide because many hundred years ago, the prophet of God declared that “The customs of the people are vain” (Jeremiah 10:3), and inspired statements are true in all ages of world’s history. E. J. W. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.7}

**“Comments on Psalm 15” The Signs of the Times, 11, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?” Psalm 15:1. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.8}

This is certainly a most pertinent question. If a person desires to go to a certain place, his first inquiry will be as to how he is to get there. Now there are few persons who do not have a desire for eternal life; few do not entertain a faint hope, though often without reason, that they will at last by some means have an entrance into the holy city. Then the question of the psalmist should be constantly on their minds; that is, they should constantly be searching for an answer to it. That no one will enter Heaven by accident; no one will dwell in the “holy hill” without knowing positively by what means he got there. As surely as the joys in the presence of the Lord are real, so surely are the steps to them real. “We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.” Acts 14:22. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.9}

Fortunately, we are not left to grope in darkness for the way to Zion, nor need we be at a loss to know when we have found it. The inspired psalmist has answered his own question. Let us then examine it together. Here is the first part of the answer:- {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.10}

“He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour.” Psalm 15:2, 3. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.11}

The first clause seems to cover it all: “He that walketh uprightly.” We hear a great deal nowadays about “crooked” dealings. The way that leads to life is too narrow to allow any “crooked” person to walk in it. Every one in it must be upright. Reader, do you realize what that means? Do any of us fully appreciate what it is to *do right?* It is simply to “keep straight” all the time; to be *upright*; to not deviate at all from a perfect standard. It is to “make straight paths for your feet,” and to walk in them continually, and not simply occasionally. The great reason why many professed Christians make so little progress in the Christian life, is that they have so low a standard of Christianity. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.12}

What is the proper standard? John says: “He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk even as he walked.” 1 John 2:6. Christ is the perfect pattern. He is the way and the truth. He “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” 1 Peter 2:22. This was because the law of God was in his heart. Psalm 40:8. Then if we would walk “uprightly,” as Christ walked, we must also have the law of God in our hearts; for David says of the one who has the law of God in his heart, that “none of his steps shall slide.” So if one wishes to know how much the law of God requires of him, let him examine carefully the life of Christ. In his life we see a living exemplification of the law. But if the law requires a walk like that of Christ, if perfect obedience to the law’s requirements makes a man like Christ, then certainly the law will condemn the one whose life is not like Christ’s. If we deviate from the pattern which Christ has set, then we are condemned. Surely it is no small thing to be a Christian. But the psalmist has specified some things. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.13}

“He that ... speaketh the truth in his heart.” Outwardly a man’s deportment may be correct; his morals may be fully up to the standard of the very best society, and yet he may be a gross violator of the law, and may be more guilty before God than one who sins openly and recklessly. “Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.” But no one must fall into the error that he can keep the law in his heart, and break it openly. Many have fallen into this error; for this is just what they mean when they talk about keeping the law in spirit and not in letter. “Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;” and as a man “thinketh in his heart, so is he.” A man may keep the law outwardly, and violate it really, in his heart; but it is an utter impossibility for any one to keep the law in his heart, and violate the letter of it. So if a man keeps the fourth commandment “in his heart,” if he keeps the spirit of that commandment, he will keep holy the seventh day of the week, and no other. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.14}

“He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour.” Verse 3. Webster gives the following definition of the word “backbite”; “To censure, slander, reproach, or speak evil of, in the absence of the person traduced.” Notice that according to this definition, backbiting is not necessarily speaking falsely against an absent one; the things said may be true, and yet it may be backbiting. It is speaking evil of a neighbor that is condemned. This is still farther shown by the expression, “Nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor.” If a man commits a sin, that is a reproach to him; for Solomon says that “sin is a reproach to any people.” Now if one neighbor has actually done wrong, and we take up his case and make it a subject of conversation, criticizing it of course, we are backbiting. This of course does not include those instances in which a man’s case is considered by those in positions of authority, with a view to reclaiming him, or of preventing him from leading others astray. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.15}

If it is a sin to speak evil of one when the things uttered are true how much worse must it be when the reports are false? The ninth commandment says: “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.” This does not mean simply that we must not swear falsely against him in court, or that we must not at any time tell what we know is not true; but it means that we must not tell what we do not know to be true. The man who hears something to the detriment of his neighbor, and repeats it to others, not knowing that it is true, is guilty of bearing false witness, as well as of taking up a reproach against his neighbor. The ninth commandment means a great deal more than we are apt to think it does. And so it is with all the commandments. They are, indeed, “exceeding broad.” {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.16}

Here is a safe and simple rule to follow with our fellowmen: “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” He who does this fulfills the whole law, so far as it relates to man. That means that we must be as careful of our brother’s reputation as we would be of our own. When we are about to repeat some thing to the detriment of any one, stop and consider whether we would like to have him repeat such a thing about us. If this rule were followed, it would shut out a great amount of gossip and slander. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.17}

For there is such a thing as going to extremes. There are proper times to speak about another, even to tell things that are to his detriment. In a court of law, a man must witness to the truth, that justice may be done. So, also, the proper authorities in the church are to be notified when a brother persists in wrong-doing. This is in the interest of good order and discipline. The Bible says: “Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him.” Leviticus 19:17. He who covers up wrong in another, neither trying to restore him nor informing those who could restore him, becomes a “partaker of other men’s sins.” Here is another specification:- {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.18}

“In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoreth them that fear the Lord.” This does not mean that we are to despise and shun sinners, nor that we are to be uncivil to anybody. We are to show “all meekness unto all men” (Titus 3:2), and we are to be like Christ, who came to save that which was lost. While he hated sin, he was the sinner’s friend, and he sought their society, not for the sake of their society, but that he might do them good. But a “vile person,” a reprobate, is not to be esteemed. Remember that the text does not discriminate. It does not say that you must despise a vile person if he is poor, but that you may honor a reprobate who is wealthy. That is the way of the world, but it is not the Lord’s way. If society would adopt as a rule the fourth verse of this psalm, it would very soon be purged of a terrible load of corruption. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 729.19}

