**“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

One of the peculiarities of the human mind is that while it readily grasps a pleasing story or a fable, it refuses to accept truth until it is compelled to. So strong is this tendency toward error, that mental philosophers are obliged to take it into account. One of Bacon’s rules for avoiding erroneous conclusions is the following: “In general, let the student of nature take this as a rule, that whatever the mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion.” The converse would teach that truth will naturally be repelled and rejected. And this is just what the Bible says: “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.” 1 Corinthians 2:14. “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Romans 8:7. “For out of the heart proceed naturally evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” Matthew 15:19. These things are directly opposed to the law of God; and therefore, as a general thing, before men will accept the truth of the Bible concerning the law, every feature must be made perfectly clear. It is not enough that the principles be unfolded, but the harmony of all the texts bearing on the subject must be shown. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.1}

Accordingly we find it necessary to devote special explanation to Romans 6:14 and kindred texts. That text reads thus: “For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” So strong is the natural tendency to reject truth, that in spite of the overwhelming evidence already produced to show that the law is to all eternity binding upon every created rational being, many people will seize upon the expression, “Ye are not under the law,” and claim that there are some, at least, who have no duty to keep it. The readiness with which this view is seized and dwelt upon, should alone arouse suspicion as to its justice. But that there may be no chance for an honest doubt, we propose to examine not only this text, but every text which contains the phrase, “under the law.” {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.2}

In Romans 6:12 the apostle gives this exhortation: “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.” We have already learned that “sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. Therefore when the apostle tells us not to sin, he virtually tells us not to transgress the law. But this is an evidence that the law is binding upon us; and therefore we are assured that the statement in verse 14 cannot mean that the law has no claims upon us. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.3}

Again: The apostle continues: “Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.” Romans 6:13. This is but a repetition of the argument presented in the preceding paragraph. For he says we must not sin, that is, must not transgress the law; and again, that we must yield our members as instruments of righteousness. Now righteousness is obedience to the commandments of God. See Deuteronomy 6:25; Psalm 119:172; Isaiah 51:6, 7, which have already been explained. So the 13th verse is an exhortation not to transgress the law, and another exhortation to keep the law, both of which amount to the same thing, and show that the apostle recognizes the fact that the law is in existence and is to be obeyed. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.4}

Then comes the conclusion: “For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” Verse 14. Notice a few facts and necessary conclusions. 1. Since “sin is the transgression of the law,” the absence of sin must indicate obedience to the law. Therefore when the apostle says to any persons, “Sin shall not have dominion over you,” it is an evidence that they are keeping the law. 2. Those over whom sin has no dominion are those who are not under the law. “Sin shall not have dominion over you; *for ye* are not under the law.” The fact that sin has no dominion over them is *an evidence* that they are “not under the law.” Therefore, to be “*not* under the law” is equivalent to being free from the dominion of sin. 2. But we have already seen that to be free from the dominion of sin represents a state of obedience to the law; therefore, to say that one is “*not* under the law” is equivalent to saying that he is keeping the law. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.5}

These propositions will stand the test of any criticism, and they demonstrate that the apostle’s argument is based on the fact that the law is in full force, binding upon all, and that there are but two classes of people; those who keep the law, and those who transgress it. Those who keep the law are *not* under it, and of course those who transgress it *are* under it. In other words, those over whom sin has dominion are under the law; and those over whom sin has not dominion, are *not* under the law. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.6}

In harmony with this, the apostle continued “When then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.” Verse 15. That is, Shall we transgress the law because we are not under it? By no means. Keep from under it, by refraining from sin. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.7}

Thus far we have not shown the full force of the terms “under the law,” and “not under the law,” but have simply shown that they do not indicate that any persons are outside the jurisdiction of the law; that those “under the law” are violating it, while those “*not* under the law” are obeying it. The next two verses give us a clew to the real force of the terms. They read thus: “Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.” Verses 16, 17. “Whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness.” Sin, the transgression of the law, brings death. “For the wages of sin is death.” Romans 6:23. Every one who sins is under condemnation of death; and since, as has been abundantly proved, those who sin are “under the law,” it follows that “under the law” is an expression meaning, Under the condemnation of the law. Now see how aptly this meaning fits verses 14 and 15. Ye are not under the condemnation of the law, but under the grace of God. Shall we sin, then, because we are not by the law condemned to death? No, indeed; for that would at once bring us again under condemnation. Let us keep from sinning, and then we shall be no more condemned.How are we freed from the condemnation which the law brings? “Being justified freely by his [God’s] grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the commission of sins that are past.” Romans 3:24, 25. Having accepted Christ, his righteousness is imputed to us, which makes us clear before the law, and we are then subjects of the grace, or forbearance of God. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.8}

Take an illustration from human affairs. Here is a man that has been convicted of murder. The law of the State forbids murder, and therefore it condemns the man. The murderer is then “under the law,” because the hand of the law is upon him. Nothing that he can do will avert the threatened punishment. He may be sorry for his crime, and may resolve never to break the law again; but that will make no difference. He has already broken the law, and must suffer the penalty. But now, through the intercession of powerful friends, and because of his repentance and his promises of future obedience, the Governor is induced to pardon the criminal. Now he is no longer under the law,-a condemned prisoner,-but a free man. He is free by virtue of the grace or favor of the Governor. Therefore he may be said to be “under grace.” The question now arises. Is he at liberty to commit murder, because he is not under the law, but under the grace of the Governor? Everybody says, No, indeed. He is now under even greater obligation to keep the law than he was before, because he is the subject of the Governor’s special favor; and that favor would not have been extended to him, but for his promise to henceforth keep the law. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 263.9}

