**“When Is It Sunset?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

A Colorado correspondent sends us the following statement of fact and question:- {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.1}

“I live a mile from the base of the mountain which is three to five thousand feet higher than where I live. As the mountain is west of us it hides the sun from our view and casts a shadow over us long before it is sunset east of us. Is it *sunset* when the shadow comes on us while the sun is shining *east* of us?” {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.2}

No; it is not sunset until the sun has gone down. When we say that the sun has gone down, we do not mean that it has gone behind a cloud, or that some intervening obstruction keeps its rays from coming direct to our eyes; but we mean that the sun is below the horizon and no longer sheds light upon the part of the earth where we live. If a man should spend the entire day on the east side of a barn, he would not think of calling it sunset at two o’clock in the afternoon, just because he could not see the body of the sun, but he would have as good reason to do so as he would under the circumstances indicated by our correspondent. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.3}

If we were to go on the principle that the sun has set when we no longer receive its direct rays, a man living in a deep canon would have a very short day. As a matter of fact, the sun sets to such a man at exactly the same time that it does to his neighbor who lives on the plain. He can tell when the sun sets, just the same as the man on the plain can when the day is so cloudy that he cannot see the sun at all. The sun sets when it sinks below the horizon, and not when it passes behind a barn or a mountain. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.4}

**“The Second Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

“I wish to know how you understand the second commandment. Does not ‘graven image’ include statues and busts? and are not all pictures, photographs, or paintings, ‘likenesses’? and does not the commandment say *in plain words*, ‘Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of the any thing’? If you believe in taking the fourth commandment as it reads, why not the second?” {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.5}

We understand the second commandment just “as it reads.” In this respect we make no difference between it and the fourth. But our correspondent has not quoted it just as it reads. He has omitted an essential part of the commandment. The prohibitory part of the commandment reads thus:- {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.6}

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bowed down thyself to them, nor serve them.” Exodus 20:4, 5. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.7}

If the commandment said, “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing,” and said no more, it would certainly prohibit paintings, photographs, etc. not only so, but would prohibit also the hewing of timbers for houses or ships, the cutting of garments, the coining of money, the drawing of plans by architects, or the printing of books and papers from types. In fact it would prohibit nearly everything that is done for the support of civilized life. But the commandment does not prohibit these things. On the contrary, immediately after the command was given, God instructed Moses to build a tabernacle according to a *pattern*, and on the walls and curtains of the tabernacle were made, by God’s order, figures of cherubim, and two images of cherubim were placed upon the ark. If the second commandment had been designed to prohibit the making of any image or likeness, God would not have immediately charged the people to do that very thing. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.8}

The commandment concerning images is not complete without these words: “Thou shalt not bowed down thyself to them, nor serve them.” This shows under what circumstances it is wrong to make images and likenesses. It is wrong to make them for the purpose of offering them even the slightest measure of worship or reverence. It is wrongto show reverence to images that others have made. It is wrong to bow down to any image, even though the worship of the heart is directed to the true God. This the commandment plainly teaches; and no one has a right to make it teach something different, by quoting only a portion of it. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.9}

**“Practical Thoughts on Psalm 63” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

“O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” Verses 1, 2. David had correct ideas of his relation to God. He says: “Thou art *my* God.” Too many imagine that God is far off from them, and that they have to make some great exertions to arouse his interest in them. They forget that God is “not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being.” They forget that God has sought us, and is anxiously waiting for us to seek him. They imagine that God is like a man,-holding off those who have done him a wrong, and refusing to be reconciled. They forget that “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8), and that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world of himself,” and that to his ministers he has committed the word of reconciliation, who in Christ’s stead beg of sinners, “be ye reconciled to God.” 2 Corinthians 5:19, 20. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.10}

Many people remain at a distance from God, because they forget, or have never heard, that he has proclaimed himself “the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin.” Exodus 34:6, 7. “The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.” Psalm 103:8. He is “long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” 2 Peter 3:9. So willing is he to forgive, that when men seek him, turning him from their wicked thoughts and actions, “he will multiply to pardon.” Isaiah 55:7, margin. And so abundant and efficient is his mercy toward them that fear him, that though their sins be as scarlet, “they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” Isaiah 1:18. Why will not men let the goodness of God lead them to repentance. What more could he have done than he has done? {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.11}

“Early will I seek thee.” David knew that that was the time to seek the Lord. “Those that seek me early shall find me.” Is not this an indication that, if seeking the Lord is put off, he may not be found? Isaiah says: “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.” Then there will be a time when he may not be found. “Now is the accepted time.” True, this refers to the gospel age, but it is literally true. We have known men, in this age when the gospel is preached, who could not find the Lord. They had once felt the strivings of the Spirit, but now they could feel no interest in divine things. They would acknowledge the truth of God’s word, but they were indifferent to it. *Now* is the time when the Lord may be found,-just now while you feel that the husks of sin, “the beggarly elements of the world,” are unsatisfying food. Do not stifle the slightest conviction: “Quench not the Spirit.” Says Jesus: “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.” John 6:37. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.12}