“But he honoreth them that fear the Lord.” One of the special requirements of an elder is that he be “a lover of good men” (Titus 1:8); and one of the sins charged against the people of the last days is that they are “despisers of those that are good.” 2 Timothy 3:3. There is to be no discrimination; the poorest and most ignorant man, if he is a God-fearing man, is worthy of more honor that the profligate prince or millionaire. There is no honor that a man can receive that will outrank the honor which God gives, in imparting his grace to the humble. “Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 9:23, 24. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 730.1}

“He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent.” By comparing this text with Exodus 22:25; Leviticus 23:35-37; Deuteronomy 23:19, 20, we see that the entire prohibition of taking usury was only from brethren; from strangers it was allowable to receive usury. This was no injustice; for extortion or unjust gain is expressly condemned everywhere. We are commanded to do good to all men as we have opportunity, but “especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” Galatians 6:10. It is just for a man to receive reasonable compensation for means which represents his own labor; still the Bible clearly teaches that a man must not be a taker of usury, that is, that must not be his business. It is almost impossible for a man to engage in the business of money lending without taking advantage of the necessities of others, and thus violating the command to love his neighbor as himself. This is why we are positively forbidden to exact usury from the poor. “But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.” 1 Timothy 6:9. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 730.2}

“He that doeth these things shall never be moved.” Let a person live fully up to the 15th psalm, and he will surely have eternal life. He who does so, will be a perfect man; he will fulfill all the law. “Why,” says the objector, “you don’t take Christ into the account of all.” Not so fast. We said that the one who should carry out the regulations laid down in psalm 15 would have eternal life, and in so saying we only echoed the words of the inspired writer. But who can fulfill them? Says Christ, “Without me ye can do nothing.” John 15:5. The unrenewed man would find it an utter impossibility to do what is required. Even his best endeavors would come so far short of the standard as to sink him into perdition. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 730.3}

More than this, supposing that it were possible for a man to do in his own strength what is required; where could the person be found who has ever come anywhere near the standard? With the exception of Christ, no such person ever lived on earth. Then how much profit could one derive from his future good deeds, even if he could perform them? Not a particle. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. He whose sins are forgiven is a new creature in Christ, and it is not till then that he can perform works that are acceptable to God. “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Ephesians 2:8-10. E. J. W. {SITI December 3, 1885, p. 730.4}

**“Sabbath-School Notes” The Signs of the Times, 11, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 2**

**Sabbath-School Notes**

The lesson for this week is a continuation of the recapitulation begun last week, and we know not how to present it better than to give the lesson entire, with our comments in the form of answers to the several questions. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.1}

1. During the period covered by the kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia and Grecia, what form of religious worship prevailed? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.2}

Paganism was the prevailing religion, not only from the rise of the kingdom of Babylon, but from the fall of Adam. The worship of idols soon almost entirely displaced the worship of God, so that the light of truth was at times wholly obscured. The moral condition of the world under heathenism is very briefly and delicately described by Paul in Romans 1:22-32; Ephesians 4:17-19; 5:11, 12. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.3}

2. What name is given to this form of religion in Daniel 8:11-13? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.4}

Paganism is referred to in Daniel 8:11-13 by the term “the daily,” not “the daily *sacrifices*,” but “the daily desolation.” The term “daily” or “continual” is aptly applied to it, since it was for ages the continual form of worship. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.5}

3. How long did this religion prevail after Rome became supreme? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.6}

For about five hundred years after Rome acquired universal dominion, paganism continued to be the prevailing religion. In Constantine’s time (A.D. 311-337) it ceased to be *the* religion of the empire; but it did not wholly lose its place as the State religion until about two hundred years later. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.7}

4. What religion then gained the ascendancy? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.8}

5. Who was the first Roman emperor that favored the Christian religion? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.9}

6. When did this emperor reign? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.10}

Those three questions we answer together, for the sake of convenience. The Christian religion was that which superseded paganism in the Roman world. When we say “the Christian religion,” we do not mean the Christian religion as we find it portrayed in the gospels, but a corrupted form of Christianity. “Pure religion and undefiled before God,” has never met with general acceptance in this world, and will never be the *prevailing* religion until sin and sinners are destroyed, and the new heavens and new earth appear, “wherein dwelleth reighteousness.” {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.11}

Constantine is properly styled “the first Christian emperor.” He began to reign in a subordinate position in A.D. 306; in 311 A.D. he became sole emperor of Western Rome, and it is from this time that his conversion to Christianity is dated; ten years later, in 323 A.D., he became sole emperor of the Roman Empire, or of the world. He died in A.D. 337. For a brief but vivid view of his life, see “Encyclopaedia Britannica,” art. “Constantine.” When we say that he nominally accepted Christianity in A.D. 311, we have said all that can be said. Conceive of an autocrat with the vices of a heathen ruler and the name of a Christian, and you have a picture of “the first Christian emperor.” The following extract is a fair picture: {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.12}

“The sublime theory of the gospel had made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the understanding of Constantine himself. He pursued the great object of his ambition through the dark and bloody paths of war and policy; and after the victory, he abandoned himself, without moderation, to the abuse of his fortune. Instead of asserting his just superiority above the imperfect heroism and profane philosophy of Trajan and the Antonines, the mature age of Constantine forfeited the reputation which he had acquired in his youth. As he gradually advanced in knowledge of truth, he proportionately declined in the practice of virtue; and the same year of his reign in which he convened the council of Nice [A.D. 325], was polluted by the execution, or rather murder, of his eldest son.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 17*. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.13}

7. How did he try to make the Christian religion popular? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.14}

8. How did he cause unprincipled men to profess to be Christians, when they were really heathen at heart? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.15}