And as sin brought condemnation and death, so, when we are cleared from sin and condemnation, continued obedience, or righteousness, brings eternal life through Christ. This is indicated by the expression, servants “of obedience unto righteousness” (Romans 6:16) and, “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 264.1}

In closing this preliminary study of the term, “under the law,” the reader can profitably compare with what he has read, the following verses:- {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 264.2}

“Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 5:18-21. E. J. W. {SITI May 6, 1886, p. 264.3}

**“Logical Antinomianism” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

A writer for a professedly Adventist paper in the East, in an article against Sabbath-keeping, says of the ten commamdments: “Paul tells those who keep this law that they are ‘fallen from grace,’ which is equivalent to saying that there is no salvation in keeping the ten commandments.” We never yet came across any such statement in any of Paul’s writings, but we know that there are many people who, in their hatred of the Sabbath, teach just such stuff. There are people organized into churches, whose chief article of faith is that the law of God is abolished, although it is seldom that one is found bold enough to declare that all who keep the law of God are worthy of death. But this is the inevitable conclusion; for if God’s law has been abolished, then it must now be sin to follow the injunctions of that law. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.1}

Let us suppose that we have the records of a church whose foundation (?) is the belief that God’s law has been abolished, in which discipline is rigidly enforced. We should read something like this: “Brother A was charged with a crime of not having taken the name of God in vain for three months. A committee was appointed to labor with him, but he acknowledged the truth of the charge, and stubbornly refused to change his course, stating that he was determined always to hold the name of his Creator in reverence. Accordingly he was disfellowshiped as one irrevocably fallen from grace. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.2}

“Deacon B had in early life been well known as a horse jockey. After he joined the church his natural ability was exerted with tenfold diligence for the edifying of the body of Christ. So skillful had he become by long practice in chicanery, that no man could by any means get even with him in a bargain. He could cheat and lie with unblushing countenance. In short, he was an ornament to the church. But in an evil day he fell in with a traveling preacher, who persuaded him that the law of God is binding upon Christians, and from that time he became a different man. He began at once to restore to those whom he had defrauded. This caused suspicion in the minds of his brethren. Finally suspicion became certainty, when Brother X overheard him tell the truth in regard to an old horse which he was selling to one he was no judge of animals. By this unwarranted act, he actually lost the opportunity of cheating the poor man out of fifty dollars! In another instance, he could easily have extorted one hundred per cent interest from a brother who was forced to borrow a sum of money for three months. Instead of doing so, however, he loaned the brother the money without interest. Patient labor was bestowed upon him, but to all entreaties he turned a deaf ear, perversely repeating the words, Thou shalt not steal, and saying that henceforth he should abide by that rule. He even expressed extreme sorrow that he ever violated it. He was decided to be an incorrigible observer of the old ten-commandment law, and was accordingly disfellowshiped by unanimous vote. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.3}

“Mr. C had gained a wide notoriety as a ‘bruiser’ and cut-throat. He had ‘killed his man’ many times, and was so expert with the pistol that his bullet never failed to reach the heart. It was his delight to lie in wait for unsuspecting and inoffensive persons, and kill them without any warning. He was so adroit with all, that the officers of the law had never been able to detect him in these acts. He had never read the Bible, nor heard of the ten commandments. He was finally arrested for a petty crime, and while lying in jail he was visited by a clergyman, who read the Bible to him. For the first time in his life he heard the obsolete commandment, Thou shalt not kill. When he learned that this was spoken by the great Jehovah, amid the thunders of Sinai, he was struck with terror and remorse, with trembling lips he confessed all his past course, and was assured by the minister that God would pardon. Accordingly, as soon as he was released, he applied for admission to the church; but he was told that he had now fallen from grace,-that the ten commandments are abolished; that no man who professed a desire to keep them could become a member of the church of Belial. After a short talk with the committee, he seemed to see the matter clearly. Drawing a revolver, he shot the chairman through the heart, and with a club he knocked down two of the deacons, all the time using the most violent oaths. Upon this clear evidence of his fitness for church membership, he was at once received into full fellowship. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.4}

“Brother D was turned out of the church in disgrace. Cause: A rigid observance of the old seventh commandment. At the same time, Mr. F and Mrs. G. on profession of having lived in open adultery for a year, were admitted into the church.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.5}

And thus we might read on for pages. Does it seem irreverent to write in such a strain? It is only what would actually be done if no-law people always lived up to their profession. People have actually been turned out of churches simply because they kept the fourth commandment; and if people are disfellowshiped for keeping the fourth commandment, why not for keeping any other? And when men say that it is sin to keep the ten commandments, who shall say what abominable things they do not do in secret? or that they would not do them openly if fear of their fellow-men did not restrain them? {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.6}

Why is it that professed Christians speak with such contempt of the law of God? Because they hate the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. Primarily, however, it is because of the hatred of all law and restraint. No doubt they would repudiate the picture which we have portrayed. They would profess abhorrence of murder, adultery, and theft. But if it is a sin to keep the fourth commandment, it is also wrong to keep the sixth, seventh and eight. If they teach that the law of God is not in force, that those who keep it have fallen from grace, they necessarily teach that it is no sin to swear, lie, steal, kill, and commit adultery! Nay, more, they actually teach people that they must do those things in order to secure the favor of God! A more horrible doctrine could not be imagined. To teachers of such doctrines we commend a careful consideration of the following texts, the application of which is obvious:- {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.7}

“Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and, stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?” Jeremiah 7:8-10. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.8}

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that the darkness to light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” “Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rotteness, and their blossoms the shall go up as dust; because they have cast away law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” Isaiah 5:20, 24. W. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.9}