But it is not sufficient to simply seek early; some start to seek the Lord, but have not a desire sufficiently strong to make them persevere. Said David: “My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee.” He felt that he must have God. He could not be satisfied without God. When a man feels that way, he gets what he wants. Says Christ: “Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.” Matthew 5:6. The trouble too often is, that instead of having an intense desire and longing for righteousness, we are simply passively willing to have righteousness. We ask the Lord to help us overcome some sin, with a mental reservation that we may indulge in it once in a while. We don’t like to say, “I *hate* the sins that made thee mourn.” “Hate” seems too strong a word; we still cherish a secret love for the sin. We want (so we think) to be righteous, and yet we feel loth to part with that darling sin. That is very far from hungering and thirsting after righteousness. Such half-way desire will never result in anything except final defeat. But when the mind is fixed upon Christ; when he is to the soul “the chiefest among ten thousand,” the one “altogether lovely;” when to be like him is the one absorbing desire;-then will he be found. To such the promise is. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.13}

“They shall be filled.” Think of that. How much righteousness does that imply? Here is the definition of “fill.” “To make full; to supply with as much as can be held or contained; to put or pour into till no more can be received; to occupy to the whole capacity of.” Now that doesn’t leave any room for anything else. When a man is “*filled* with the fruits of righteousness,” there isn’t going to be any wickedness cropping out. Such a one “keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.” {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.14}

But is such a condition possible? Let us see. Paul told the Ephesians that he prayed to God, “that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be *filled with all the fullness of God*.” Ephesians 3:16-19. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.15}

Do you know anyone who has realized the answer to that prayer? Such a thing must be possible, for Paul prayed for it, and he says that God is able “to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, *according to the power of that worketh in us*.” Ah that’s the secret. There is some power working in us that a stronger than we, “That Christ may *dwell* in your hearts.” Well, Christ was unsullied by the strongest of Satan’s temptations, and if he *dwells* in our hearts, why may not we likewise repel all of Satan’s advances? {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.16}

Says Paul: “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Galatians 2:20. No man has the strength to resist the devil, but with Christ to strengthen him he can do all things. “This is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith.” 1 John 5:4. Not the victory that makes a feeble effort to overcome, and fails; but the victory that does overcome. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.17}

What has been done may be done. Zecharias and his wife Elisabeth, “were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord *blameless*.” Luke 1:6. Enoch “walked with God;” and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Moreover we have the Lord’s own testimony concerning Job that he was “A perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil.” It is true that there was “none like him in the earth;” but the fact that there was one such man shows that there might have been more; and if there might have been more there ought to have been more. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 390.18}

Let it be remembered, however, that this is not a gift suddenly bestowed, but is a constant work. Says David: “My soul followeth hard after the.” Psalm 63:8. It is not enough simply to seek the Lord early, or even to hunger and thirst after him, unless it is kept up. “This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed God might be careful to maintain good works.” Titus 3:8. Such a state of righteousness is progressive. “And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be blameless till the day of Christ.” Philippians 1:9, 10. “The path of the just is says the shining light, that shineth more and more on to the perfect day.” Proverbs 4:18. The Christian can never arrive at a place beyond which there is nothing. Stereotyping is a thing that is done in Christian experience. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.1}

As a matter of course, walking with God produces humility. “Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not up right in him.” Habakkuk 2:4. When a man becomes satisfied with his condition, he ceases to hunger and thirst after righteousness; he ceases to follow hard after God, and consequently he becomes empty. Notwithstanding Job’s perfectness, when God revealed himself to him in an especial manner, he said: “I had of heard of thee with the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself.” Job 42:5, 6. The nearer one gets to God, the greater will seem the contrast between God and himself. If it were not so, there would come a time when he would cease to say, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain,” and would ascribe worthiness to himself. That time can never come. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.2}

“To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” That is what David longed for. He had been at times wonderfully impressed, during the services in the sanctuary, with the power of the love of God. He had been greatly blessed. Now he wants to see the Lord just as he had seen him in the sanctuary. He believed that a person might enjoy just as much of the blessing of God while about his daily business as when the in church. How was it with Daniel? He was prime minister of the kingdom of Babylon, with all the burden of the business of that mighty empire upon him, yet while he was in the palace, doing “the king’s business,” he received a vision from God. See Daniel 8:1, 2, 27. He did not allow business care to separate him from God. “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.” Romans 15:4. For what purpose was it told what Daniel was doing when he had that vision, except that we might learn that it is possible to “walk with God,” and to have close communion with him, even when burdened with business cares. Daniel had learned to cast his care on the Lord. When a man has learned that, he can say, {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.3}

“Because thy lovingkindness is better than life, my lips praise thee.” He can’t help praising the Lord. “Thus will I bless thee while I live; I will lift up my hands in time name.” Yes; “they will be still praising thee.” {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.4}

“My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness; and my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips; when I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches. Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice.” Verses 5-7. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.5}

Continual remembrance of God must result in praise and thanksgiving; and praise to God is a powerful help in overcoming. Says David: “So will I say praise unto thy name for ever, that I may daily perform my vows.” Psalm 61:8. Meditation upon God reveals his goodness, and this calls for praise; praise is but an expression of confidence in God, “and this is the victory that overcometh the world, and even our faith.” W. {SITI July 1, 1886, p. 391.6}