The mere fact that the emperor professed Christianity would tend to make it popular; but the form which would be popular can be imagined by the character of Constantine, and the means which he used to propagate his religion, which are described by the historian as follows: {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.16}

“By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto retarded the progress of Christianity; and its active and numerous ministers received a free permission, a liberal encouragement, to recommend the salutary truths of revelation by every argument which could affect the reason or piety of mankind. 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 a future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace. The cities which signalized a forward zeal by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donations; and the new capital of the East gloried in the singular advantage that Constantinople was never profaned by the worship of idols. As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, or power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that in one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of woman and children, and that a white garment with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor of every convert.”-*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 18*. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.17}

9. How was the church affected by such a course? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.18}

As might be expected when men by the thousands gave a nominal assent to Christianity without the slightest knowledge of its spirit, the church speedily became very corrupt. Mosheim, the learned church historian, says that in the second century “a large part of the Christian observances and institutions” “had the aspect of heathen mysteries.”-*Eccl. Hist., Book 1, century 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 5*. If this was the case in the second century, how much more would it be true in the fifth? In describing the church after Constantine’s “conversion,” Mosheim says:- {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.19}

“Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which originated partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites and combined them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion.... Further, the public supplications by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed and the same privileges assigned as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations before the advent of Christ. Images, indeed, were as yet but rare, and statues did not exist. And shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt that the worship of the martyrs-with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the Christian cause-was modeled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods. From these specimens, the intelligent reader will be able to conceive how much injury resulted to Christianity from the peace and repose procured by Constantine, and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion.”-*Eccl. Hist., Book 2, cent. 4, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 2*. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.20}

10. What disgraceful course was taken about the middle of the fifth century by several of the leading bishops? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.21}

11. How was this question decided in A.D. 533? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.22}

12. When and how was the supremacy of the bishop of Rome fully established? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.23}

During the fifth century there was a great contest among the leading bishops of the churches, each struggling for the supremacy. Among the most active in this disgraceful strife were the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In A.D. 533, the matter was decided by a decree of the Emperor Justinian, declaring the pope of Rome to be head over all the churches. The three powers that opposed this decree were the three horns that were to be plucked up by the little horn of Daniel 7. The last of these was conquered in A.D. 538, and the great papal hierarchy was then established? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.24}

13. What is this papal religion called in Daniel 8:13? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.25}

It is justly styled “the *transgression* of desolation.” {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.26}

14. How is pagan Rome symbolized in the seventh of Daniel? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.27}

15. How is papal Rome symbolized in the same chapter? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.28}

In the seventh of Daniel, pagan Rome is symbolized by the “dreadful and terrible” beast with ten horns (verse 7), and papal Rome is symbolized by the same beast after the “little horn” with the eyes of a man, and the mouth speaking great things, had arisen and plucked up three horns. The “little horn” itself represents the papacy. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.29}

16. What is meant by the terms “pagan Rome” and “papal Rome”? {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.30}

“Pagan Rome” means Rome when idolatry was the prevailing religion; “papal Rome” applies to the same power after Christianity had nominally become the religion of the empire. The word “pagan” is from the Latin *pagus*, meaning a district, from which comes *paganus*, belonging to the country. Changes are made much more rapidly in cities than they are in the country or remote villages; and so it happened that for some time after Christianity had been accepted by the court of Constantine, and by the inhabitants of the larger cities, the people residing in the country still worshiped idols. Therefore those who worshiped idols received the appellation of “pagans.” This term was not used to designate the heathen until the first centuries of the Christian era. “Papal” is derived from *papa*, father, a name applied to the bishops of Rome, from whence comes also the name “pope.” {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.31}

Lack of space makes it impossible for us to give the remaining questions with specific answers. Specimens of the “great words” which the Romish Church has spoken against the Most High have been given in the SIGNS in notes on previous lessons. We have also given quotations to show that the prediction that the little horn should “wear out the saints of the Most High,” has been fulfilled by the Roman Catholic Church. We have seen how its power was curtailed in 1798, at the close of the 1260 years (time and times and the dividing of time), and that its blasphemous pretensions have increased until the present time. This check that was put upon the papacy is represented in Revelation 13:3 by the statement that one of the heads received a deadly wound. The prophet saw this deadly wound healed, so that “all the world wondered after the beast.” This was partially fulfilled when Pius VII. was set in the papal chair, in place of the pope who had been deposed two years before. Its complete fulfillment, however, is yet future; for the prophet saw that the 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. A complete restoration to its former power yet awaits the papacy. But its triumphing will be short; for the Lord will soon come, and destroy “that wicked,” utterly consuming it (Daniel 7:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:8), and then “the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.” Daniel 7:27. E. J. W. {SITI December 10, 1885, p. 742.32}

**“The Everlasting Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 11, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.**

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 9**

**The Everlasting Kingdom**

When is the everlasting kingdom to be set up? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.1}

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.” Daniel 2:44. “In the days of *these* kings.” These words occur at the close of the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the great image. The kings (kingdoms) referred to cannot refer to the four universal monarchies,-Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome,-because these follow in succession, and it would be impossible for one kingdom to be set up in the days of each of them. The expression can refer to nothing else than the kingdoms into which Rome was divided, and which are referred to in Daniel 2:41. This division was completed before the close of the fifth century A.D. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.2}

The expression, “in the days of *these* kings,” shows conclusively that in no sense was the kingdom of God set up at the time of Christ’s first advent. There was at that time only one kingdom-Rome-and it exercised universal dominion. There was then nothing to indicate that the proud empire would ever crumble into fragments. This fact alone is sufficient to show that the setting up of the kingdom was not in the days of Christ or his apostles. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.3}

By what special symbol is it represented? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.4}