**“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The next text which we shall notice is Galatians 5:18. “But if ye led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” Antinomians very rarely quote this verse, doubtless because it is so very evident from the connection that the law is recognized as being in active existence. Let us give it our attention for a little while, that we may see what beautiful harmony there is in the Bible on the subject of the law. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.10}

Since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, it follows that those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law. Again, the preceding verses read as follows: “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other.” Galatians 5:16, 17. These verses state in the plainest terms that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to each other; that walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit are directly opposite conditions. Then since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, and those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law, it follows that those who are under the law are those who are fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.11}

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” Galatians 5:19-21. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.12}

The fruit of the Spirit is, of course, the very opposite, being “love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” Verses 22, 23. Referring to these fruits of the Spirit, the apostle says: “Against such there is no law.” Verse 23. That is, those who are led by the Spirit, and who yield its fruits, are in harmony with the law; while the law is against the works of the flesh; and those who do the works of the flesh are condemned by the law, or are under it. Here we arrive at the same conclusion as in regard to Romans 6:14, that “under the law” simply represents a state of antagonism to, and violation of, the law; and of course no one could be in such a state if the law were not in full force. Now since all sinners are by the law condemned to death (Romans 3:19; 6:23), it follows again that “under the law” means condemned by the law-under the sentence of death. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.13}

Turning backward, we find the expression “under the law” used twice in Galatians 4:4, 5: “But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.14}

In the third verse the apostle says that when we were children we were “in bondage under the elements of the world.” But (that marks a change) God sent forth his Son to redeem “them that were under the law.” We would naturally expect the redemption to be from that under which we were in bondage, which was “the elements of the world.” In the fifth verse the redemption is said to be from “under the law,” thus showing that “in bondage under the elements of the world,” and “under the law,” are equivalent terms. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.15}

Let us trace further this matter of bondage. In verse 9 Paul says to the Galatians: “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” Here it is implied that they were in danger of returning to a condition in which they had previously been. And what condition was that? Read verse 8: “Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.” That is, they were heathen. So being in bondage to the elements of the world,-the “weak and beggarly elements,”-is equivalent to being in a state of heathenism. Those who do not know God are termed heathen. But no man can know God without being a follower of Christ, as the Saviour said, “No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” John 14:6. In the strict Bible sense, therefore, all who are not in Christ are heathen. And therefore although Paul addressed his epistle to those who had been idolaters in the commonly accepted sense, the argument is of universal application. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 278.16}

We conclude, then, that the “elements of the world” are simply the various forms of sin. This is still further shown by Ephesians 2:1-3: “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation [manner of life] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.” Nothing but sin is meant by “the course of this world,” the “weak and beggarly elements,” and “the elements of the world.” And to be “in bondage under the elements of the world,” is to be “under the law,” in a state of condemnation. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.1}

Christ came in the fullness of time (see Mark 1:14, 15; Daniel 9:25) “to redeem them that were under the law.” But in order to do this, he himself had to be “made under the law.” This is in harmony with Hebrews 2:17, which says: “Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” The people whom Christ came to redeem were “under the law,” therefore he was made like them, “under the law.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.2}

Now if there is any lingering doubt as to the meaning of “under the law,” compare with the above and Galatians 4:4, 5, Paul’s words in 2 Corinthians 5:21: “For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Christ was sinless; he “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth” (1 Peter 2:22); the Law of God was in his heart (Psalm 40:8), and his whole life was an exemplification of the law. Yet knowing no sin, he was made to be sin for us. As the prophet said: “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isaiah 53:5, 6. We were in bondage to sin, “under the law,” and he took upon himself the same bonds, and was made under the law. Moreover, since those “under the law” are condemned, under sentence of death, he, “being found in fashion as a man,” having voluntarily placed himself in the same condemnation, “became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” Philippians 2:7, 8. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.3}

And so the innocent suffered for the guilty. Man had been overcome by sin, and by it brought into bondage (2 Peter 2:19), and in order to redeem him from this corruption, and the death that must necessarily follow (James 1:15), the spotless Son of God took upon himself the form of a servant of sin, and consented to be covered with the same degradation into which man had plunged himself. What for? “That we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. In order that we might be made without “spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing” (Ephesians 5:27),-perfectly conformable to the holy Law of God; and that thus being enabled, in Christ, to keep the commandments, we might through him have eternal life. Matthew 19:17. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.4}

Before leaving this text in Galatians, there is one more point which we wish to place before the reader. We read that Christ was “made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.” It was necessary for Christ to assume the condition of those whom he would redeem. This being the case, we may know that Christ redeems none who occupy a position different from that which he took. This is plainly stated in the Scripture. “For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren,” etc. Hebrews 2:16, 17. Those whom he was made like, he can redeem; others he cannot. We read also that Christ “died for all.” 2 Corinthians 5:15. What, then, is the necessary conclusion? Just this: Since he was made “under the law,” and was made like those whom he came to redeem, and he came to redeem all men, then all men were “under the law.” Further, the text indicates that he came for the sole purpose of redeeming them that were under the law; their being under the law made necessary some act for their redemption. If they had not been under the law, they would have needed no redemption. Now when we recall Paul’s words to the effect that Christ “gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus 2:14), the conclusion is unavoidable that “under the law” indicates the state of sin which characterizes every human being, and from which none can be rescued but by Christ. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.5}

But notice the dilemma in which they place themselves, who claim that Gentiles are not “under the law,” and that the law was only for the Jews. If that position were true, it would necessarily follow that since Christ came to redeem only those who are under the law, he came to redeem only the Jews! For certain it is, that no person who is not in the position which Christ took upon himself when he came to redeem man, can have any part in that redemption. We think that none, when they consider this point, will place themselves outside of God’s scheme of redemption, by refusing to admit that they are by nature and by practice “under the law.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.6}

