**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Our good friend, the editor of the *Herald of Truth* (Baptist), has shown zeal in his efforts to uphold the Sunday-Sabbath, which would be commendable if it were in a better cause. He has ransacked the coast from Washington Territory to Southern California to find men who had skill in making assertions appear to be argument, and has had several different men try their hands at building under the Sunday institution a cobweb support which would look strong and beautiful if not examined too closely. It has been of slight importance that these men have differed materially in many of their statements, since they all agreed in one thing, namely, that Sunday is the Sabbath, and this conclusion would serve to satisfy people who are already convinced. It would seem, however, that their efforts have not fully satisfied the editor of the *Herald*, for of late he has been very earnest in his endeavor to have the State Legislature enact a law compelling all people to keep Sunday. From this it appears that he has not the utmost confidence in the power of the arguments of his correspondents to substantiate the claims of Sunday. The strongest argument for Sunday, namely, the law of the land, has been reserved for the last. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.1}

We do not wonder that the editor of the *Herald* thinks it necessary to appeal to something besides theological arguments, when we read the last one that was offered before he began to work for the civil argument. It was written by one Gilbert S. Bailey, D. D., and although the editor said in regard to it, “It is not often that the *Herald of Truth* carries such a weighty and timely utterance of an honored Baptist, as in this number,” we think that on second reading he must have revised his opinion. The article, however, was thought worthy of being put in tract form for extensive circulation, and we notice it, not because it contains anything which the SIGNS has not answered again and again, but chiefly that our readers may understand just what, among California Baptists at least, is considered “a weighty and timely utterance” in behalf of Sunday. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.2}

After a paragraph of assertions, the Doctor states the following proposition, which he says he will prove:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.3}

“The disciples of Christ commenced the religious observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and Christ himself was present with them and gave them his sanction and blessing.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.4}

This proposition he considers under three heads: 1. The Scripture proof. 2. Proofs from church history. 3. Testimony of the Fathers. The first text which he quotes in proof of his proposition is John 20:19: “Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.” On this text the Doctor says: “Four times on this day of his resurrection he appeared to his disciples, and this last time is particularly described.” “Jesus imparted to his disciples the Holy Spirit, and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as embassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct, and to guide them in teaching others.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.5}

In harmony with his statement that the disciples began the observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, the Doctor evidently means to convey the idea that the disciples were gathered together in a religious meeting in honor of Christ’s resurrection. That this assumption has no foundation whatever in fact, may be seen by anyone who will take the trouble to read a few texts of Scripture. We will notice those texts which refer to the day of his resurrection. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.6}

“Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.” Mark 16:9-11. No comment is needed on this, and we will let the sacred historian proceed with his narrative: “After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them.” Verses 12, 13. This appearance to the two disciples who were going into the country is described in detail in Luke 24:13-25. There we learn that as they were walking along the road, Jesus joined them, but they did not recognize him. They had heard the story of the women to whom Jesus had appeared earlier in the day, but did not believe that Jesus was risen. And it was not until they sat down to supper that Jesus made himself know to them. Verse 30, 31. This was at the close of the day. Verse 29. They immediately arose and returned to Jerusalem, a distance of eight miles, and found the eleven gathered together, to whom they told the experience of the day. But as we have already learned from Mark 16:12, 13, the eleven, did not believe them. This is made still more evident from Luke’s account of the appearing of Christ to the eleven, for he says that when Jesus came into their midst and said, “Peace be unto you,” they were terrified. Jesus, noticing their terror, showed them his hands and his feet to convince them that he was a real being and the one whom they had seen crucified. And even then, although the truth was beginning to force itself upon them, “they yet believed not for joy.” Here, then, we have some of the particulars concerning the meeting spoken of in John 20:19, and we find that instead of having a meeting to commemorate Christ’s resurrection, the disciples did not believe that he had risen. Thus the first text which the Doctor quotes in support of his proposition contradicts it. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.7}

But this is not all. Mark tells what they were doing there together that evening. After having told how Jesus appeared to the two as they went into the country, and how they had told the eleven but had not been believed, he continues: “Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.” Mark 10:14. Thus we find that instead of holding a religious meeting on the evening of that first day, they were simply eating supper, and so Christ appeared to them and asked them for something to eat, in order that he might convince them that he was not a phantom but a real being. They had food ready at hand, “and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them.” Luke 24:42, 43. Now if the reader wishes to know how the disciples happened to be together that evening, he may read Acts 1:12, 13, where he will find that they all lived at the same place. From the time of the last Passover until the day of Pentecost the disciples had one dwelling-place. So, then, the idea that when Jesus met with the disciples on the evening of the resurrection they were holding a religious service in honor of his resurrection, is not merely an unwarranted assumption, but is a positive contradiction of the Scriptures. This is a fair specimen of these “weighty and timely utterances” in behalf of the Sunday. The editor of the *Herald of Truth* says that his paper is not often honored with such a “weighty and timely utterance” on the Sunday question as this of Mr. Bailey’s. If that is so, he has cause to congratulate himself. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.8}

But there is still another point. The Doctor quotes with great confidence the fact that Jesus said to the disciples, “Peace be unto you.” He says: “Jesus imparted to his disciples his Holy Spirit and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as embassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct and to guide them in teaching others.” But what has this to do with the sanctifying of Sunday? He said, “Peace be unto *you*,” and not, “Blessed is this day.” He endowed the disciples with the Holy Ghost, but imparted no sacredness to the day. First-day writers are wont to lay great stress on the fact that Jesus blessed his disciples one Sunday evening, as though that imparted any sacredness to the day. If they could show an instance where the day itself was blessed, it would be more to their purpose. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.9}

Some may, however, think with Dr. Bailey, that by thus breathing on the disciples and imparting to them the Holy Spirit, he “gave the highest possible approval to their meeting;” but when they remember what we have already proved, that their meeting was simply a family gathering around the supper-table, they will hardly think that an every-day affair like that needed a special act of divine approval. If the reader will bear in mind that what Jesus said was *to his disciples*, and not *about a day*, they will be saved from jumping at a false conclusion. When Jesus said to his disciples, “Peace be unto you,” it was without the slightest thought of specially sanctioning what they were doing, but because they were terrified at his appearance when they supposed that he was dead. John 20:19 would never be quoted as an argument for the sacredness of Sunday if that institution were not in desperate straits. An unprejudiced person who did not know that the Sunday must be maintained at all hazards, would read that text a thousand times and never get the idea that it could be used as an argument for Sunday. W. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.10}

(*To be continued.*)

**“The Curse of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother in the State of Minnesota asks the question, “What is the curse of the law?” and wishes an answer through the SIGNS. We could give a categorical answer in one word, and say, “Death,” but this would not relieve the brother’s difficulty, as he wants better authority than our unsupported word. We will therefore take a little more space and let the Bible answer. We cannot refrain, however, from expressing our astonishment that such a question should be asked, because a knowledge of what the curse of the law is almost necessarily precedes the acceptance of the gospel. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.11}