The verse above quoted says that the kingdom of the God of Heaven “shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms.” In the statement of the dream, Daniel 2:31-35, we are told that the stone which was cut out without hands, “smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces,” and that “then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them.” When we remember that these various metals represent the kingdoms of earth, which are to be broken in pieces and consumed by the kingdom of God, we know that in this prophecy, the kingdom of God is represented by the stone. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.5}

Where is the image to be smitten by this stone? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.6}

What part of the world’s temporal history is represented by the feet of the image? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.7}

“Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his *feet*.” Daniel 2:34. It is self-evident that the feet of the image represent the last portion of this world’s history, or, rather, of the history of nations on this earth. We say this is self-evident, because in the time represented by the feet, the image is to be totally demolished and consumed. After it is smitten, no place is to be found for its fragments, showing that from that time the nations of earth are to have no place in history. It is evident, then, that this smiting of the image on the feet is the thing to which the disciples referred when they asked Christ, “What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?” Matthew 24:3. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.8}

Did either of the four great kingdoms utterly destroy, or exterminate, the kingdoms that ruled before it? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.9}

Repeat a scripture that seems to allude to this fact. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.10}

In speaking of the fourth and last beast, Daniel says: “I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.” Daniel 7:11. But in direct contrast with this, he speaks of the three preceding beasts as follows: “As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.” Daniel 7:12. This shows that none of the kingdoms are utterly destroyed until the last.When Cyrus conquered Babylon, the Medo-Persian kings began to rule over the territory and subjects over which the Babylonian kings had formerly ruled. It was the same way, also, when Alexander conquered the Persians. When one universal empire succeeded another, the world simply changed rulers. Had it been otherwise, the conqueror would not have had much dominion. The characteristics of the conquered nation modified to a great extent the nation which subdued it. This is plainly indicated in the symbol of the fourth kingdom, as seen by John (Revelation 13:1-10). That beast was like a leopard (third kingdom); its feet were as the feet of a bear (second kingdom); and its mouth as the mouth of a lion (first kingdom). Besides these characteristics, it had the seven heads and ten horns peculiar to Rome, and did the same work that is ascribed to the fourth beast of Daniel 7. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.11}

These facts of Scripture are in harmony with the statement in Daniel 2, that when the stone smites the image, the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold are all broken to pieces together. It is in the days of “these kings,” the ten divisions of the Roman Empire, that the smiting is done, but the consequent destruction takes in all that remains of all the preceding kingdoms. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.12}

What is to be the effect of this smiting? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.13}

When will this utter destruction take place? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.14}

Daniel 2:34, 35, 44, which have already been quoted, answer question 8. All earthly kingdoms are to be destroyed utterly, to make room for the everlasting kingdom of God. This smiting is many times referred to in the Bible. God, speaking through the prophet David, says to Christ: “Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter’s vessel.” Psalm 2:8, 9. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.15}

The prophet Habakkuk had a view of this terrible dashing to pieces of the nations, and he describes it thus: “The mountains saw thee, and they trembled: the overflowing of the water passed by; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger.” Habakkuk 2:10-12. Compare the last clause with Daniel 2:35. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.16}

Isaiah also bears testimony similar to that given by David: “And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, ... and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall *smite the earth* with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.” Isaiah 11:1-4. Compare 2 Thessalonians 2:8. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.17}

And lastly we read the graphic prophetic description given by John: “And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.... And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him.... These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” Revelation 19:11-21. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.18}

Let the reader carefully compare these texts, and he will be convined that they refer to the same time to which Peter does, when he says: “But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition of ungodly men*.” 2 Peter 3:7. And this is, in part, the fulfilling of the promise of Christ’s coming. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.19}

But the destruction of the wicked of earth is only a part of the work to be done. Habakkuk says, immediately following the words before quoted from him: “Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed.” Immediately following the statement quoted from Isaiah, is a description of a wonderful state of peace, closing with these words: “They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for *the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord*, as the waters cover the sea.” Isaiah 11:9. And this agrees with the statement in Daniel 2:35, that, after the destruction of the image, the stone, representing the kingdom of God, “became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.” This shows conclusively that the kingdom of God is to be finally established on this earth; that it is to be as real and literal a kingdom as were the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian; that it is not yet set up, because when it is set up it immediately consumes the kingdoms of earth; and that it is to be absolutely universal, because it is to fill *the whole earth*, and no place is to be found for any opposing power. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.20}

How will the earth itself be purified from the effects of sin and the curse? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.21}

“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.” 2 Peter 3:10. That this results in the purification of the earth, is evident from verse 13: “Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.22}

How will all the righteous, both the dead and the living, escape this terrible destruction? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.23}

Habakkuk says that when the Lord brings these terrible judgments upon the earth, he goes forth for the salvation of his people. Since the preservation of his people is the object, they may fearlessly “abide under the shadow of the Almighty.” Resting on the promise of Jehovah, that, “Because thou hast made, the Lord... thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling” (Psalm 91:5-10), the righteous can sing: “God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.” Psalm 46:1, 2. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.24}

But the people of God are not to be left on the earth during the great conflagration which destroys the wicked and melts the elements. “For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. As the trumpet sounds, the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are likewise changed from mortal to immortal, “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye” (1 Corinthians 15:51, 52); so that when they go to be with Christ, and to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Matthew 25:34), they are equal unto the angels, for they cannot die any more. And thus is fulfilled the statement in Daniel 2:44: “And the kingdom shall not be left to other people.” {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 758.25}

Not forever are the people of God to remain away from this earth. Says John: “And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.” Revelation 20:4, 5. Here the first resurrection, the resurrection of the righteous, is brought to view, with the statement that a thousand years is to intervene between that and the resurrection of the wicked. During that time the earth is in a state of chaos, an abyss, as it was in the beginning. Isaiah describes it thus: “Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof.” “The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word.” Isaiah 24:1, 3. And Jeremiah says: “I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place [was] a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end.” Jeremiah 4:23-27. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 759.1}