Let us rather acknowledge our guilt, that it may be washed away in the blood of the Lamb. “He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.” Proverbs 28:13. W. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.7}

**“Cleansing of the Sanctuary” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-“Was the cleansing of the sanctuary finished at the end of the twenty-three hundred days? or is the work of cleansing still going on? If it is still going on, when will it be finished? “W. L. K.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.8}

ANSWER.-It is very evident from the reading of Daniel 8:13, 14 that the end of the twenty-three hundred (years), the cleansing of the sanctuary was begun, and not then finished. The angels words, “Unto two thousand and three hundred years; then shall the sanctuary cleansed,” were in reply to the following questions: “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the post to be trodden underfoot?” The reply showed that the sanctuary and the host were to be *trodden underfoot* “unto two thousand and three hundred days;” consequently the cleansing *began* at the close of the days. {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.9}

The cleansing of the sanctuary is the blotting out of the sins of God’s people. When that work is finished, the names of those who have not overcome will have been blotted out of the Lamb’s book of life, and that shows that probation ends when the work of cleansing the sanctuary is completed. But the gospel still reaches the hearts of sinners; therefore probation is not ended, and the work of cleansing the sanctuary is still going on. When this work will be finished, no man can tell. We cannot know that it will be soon. To the close of this work the following words apply: “Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.” {SITI May 13, 1886, p. 279.10}

**“Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

We had the pleasure one day last week of listening to a “Bible-reading” on the Sabbath question, given by Dr. L. Munhall, the evangelist who has been holding revival services in San Francisco for several weeks. It was advertised to be a Bible-reading, but was, in fact, a short sermon, with a few more Scripture quotations that are usually heard in the popular modern sermon. The “reading,” however, was more pointed and interesting than any other Sabbath study we ever heard from a first-day preacher. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.1}

The Doctor began by saying that the law of the Sabbath was given long before Mount Sinai. He quoted Exodus 16:25, 26: “And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.” “These words,” said the speaker, “indicate that the Sabbath was not first given at Sinai, but was kept before. The law of the Sabbath is as old as creation. The Fourth Commandment found in Exodus 20:8-11, connects itself with what was said at the first, recorded in Genesis 2:1-3, and makes good the law that obtained among God’s people even before the thunders of Sinai. The Sabbath was the seventh day of creation.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.2}

In the above paragraph we have given the exact expressions of Mr. Munhall. No one could have made a better statement on the case, for it is the exact truth. The speaker then read the following texts: {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.3}

“Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing [plowing] time and in harvest thou shalt rest.” Exodus 34:21. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.4}

“Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death.” Exodus 35:2. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.5}

“These,” said Mr. Munhall, “are explicit statements with reference to the Sabbath law. We are to cease on the Sabbath from our usual daily employments. The Sabbath is to be a day of rest. It is not to be spent in idleness, sleeping half the forenoon, eating a big dinner, and taking a buggy ride in the afternoon. Rest don’t mean idleness. But the Sabbath is to be spent in work for God, because it was hallowed by him.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.6}

The Doctor then read Nehemiah 10:31; 13:15, as another point on the way the Sabbaths should be kept. They read thus: “And if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath, or on the holy day; and that we would leave the seventh year, and the exaction of every debt.” “In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.7}

On these texts the following strange comments were made: “This touches a point that needs to be noted by Christian people. Some of you will send your children to market on Sunday morning for meat. Or you will step into a cigar store, or stop and get a glass of soda on your way home from church on Sunday. But you will say, ‘Suppose I should forget to get my beefsteak on Saturday night; but not be necessary to get it on Sunday morning?’ You have no business to forget. If you do forget, you must go without. Every desire of a heart and stomach is not to be gratified at the expense of God’s law. If your grain will spoil if you don’t work on Sunday, then lose your grain. If you are a produce dealer, and your provisions will spoil if you don’t work on Sunday, then use your provisions. Obey God.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.8}

To the last sentence in the above paragraph we can hardly subscribe. So we could to all the rest, if the speaker had used the word Sabbath instead of Sunday. He had previously said that the seventh day was set apart at creation, and that was kept by the people of God before the commandment for its observance was given upon Mount Sinai. Of course the seventh day must have been kept by God’s people after the specific law for its observance had been given amid the thunders of Sinai; and this is allowed by Mr. Munhall, for later in his discourse he said that no day but the seventh day is the Sabbath. How then can he learn from Exodus 34:21; 35:2; Nehemiah 10:31, and 13:15 how Sunday should be kept? We agreed that the things of which he speaks ought not to be done on the *Sabbath*, because God has forbidden them. “Obey God,” says Mr. Munhall. So we say; and therefore we refrain from labor on the seventh day of the week, as God as commanded. But how can a man obey God by doing something which God never commanded? Impossible. Mr. Munhall exhorts the people to obey God by refraining from labor on Sunday, and in the same discourse tells them that “there is no ‘Thus saith the Lord’ for the observe of Sunday,” and that “the Sabbath has never been transferred from the seventh to the first day.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.9}

But a still more wonderful exposition followed. The Doctor said: “I may be called a Puritan, because of my rigid observance of Sunday. Very well, I am willing. There are specific reasons in God’s word why this they should be kept. Exodus 20: He says: ‘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.’ God has hallowed this day. Because he has hallowed it, we must keep it holy.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.10}

God has hallowed the seventh day, and therefore we must keep the first day holy! If the Doctor had designed to give us an example of a *non sequitur*, he could not have done better. Yet he was in sober earnest. God commands us to do a certain thing, and we obey him by doing something directly contrary! People never reason that way in regard to the laws of men. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.11}