The only place where the term “curse of the law” occurs in the Bible is Galatians 3:13, which reads as follows: “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.” The text itself contains the answer to the question asked. For since Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us, if we know what Christ suffered for us, we shall of course know what is the curse of the law. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture to prove that Christ suffered death for us, yet in order to make the argument complete we will quote a few texts. Paul says (Romans 4:25) that he “was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification.” Isaiah says (chap. 53:8), “He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.12}

Again Paul says (Romans 5:6-8): “For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Death, then, is what Christ endured in order to redeem us, and that this is the curse which he suffered and from which he redeemed us, is plain from the last clause of Galatians 3:13: “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” This refers to Christ’s death by crucifixion, as Peter says in Acts 5:30: “The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.” The argument then stands thus: Men were under the curse of the law; Christ came to redeem them from this curse; in order to redeem them from this curse, he had to endure the same curse; what he endured was death; death, therefore, is the curse of the law. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 70.13}

This is a sufficient answer, but we will give further Scripture evidence to prove the same thing. Paul says in Romans 8:7 that “the carnal mind is enmity against God,” for the reason that “it is not subject to the law of God.” But “to be carnally minded is death” (verse 6), therefore we must conclude that death follows the violation of the law; and this is only what Paul expressly declares in Romans 6:23: “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Now in Deuteronomy 30:15-20, death is expressly shown to be the curse which God pronounced against sinners. We quote verse 19: “I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may life.” We read also (Romans 5:12) that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Thus we know that death is the curse that follows sin. But “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4); therefore death is the curse for transgression of the law; or, in other words, it is the curse of the law. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.1}

Once more; Paul says that the doers of the law shall be justified; that is, if men never violated the law they would have the favor of God. But the favor of God is life (Psalm 30:5); therefore obedience to the law would secure life. Compare Matthew 19:17. But “all have sinned” (Romans 3:23), and “therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified.” Romans 3:20. This means that the law condemns everybody, since all have violated it; and since justification by the law means the favor of God and life, it follows that condemnation by the law means the wrath of God and death. And this argument is summed up in one sentence, thus: “The commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.” Romans 7:10. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.2}

Scripture proofs on this point might be multiplied indefinitely, but we think these are sufficient to establish the almost self-evident fact that the curse of the law is death. W. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.3}

**“Is It Peace?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

Elsewhere in this paper the reader will find articles bearing on the present war preparations in Europe. Scarcely a day passes but that some new feature is not reported. For instance, “The German army possesses a new explosive called roburite. It is reported to be stronger than melinite. The method of its manufacture is a secret. It is exploded by intense heat.” Again we learn that “the Austrian war budget is to be increased twenty-five million dollars.” We are also told that the Austrian Landsturm will supply one million additional men, and that the rules which have just been published show that nothing except men from the service. All agree that no such war preparations have ever before been made in Europe, even when war had been declared, whereas now there is general peace. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.4}

Some of the comments made by the daily papers concerning these things strike us as being decidedly strange. The S. F. *Evening Bulletin* says:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.5}

“Never in the history of Europe have war preparations been made on so large a scale. Yet who can say that these preparations may not tell in the interests of peace?” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.6}

The Oakland *Evening Tribune* says:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.7}

“Everything portends war. A spark may ignite the combustible material at any moment.Such preparations for war have not been known in Europe for many years; but each nation being prepared may be the very cause of preventing war.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.8}

We fail to see any promise of peace in preparations for war. The peaceable men of a community are not the ones who always go armed. Men do not carry weapons unless they expect to use them at some time. True, they may not have any definite hostile determination, but they go armed so that they may be “prepared” when any provocation is given. Men who never intend to fight, never carry arms. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.9}

So with nations. Where there are warlike preparations, there is expectation of war. The nations of Europe are not members of any peace society. They have been known to fight when they had less strength and less confidence in their strength than they have now. They are extremely jealous of one another. The increased preparation of any one nation will not frighten the others into greater desires for peace, since they all are keeping equal pace in the work of arming. These preparations mean nothing else but war. It may not come for some time; the longer it is delayed the greater will be the preparation; and when at last the spark is dropped into the magazine, there will be such a commotion on the continent of Europe as the world has never seen. It will then be demonstrated whether or not the people of the United States can, as the *Tribune* says, look complacently on and profit by the struggle. It is now almost too soon to be so positive in regard to that matter. W. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 71.10}

**“The Nations Are Angry” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Interior* of January 20, 1887, gives an excellent view of the condition of Europe. The word of God says that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet “the nations were angry.” Assuredly this is the case now. And when the elements do break loose, with such immense armaments, and such multitudes of soldiers, what can the result be but destruction upon destruction? Whether it comes sooner or later the certainty is that it must come, and it can only be as described in Jeremiah 25:32, “A great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth.” And yet in the presence of those things men will preach peace and safety, and the speedy coming of a glorious millennium of peace on earth! {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 72.1}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received an envelope containing two post-office money orders, and some postage-stamps, but not a line to indicate from whom the money came, nor where it should be applied. Whoever has sent money from which he has received no return, would do well to communicate with us at once. We would like to know what to do with the money. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.1}

Through the courtesy of J. H. Kellogg, M. D., member of the Michigan State Board of Health, we have received the thirteenth annual report of that body. It contains many interesting statistics, and directions for avoiding disease. The book also contains the report of Professor Vaughan’s experiments with poisonous cheese, some extracts from which we shall give in our Health and Temperance Department. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.2}

We clip the following item of news from a secular paper:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.3}

“The Saturday half-holiday movement promises to be stronger than ever in the East the coming summer. A bill has been introduced in the New York Legislature making the entire day Saturday a legal holiday, and there is a strong popular sentiment behind it.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.4}

This means the enforced observance of Sunday; for the advancement of the counterfeit sabbath is just in proportion as the Sabbath of the Lord is depreciated. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.5}

We learn from the report of a sermon by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, of San Francisco, that although Solomon “has been called a very wise man,” he possessed wisdom only to a limited degree,” but was not a wise man nor a profound man.” The *learned* speaker said that Solomon “was always asking questions about everything, never seeing into anything.” The declaration is in the face of the following words addressed to Solomon by the Lord: “Lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee.” 1 Kings 3:12. But Solomon didn’t live in the nineteenth century, and was consequently ignorant of many things that are *known* by modern “divines.” However, we would rather know only a few things that are true, than to know so many things that are not so. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.6}

The following we clip from a secular paper published in an interior town:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.7}

“The basket social given at the Christian church last evening was very well attended, and was a very pleasant and enjoyable affair. The mating brought about by the sale of the baskets was voted a most happy thought, and created no end of fun and laughter. After the supper, a season of social entertainment was had, and at a late hour the meeting broke up, all present having had a jolly good time.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.8}