During this period of desolation, those who have had part in the first resurrection, upon whom the second death has no power (Revelation 20:6), are sitting on thrones of judgment (Revelation 20:4), judging the world and wicked angels. 1 Corinthians 6:1-3. They are in the kingdom of God, because they are in the New Jerusalem, the capital of that kingdom. The gates of the “strong city” will have been opened, “that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth” might enter in. Isaiah 26:1, 2. At the close of the thousand years, when “the holy city, New Jerusalem,” comes down “from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband” (Revelation 21:2); the wicked dead are then raised, and the prophetic declaration is, that “they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them.” Revelation 20:9. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 759.2}

This devouring is the same as the destruction described in the nineteenth chapter, a portion of which has been quoted. It is the same as the casting of the tares into the fire, spoken of by Christ in Matthew 13; and when this has been done, “Then shall the kingdom shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.” {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 759.3}

Reader, would you be one of the happy subjects of that kingdom? If so, you must do the will of God, and that means that you must keep his holy law; for only “the righteous nation which keepeth the truth” shall have a place in that kingdom. “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.” Revelation 22:14. E. J. W. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 759.4}

**“Principles and Precepts” The Signs of the Times, 11, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The word “law” is derived from the same root as the words “lie” and “lay,” and primarily has the same meaning. “A law is that which is laid, set, or fixed, like statute, constitution, from Lat. *Statuere.”-Webster*. And in harmony with this, the same authority gives as the first definition of the word “law,” “a rule of order or conduct established by authority.” It is a favorite saying with those who would make void the law of God while professing allegiance to his word, that the ten commandments are good, but that they are adapted only to fallen beings, and hence cannot bind angels nor redeemed saints, nor even people in this world who have been converted. Let us see how such a theory agrees with the definition of law. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 760.1}

We will suppose that the angels are free from law, and that redeemed saints are to have a like freedom. In that case there would be nothing “laid down” for their guidance-no rule or order of conduct established by authority. In fact, there would be no authority, and each one would act independently of all the others. There would then exist in Heaven the same thing that would exist on earth if there were no law, namely, anarchy; for that means “without rule.” But “God is not the author of confusion,” and therefore such a state of things cannot exist in Heaven, and if not in Heaven, then of course not among the saints still on earth. The case may be stated thus: 1. When there is no law there is anarchy and confusion; there can be nothing else. 2. Confusion cannot exist among God’s people, whether in Heaven or on earth. 3. Therefore, the people of God are always and everywhere subject to his law. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.1}

Seeing that it will not do to claim that any beings are absolutely free from law, the enemies of the truth have invented a specious theory, with which, unfortunately, many firm believers in the law of God have been captivated. It is this: “The law,” they say, “as it exists in the ten commandments, is adapted only to fallen beings. These commandments hang on the two great principles of love to God and love to man, and it was these principles alone that existed before the fall, and these alone will be the law for the redeemed.” And some there are who claim that these *principles* are all the law there is now for Christians. We regard this theory as more dangerous than the one which claims that all law is abolished; for it is the same thing in reality, while it has the *appearance* of great deference to the truth of God. Let us examine it. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.2}

It is utterly impossible for anyone to be guided by an abstract principle. Certain principles may have a controlling influence on our lives, but they must be embodied in definite precepts. As an illustration, we will relate a portion of a conversation which we once had with a gentleman who claimed that Christians have nothing to do with the ten commandments. The question was asked him, Is there, then, nothing for Christians to do? *Answer*-“Yes, they must love the Lord.” Very good, but how are they to show that they love the Lord? *Answer*-“By doing what he tells them to do.” Well, what is it that contains specific statements of what the Lord requires us to do to show our love for him? *Answer*-“Young man, I am older than you are.” The reader will wonder, as we did, what bearing this had on the subject. It showed that the man saw that the only possible *answer* was, “The law of God,” an answer which would not agree with his theory, hence he chose to give none. But the illustration serves to show that principles, to be obeyed, must be embodied in precepts. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.3}

Says the beloved disciple: “This is the love of God, that we keep is commandments.” 1 John 5:3. So when we read that the first great commandment is, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” (Matthew 22:37), we know that it means nothing more nor less than that it is our first and highest duty to keep, both in letter and in spirit, all those commandments which define our duty to God. In no other way can we show that we love him. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.4}

Suppose for a moment that a man were placed here on earth with nothing to serve as a rule of life except the statement that he must love God supremely and his neighbor as himself. He sets out with a firm determination to do his whole duty. But erelong he is found doing something which God abhors. We will suppose that he is adoring the sun and moon. When reproved for this, he might well reply, “I did not know that I was doing anything wrong; nothing was said to me about this matter. I had a feeling of love and gratitude to God, and did not know how to manifest it in any better way than by paying homage to the most glorious of his created works.” By what law could the man be condemned? He could not justly be condemned, because the will of the Creator on that point had not been made known to him, and he could not reasonably be expected to know the will of God if it had not been revealed. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.5}

It will be seen by a very little consideration, that to put a man on the earth with nothing but a general command to love God, and at the same time to expect him to do nothing displeasing to God, would be to assume that the man had infinite wisdom. For God is infinite; and if a man, without being told, finds out what God requires, it can only be because he can comprehend infinity. But this is an impossibility. “Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?” No indeed; the creature that could know the mind of God any further than it was directly revealed by him, has never existed. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.6}