Ezekiel 20:12: “Moreover all so I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they may know that I am the Lord that sanctify them.” On this text, the Doctor made the following true statement: “Unless we observe the Sabbath as God has directed, we shall forget God. There was never a nation that ignored the Sabbath that did not forget God. France is an example, and the same thing is coming upon this country. [The speaker then quoted Exodus 31:15, 16; Nehemiah 13:18; and Ezekiel 20:20, 21.] These also have direct reference to God’s ancient people, and to the troubles that came upon them because they violated the Sabbath. Their land was filled with mourning. The Sabbath was made for men (Mark 2:27), for the welfare of society. The violation of the Sabbath always brings trouble. Look at the riots in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. In the cities the Sabbath is almost universally trampled under foot. There will also be riot and bloodshed in San Francisco if the Sabbath is not observed better. Show me a city where there is riot and bloodshed, and I will show you one where the Sabbath is disregarded.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.12}

It is true if that the violation of the Sabbath is always accompanied by forgetfulness of God. If all people kept the Sabbath, there would be no heathenism, and prosperity might be expected. But Sabbath-keeping is not a national, but an individual affair. That is, a nation, in its national capacity, cannot keep the Sabbath. A nation can be said to keep the Sabbath only when all the individuals composing a nation are Sabbath keepers. And when any considerable number of people in a nation do not observe the Sabbath, any number of legislative acts in favor of Sabbath-keeping will not make that nation a Sabbath-keeping nation. The same is true with regard to any other which God requires. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.13}

But it is the keeping of *the Sabbath* that makes people know the true God. Now Doctor Munhall himself declares that the seventh day, and that only, is the Sabbath. It alone was rested upon by the Creator; the seventh day alone was blessed by him; and the seventh day, and no other, was by the Creator appointed to be kept holy. No other day could be *kept* holy, because no other day was ever *made* holy. How then is it possible for Dr. Munhall, while acknowledging all these facts, to say that the disregard of Sunday is responsible for the prevailing godlessness? Further: Since the keeping of the Sabbath is the only evidence given to indicate that people know God, must we not conclude that the keeping of the day which is not the Sabbath, and the consequent profanation of the only day which God ever appointed as the Sabbath, is evidence that people have largely forgotten God? It cannot be otherwise. And when a nation goes so far as to enjoin the observance of Sunday, then we may know that God is practically ignored. And still further: When we find legislators and ministers of the gospel combining to enact laws devoting the Sabbath of God’s appointment to pleasure, in order that men may rest on Sunday, concerning which God has said nothing except to command us to work upon it, we have overwhelming evidence that men are not only ignoring God, but that they have so forgotten him that they can heap insult upon him without the slightest fear of his power. “For which things’ sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.” Most true it is that terrible judgments are coming upon this land because of the insults which the people have offered to the one great Lawgiver; and we cannot help trembling for the fate of men who use their influence as ministers of the gospel to induce people to disregard the true Sabbath of the Lord for a day which they acknowledge has no “Thus saith the Lord” in its behalf. W. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.14}

*(Concluded next week.)*

**“The Bible vs. Mythology” The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among Christian people of modern times nothing is more common than to speak of death as a river. It is spoken of as “the dark river,” “death’s river,” “the dismal flood,” etc. people have died are said to have “crossed the river,” or “passed over to the other side.” Of course these terms can be used only by those who believe the paradox at death men still continue to live. They believe that death is but the entrance to life, and therefore they sing, “Death is the gate to endless joy,” and, “‘Tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms.” In harmony with this idea, also, they sing, “Shall we meet beyond the river?” meaning, shall we meet after death? {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.15}

Now every Bible student ought to know that these expressions are entirely unscriptural. Death is not the gate to enldless joy, but an enemy. See 1 Corinthians 15:26. It is not the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms, but something that is under the control of the devil. Hebrews 2:14. Christ gained the power and the right to call his children to his arms only by gaining the victory over death. Hebrews 2:14, 15; Revelation 3:18. Death is not a river across which the righteous are ferried to the realms of bliss, but a voracious monster by which they are held until the last trump releases them from its cruel grasp. 1 Thessalonians 4:16; 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52; Hosea 13:14. And then this last enemy shall be destroyed. Nowhere in the Bible is death likened to a river. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 294.16}

Whence then did these expressions arise. Some, no doubt, think that the figure comes from the Israelites crossing the river Jordan into the land of Canaan. But that is a mistaken idea. 1. Although the entering of the Israelites into Canaan was a type of the entering of the saints into their final inheritance, we have seen that death is not the gate to that inheritance, and that some will receive their inheritance without seeing death. See 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52; 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17. Therefore the river Jordan cannot be a type of death. 2. Even if it were a type of death, the popular idea would not hold, because the river was cut off, so that the Israelites went over dry shod. 3. There was no change whatever of the condition of the Israelites after the cross the river. The entire absence of any Bible comparison of death to a river, and the fact that death is emphatically stated to be an enemy, and that it is not in any sense the boundary of of our eternal inheritance, show that the popular expressions for death have no Bible foundation. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.1}

If we study heathen mythology, however we find the origin of these terms. Among the heathen, the river Styx encircled the abode of the dead. In order to get to this abode, the departed had to be towed over the Styx in a ferry managed by Charon who, demanded an *obelus*, about three cents, as his fee. To provide the soul with the necessary means to defray his expenses to *hades*, an *obelus* was always placed in the mouth of the dead person. From this heathen custom arose the modern practice of calling death a river, and of speaking of the dead as having passed to the other shore, or as having been watted over the river. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.2}

Now we have no objection to this. Indeed, we think that it is eminently fitting that those who hold to the heathen doctrine of natural immortality should use heathen terms in speaking of it. Nevertheless, the users of such language sometimes get mixed in their metaphors, as is evident from the following extract from a communication written by Dr. William Dean to the *Watchman:*- {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.3}