This was in a “Christian” church. If it were indeed a Christian church we would not greatly blame those who see no need of their becoming Christians. People can do such things as that without the trouble of making a profession of Christianity. In the days of Noah, people were doing the very same things; but they were not the ones who went into the ark. In the days that were before the flood, “they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage,” no doubt having “a jolly good time,” and “no end of fun and laughter,” until the day that Noah entered into the ark. So absorbed were they in their fun that they “knew not until the flood came, and took them all away.” And “so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.9}

The *Christian Union* makes merry over the regulations of the West Boston Bridge Corporation, a section of which stands thus: “And the said proprietors shall meet annually on the first Tuesday of June, providing the same does not fall on Sunday.” Well, that does sound funny, but the lawyers who drew it up doubtless know what they were about. They had evidently read the “arguments” for Sunday-keeping, in which we are gravely informed that the first day of the week is “the eighth day,” and they very naturally concluded that it must be easier for the first and the third days to be identical than for the first and the eighth, especially since there are but seven. Since the Sunday advocates have shown us how variable the days of the week are,-the first day being both the seventh and the “eighth,”-people can’t be too careful in specifying, if they want them kept separate. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.10}

On another page mention is made of the new explosive, roburite, which the Germans have discovered, and which is considered to be far more powerful than melinite, which has recently been invented by two French officers. Of course the composition of both explosives is a secret, but they are known to have terrible power. Melinite is said to have ten times the destructive power of nitro-glycerine. A shell charged with a quantity of this explosive would be capable of doing deadly work. It is also reported that while the manufacture of this material is going on, its inventors are experimenting with a new rifle powder which explodes without making any smoke, and which will enable a body of infantry to fire on the enemy from cover, without betraying their position by clouds of smoke. Science has been developed to its present state of advancement principally for the purpose of enabling armies to exterminate one another as speedily as possible. As has been remarked, “chemists are developing into wholesale slaughterers of men.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.11}

A religious exchange says:- {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.12}

“Omaha has 100 saloons paying $1,000 per year license, and that money goes into the school fund. The result is that the public schools of Omaha are as fine as any in the country.” {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.13}

What a blessing saloons are, to be sure! It is evident that if Omaha only had a few more saloons, it might have the very best public schools in the country; and since nothing is more desirable than good schools, it follows that a few more self-denying philanthropists ought to start saloons in that city. How good the honest drunkard-makers must feel to have the assurance of the religious press that they are the principal supporters of civilization and education. The journal, however, forget to note two points: (1) That in order to get that one hundred and sixty thousand dollars for the public schools, the people of Omaha and vicinity must pay the saloon-keepers not less than one million dollars, at a low estimate; and (2) that Omaha is about the hardest town in the interior of the United States. Six hundred per cent. per annum, besides hundreds of criminals and paupers, is a pretty high rate of interest to pay for money, even for educational purposes. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.14}

In recording an interview which she recently had with a lady of some note, Miss Francis Willard says: “I was glad to note her fair, unpunctured ear-a proof of wholesome instincts.” Miss Willard is a woman of excellent sense. While it is true that many ladies of refinement and taste do disfigure their ears with rings and pendants, it remains a fact that the custom is borrowed from the savage races. The more barbaric a people are, the more so-called ornaments they put on. When we see a lady with unpunctured ears, we involuntarily, like Miss Willard, give her credit for good sense or else for good training. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.15}

In our notice of the “Gospel Manual,” two weeks ago, we stated that “where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing, only the fullest account is given.” This was an error on our part. The author says: “I am not aware of a single chapter or page where this is done. My aim was to produce a book which should embody the entire contents of the four Gospels, *except* where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing *in the same* words. Verbal differences of statement, embodying faintest shades of meaning, are all interwoven into the general narrative.” This feature is certainly an important one, and greatly enhances the value of the book. We very gladly do the author the justice of correcting the error which arose from a too hasty examination on our part. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.16}

**“The ‘True Educator’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have seen a good many college and school journals “edited and conducted wholly by the students,” and there are a few that come to us occasionally. The most that can be said for the majority of such journals is that they serve to keep the students out of worse employment. Too often they are filled with local notes and jokes which can interest no one but the students themselves, and which have anything but an elevating effect on them. The *True Educator*, published at South Lancaster, Mass., is emphatically not one of this class. While it is published by the “Academy press,” and the mechanical work is done by the students, it is edited by the principal of the Academy, Prof. C. C. Ramsey, who is making it just what it claims to be, a journal “for teachers, students, parents, and school officers.” We can conscientiously say of it that it improves with every number. Professor Ramsey is one who believes that “it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing,” and is untiring in his efforts to make both the Academy and the journal worthy of the patronage of all. The *True Educator* is warmly recommended by some of the best teachers in the country, because it is just what its name implies. Subscription price per year, seventy-five cents; combined with the *American Sentinel*, on dollar, the price of the latter paper alone being fifty cents. Address, *The True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass.; or Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. {SITI February 3, 1887, p. 80.17}

**“Things We Should Know.—No. 2” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment.” Ecclesiastes 11:9. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.1}

Here is another thing we must know. The knowledge of this naturally follows from the knowledge of the existence of God. He is our Creator, and therefore has a right to claim that we shall do his will; but if this is so, it necessarily follows that judgment must be passed upon us, to see if we have done his will. The text is addressed to young men; but since God is no respecter of persons, we must conclude that all classes of people will alike be brought into judgment. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.2}

That all the world will be brought into judgment, is positively stated in the Bible. In his sermon on Mars Hill, Paul said that God “now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.” Acts 17:30, 31. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.3}

What shall be the standard of the final judgment? If we are to know that for certain things God will bring us into judgment, it must be that we can know what to do in order to secure a favorable decision. We have already learned that, being wholly dependent on God, we are bound to conform to his will in every particular; therefore we must conclude that God’s will is to be the standard of judgment. This conclusion is supported by the words in the Lord’s prayer, which indicate that when God’s kingdom comes his will will be done by all. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.4}

What then is the will of God, by which we are to be judged? Paul gives the answer in the following words: “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law.” Romans 2:17, 18. How was it that those whom Paul addressed knew the will of God? Because they were instructed out of the law. Then it must be that the law of God contains the will of God. This is still further shown by the words which David uttered prophetically in behalf of Christ: “Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:7, 8. It was Christ’s delight-more than his meat or drink-to do the will of God. He ever did the will of the Father. This was because the law of God was in his heart, so that all his actions were spontaneously in harmony with it. But acting in harmony with the law of God, was doing the will of God; therefore the law of God is identical with his will. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.5}

Once more: When the young man came to Jesus and asked what he should do that he might inherit eternal life, Jesus answered: “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” Matthew 19:17. In his sermon on the mount, he said: “Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven.” Matthew 7:21. Therefore keeping the commandments of God is equivalent to doing the will of God. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.6}

The law of God, then, is to be the standard by which all men shall be judged. This is incidentally shown in the passage already quoted from Romans: Thou “knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law.” According to the marginal reading it is, Thou “triest the things that differ, being instructed out of the law.” The law of God is that by which we try things that differ, by which we decide what things are honest and just and pure and lovely and of good report, and what are not. This, we say, is incidental proof that we are to be judged by the law of God, the ten commandments; for it is manifest that we must judge our actions by the same rule by which God will judge them. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.7}