Then since, as we have conclusively proved, there must be a law for all creatures, and since this law must be definitely expressed, and since, moreover, the whole duty of man is to love God above all things, and his neighbor as himself, we are shut up to the conclusion that the ten commandments always have been and always will be the rule of life for all created intelligences. In direct support of this, Solomon says, “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” Ecclesiastes 12:13. This settles the matter, at least for the present time. John also says that the love of God is to keep his commandments; but it will be our duty to love God to all eternity; therefore it will always be our duty to keep the commandments of God. And it makes it no less a duty because it becomes our highest pleasure. To the natural man, duty is irksome; the object of making him a new creature in Christ, is that it may be a pleasure for him to do his duty. Paul says that God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, thus condemning sin in the flesh, in order that the “righteousness [requirements] of the law might be fulfilled in us.” Romans 8:3, 4. The object of the gospel is to make us like unto Christ, who said, “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:8. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.7}

In addition to the above, we offer the words of the prayer which Christ has commanded us to pray to God: “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.” Matthew 6:10. Now the will of God is his law. See Romans 2:17, 18; Psalm 40:8. We are taught by this prayer, then, that when the kingdom of God is established on this earth, God’s law will be kept here even as it is now kept in Heaven. And David says by inspiration, that the angels that excel in strength “do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word.” Psalm 103:20. That is, they are anxious and delight to keep God’s commandments. Duty is with them a pleasure. And when God’s kingdom comes, we also, if permitted to become subjects of it, will delight to do God’s will, and will keep all his commandments, of which “every one” “endureth forever.” We shall then do perfectly what we now are (or should be) striving to do in spite of the weakness of the flesh. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.8}

This subject will be continued in another article, in which we shall consider the objection that there are certain commandments of the Decalogue which angels or glorified saints could not violate if they wished to, and that therefore it is absurd to suppose that obedience to those commandments is required of them. E. J. W. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.9}

**“The High-License Delusion” The Signs of the Times, 11, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following we find credited to the San Francisco *Alta:*- {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.10}

“The only bulwark so far thrown up against the encroachment of prohibition is the high license. Prohibition has outlawed beer and wine in Maine, Vermont, Iowa, and Kansas. Wisconsin, with her great brewing interest, has only saved herself by adopting high license. Nebraska, with her enormous distilleries and breweries, has taken the same shelter. Southern States, like Georgia and Texas, have their feet upon the very threshold of prohibition. Will the dealers in California hear and heed in time?” {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.11}

This wail does not sound much as though high license were the grand, desirable thing which many misguided temperance people imagine it to be. There is a large number of influential men in California who are earnestly striving for what they call “high license.” Will they hear and heed in time? or will they persist in throwing up this “bulwark against the encroachment of prohibition”? {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.12}

The first thing to do in dealing with the liquor traffic is to determine its character Is it wholly good and beneficial? or are there some evils connected with it? or is it an unmixed evil? The first question will be universally answered in the negative. No one will claim that there are no dark features to the liquor traffic. Well, then, is it partly good? This must be answered in the affirmative, if it can be shown that the use of liquor has any tendency to make men better, or wiser, or more kind to their families, or wealthier, or that it in any way conduces to their real happiness. Not one of these things can be claimed for it. On the contrary, it is brutalizing and degrading in its tendency; ignorance and poverty everywhere accompany it; and misery of every description is caused by it. The use of liquor is a promoter of vice in every form; and it is safe to say that more murders and suicides result from it than from all other causes combined. It cannot be denied that the use of alcoholic liquors is evil, and only evil, continually. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.13}

Now what about licensing a traffic that is so unmitigated an evil? What does the word “license” mean? It means liberty. To license the sale of liquor, is to give men full liberty to dispense that which will entail all the evils above enumerated, and thousands more. Why not with just as good reason license murder outright? It will be claimed, of course, that those who sell liquor do not murder anybody. No, they do not directly; but it is well known that what they sell cannot possibly produce any good results, and tends directly to all manner of evil. An apologist will doubtless say that we do not prohibit the sale of fire-arms, and men often buy them with the sole design of committing murder. The case is not a parallel one; for weapons may be, and most commonly are, used for inoffensive purposes. If it were impossible to use them for any other purpose than that of murder, we think there would be a quite general demand for the prohibition of their sale. As it is, we are not championing the sale of fire-arms. Even if fire-arms were also an unmitigated evil, the question of their sale would have no bearing on the liquor traffic; for the existence of one evil is no just reason for the existence of another. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.14}

But the friends of license say we must not consider it as a *permission*, but as a *tax*. That is a distinction with no difference. We must consider it just as it is. A liquor license is simply a permission to certain men to sell that which will ruin their fellows, but with the provision that the profits of the unholy traffic are to be divided with the Government. And so, in spite of all casuistry, it is a fact that the Government becomes a partner in crime. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.15}

Whether any kind of license will serve as a step toward temperance, may be easily determined by a moment’s thought. People who are addicted to the use of liquor will get it if it is to be had. Then, if the license tax be placed so high that the small dealers cannot afford to continue the business, the result will be that instead of having a given quantity of liquor sold by one hundred dealers, we shall have the same quantity sold by seventy-five or less. But since these have to pay a heavier tax than before, they will make greater efforts to increase the profits, either by increased sales, or by adulterating the liquor still more, so that nothing is gained in the way of temperance. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.16}

The great argument which misguided temperance men urge in support of high license, is that public sentiment is not ready for prohibition, but that high license can be carried, and therefore we must take when we can get. True, and if they would lower the price of the license, they could carry their measure by a still greater majority. The question to be considered is not, What measure will secure the largest support? but, What measure is best? Let the latter question be settled, and then work for the support of what is right. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.17}

“But it is impossible to stop the sale of liquor entirely, even by the most stringent prohibitory laws; therefore the best thing to do is to secure as much revenue from it as we can.” This is another argument often used, but it is very fallacious. There are places where the sale of liquor is absolutely prohibited, and what has been done may be done. It is true that in large cities it is next to impossible to eradicate the evil; but the same thing may be said of all crime. We have a prohibitory law against murder, with severe penalties attached; but it has never been effectual in causing murders to cease. In our large cities the law is violated daily; yet no one thinks of licensing the evil. It is very certain that there are far fewer murders than there would be if there were no prohibitory law against murder; and no one can doubt that if the law were abolished, and any form of license substituted, murder would be rampant. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 761.18}