**“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 1” The Signs of the Times, 12, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no portion of Scripture which is more commonly supposed to give “aid and comfort” to the enemies of the law of God, than the third chapter of Galatians. It is true that there are in this chapter, as in other parts of Paul’s writings, some things “hard to be understood,” but only the unlearned and unstable will wrest them to their own destruction. The student of the Bible may rest assured that the law of God stands fast forever and ever (Psalm 111:8), and cannot be overthrown. And he may also remember another thing: those texts which are the most depended upon by antinomians in their opposition to the law, will be found, after careful study, to be strong bulwarks in its support. No weapon formed against God’s law can prosper. “Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever.” Psalm 119:152. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.1}

There is not a point in the third chapter of Galatians that has not been explained in our study of other texts; therefore in our brief study of this chapter we shall only emphasize facts already established. The reader will recall our remarks in a previous article on the particular errors into which the Galatian brethren had fallen, and the object of the epistle to them. It will not be necessary to give more than an outline of the statements there made. Men had come from Judea saying to the young converts, “Except ye be circumcised.... ye cannot be saved.” This was teaching them that their salvation depended on their own works, and was directly contrary to Paul’s teaching, that works outside of Christ amount to nothing. Paul taught that sinners can obtain justification only by the grace of God, through faith in the blood of Christ; those Jews taught that circumcision was the true means of justification. It can readily be seen that the latter teaching was directly subversive of the former, and that the acceptance of it was equivalent to the rejection of Christ. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.2}

In harmony with the above idea are the opening words of the third chapter: “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?” Christ and him crucified had been set forth among them, and Christ is “the truth.” Through faith in him they had begun the Christian life, and now they were in danger of turning from him and endeavoring to be “made perfect” by their own works. For such a proceeding they justly merited the epithet “foolish.” {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.3}

Abraham is next taken as the model for Christians. “Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.” Verse 6. Nothing else but his faith could be counted to him for righteousness, that is, for his past life; for any work that he could do could not take away a single sin. Abraham did works, as it is written, “Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” (Genesis 26:5); but these works were done only through his faith. Works are necessary, but they are of no avail outside of Christ. Paul says:- {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.4}

“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. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.5}

The patriarch was justified by faith, and then by works his faith was made perfect, or shown to be genuine. James 2:22. Having shown that even Abraham was not justified before God by his own works, Paul shows that the promise is to none but the children of Abraham; and since the children of Abraham are those only who have the same faith that he had, only those that are of faith can receive the promise. These are his words:- {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.6}

“Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, forseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.” Galatians 3:7-9. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.7}

Following this statement, the apostle emphasizes the fact that we can be justified only by faith, and not by works. He says:- {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.8}

“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” Verse 10. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.9}

This verse is the cause of much stumbling, and is often wrested from its true meaning, but its explanation is simple, and is contained within the verse itself. It is written, “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” These words are quoted from Deuteronomy 27:26, and Jeremiah 11:2-4, in both of which places they have unmistakable reference to the ten commandments. The law contains the whole duty of man, and the transgression of it brings death, and therefore the man who fails to obey it comes under the curse of God. But there is no man who has kept the law perfectly. Consequently if any are saved they must have recourse to something outside of the law; for the law cannot justify the sinner. Or, to use the words of Paul, “As many as are of the works of the law [that is, as many as depend upon the law], are under the curse.” They are “under the law;” condemned to death. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.10}

“But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but, the man that doeth them shall live in them.” Verses 11, 12. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.11}

This is a repetition of the thought already presented, showing that no man can be just except through faith. It is parallel to Romans 10:4, 5. W. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.12}

**“The Doctors Disagree” The Signs of the Times, 12, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Baptist Flag* has been publishing some articles by one Dr. Dobbs, who claims that the ten commandments are not moral, and are not to be obeyed by Christians. This has called out an emphatic protest from Rev. W. A. Jarrel, author of “Old Testament Ethics Vindicated,” who writes to the editor of the *Flag* as follows:- {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.13}

“Permit me to enter my emphatic protest against the position of Dr. C. E. W. Dobbs that the ten Commandments are not the moral law, and that the Sabbath of to-day, is not the same Sabbath which was ordained in Eden, but now put upon the first day. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.14}

“Dr. Dobbs’ position, while intended to meet Seventh Dayists, only plays into their hands. Besides, it positively contradicts the Baptist position, and is Campbellism. Campbellites argue as he does, while Baptists say of the Sabbath: it “is a positive, moral and perpetual commandment binding on all men.... to be kept holy unto him, which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection was changed into the first day of the week,” etc.-*London Conference of 1689, chapter 22.* The Scriptures are fearfully tortured into the support of Brothers Dobbs’ and Smith’s position. Had it not been to refute Seventh Dayists, no one would ever have dreamed of sawing off the limb we are all sitting on. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.15}

“Whenever I cannot refute heresy without destroying the Ten Commandments, I will, as the lesser of two evils, become the heretic. I have had much to do with debating with Seventh Dayists, and well know they are successfully met only by the old Baptist position, in the above quoted confession. I have not now time to give my reason. But if, when I get some work off my hands, the *Flag* will give the room for a series of articles, I will do so.” {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.16}