In the text quoted at the beginning of this article, Solomon tells the young man to have his own way if he will, to walk in the ways of his heart, and in the sight of his eyes, but to *know* that for “all these things” God will bring him into judgment. Then we are to know not only that there will be a judgment, but that the judgment will take into account our thoughts; for the ways of a person’s heart are the ways which his heart devises or thinks upon. This is plainly stated in the next chapter: “For God shall bring ever work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Ecclesiastes 12:14. This agrees with the words of Paul, that when the Lord comes he will “bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” 1 Corinthians 4:5. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.8}

We have seen that the judgment is to be in accordance with the law of God; and since every secret thought is to be brought into judgment, it follows that the law of God takes account of even the thoughts of the heart. Read now Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14: “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God, and keep his. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Here we see that the fact that God will bring every secret thing into judgment, is given as a reason why we should keep the commandments of God. This shows again that the law is so spiritual as to detect the slightest deviation from it even in thought. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.9}

With this agree the words of Paul: “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” Hebrews 4:12. As showing how the law discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, we refer to the words of Christ in Matthew 5:18-22, 27, 28, where we find that a single hateful thought or lustful look is accounted a violation of the sixth or the seventh commandment. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.10}

There is an intimate connection between Ecclesiastes 11:9 and Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14. The latter text is an exhortation to keep the commandments of God, based on the truth that by those commandments God will bring “every work into judgment, with every secret thing.” The former text is an emphatic command to those who seem bent on having their own way, to *know* that “for all these things” God will bring them into judgment. And since that judgment is to be based on the commandments of God, and is to take into account every secret thought, it follows that Ecclesiastes 11:9 is virtually a command for us to *know* that the ten commandments cover every possible deed or thought, and demand perfect obedience. It is a command for us to study the law, and to meditate in it day and night. If we are ever at a loss to know how perfect the law requires us to be, we have only to consider the life and character of Jesus. He “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” This was simply because the law was in his heart. Any one who models his life in accordance with the law of God, will be just like Christ, and the law will be satisfied with nothing less. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.11}

This righteousness cannot be attained by our own individual effort. Of ourselves we can do nothing: but Christ, who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, in order “that we might be made the righteousness of God *in him*.” And so the command to know that God will bring us into judgment for every secret thing, includes the command not only to know that the law of God is to be the standard of that judgment, but also that through Christ alone can we attain to that perfect righteousness which the law demands. If Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, then we can exhibit in our actions the righteousness of the law, for if we have Christ in the heart we must have the law there also. And having lived thus, when we are brought before the judgment seat, and God fixes upon us his piercing gaze, he will see, not us, but the image of Christ, and because he lives we shall live also. W. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 86.12}

**“‘Barkis Is Willin’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a movement on foot in California to secure a law exempting from taxation private and denominational schools and churches of all faiths. Dr. Stratton, of the University of the Pacific (Methodist), is doing all in his power to secure influence in favor of such a law. In pursuance of that object, he called upon the Catholic Archbishop Riordan. To his evident surprise he found that the archbishop expressed not only a willingness but a desire to co-operate with him and others in securing such legislation. We could have told him without going to inquire, that the Catholics would be in favor of having church property exempted from taxation. There are more than four times as many Catholics in California, as there are of Protestants of all denominations; and it is certainly not far out of the way to say that the Catholic Church owns at least twice as much property as do all the Protestant denominations combined. President Stratton may rest assured that he can count on Catholic co-operation in any scheme tending toward the support of the church by the State. Such a law would be a good deal in the nature of special legislation in behalf of the Catholic Church. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.1}

For our part, we have no hesitation in expressing our disapproval of such a law, leaving the Catholic Church out of the question. The church is not, or should not be, a pauper. Let Christians support the churches. It would certainly be an act of injustice to tax infidels and other non-professors, to support something in which they have no interest, or to which they are decidedly opposed. When Christianity has not enough strength to stand alone, but must lean on the State, it has not enough vitality to carry on aggressive evangelical work, and is not worth supporting. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.2}

But Dr. Stratton found out something else when he called on the archbishop. He says in a letter to the *Advocate:*- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.3}

“Among other subjects of conversation were the questions of temperance, and Sabbath [Sunday] observance, and he expressed a desire to co-operate with all Christian people, or others, in promoting these causes.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.4}

Will not a mother care for her own child? Here again we could have told Mr. Stratton that he would find the Catholic Church more than ready to co-operate with Christians, “or others.” Sunday is a child of the Papacy, and professed Protestants may depend upon it that she will not disown her offspring. The Doctor’s interview with the archbishop convinced him that the Catholics have been misrepresented. “The Church,” is a pretty good thing after all, and will aid greatly in matters of “reform.” Strange that intelligent Protestants can be so blind! But this only serves to show how professed Protestants are preparing the way for the triumph of Roman Catholic principles in this country. Meanwhile the wily prelates of the Catholic Church are chuckling over the situation. They well know that if they were to take the initiative in attempting to secure State patronage and Sunday legislation, there would be an outcry which would work disaster to their projects; but they are perfectly willing to “co-operate” with Protestants. True Protestantism, however, will never lend itself to become a catspaw for Catholicism. W. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.5}

**“A Weighty and Timely Utterance” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

**“AFTER EIGHT DAYS,” PENTECOST, AND TROAS**

The next “weighty utterance” that we find is the following:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.6}

“We have no account of their meeting again *until a week later*, after eight days according to the Jewish reckoning. No meeting is mentioned on the old Jewish seventh day; but *on the first day of the next week*, their second Lord’s day, they met again and Thomas was with them, and again he said, ‘Peace be unto you.’” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.7}

We never before heard that Thomas said to the disciples, “Peace be unto you,” and perhaps Dr. Bailey did not mean to say so; but if he had positively declared that it was Thomas instead of the Lord that said, “Peace be unto you,” he would have been no further out of the way than he is in saying that the second time Jesus met with the disciples was on the first day of the week. The assurance with which he says, “We have no account of their meeting again until a week later,” would lead a novice to suppose that John plainly states that it was just one week later, and that the “after eight days,” which the Doctor repeats in an “*aside*,” is simply his own explanation of the Bible term. What John really says is this: “And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you.” John 20:26. Dr. Bailey tells us that “after eight days” is the Jewish expression for one week. It would have been more satisfactory to the inquiring reader if he had given a few examples of such use of the expression, in proof of his statement. Since he did not, we will quote a few instances of similar expressions, which will plainly show that “after eight days” does not mean just one week. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.8}

In Hosea 6:2 we read: “After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.” If “after eight days” means just seven days, then “after two days” ought to mean just one day, and the prophet should have said, To-morrow he will raise us up. But the prophet evidently said just what he meant, namely, that after two days is the third day. This is the Jewish as well as the common-sense mode of reckoning, and according to it “after eight days” would be the ninth day. Therefore if we begin our count with the day on which they first met, the earliest that we can place this second meeting would be the next Monday evening. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.9}