When the question of the resumption of specie payments was under discussion, a prominent statesman solved the problem by saying, “The way to resume is to resume.” So the way to prohibit is to prohibit. It is true that it would take more time and a greater effort to secure prohibition than it would to secure even a very high license; but when secured something would be accomplished. Nothing is ever gained by parleying and compromising with evil. Vigorous measures alone are of any value, whatever the evil against which we are striving. We are firm in the belief that absolute prohibition is what all temperance people should labor for, no matter how impossible it may seem to secure such a result. The extract quoted at the beginning of this article, followed as it was by the statement, “We are opposed to prohibition,” should open the eyes of temperance people who are courting “high” license. We do not doubt that license is a practical measure, but we have no faith in the results of such practice. It would not be so difficult a matter to secure prohibition as it seems, if men were in earnest. But whether difficult or not, makes no difference. We are not to abandon a good measure for a bad one simply because the bad one may be more easily executed. What we consider the proper method to adopt to secure prohibition may be discussed at another time. E. J. W. {SITI December 17, 1885, p. 762.1}

**“The Law of God-for Whom Made” The Signs of the Times, 11, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, under the head of “Principles and Precepts,” we showed that not simply the great principles of love, but the embodiment of those principles in the ten commandments, are the rule of life for all men in all ages; that the law is adapted to pure and holy beings, and is kept even by the angels in Heaven. After one additional thought on this point, we shall proceed to notice in detail some things that are offered as objections to this view. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.1}

The difference between sinful man and the law of God, is shown by Paul in the following words: “For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.” Romans 7:14. Between things spiritual and things carnal there is no possibility for the slightest union, as is proved by Galatians 5:17: “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other.” And therefore, as a consequence of this implacable enmity, the words of Paul follow very naturally: “So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” This last statement is made more emphatic in Romans 8:7: “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.2}

That by the term “law” Paul refers to the ten commandments, and not to certain abstract principles, is easily seen from Romans 7:7 and 2:17-23. The fact, then, is made plain that men cannot meet the requirements of the ten commandments, because the commandments are spiritual, and men are carnal. “They that are in the flesh cannot please God.” Romans 8:8. Now it is required of all men that they please God, and therefore the apostle proceeds to show how it may be done: “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” Romans 8:9. A man in whom the Spirit of God dwells is certainly spiritual, and therefore just in harmony with the law of God, which is also spiritual. And so we see that instead of the law being adapted only to sinful beings, it is especially adapted to the righteous; for they are the only ones who can continue in its requirements. It is the keeping of the ten commandments (which can be done only by those who are “in Christ”) that makes men spiritual; when they cease to keep the law, they cease to be spiritual. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.3}

In supposed opposition to the position which we have taken, is 1 Timothy 1:9, 10: “Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.” Whoever imagines that this text means that a righteous man is not under obligations to keep the law, has never read more than the first clause. Since the law is “made for” those who steal, lie, kill, commit adultery, blaspheme, etc., we should gather that it forbids all those things, and so it does. Then according to the common supposition, the righteous, for whom the law is *not* “made,” are not prohibited from these practices! A necessary conclusion which is so absurd, shows plainly that the premises are wrong. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.4}

But if it is the duty of Christians to keep the law, how shall we understand Paul’s statement that the law is “made” for the wicked, and not for the righteous? We can answer this question in no better way than by quoting a portion of Dr. Clarke’s comment on 1 Timothy 1:9:- {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.5}

“He [the apostle] does not say that the law was not MADE for the righteous man; but *ou keoti*, it does not LIE against a righteous man, because he does not transgress against it; but it *lies against* the wicked; for such, as the apostle mentions, have broken it, and grievously too, and are condemned by it. The word *keittai, lies*, refers to the custom of writing laws on boards, and hanging them up in public places, within reach of every man, that they might be read by all; thus all would see against whom the law *lay*.” {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.6}

This is exactly in harmony with the primal meaning of the word law,-“something laid,”-as given in the article last week. The law is “laid” for the benefit of all; it lies *against* the man who violates it, and crushes him if he persists in his disobedience; but it does not lie *against* the righteous, because they “walk in the law of the Lord.” There is no opposition between them and the law; to them the law is indeed “the way of peace,” because they delight in it. But let one of the righteous ones step out of this way, and that step will bring the law *against* him. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.7}

And now to the statement that Christians are in duty bound to keep the ten commandments, and that, in fact, that is the badge of their discipleship, we must add another statement which necessarily follows, namely, that this delightful duty will be theirs throughout eternity, just as it has been that of the angels ever since they were created. “Angels that excel in strength” do the commandments of God, “hearkening unto the voice of his word.” Psalm 103:20. And when the kingdom of God is established upon earth, God’s will (the ten commandments) will be done on earth even as it is now done in Heaven. Matthew 6:10. As long as the throne of God endures, the ten commandments will be the law by which God rules his vast Government, the foundation of his throne. E. J. W. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.8}

**“How Does It Happen” The Signs of the Times, 11, 49.**

E. J. Waggoner

When people for the first time hear or read the truth concerning the Sabbath, the nature of man, the coming of the Lord, and other Bible doctrines held by Seventh-day Adventists, they frequently ask, “If these things are so plainly taught in the Bible, why is it that they have not been taught by Bible students in past ages? Why is it that Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and other learned and pious theologians did not see these doctrines? {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.9}