Good! We hope Mr. Jarrell will cling to his determination never to attempt to refuse heresy by the ten commandments, and to accept any “heresy” that cannot be overthrown except by destroying them. We heartily thank him for his noble stand for the commandments of God, and for rebuking his brethren in the church who would treat them with contempt. But we are anxious to know how he reconciles this acceptance of the ten commandments with his observance of Sunday. We know him to be a gentleman and a scholar, one who does not believe in “torturing” Scripture into the support of any theory, and is to wise to saw off the limb on which he sits. He is, moreover, a direct and forcible writer, and therefore whenever his work will allow him to write an article showing how first-day observance can be reconciled with the belief that the fourth commandment is a “Moral and perpetual commandment, binding on all men,” we will gladly give it a place in the SIGNS. We hope to hear from him soon. Meanwhile let it be noted that scarcely any two leading first-day writers are agreed as to the authority for Sunday-keeping. {SITI July 8, 1886, p. 406.17}

**“Peter’s Vision” The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we answered a question concerning the use of swine as food, promising to consider Peter’s vision of the net full of beasts if, as we expected, somebody should offer that as Bible authority for pork-eating. It was but a few days before we received a request for an explanation of that vision, with which we cheerfully comply. We will first state the circumstances under which the vision was given; the entire narrative may be found in the tenth chapter of Acts. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.1}

A Roman by the name of Cornelius, a centurion, was stationed at Cæsarea. This man, although a Gentile, was very devout and benevolent, serving God to the best of his knowledge. To him an angel of God came one day, telling him that his prayers and all had gone up for a memorial before God, and directing him to send men to Joppa to call for Simon Peter, who would tell him what further he ought to do. Accordingly Cornelius sent two of his household servants and a devout soldier to Joppa, with instructions to bring Simon Peter back with them. But Peter was a Jew, with all the natural Jewish prejudices against associating with Gentiles, and therefore he would have refused to follow the Heaven-directed messengers if the Lord had knocked prepared him for their visit. This was done by means of a vision, which we quote:- {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.2}

“On the morrow, as they went on their journey, and drew nigh unto the city, Peter went up upon the housetop to pray about the sixth hour; and he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven.” Acts 10:9-16. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.3}

Was taught by this? Pork-lovers claim that the Lord meant by this vision to teach that Peter might eat pork, and that everybody else may do likewise. Indeed, many people seem to think that the vision teaches that we ought to eat pork. But why stop at the hog. That sheet contained “all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air.” Then besides the hog, there must the be in it dogs, cats, rats, hyenas, jackals, monkeys, porcupines, weasels, buzzards, vultures, crows, bats, lizards, snails, centipedes, scorpions, toads, etc. Now if that vision meant that we should eat the hog, it meant that we should also eat all other scavengers and reptiles. We say this: If the vision has the slightest thing to do with the hog, which we deny, it teaches: (1) That it is a Christian duty for us to eat him; and (2) That it is equally our duty to eat every beast, fowl, or creeping thing, however filthy it may be. No one can dissent from this; and certainly swine-lovers should not shudder at the thought of eating anything filthy. There is nothing in creation more filthy then the hog; and we cannot see why it should be preferred to crow, bat, buzzard, vulture, hyena, jackal, or any other scavenger. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.4}

But now to show what the vision does mean. When the three men that were sent by Cornelius reached Peter’s lodging-place, while he was wondering what the vision could mean, the Spirit said to him: “Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and give thee down and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them.” Verses 19, 20. Notice that Peter did not understand the vision to teach that he might eat hogs, hyenas, buzzards, etc.: he knew that God meant by it to convey to him some important truth. What that truth was he learned before he reached the house of Cornelius the next day, for when he entered and found a company of Gentiles assembled, he said to them: “Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.” Verse 28. Still later he stated more particularly what learned: “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” Verses 34, 35. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.5}

That this is what the vision was designed to teach, no one who reads the chapter can deny. And if it teaches this it cannot teach something else entirely different. It was designed to show that God’s love to man is not confined to one race, and that, partaking of the divine love, we should as readily preach the gospel or give other aid to the meanest specimen of the most despised heathen race as to the most refined citizens of an enlightened land. By this vision Peter was taught what Paul teaches in Ephesians 2:11-21, and what David teaches in Psalm 68:13, “Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.” The gospel brings all men to the same level, whatever their position or condition in this life. And it seems to us one of the clearest evidences of the perverseness of human nature, that so many can see in this illustration of the divine love to man, nothing more than a divine permission to eat pork. It certainly is a magnificent display of the divine mercy and pity that he forbids the regarding of even *such* persons as unclean. W. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.6}

**“Something To Be Followed” The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to some queries an exchange has a column of replies, among which is the following categorical answer: “We should *not* follow Christ’s example in washing one another’s feet.” And this not withstanding Christ’s emphatic statement: “If I then, [your] Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also *ought* to wash one another’s feet. For *I have given you an example*, that ye should do as I have done to you.” John 13:14, 15. An “example” is something “which is to followed or imitated;” and Christ said that he designed that his disciples should follow his example. He wished them to do *as* he had done to them. More than this, “ought” implies duty; it is the old form of the past tense of the word “owe” and therefore indicates obligation. If we say a person *ought* to do a certain thing, we indicate that to do that thing is a debt that he owes. So when Christ says, “Ye *ought* to wash one another’s feet,” he means that to do so is a duty; it is a debt that Christians owe. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.7}