But some one will say that the Jews were not always exact in their reckoning of time. Very true, and we will give an instance of this inexactness. In his account of the transfiguration, Marks says: “And *after six days* Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves.” Mark 9:2. Luke, in relating the same event, says “And it came to pass *about an eight days* *after* these saying he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray.” Luke 9:28. From these two accounts we find that “after six days” may mean “about an eight days after;” therefore if it is claimed that John did not mean to express the exact time, we must admit that “after eight days” means at least about ten days after, and this would bring the meeting to the middle of the next week. But by no possible conclusion can the meeting recorded in John 20:26 be placed earlier in the week than Monday evening. How, then, must we regard the statement which the Doctor makes immediately following, that this meeting is “*specifically mentioned* as on *the first day of the week*.” We are unwilling to believe that he would willfully tell an untruth in order to deceive those who might be ignorant of the exact wording of the text, and we are therefore obliged to suppose that when he wrote his article he did not look at the Bible, but simply quoted from a too treacherous memory. Whichever way it is, it shows the desperate straits in which a man is placed when he attempts to maintain Sunday sacredness. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.10}

Let us now look at the text itself a moment, and see how simple the narrative is. Remember that we have already shown that the disciples had one common dwelling-place at this time. On the evening of the resurrection, Jesus had come into the room while they were eating supper, to convince them that he had actually risen. For some cause not stated, Thomas was not in when Jesus came. Although they all lived at one place, it is not to be supposed that they never stirred from the house. But after eight days (whether nine or ten or more, there is no means of knowing) they were all “within.” And then Jesus appeared to them again. Whether they were eating supper at this time or not is not stated. But knowing the facts as they are stated, how foolish seems the following question: “What higher sanction could Jesus give to this meeting for worship on the first day of the week, *this change from the seventh day* to the Lord’s day?” The Doctor’s method of argument seems to be something like this: Assume that certain things were done at a certain time; if this assumption happens to be contrary to the Scripture, then change the assumption into an emphatic declaration, so as to make people think it must be so, even though the Bible says it is not; and then from these erroneous assumptions and declarations draw a conclusion with such an air of confidence that people will think that it must be so. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.11}

The next “argument” is the following:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.12}

“We have no account of the disciples meeting for worship on any seventh-day Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ to the day of Pentecost, which was also *on the first day of the week*.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.13}

Inasmuch as the day of the week on which Pentecost came that year is not mentioned, it seems rather a lame thing from which to build an argument for Sunday sacredness. It is about equal to the argument on John 20:26. If the pouring out of the Spirit upon the disciples upon the day of Pentecost were intended as a sanction for Sunday observance, it certainly would not be too much to expect that something should have been said about Sunday. On the contrary, however, no hint is given as to the day of the week, and some of the ablest commentators do not pretend to know what day it was, one among whom is Dr. Hackett, a Baptist commentator; he holds that Pentecost came that year on the seventh day of the week, while there are some who hold that it fell on Monday. This shows that they are of the same opinion as Dr. Barnes, who says that it is a matter of no importance what day of the week it was. And that is exactly true. If there were any significance as to the day of the week, the day would certainly have been mentioned. We could easily show from the Scriptures that that Pentecost was on the seventh day of the week, but we shall not take the time, because it would not add a particle of strength to the Sabbath argument. Even if it were plainly stated that that wonderful outpouring of the Spirit was on the seventh day of the week, we should not think of quoting that as an argument in favor of the Sabbath. At the close of creation God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, and no subsequent act could add to the sacredness there put upon it. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 87.14}

And here we will say that even if the statements which Dr. Bailey has made concerning meetings for worship on the first day of the week were true, they lack the essential element to make them of any force in favor of the Sunday; namely, a Bible statement that any sacredness was ever imparted to Sunday. If the mere being together on a certain day were proof of the sacredness of that day, then we would have, according to John 20:26, either Monday, or Tuesday, or Wednesday as a sacred day, for it was on one of these days, we do not know which, that Jesus met with his disciples the week after the resurrection. The day of the ascension of Christ, forty days after his resurrection (see Acts 1:3), was on Thursday, and on that day the disciples all met together with Jesus, and he blessed them, and they worshiped him. See Luke 24:50-52. If Dr. Bailey has any confidence in his method of argument, he ought to keep Thursday. The fact that he does not keep Thursday as sacred, even though Jesus met with and blessed his disciples on that day, shows that he does not really believe that Christ’s meeting with and blessing his disciples on the evening of the resurrection imparted any sacredness to that day. Yet that is all the argument he as in favor of Sunday. So far as the Bible is concerned, there is just as much authority for keeping Thursday as there is for keeping Sunday. The Doctor continues:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.1}

“Was this new order of Sabbaths or *meetings on the first day of the week* kept up by the apostles and by the churches which they established under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? They bade the churches ‘not to forsake the assembling of themselves together.’ On what day did they meet to break bread, and worship? When Paul was at Troas, where a Christian church had been previously formed, we are told in Acts 20:7: ‘And upon the *first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread*, Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight.’ Here again is specifically recorded their customs of assembling on the *first day of the week*, led by an inspired apostle. Were they right or wrong in this?” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.2}

Notice how adroitly everything is turned in behalf of the Sunday. The apostle says to the Hebrews: “Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together;” and behold, it is quoted as an argument for Sunday! Because he tells the disciples to meet together for exhortation, it is taken for granted that he must mean for them to meet on Sunday. We are a little surprised that the Doctor did not say that we are here specifically commanded to meet on the first day of the week. We have heard Hebrews 10:25 quoted thus: “Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together on the first day of the week.” Dr. Bailey here neglected a rare opportunity to make another “weighty utterance” in behalf of Sunday. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.3}

But now what about this meeting at Troas? The apostle and his companions had been with the church there an entire week. Acts 20:6. If anyone thinks that Paul spent seven days with the church in Troas, and did not hold a meeting until just before he started away, he has read the life of Paul to little purpose. If Paul did not hold a meeting every day he was there, he did differently from his ordinary custom. See Acts 19:8-10. We have, however, the record of only one meeting with the church at Troas, and when did that take place? The record says, “On the first day of the week.” But on what part of the first day of the week was it? It was in the night, because they had “many lights,” and it is plainly stated that the meeting lasted all night. But according to Scripture reckoning, the day begins and ends at sunset. See John 1:5, 8, 13, etc.; Deuteronomy 16:6; Leviticus 23:32. The first day of the week, then, begins at sunset Saturday evening, and ends at sunset of the following evening. Therefore a night meeting on the first day of the week must be held on Saturday evening, and that is just when the meeting was held which is recorded in Acts 20:7-11. Then having held this meeting in the night of the first day of the week, what did Paul do in the day-time? Luke tells that he departed when it was light, and traveled on foot to Assos. That this is the view that must necessarily be taken even by Sunday-keepers, when they are not specially set to uphold that institution at all hazards, will be seen by the following extract from Conybeare and Howson’s “Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.4}