“Yesterday I stood on the banks of the dark river to help a young man of twenty-nine years, a New York broker, into the ferry-boat to take him over to the other side. As he was moving out, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, exclaiming, in her anguish, ‘-, don’t go! I cannot let you go. If you must go, take me with you.’ This departure reminded me that I was sent to cross the same river, and gave rise to a train a serious reflections.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.4}

The mixture of the literal and the figurative in the above paragraph is amusing. For instance, are we to suppose that the Doctor was himself at the point of death? That is what is usually meant when a person is said to be standing on the brink of “the dark river.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.5}

Again, when the Doctor says that he was helping the young man into the ferry-boat which was to bear him over the river, are we to understand that he was trying to hasten the young man’s death? We have never heard it claimed by even the most enthusiastic believer in the doctrine that “death is the gate to endless joy,” that it is allowable to kill a good man in order to get into heaven sooner. The Doctor’s conduct ought to be inquired into. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.6}

But the next sentence is more wonderful still: “As he was moving off, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, explaining in her anguish, ‘—don’t go! I cannot let you go!’” How was this? Was the young man about to cross the river bodily? We never supposed that Charon’s craft was staunch enough to carry anything more substantial than an immaterial spirit. The language would indicate that his body was about to make the attempt to accompany the spirit to the “other side.” Or are we to infer that the young wife caught her husband’s immaterial spirit in her arms? If so, it was a remarkable case of materialization. We hope that in a future letter the Doctor will give us more of the details of this affair. He ought at least to tell us plainly whether he killed the young man or not. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.7}

The only moral which we shall draw from this narrative is that professed Christians ought not to mix their faith with heathen doctrines and mythological expressions. Leave such things to the unenlightened heathen, but let Christians follow the doctrines and use the language of the Bible. W. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 295.8}

**“The Church and Boycotting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Fresno *Democrat* thinks that Judge Sawyer’s decision that boycotting is conspiracy, is not just, and says:- {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.1}

“A peaceful boycott against them [the Chinese] and those who employ them was commanded by the Sacramento Convention. This is clearly lawful, and even were it not, no number of statutes could prevent it. If this style of boycott is declared against the laws, where will the matter end? Church organizations may be prosecuted for declaring war against theaters, dancing-halls, and the like, and temperance organizations may be held to answer for putting the whiskey-shops under their ban. Such strange construction of law would lead us into foolish and dangerous straits.” {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.2}

The above simply shows how terribly muddled political journals are apt to become when they attempt to enunciate principles of religion. Boycotting the Chinaman, who has as much right to protection from this country as any other person has, and boycotting those who refuse to boycott the Chinese, is no more to be compared with the opposition of the church to theaters, saloons, etc. than Herr Most’s incendiary speeches are to the preaching of the gospel. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.3}

Any man, or any number of men, may decline to deal with any other person or number of persons. No one has a right to compel them to trade where they do wish to; but by the same rule they have no right to try to compel others not to trade where they may wish to. This last is just what boycotting is; and any candid man must admit that it is not straining a point in the least to say that for a number of men to combine to rule on another’s business is conspiracy. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.4}

The opposition of the church and the temperance society to theaters, saloons, etc., has no such characteristics. Christians are by their profession pledged to abstain from all evil; and knowing that theaters and saloons are only evil in their nature, they shun such places. They also endeavor to induce others to shun evil places and associates. But no Christian boycotts either the saloon-keeper or his victim. One who follows the teachings of Christ will be as ready to assist a saloon-keeper if he is in distress as he will one who is in a respectable business; and while rendering this assistance, the Christian will try to turn a man from the evil of his ways. Much less does the Christian refuse all intercourse with the man who may patronize the theater or the saloon. His very profession requires him to “do good unto all men;” and the Master has set the example of kindness to the erring. Therefore when a man compares the work of the church with that of boycotting leagues, he shows that he has no knowledge whatever of Christianity. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.5}

We have said that no Christian boycotts either the saloon or the theater. Much less will a Christian boycott one who is pursuing a legitimate business, and is doing no injury to anyone. But we are compelled to admit that many people who profess Christianity, and whose names are on some church roll, do advocate the boycott. We have heard the boycott advocated from the pulpit, as the Chinese were not the ones against whom the boycott was to be directed. Neither were the saloons and theaters to be boycotted, unless they kept open on Sunday. In fact, it was urged that all who did any business on Sunday, no matter how legitimate that business might be, should be boycotted. The lack of Christianity in this proposed boycott was manifest from the fact that the foulest dives were not to be molested if they kept closed on Sunday. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.6}

We believe that erelong a large part of the professed church of Christ will go into this business of boycotting. The beloved apostle, looking in prophetic vision to near the end, saw a decree go forth “that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” Revelation 13:17. But of one thing we are certain, that no Christian will ever engage in any such business. When the keeping of Sunday is made a test of citizenship, as is desired by the Religious Amendment Party, then hypocrisy will be at a premium; then the church and the world will be identical; and then boycotting and other kindred abominations may be carried on under the name of religion. W. {SITI May 20, 1886, p. 296.7}

**“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The text which next claims our consideration is Galatians 4:21: “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?” A complete understanding of the force of this verse can be had only by (1) a knowledge of the peculiar danger of the Galatians, which made the writing of this epistle necessary; (2) an examination of the remainder of the chapter, which involves (3) a brief consideration of the two covenants. As this is all in the line of our study of the law, and will be very useful in our further investigation, we will take time right here to examine these points. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.1}

In the first chapter of Galatians, Paul speaks of his call to the ministry, and his first connection with the church. His call, he says, was not from men, but from God. It was three years after his conversion before he went to Jerusalem, and then the only apostles whom he saw were Peter and James. Therefore he did not receive his knowledge of the gospel from men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.2}