Again Christ says: “If ye know these things, happy are ye are if ye do them.” John 13:17. “Happy” is equivalent to “blessed.” A blessing is pronounced on those who *do* according to Christ’s example in this respect. And what if, knowing these things, we do not do them? Certainly the blessings will be withheld. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.8}

The matter is as plain as words can make it. True, there is only one mention of it in the Bible; but if those who plead this fact as against the adoption of the ordinance, mean to imply that Christ never did and said the things recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John? We believe not, for we never heard any doubt expressed as to the truthfulness of the account. Then if it is a fact that Christ washed his disciples’ feet, and said “Ye also ought to wash one another’s feet; for I have given you an example,” isn’t it just as valid as though the account were repeated fifty times? It certainly is. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.9}

We are morally certain that if such evidence could be found in favor of Sunday-keeping, or of infant “baptism,” those who believe in these practices would not ask for any stronger testimony in their support. We also know that there are hundreds of men who would shout for exultation if they could fined as strong as argument for Sunday-keeping as the thirteenth of John contains for feet-washing. The trouble is, it is too humiliating an ordinance to be generally adopted; and a strong tendency nowadays is to reject all the Bible except Christ’s own words, and to reject all of his words that are unpalatable. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.10}

**“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 2” The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

The next verse that we come to the 13th, is another “stone of stumbling” to many, but with an understanding of the 10th verse, it is impossible to go wrong on this. We quote it with the 14th:-“For Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, ‘Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.11}

What is the curse of the law? Is it obedience to the law? No; for it is written, “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous.” 1 John 5:3. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.12}

The psalmist also says: “Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord.” Psalm 19:1. Now if the keeping of the law is a blessing, disobedience, with its consequences, must be the curse. And so Paul, after warning the Ephesians against whoredom, covetousness, and idolatry, says: “For because of these things the wrath of God... curse of God cometh upon the children of disobedience.” Ephesians 5:6. And “the wages of sin is death.” So “the curse of the law” is, in a word, death. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.13}

That death is the curse from which Christ has redeemed us, is evident from the latter part of the ninth verse. He redeemed us from the curse by being made a curse for us, and the curse which he suffered was his death,-being hanged on a tree, which was absolutely necessary that Christ should be made in all respects like those whom he would redeem. Hebrews 2:17. He came to save sinners, therefore he was counted as a sinner. Isaiah 53:12; 2 Corinthians 5:21. And being found in fashion as a man, he suffered the curse which hung over guilty man. He died that we might live. And because he was made a curse for us, we may all through faith share in the blessing of Abraham. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.14}

“Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man’s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promise made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.” Galatians 3:15, 16. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.15}

Here the apostle introduces a new point, the conclusion of the argument being, as stated in verse 21. That the law is not against the promises of God. He makes the positive and unquestionable statement that if a covenant be once confirmed it cannot afterwards be altered. Now the covenant was confirmed to Abraham by “two immutable things [God’s promise and his oath] in which it was impossible for God to lie” (Hebrews 6:15-18); therefore, as is stated in verse 17, the law given from Sinai four hundred and thirty years after, cannot make the promise void, nor destroy the fact that the inheritance is solely by promise. Thus the main idea of the chapter, that God’s grace as manifested in Christ is man’s sole hope, is kept prominent. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 422.16}

But there is still another point which we should not fail to consider in connection with the fifteenth verse. 1. Although the law “was four hundred and thirty years after” the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: “Walk before me, and be thou perfect.” Exodus 17:1. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was “because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.” Exodus 26:5. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise. 2. Although the covenant was confirmed in Christ to Abraham, it was only in anticipation. As the first covenant was confirmed by blood,-the blood of beasts,-so the second covenant was also ratified by blood,-the blood of Christ. Christ himself “confirmed the covenant with many for one week,” in the midst of which he shed his blood on the cross, thus affixing the final seal to the covenant of God’s grace. 3. As the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as “the second covenant,” which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10. None can deny that in his earthly ministry Christ taught the necessity of obedience to the law of God. See Matthew 5:17-19; 19:17; Luke 16:17, etc. Always, in the strongest terms, he proclaimed the enduring nature and obligation of God’s law. Now since the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one tittle could pass from it. The fact that God’s law cannot be changed, we have learned before; but it is well to emphasize it in connection with the death of Christ. That which some suppose marked the abolition of the law, was that which emphasized its perpetuity. It is admitted, even by antinomians, that the law of God was in full force until the death of Christ, and therefore Galatians 3:15 should convince them that it is in full force now. Says Paul, “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.” Romans 3:31. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.1}

Verse 16 also shows that the promise is made only to Christ and to those who are his. In the verses following, 17-26, the apostle shows the relation of the law to the promise of God. “And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that is should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise.” Verses 17, 18. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.2}