“The labors of the early days of the week that was spent at Troas are not related to us, but concerning the last day we have a narrative which enters into details with all the minuteness of one of the gospel histories. It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath. On Sunday morning the vessel was about to sail. The Christians of Troas were gathered together at this solemn time to celebrate that feast of love which the last commandment of Christ has enjoined on all his followers.”-*Chap. 20, par. 9*. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.5}

After describing the meeting, the departure of the ship with Paul’s companions, and Paul’s departure on foot, the same writers says:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.6}

“Strength and peace were surely sought and obtained by the apostle from the Redeemer as he pursued his lonely road that Sunday afternoon in spring among the oak woods and the streams of Ida.”-*Par. 11*. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.7}

So much for Paul’s sanction for Sunday worship. Perhaps, however, some may insist that the meeting was held in the night following Sunday, and that Paul’s journey was on Monday; then according to their assumption that Paul tarried there a week in order to be with them at their regular time of meeting, they must necessarily claim that he passed over the whole of the first day of the week without having any meeting, and did not meet with them until the setting of the sun and the gathering darkness showed that the first day had passed. Whichever way they fix it, the record of this meeting gives no aid or comfort to the advocates of Sunday observance. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.8}

Now one word about apostolic example, for that is the stronghold of Sunday advocates. If apostolic example has to be followed at all, it must be followed closely. It will not do to discriminate and say that we must follow certain apostolic practices, but may neglect others. Therefore our friends who are such sticklers for apostolic example, must hold their meetings in the dark part of the first day of the week, and never in the day-time on Sunday, for the entire Bible contains no account of a religious meeting on Sunday in the day-time. And the meeting at Troas is the only recorded instance of a meeting on the first day of the week, even in the night. W. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 88.9}

**“Holiness of Angels” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ spoke of the condition of the righteous after the resurrection he said, “Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels.” Luke 20:36. Thus the angels in Heaven are immortal. But there is another feature in which the saints will resemble the angels, and that is in their holiness. This quality is a characteristic of the angels. This is so well known that an angel is almost a symbol of purity. When they are mentioned in the Bible the adjective “holy” is often applied to them. The servants of Cornelius told Peter that their master had been “warned from God by an holy angel.” Acts 10:22. In Matthew 25:31 Christ himself applied the term to all the angels of Heaven. He said: “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.” Without these direct statements as to their character, we would know that they are holy, for Christ says of these “ministering spirits,” they “do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven.” Matthew 18:10. And only the pure and holy in heart can see God. Matthew 5:8; Hebrews 12:14. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 90.1}

In what does the holiness of the angels consist? What is it that makes them holy? It must be in that they do the will of God. That the will of God is done in Heaven, is evident from Matthew 6:10; and since there are none in Heaven except the angels who do the will of God, it is a necessary consequence that they are the ones to whom Christ refers. God is holy, and the doing of his will would make one like him, holy. From Romans 2:17, 18 we learn that God’s law is his will; and that this is the will which the angels perform, and which constitutes their holiness, is plainly stated in Psalm 103:20: “Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word.” The perfection of the angels, then, is due to the fact that they keep the perfect law of God. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 90.2}

Christ taught his disciples to pray, “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven.” Matthew 6:10. This shows that a time will come when the commandments of God will be kept on earth even as the angels now keep them in Heaven. This will be in the new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. But although the change of the earth from old to new will be quickly effected, and although man’s change from mortal to immortal will be brought about in the twinkling of an eye, the change to holiness is a gradual work. “Heaven is not reached at a single bound.” The work of sanctification is a progressive work. Therefore the fact that the commandments of God will some day be kept by men on earth even as they now are by the angels in Heaven, shows that they who hope to be among the equals of the angels must now be keeping the commandments of God. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 90.3}

**EVIL ANGELS**

We read in 2 Peter 2:4 that “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.” This shows conclusively that the angels were once on probation as Adam was in the garden of Eden, and that those who are now called the holy angels have had their characters tested, so that they are now placed beyond the reach of temptation. It shows also that the angels who sinned can have no hope of a restoration to the favor of God. Peter says that God “delivered them into *chains of darkness*.” We can understand what this means by comparing a few texts. From 2 Peter 2:19; Fal. 3:22, 23; Romans 7:14 we learn that sin is bondage. The person who is in the darkness of error is in a state of bondage. Moreover, we learn from 2 Thessalonians 2:9-12 that those who persist in rejecting light will finally be given up to believe a lie. The same thing is taught in Romans 1:28. That is, those who persistently sin in the face of great light, will finally be left in the bondage of sin without hope of escape. This is what is doubtless meant by the angels that sinned being delivered into chains of darkness. They had light and knowledge greater than man had, as they were a higher order of creatures than he was. In the face of this light, and in defiance of the love and mercy of God, they deliberately chose the way of darkness. Having once chosen the bondage of sin, their choice was irrevocable. They were in “chains of darkness” that could not be broken. And so until the Judgment day ends their miserable careers, they are in darkness. They are darkness itself. Darkness and error are inseparable from them. Wherever they are, their presence contaminates; and their sole aim is to perpetrate lying wonders which shall lure men away from the truth into the same chains of darkness with themselves. Let us never forget to pray, “Deliver us from evil.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 90.4}

**CARE OF GOOD ANGELS FOR MEN**

But if “the rulers of the darkness of this world” are actively engaged in trying to overthrow us, and drag us down to eternal ruin, we have the assurance that “angels that excel in strength” are “ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation.” Hebrews 1:14. Every “little one,” every child of God, has one for his especial guardian. Matthew 18:10; Acts 12:15. Not only so, but all the heavenly host are intensely interested in the whole human race, and anxious for the conversion of each sinner. Says Christ: “I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.” Luke 15:10. When Jesus was born in Bethelehem of Judea, there was joy in Heaven. It was not sufficient to send a single angel to announce his birth, but a multitude of the heavenly host must accompany him to sing their joy at the good tidings which should be to all people. So great was the joy among the angels over the fact that fallen man’s Redeemer had actually come, that it would seem that they could not remain quiet in Heaven. They must flock to witness the joy of the humble shepherds, and to proclaim their own. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 90.5}

Seeing then that “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16); that “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8); that Christ is at the right hand of God making intercession for us (Romans 8:34); and that all the holy and mighty angels of God are interested and loving messengers of light and strength to those who are striving against sin, may we not even in the face of Satan’s hosts say: “In all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Romans 8:37-39. W. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 91.1}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last Wednesday, February 2, Brother W. I. H. Baker and Sister Josie Baker sailed on the steamer *Australia* for Honolulu, whence, after a stay of ten days, they will sail on the *Mariposa* for Australia. Brother and Sister Baker have been faithful laborers in the office of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and we shall miss them both here and in the Sabbath-school. Many prayers and good wishes will follow them on their journey, and to their new field of labor. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.1}