In the second chapter, Paul states the occasion of his second visit to Jerusalem, which was fourteen years after his first visit. The occasion of this visit was the council which was held in Jerusalem, and which forms the subject of the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Certain men had come down from Judea to Antioch, where Paul was laboring, and had taught the brethren, saying, “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” Acts 15:1. After much discussion in regard to the matter, the brethren determined that Paul and Barnabas, and a few others, should go up to Jerusalem to lay the matter before the apostles and elders. That the question which came before this council was the one which was troubling the Galatian brethren, in regard to which they were in danger, appears from the second chapter of Galatians. Paul mentions the visit, but assures the brethren that those who “seemed to be somewhat in conference,” that is, the leading men in the council, “added nothing” to him. The gospel had been made known to him by direct revelation from Jesus Christ, and so he knew the whole truth of the matter before the council convened. Further, he states that after the council, he had a controversy on the very same subject which was there discussed, with Peter, who was acting contrary to the decision of the council. These things show that the danger which threatened the Galatian brethren, and which called out Paul’s epistle to them, was the same thing into which the men from Judea tried to lead all of Paul’s converts. For the Jews constantly followed Paul around, trying to overthrow his work. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.3}

Let us now examine the teaching of these men from Judea. “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” Of course all the kindred ordinances of the ceremonial law were included with circumcision. Now why did they want to force circumcision upon these converts from among the Gentiles? The reason given was, in order that they might be saved. Circumcision, they taught, was the one thing indispensable, if they would secure salvation. But the only thing which stands in the way of salvation of all men is sin; and therefore since circumcision was put forth as the condition of salvation, we must conclude that it was urged as a means of justification. But this was directly contrary to the gospel which Paul preached, namely, that justification comes only through Christ. This was indeed “another gospel,” which was no gospel at all. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.4}

That the seditious ones urged circumcision upon the Gentiles as the means of justification, is still further shown by the words of Peter, who said: “Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.” Acts 15:7-9. Peter’s argument was that God purposed to treat the Gentiles who believed just as he did the believing Jews, giving both the Holy Ghost, and purifying them by faith, and not by circumcision or by any other work which they could do. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.5}

Notice particularly the effect which the teaching of these men from Judea must necessarily have had on those who accepted it. It led those who accepted it to reject Christ as the means of justification from sin. If they were justified by circumcision, of course they would have no need of Christ. And this was why that doctrine was taught. These men from Judea did not accept Christ; their sole opposition to the preaching of Paul and the other apostles was that Christ was set forth as the only means of justification and future resurrection. See Acts 4:1, 2. These men from Judea are sometimes styled “Judaizing Christians,” but they were not Christians at all. Their sole work was to oppose the gospel of Christ. And in their hatred of it and of Christ, they went about among the churches, trying to induce the new converts to seek pardon and salvation by circumcision, instead of through Christ. These were the men who were “zealously affecting” the Galatians, with the sole purpose of “excluding” them from the faith of Christ.” Galatians 4:17. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.6}

We have before shown that all who are in sin are “under the law,”-condemned. Then since besides Christ “there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12),-since men are not justified by any works of their own, but solely by faith in Christ,-it follows that all who accepted the teaching of the men from Judea, and were circumcised for justification, were still “under the law.” No amount of work, whether it was circumcision or something else, could clear them from the guilt of past sins. Moreover, those who had accepted Christ, and had been forgiven, if they listened to this teaching fell from grace; for to be circumcised with a view to justification thereby, was simply rejecting Christ and repudiating their former profession. And this is just what Paul told them: “Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.” Galatians 5:2. Paul did not mean that there was anything wicked in circumcision of itself, for he himself circumcised Timothy, and that, too, after the council at Jerusalem. Acts 16:1-3. Timothy’s father was a Gentile, although his mother was a Jewess, and if Timothy had not been circumcised, he would not have been allowed to labor with Paul among the Jews in their synagogues. Therefore as a matter of expediency, Paul circumcised Timothy, thus showing that whether a man was circumcised or not, was regarded by him as a matter of no vital importance. See 1 Corinthians 7:19. But when men submitted to circumcision as a means of gaining salvation, that moment they rejected Christ, man’s only hope, and therefore Christ profited them nothing, Christ cannot help those who reject him. So we see that it was a grave heresy which was being preached to these young Christians. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.7}

Note again: The heathen religion was a religion of forms and ceremonies. Some of these ceremonies were of the most licentious nature. Now if the converts from among the heathen could only be induced to rest their hope of salvation on Jewish ceremonies, it would be but a step for them to sink back into their old heathen customs. This was actually the effect that it had on the Galatians; for Paul said to them: “Ye observe days, and months, and times [Deuteronomy 18:8-10 tells how the Lord regarded this], and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.” Galatians 4:10, 11. Their being circumcised did not lead simply to the substitution of Judaism for Christianity, but to a relapse into heathenism. And thus we see that the Galatians were really going back “under the law,” or, as stated in verse 9, they were turning to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, to which they were desirous of again being in bondage. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.8}

Some may wonder at the expression which Paul uses in verse 21, “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law,” etc. Why should Paul charge them with desiring death? For if “under the law” means under sentence of death, he did virtually charge them with desiring death. A parallel passage is found in Proverbs 8:36: “They that hate me love death.” Now while no one would love death itself, so as to deliberately choose it, people do love sin, not realizing that the end thereof is death. So with those to whom Paul speaks. They desired a certain thing which would bring them under the condemnation of the law; and therefore they could be said to desire to be under the law, although they did not realize that such would be the consequences of their choice. W. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.9}