What covenant was it that “was confirmed before of God in Christ”? Manifestly it was the covenant with Abraham, quoted in verse 8 from Genesis 12:1-3; 13:14, 15; 17:7, 8, and 22:18. The promise was that Abraham should be “heir of the world” (Romans 4:11), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. Genesis 17:1-8. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed “in Christ” (Galatians 3:17) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare Romans 4:11 with 3:22-25. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as “the second covenant,” which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called “the first covenant,” although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.3}

Now the apostle says that the law, which was formally announced from Sinai four hundred thirty years after the covenant with Abraham, cannot disannul that covenant, that it should make the promise of none effect. “For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise.” That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.4}

The reader can readily see the force of the apostle’s argument. He is trying to convince the Galatians, and with them all men, that out of Christ, there is no salvation. The man who hopes to gain an inheritance in the kingdom of God through his own works, no matter how high his aim may be, will fail. The promise is not for works, lest any man should boast; but it is through faith in Jesus Christ, that he may be “Lord of all.” “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 4:12. W. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.5}

**Extracts**

Galatians 3:21 That the law is not against the promises of God. {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.6}

“...the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: “Walk before me, and be thou perfect.” Exodus 17:1. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was “because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.” Exodus 26:5. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.7}

“...the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as “the second covenant,” which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.8}

Galatians 3:15 “... the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one tittle could pass from it.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.9}

“The promise was that Abraham should be “heir of the world” (Romans 4:11), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. Genesis 17:1-8. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed “in Christ” (Galatians 3:17) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare Romans 4:11 with 3:22-25. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as “the second covenant,” which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called “the first covenant,” although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.10}

“For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise.” That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith.” {SITI July 15, 1886, p. 423.11}

**“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 3” The Signs of the Times, 12, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Wherefore then serveth the law?” This is a very pertinent question, and several points need to be borne in mind in reading it. First, the word “serveth” seems to convey to many minds the idea that the law was subservient, or secondary, to something else. There was really no necessity for the insertion of the word by the translators, for it is not expressed in the original. The text reads, *Ti oun ho nomos*? “Why then the law?” This conveys the exact meaning. It may also be more freely rendered, “O, what use, then, is the law?” Second, it must be remembered that questions of this sort are very common in Paul’s writings. After having stated a proposition, he puts himself in the place of a supposed objector, in order that, by answering the question, he may bring out an additional thought. By so doing he anticipates every objection that might be brought against his argument. {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.1}

Now recall the argument of verses 16-18, and you will readily see the force of this question. He has shown that the works of the law will not suffice to gain the promised inheritance for anybody. Faith in Christ is the only condition of salvation. Then the objector speaks up, and says, “Then what is the use of the law? If the inheritance is only by promise, what do men gain by having the law? Is it not rather a detriment to them?” There was need of asking and answering this question; for, notwithstanding Paul’s answer, thousands are to-day asking the same question, and in so doing they imagine that they are making an unanswerable objection against the law. They say, “If we are saved by grace, what need have we of the law?” And what is the answer?-“It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” Verse 19. {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.2}

This is a very short answer, but it is full of meaning. Let us examine it candidly and carefully, giving due weight to every word. “It was added.” Here the casual reader is liable to be misled into supposing that some mathematical process is referred to. It is true that the word (*prostithami*) is most commonly used in the sense of “add,” but every word must be rendered in accordance with its connection. When used in connection with the law, it does not have the sense of “add.” The only other instance in the New Testament where this word is used with reference to the law is Hebrews 12:19, where it is rendered “spoken.” Paul says that when the people heard the voice of God proclaiming the law from Sinai, “they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken unto them any more.” This makes the meaning more clear than if it had been rendered, “They that heard entreated that the word might not be added to them any more.” In fact, that rendering would not bring out any idea at all. The “Emphatic Diaglott” uses “added” in this place, thus: “The hearers of which entreated that not another word should be added to them;” but by the change of construction the expression is equivalent to that in the regular version. So if in Galatians 3:19 it were rendered “spoken,” the meaning would be brought out more clearly. “It was spoken because of transgression.” Now when the antinomian asks: “What was the use of the law, if the inheritance was only by promise?” Paul answers, “It was spoken because of transgressions.” {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.3}

“Because of transgressions.” Again the casual reader will say: “You have told us that there can be no transgression when there is no law; yet here you have the law spoken because of transgressions already existing; how is this?” It is all right. There can indeed be no transgression when there is no law; but it must be remembered that the law existed in full force long before it was spoken from Sinai, yes, long before the creation of man. In the temple of God in Heaven the law of God was beneath the throne of God, the basis of his Government. This we have clearly demonstrated. And when it was spoken from Sinai, and a copy of it was given to Moses to place within the ark, there was no more law in existence than there was before. The people of the world were under just as much obligation to keep the law before that time as they were afterward. And that was just why it was then given. The people being under obligation to keep the law perfectly, it was necessary that they should have it in such a form that they could study it carefully. Before the giving of the law upon Sinai, God had conveyed a knowledge of his will to the people by his prophets, as Enoch and Noah. The people also had in their hearts more or less trace of the law originally written in the heart of man. But the only people who cared to remember God had been in long and cruel bondage to the heathen, and their knowledge of right and wrong had become blunted. Consequently the law was given that wrong might be known to be wrong. If this point be kept in mind, the reader will not become confused by the text, even though he retains the rendering “added” instead of “spoken.” Thus the law was already in existence, and known to man, although only by tradition; but now the Lord added it in written form. But however it is rendered, there is no more reason for supposing that it teaches that the law was here first introduced than there is of supposing that by the “entering” of the law, in Romans 5:20, or the “speaking” of it, in Hebrews 12:19, the first introduction of the law is indicated. {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.4}