The *American Sentinel* for 1886, bound either in paper or I cloth, can now be furnished in any quantity. In either style it is very convenient for carrying, and can thus be used for reference by ministers who are traveling from place to place. Nowhere else can so many facts and arguments be found on the vital subject of “National Reform.” No one who wishes to be intelligent in regard to this matter should fail to procure a bound volume of the *Sentinel*. Price, in paper, sixty cents; in cloth, one dollar. Address *American Sentinel*, Oakland Cal. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.2}

An Eastern paper says: “The Jews are talking of changing their Sabbath to our Sabbath, beginning with the year 1900.” We do not see how this thing can be done; the Jews might easily abandon the ancient Sabbath and go to keeping another day; but to change “their Sabbath”-by which we suppose is meant the seventh day, “the Sabbath of the Lord”-to “our Sabbath”-which, we take it, means Sunday-is just as impossible as to change Monday to Thursday, or 12 o’clock noon to 12 o’clock midnight. God has spoken, and said, “The seventh day is the Sabbath,” and though “hand join in hand,” and both Jew and Papist think to change the times and laws of the Most High, all his commandments will still be sure, they will stand fast forever and ever. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.3}

The *World’s Advanced Thought* thus patronizingly notices the progress of a prominent “divine:”- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.4}

“The *Christian Union*, called by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, repudiates the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as ‘inconsistent with Scripture, antagonistic to science, and a product of a Pagan and materialistic habit of thought.’ If the Reverend Abbott would get hold of a file of the paper edited by Andrew Jackson Davis twenty-five or thirty years ago, he could pick up a good many such views that were held by the last generation of spiritual Spiritualists, and that the spiritual Spiritualists of the present consider too well established to be live subjects for discussion.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.5}

It must be encouraging to “the leaders of Christian thought” to be assured by the very “spiritual Spiritualists” that they are making advancement in the spiritualness of Spiritualism. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.6}

It is stated that there were 3,247 arrests for gambling in Los Angeles last year, but that only twenty-two of the arrests were of white men. The others we suppose were Chinamen. It is touching to see the tender regard which the California policeman has for the morals of the benighted brethren who are among us. No one supposes for a moment that the number of Chinese gamblers exceeds the number of white men who indulge in the same vice; and the only reason we can give why the police do not arrest the white man as well as the Chinamen, is that they think the former were beyond reformation. Heathenism is not dependent on race or color, and we very much doubt if the Asiatic heathen could give any information in vice to those who are of American or European birth. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.7}

When Peter speaks of the manner in which the prophecies were given, he says: “But there were false prophets also among the people.” Wherever you find anything of value, you will find a counterfeit. Those false prophets arose for the purpose of bringing the true prophets into disrepute. In like manner we might expect that when prophecies are interpreted by the word of God, there will be false and absurd interpretations, calculated to make sensible people disgusted, so that they will resolve to have nothing to do with any interpretations of prophecy. There are some professed Adventist journals which persist in setting a time for the coming of the Lord, although the Lord said, “But of that day and hour knoweth no man.” They have been at this work for years, and have set no less than a score of different times for the Lord to come. In order to make their computation seem to be correct, they manufacture history without any regard to fact. The time now fixed by these pseudo-Adventists is 1889. We earnestly protest against such tampering with prophecy and history; its effect is only to cause people to disbelieve that the Lord is coming at all. It is enough for us to know that the coming of the Lord is near, “even at the doors.” We are not required to understand the things which God has not revealed. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.8}

The Papal Consistory has been postponed till the early part of March, when the new foreign cardinals will receive their hats. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.9}

**“No Sunday Law for California” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The readers of the SIGNS will remember the account that was given of a Sunday Law mass-meeting in San Francisco several weeks ago, and of the vigorous efforts that were being made by the clergy of California to induce this Legislature to enact a rigid Sunday Law. Petitions have been circulated in all parts of the State, and several have been presented to the Assembly. A few days ago an effort was made to create a boom by means of a mass-meeting in the Assembly Chamber, which was granted for the purpose. But although the meeting was presided over by the Speaker of the House, and eloquently addressed by several clergymen and one member of the Legislature, it did not seem to have the desired effect on the members generally. On Friday, February 4, the Committee on Public Morals reported back a petition in favor of a Sunday Law, with the recommendation that the Speaker appoint a committee of one to prepare and introduce a bill in accordance with the petition. The House refused to take the action recommended. It said that there were only four votes in favor of it. This settles the Sunday Law question for this session of the Legislature. We are glad that there is in our Legislature so clear a sense of justice and a perception of the fitness of things. We earnestly pray that the Legislators of other States where the Sunday conflict is raging, may be gifted with equal good sense. California has at present a Sunday law amply sufficient to meet the demands of good order; it is insufficient only to meet the demands of bigotry. {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.10}

**“The Great Strike in New York” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is getting to be a good deal more than a local affair, and is assuming proportions that entitle it to more than the space of a news item. A dispatch of February 4 says:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.11}

“The only hope the strikers have of success is to so hamper business as to bring about a settlement by arbitration. There are now on the strike nearly 49,000 men, with perhaps half that number out of work through the stoppage of business incident to the strike.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.12}

Another dispatch of same date says:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.13}

“The Country General Committee of the United Labor party adopted the following resolution last night:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.14}

“That is, in the opinion of those now conducting the strike, it becomes necessary to call out on the strike, men of other branches of industry affiliated with our party, we recommend they obey the summons, even to the point of stopping all the wheels of industry, and in time they may learn how necessary to society producing workers are.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.15}

Still another says:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.16}

“The White Star steamship *Republic* and the Cunard Line steamship *City of Chicago* scheduled to sail to-day with the transatlantic mails, will not be able to get off because of the strike.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.17}

Another dispatch of February 5 says:- {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.18}

“The calkers and joiners at work repairing the *Chyandotte*, the steamer that was damaged by the explosion of an infernal machine, struck. They had no grievances, but struck out of sympathy with the freight-handlers. Their places will be filled to-day by non-union men. The coopers employed along the piers, with the mill-wrights, joined the strike to-day. The painters and mechanics on the *Union* Line also struck. The Italians who took the place of the strikers at the Hudson River depot quit work in the afternoon.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.19}

We are workingmen ourselves, and we have a strong sympathy for them when they are oppressed. But we cannot sympathize with them in lawless acts even when they are oppressed, and much less when they have no grievance. Those who first struck may have had a grievance; but for all other workmen to join them, and to deliberately plan to stop all industries, is simply barbarous selfishness. Thousands of poor people will suffer from cold and hunger because of this strike. We insist that there is no monopoly in this country so regardless of the rights of the poor as are the Labor Unions. This is emphatically an age when men are “lovers of their own selves.” {SITI February 10, 1887, p. 96.20}

**“Human Law Against Divine Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Standard* having been asked what the duty of an elder of a church is with a member who stays away from church service during the busy part of the year, and spends the “Lord’s day” in labor, the editor of the *Standard* replies as follows:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.1}