*(To be continued.)*

**“Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded*.)

The Doctor seemed nettled because some reporters and doctors had poohed at a statement by him that man is built on a seventh-day plan, so that the Sabbath rest is a demand of his physical nature. We are willing to accept that statement. “The Sabbath was made for man,” and we believe that the Lord made no mistake in the amount of time which he allotted to men for rest. But this is not given in the Bible as a reason for Sabbath observance. The Sabbath was given to man that he might remember God; and the fact that God commanded its observance is sufficient reason why we should keep it. Notice this fact: Nobody ever heard a Sabbath-keeper urge man’s physical necessity as a reason for Sabbath observance; with a Sabbath-keeper, the commandment of God suffices. But the fact that man needs a rest one day in seven is the most prominent reason given for Sunday observance by the advocates of that day. It is the only thing they can urge; but as a Sunday argument it is useless from the fact that God has said nothing about it, and it is applicable to any other day of the week. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.10}

In behalf of Sunday as the Sabbath, the Doctor simply read Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2; and Revelation 1:10, without comment. Since the last mentioned text makes no mention of the first day of the week, and since concerning the other two the Doctor said, “The fact that the disciples met to break bread on the first day of the week is no authority for the sanctification of Sunday,” we may safely say that he does not believe that the Bible anywhere authorizes Sunday observance. In fact, we know that he does not, for he said: “The resurrection of Jesus Christ had no more to do with sanctification of Sunday than did his crucifixion on Friday. Some people think that it did, but there is no ‘Thus saith the Lord for’ it.” Again he said: “There is no ‘Thus saith the Lord’ for keeping the first day of the week, and there is no use and saying there is when there isn’t. The seventh day was hallowed by the Lord, and there has been no transfer.” {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.11}

We would that Dr. Munhall’s hearers remember these words, and then follow his exhortation to “obey God.” But someone may be anxious to know why he keeps Sunday, holding the views that the does. Well, here is his “reason:” {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 310.12}

“We find evidence that the disciples did keep the first day, and therefore we keep it; though why they kept it I do not know, for they gave no reason, and there is no ‘Thus saith the Lord’ for it.” {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.1}

The “evidence” that the disciples kept the first day is all found in Acts 20:7, and 1 Corinthians 16:2, which is just no evidence at all. But allowing the Doctor’s claim, that the disciples did keep Sunday, what then? Why, we have been doing something for which they have given no reason, and for which no reason could be given. One of the same disciples charges us to “be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you.” How can we do this if we keep Sunday, since the apostles themselves gave no reason for it, and the Lord never commanded it? The fact that the Lord never commanded Sunday observance, and that the apostles, while exhorting Christians to be able to give a reason for their faith and practice, gave no reason for Sunday observance, should convince anybody that the apostles never kept Sunday. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.2}

In closing, the Doctor said: “I know that I can’t observe the law of the Sabbath on the seventh day.” Well, then, in the name of common sense, how can the law of the Sabbath be observed? That law enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and no other. This law Dr. Munhall proposes to observe by keeping Sunday! And by the same token we propose to celebrate next Fourth of July the first of August. It will be just as easy for us to rest on the Fourth of July on the first of August, as it is for Dr. Munhall to observe the law of the Sabbath on the first day of the week. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.3}

But why cannot the Doctor “observe the law of the Sabbath” on the seventh day, the day which the law of the Sabbath designates? Because “as things are in the world,” it is *inconvenient*! Is this the same man who half an hour before said: “You have no business to forget; you must not think that every desire is to be gratified at the expense of God’s commandment. If your business will suffer if you keep the Sabbath, let it suffer. Obey God. That is all you have to do. The man who lives up to an honest conviction and does right, must expect to suffer inconvenience”? Yes, it is a very same man who now says that “as things are in this world” he cannot keep the Sabbath. And then in the next breath he urges his hearers “to have a conscience in this matter”! {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.4}

In Bunyan’s “Pilgrim’s Progress,” we read of one Mr. By-ends, one of whose kinsmen was Mr. Facing-both-ways, who earned his money as a waterman, “looking one way and rowing another.” The Saviour described the same class of men when he said: “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’s seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not seek after their works; for they say, and do not.” It was not by accident that Bunyan made Mr. By-ends a relative of Mr. Facing-both-ways; for when a man acknowledges a certain obligation, and then says that circumstances will not allow him to regard it, he faces both ways, and advertises himself as a man who has ends of his own to serve. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.5}

We might sum up Dr. Munhall’s discourse as follows:- {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.6}

1. The law of the Sabbath was given at creation, and simply reaffirmed at Sinai. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.7}

2. The seventh day of the week, and no other, is the Sabbath. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.8}

3. The Sabbath is a memorial of creation, and was given that men might remember God. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.9}

4. Those people and nations that disregard the Sabbath will have to suffer disastrous consequences. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.10}

5. No man has any business to forget the Sabbath, or to allow business or pleasure to interfere with his observance of it. God requires us to obey him whether it is convenient or not. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.11}

6. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath, and there is no use in saying that it is. God rested upon and sanctified only the seventh day, and no transfer has ever been made. There is no “Thus saith the Lord” for the observance of Sunday. God never required it. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.12}

This is good Bible doctrine: whenever the Doctor preaches such doctrine, we shall be glad to assist him in his work by giving it wide circulation. And in connection with the above, we hope no one will fail to remember Dr. Munhall’s only “reason” for keeping Sunday. It is this:- {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.13}

“I believe that the apostles kept Sunday, though I don’t know of any reason why they did so. The seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, but it isn’t convenient to keep it.” {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.14}

In conclusion, we would urge our readers to heed the Doctor’s exhortation to “have a conscience in this matter.” W. {SITI May 27, 1886, p. 311.15}