A parallel to the expression, “It was added [or spoken] because of transgressions,” is found in Romans 5:20: “Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound.” The “entering” of the law was at Sinai. Why did it enter?-That the offense (sin) which previously existed might abound. The previous existence of sin implies the previous existence of the law; but it was then formally given that the enormity of sin might be seen. And why was it necessary that the enormity of sin might be seen? Says Paul, “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.” That is, it was necessary for men to see the real nature of sin, in order that they might seek the grace that is in Christ, which alone can take away sin. And the more enormous sin appeared, the more comprehensive views could they have of grace; for no matter how greatly sin abounded, grace super-abounded. This will be made more clear further on. W. {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.5}

**“‘Rome Never Changes’” The Signs of the Times, 12, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Sabbath Recorder*, after noting the position of the Catholic Church in regard to secret societies, and its *quasi*-support of temperance principles, asks: “May we not hope that the time is not far distant when the dominion of the church over the fate and practice of her communicants will be broken, and the era of freedom of conscience shall come again to this priest-ridden church?” No; the Bible forbids us to hope for any change. It is a truth that “Rome never changes.” The prophet, speaking of the papal power, says: “I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the Saints possessed the kingdom.” Daniel 7:21, 22. Freedom of conscience and Roman Catholicism are incompatible. {SITI July 22, 1886, p. 438.6}

**“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 4” The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” There is no question of course but that the “seed” is Christ. The sixteenth verse plainly says so. Then what is the coming of the seed? Some have supposed it to be Christ’s first advent, but a little study will show that the second advent is here spoken of. The “seed” is never mentioned except in connection with the promise, and the promise is fulfilled only at the second coming of Christ. The following texts and argument will make this appear:- {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.1}

In Genesis 3:15, the Lord, in pronouncing the curse upon the serpent (Satan), said, “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it [the seed] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Paul, in his letter to the Romans, many years after Christ had come and had ascended to Heaven, said, “And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.” Romans 16:20. The bruising of a serpent’s head is its destruction; but this was not accomplished at Christ’s first advent, but was something still future. The destruction of Satan begins only at Christ’s second coming. See Revelation 20. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.2}

Again, in the promise to Abraham it was said, “And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.” Genesis 22:17. This was not fulfilled at the first advent of Christ. On the contrary he was then delivered into the hands of his enemies, and they did to him whatsoever they would. He will possess the gate of his enemies only when the following promise is fulfilled: “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 2:7, 8. And this is fulfilled at Christ’s second advent, when he takes vengeance “on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel,” as is described by the revelator:- {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.3}

“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 he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.... 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. Thus he possesses the gate of his enemies. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.4}

Again, another part of the promise to the seed was that he should possess the whole earth. See Psalm 2:7, 8, where the uttermost parts of the earth are promised to Christ for a possession; also see Genesis 13:14-17, and Romans 4:13. But when Christ was on earth, he possessed not so much as a place where he could lay his head. Matthew 8:20. When, however, the seventh angel sounds (when the mystery of God is to be finished, Revelation 10:7), then it will be said: “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.” Revelation 11:15. The eighteenth verse says that this is at “the time of the dead, that they should be judged,” showing conclusively that it is at the second coming of Christ. Compare 2 Timothy 4:1. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.5}

Still further, in the prophecy of Ezekiel the promise of the earth to Christ is directly associated with his second coming. The prophet foretells the captivity of the Jews, the succession of the four universal monarchies, and the setting up of the kingdom of God, as follows:- {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.6}

“And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” Ezekiel 21:25-27. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.7}

The diadem was taken from the king of Israel when he and his people were carried away to Babylon. At that time Babylon was a universal monarchy. Then three “overturnings” are mentioned, which reach to the second coming of Christ. Thus: The first overturning made Medo-Persia a universal dominion; the second gave the dominion of the world to Grecia; and the third overturning made the empire of Rome fill the world. This was the state of things at Christ’s first advent, and for four hundred years later, and the prophet declared that there should be no more general revolution “until He come whose right it is.” Note the parallel between this and the clause in Galatians 3:19, which says, “Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” In the light of Ezekiel 21:25-27 we think there can be no question but that in the latter passage the second coming of Christ is referred to. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.8}

Once more: The promise to the seed was that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed. This of course could not be fulfilled as long as any wicked are in existence. But when Christ comes, sitting on the throne of his glory, to destroy sinners out of the earth, “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” Matthew 25:34. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.9}