A satisfactory answer to these questions may easily be given. We must consider the circumstances under which those men began their labors. We must remember that when the Reformation began, the Bible had been for several hundred years a proscribed book. The art of printing was unknown, and books were necessarily copied by hand. This was a tedious process, and made it impossible for poor people to own them. Besides this, the only copies of the Bible in existence were in the original Greek and Hebrew, or in Latin; and when we remember that Greek and Hebrew were rarely taught, even in the universities, and that few learned men had any knowledge of those languages, Latin being the only language of educated people, we see that the number of people who could use the Bible, even had they possessed a copy, was very limited. Still further, when we remember that the few manuscript copies of the Bible that were in existence were the property of the Catholic Church, which had no interest in circulating them among the people, but on the contrary, kept these copies carefully concealed, we see that it was next to impossible for anybody to have any personal acquaintance with the word of God. Says D’Aubigne:- {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.10}

“The priests having taken into their own hands the disposing [of] a salvation which belonged only to God, had thereby secured a sufficient hold on the respect of the people. What need had they [the priests] to study sacred learning? It was no longer their office to explain the Scriptures, but to grant letters of indulgence; and for the fulfilling of that ministry, it was unnecessary to have acquired any great learning. In country parts, says Wimpheling, they appointed as preachers poor wretches whom they had taken from beggary, and who had been cooks, musicians, huntsmen, stable-boys, and even worse. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.11}

“The superior clergy themselves were sunk in great ignorance. A bishop of Danfeldt congratulated himself on never having learned Greek or Hebrew. The monks asserted that all heresies arose from these languages, but especially from the Greek. ‘Greek,’ continued he, ‘is a modern language but recently invented, and against which we must be upon our guard. As to Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that whoever studies that immediately becomes a Jew.’ ... Thomas Linacer, a learned and celebrated divine, had never read the New Testament. Drawing near his end (in 1524), he called for it, but quickly threw it from him with an oath because his eye had caught the words, ‘But I say unto you, Swear not at all.’ ‘Either this is not the gospel,’ said he, ‘or we are not Christians.’ Even the schools of theology in Paris did not scruple to declare before the Parliament. ‘There is an end of religion if the study of Hebrew and Greek is permitted.’ {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.12}

“If here and there among the clergy some learning existed, it was not in sacred literature. The Ciceronians of Italy affect great contempt for the Bible on account of its style. Men who arrogated to themselves the title of priests of Christ’s church, translated the words of the Holy Ghost into the style of Virgil and of Horace to accommodate them to the ears of men of taste. The Cardinal Bemlo wrote always instead of ‘the Holy Spirit,’ ‘the breath of the celestial zephyr;’ for ‘remission of sins’ he substituted ‘the pity of the manes and of the gods;’ and instead of ‘Christ the Son of God,’ ‘Minerva sprung from the brows of Jupiter.’ Finding, one day, the respectable Sadoletus employed on the translation of the epistle to the Romans, ‘Leave these childish productions,’ said he, ‘such puerilities do not become a sensible man.’” {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.13}

It was only a few weeks ago that a Catholic priest in Montreal, speaking of the Protestant Bible, said to his congregation: “I want to be understood that the Church forbids you to read those Bibles. If you have any of them in your house, burn them; and if you do not want to burn them, bring them to me, and I will burn them.” {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.14}

It was amidst influences like these that the Reformation began. Luther was twenty years old before he had even seen a copy of the Bible. Now if any one wonders why he did not, in his lifetime, grasp all the truths which it contains, let him try an experiment: Let him give the Bible to a man who has never seen the book, and see how long it will take him to thoroughly understand it. Let the reader consider his own case, and see how great an understanding he has of the Bible; then remember that there can scarcely be a parallel to Luther’s case nowadays, because the influence of the Bible is everywhere. The people who have never read it have met its teachings in books, or perhaps in sermons, or in their intercourse with other people. When we think of these things, instead of wondering that Luther did not understand more of the Bible, we are lost in astonishment that he was able to grasp so many of its truths as he did. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.15}

When we come to the time of Wesley, we find that he had a still better understanding of the Bible than Luther had. This was not because he was a more talented or a more devoted man than Luther, but because he had better advantages. He had the benefit of all of Luther’s study and experience, as well as of that of many other learned men. And as we come down a hundred years later, to our own time, it is no egotism to say that we may have a deeper insight into the truths of the Bible than Wesley had, because we have the aid of his research, and that of Bible students since his time. It would indeed be a cause for shame to any intelligent Bible student if he did not profit by the light thrown upon the word by those men of God. Besides this, we must remember that there are special truths for special occasions. Peter speaks of the “present truth.” There is such a truth for every age. The special truth for the time of Luther was justification by faith. The people were swallowed up in dead forms and useless ceremonies, and needed instruction in the first principles of the gospel, of which the world was totally ignorant. All the preaching needed to be directed to that one thing. As the Bible became a common book, and the doctrine of justification by faith and not by works was more generally understood, other points could be brought in. As we come down to the early portion of this century, we see a special prominence given to the doctrine of Christ’s second coming. Ministers of all denominations seemed moved by a common impulse to study the prophecies, and to teach them to the people. A little later the doctrine of eternal life only in Christ, and that received at the resurrection, began to be preached quite extensively. This was a natural consequence of the preaching of the second advent. And still later we find special attention given to the law of God, and the Sabbath, until now the truth on this point has been circulated throughout the world. To be sure, there have been a few people in all generations who have held all, or nearly all, of these truths; but the attention of the people as a whole has been directed to only one new truth at a time. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 777.16}

Our Lord, in speaking to his disciples, recognized the fact that the human mind must be led into truth step by step when he said: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.” John 16:12. It will be noticed, however, that while in different generations one truth has been made especially prominent, the truths which have been brought out in preceding generations are not ignored, but the new truths are added to them; and thus is fulfilled the statement that “the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” Proverbs 4:18. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 778.1}

It is not for us to spend time wondering why former generations did not have certain doctrines preached to them, but simply to inquire, Are these things so? This may be easily determined by the Bible, and we should, instead of questioning, rejoice that new light is given to us, and should walk in the light while we have the light, lest darkness come upon us. E. J. W. {SITI December 24, 1885, p. 778.2}