From the above quotations and references it will be seen that the promises to “the seed” are not fulfilled until the second coming of Christ; they all culminate at his second advent. It was willful forgetfulness of this fact that caused the Jews to reject Christ. They read the promises to the seed,-promises of glorious triumph,-and applied them to the coming of the Messiah; and when they saw none of those promises fulfilled in him, they rejected him. Let us not, like them, fall into grievous error by referring to his first advent those promises to be fulfilled only at his second glorious coming. That was the time of his humiliation, not of his triumph. Christ then came as an offering for sin, and not as the seed to whom the promise was made. When he comes the second time he comes as King of kings and Lord of lords; he comes to take possession of the gates of his enemies, whom he will dash in pieces as a potter’s vessel; he comes to take possession of his inheritance, even “the uttermost parts of the earth,” and to receive as his own a great multitude whom no man can number. Compare Revelation 7:9 and Genesis 13:16. In short, he comes as “the seed to whom the promise was made.” W. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.10}

**“Plain Facts on the Sunday Question” The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among the letters on the Sunday question, published in the St. Louis *Republican* of July 4, is one from a Catholic priest, D. S. Phelan, of the St. Louis, which states the facts relative to the Sunday in such a plain language that we reproduce it entire. We earnestly invite all Protestants to give it a careful perusal:- {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.11}

“St. Louis, July 3.-EDITOR REPUBLICAN: I have been asked my view on the question of Sunday observance. I have no views. It is a matter of positive law. Dogmas of faith and canons of discipline are great and stubborn things; views are trifles light as air. The Sunday is an institution of the church. The attempt to identify it with the Jewish Sabbath, or to make it heir to its rights and ceremonies is futile and absurd. The ceremonial law Moses is abrogated-buried in the same grave with the synagogue. The Lord’s day is the creation of the church in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in the week would seem to be of divine origin. When the church set apart the first day of the week for public worship, she enacted that all her children who reached the years of discretion should first hear mass, and secondly abstain from servile works on that day. This is positive law, and any man’s views contrary to this enactment are treasonable. The mass is the one great sacrifice of the new law, and all the faithful are obliged to assist at on the Lord’s day. Sunday is likewise a day of rest-made so by the church’s enactment. She says we may not do any work on that day which is of servile or ordinary wage-earning character. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 454.12}

“But how all about games and amusement on the Lord’s day? ‘What saith the law?’ the Church does not condemn them, although she encourages the faithful to works of piety and prepare. She knows the world too well to impose a burden they cannot bear. She is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for all Christians to spend all of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.1}

“Why do our separated brethren place so much stress in observing this Sunday ordinance of the Catholic Church? They are more Catholic than the Catholic Church. But they are Catholic only on Sunday. On Friday they are pagans. Why do they eat meat on the latter day? The church, who presented the method of Sunday observance, forbids the use of flesh meat on Friday. Why, too, do they not observe the laws of the Lenten season? They emanate from the same authority which fixed the time and method of the weekly public worship. The Pharisees were in the habit of higgling about trifles, while they neglected the weightier things of the Mosaic law. Our separated brethren are in the same predicament. They take the Sunday from the church, and they get the scare-crow of Christendom, while they throw away the Friday abstinence, and the Lenten fast, not to speak of the annual confession and communion.” {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.2}

The only thing in the above that we would criticize is the implication that by the abrogation of the ceremonial law the Sabbath was also abolished. The fourth commandment had in it nothing of a ceremonial nature, consequently it was not affected by the blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances. So when “the church” set apart Sunday as a demi-semi-holy day, there were too weekly days of worship claiming man’s allegiance: one given by man himself; the other, the original Sabbath which God gave to man. We wish now to call our readers special attention to the following points in the letter of “Father” Phelan:- {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.3}

1. “The Sunday is an institution of the church.” It has no connection with the Sabbath, and derives none of its “authority” from the command enjoining the observance of what is termed the “Jewish Sabbath.” {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.4}

2. “The Lord’s day [an erroneous title for Sunday] is the creation of the church, in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in the week would seem to be of divine origin.” But why should it “see” that the obligation to observe one day in the week is of divine origin? If the Sabbath commandment be abolished along with the ceremonial law, the obligation to observe one day in the week must also be gone; for the fourth commandment is the only place where such obligation is expressed. But if there is now obligation to observe one day in the week, and that of divine origin, it must be derived from the fourth commandment, which specifies particularly which gave the week shall be observed. Note this point: Our Catholic friend distinguishes between the obligation that is of “divine origin,” and the “obligation” which originated in the “church.” This is as it should be. The observance of one day in the week is enjoined by the Creator, in the fourth commandment; the setting apart of the first day, instead of the seventh “according to the commandment,” rests solely on the authority of men. There is nothing divine about it. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.5}

3. The same power that set apart the Sunday also originated the mass; and the Sunday was set apart so late for the celebration of this mummery. Notice: The church “is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for Christians to spend the whole of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour.” Outside of that hour, the people may engage in anything except servile work. Thus the only *essential* thing about Sunday is the mass. If professed Protestants want to know how to keep Sunday, why do they not go to the only source of authority on that subject? {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.6}

The remainder of the letter speaks for itself. We commend to all Protestants the questions which it contains. If they are determined to follow, and even to exceed, the Catholic ordinance concerning Sunday, why not be consistent, and attend mass on that day, abstain from meat on Friday, and go to confession? But if they are determined to be Protestants indeed, the way is plain. We do not acknowledge the Pope’s authority, and the only treason that we know of in matters pertaining to morals, is disobedience to the commandments of God. W. {SITI July 29, 1886, p. 455.7}