“The course of the brother referred to is in direct violation of the law of the land, and is, therefore, directly opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures, which insist that Christians shall be law-abiding citizens.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.2}

It seems to us that that is a roundabout way of answering the question. Why could not the editor of the *Standard* have come direct to the point, and given the commandment which the brother was violating by laboring on Sunday? The reason is obvious; because there is no such commandment. If we were asked what should be done with a church-member who persisted in laboring upon the Sabbath, the answer would be to deprive him of church fellowship; and the reason for such action would be that he had violated the fourth commandment, which forbids secular labor on the seventh day of the week. But it is impossible to name any scripture which a man violates by working on Sunday, and therefore such an one can be accused only of violating the law of the land. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.3}

Could anything more clearly show that the Sunday-sabbath is wholly a man-made institution, having nothing but human authority to support it? We could not frame an argument that would show the utter worthlessness of Sunday more clearly than does this admission by one of its advocates; for the reader may rest assured that if the editor of the *Standard* had known of any divine law against Sunday labor, he would have quoted it without delay. The Sunday-sabbath has no sanction in the Scriptures, and therefore is not binding on anybody. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.4}

It is said, however, that the law of the land forbids Sunday labor, and that the Bible commands us to obey the laws of the land, thus sanctioning Sunday rest. The Bible does nothing of the kind. Paul says that every one should must be subject to “the higher powers,” because they are ordained of God; but by that very statement he recognizes a power still above the “higher powers,” and that is God, the highest power. All men owe allegiance to this highest power, and if the “higher powers” are unmindful of their duty, that does not absolve us from our allegiance to God. If they make laws which contravene the laws of God, then the Bible tells us that “we ought to obey God rather than men.” Acts 5:29. Now the law of the land, forbidding labor on Sunday, is in direct opposition to the law of God, which says: “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” Exodus 20:8-10. Therefore we are bound to disobey any human law requiring us to regard Sunday as a sacred day. We cannot, even by implication, admit that Sunday has any claims to reverence. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.5}

Some years ago there was a law in the United States to the effect that if a slave left his master, and escaped to a State where slavery was not allowed, anybody finding him should return him to the one who professed to own him. Any man who would refuse to send a fugitive slave back into bondage, was liable to heavy penalties. We do not know how the editor of the *Standard* regarded that law, but we do know that many men who plead for Sunday observance on the same ground that he does, namely, that it is required by the law of the land, utterly refused to be bound by the Fugitive Slave Law. Christian men despised the law, and deliberately violated it. And they were justified in so doing. Why? Because slavery is an accursed thing, and because the Fugitive Slave Law was in direct violation of the command of God, which says: “Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him.” Deuteronomy 23:15, 16. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.6}

It is a maxim, even in human law, that if the human law is contrary to the divine law, the subject is in duty bound to break that law. No human law can claim a moment’s consideration when it conflicts with the law of God. We venture the assertion that if Congress should enact a law requiring men to take the name of God in vain, the editor of the *Standard* would not only ignore that law, but would use all his eloquence to persuade others to trample upon it. If he would not obey the law of the land, when it is in opposition to the third commandment, why should he plead for it when it is in opposition to the fourth? {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.7}

Let the reader not forget that one of the ablest and staunchest advocates of Sunday has plainly admitted that there is no divine command for Sunday observance. And he is not the only one who has made such an *admission*. Remember also that there is a most emphatic commandment of the Lord, enjoining the observance of the seventh day of the week, and setting apart the other six days, Sunday among the rest, for labor. Then let him decide whether he ought to obey God rather than men. W. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.8}

**“Infant Baptism—An Explanation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

“In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of January 6, there is an article over Brother R. F. Cottrell’s name headed, ‘One Error Leads to Another,’ in which is quoted an extract from a Methodist minister’s discourse upon baptism, and Brother C. says: ‘It is hard to see how the Baptists can answer this argument while they hold to the change of the Sabbath.’ Does Brother C. believe in infant baptism, or that baptism came in the room of circumcision? A TRUTH SEEKER.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.9}

To both these questions we can answer, No. Brother Cottrell does not believe in infant baptism, nor that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Neither of these things is believed by any writer for the SIGNS. In the article referred to he means that he does not see how the Baptists can from their own standpoint answer the argument of the Methodist minister. Thus: It is stated that the New Testament nowhere expressly enjoins the observance of Sunday, improperly called “the Christian Sabbath,” and this is true. It is also a truth that the New Testament, and the Old too, for that matter, says nothing about infant baptism, neither does the New Testament intimate that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Baptists reject so-called infant baptism because it is not commanded, yet they keep Sunday, which also is not commanded, now if they persist in the observance of Sunday without any divine command therefore, it is evident that they cannot consistently repudiate infant baptism on the ground that it is not commanded. This is an instance of *argumentum ad hominem*. The writer does not mean to intimate that it is right to baptize infants, but to show how inconsistent those are who reject that ceremony because it is not commanded, and accept another ordinance which is equally unfounded. Baptists are right in their position upon baptism; if in all things they were consistent with this, they would keep the Sabbath. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.10}

There is just one text in the Bible which is sometimes referred to as showing that baptism takes the place of circumcision, although it gives no color whatever to that idea. It is Colossians 2:10-12, which reads thus: “And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” The very reading of it shows that baptism is not the circumcision referred to, because it says, “Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands,” and baptism cannot be administered without hands. This circumcision made without hands is the “putting off the body of the sins of the flesh,” and is the same as the circumcision of the heart, spoken of in Romans 2:29. It is the spiritual observance of the commandments, which is accomplished only in Christ, see Romans 8:3, 4; 2 Corinthians 5:21. The putting off of the sins of the flesh is the same as the crucifixion of the old man, that the body of sin might be destroyed (Romans 6:6), or the becoming dead to the law by the body of Christ (Romans 7:4), and is properly followed by burial with Christ in baptism, as is indicated in Colossians 2:10-12. W. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.11}

**“‘My Lord Delayeth His Coming’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

“True, our Lord delayed his coming, but as a thief suddenly he is coming to many every day, and to all he will finally come at such an hour as we think not.” This quotation isn’t from the Bible, but from a denominational newspaper. As we read it, we could not help thinking how blind so many professed Christians are upon the simple subject of the coming of the Lord. It will be noticed that the writer of the above takes it for granted that the Lord is coming. How did he learn that truth? Evidently from the Bible. But how could he learn it from the Bible that the Lord is coming, without learning some of the particulars concerning his coming? That is a mystery. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.12}

Is the Lord “coming to many every day”? The Scriptures are silent about the many comings. Christ said, “I will come *again*,” which means only once more; and Paul plainly declares that he will come “the *second time*.” Since Christ is to come only the second time, it is evident that he is not coming to many every day. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.13}

Another evidence that the Lord is not coming to many every day, is that when he comes everybody will know it. Said Jesus, “For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” Matthew 24:27. “A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.” Psalm 50:3. When he comes, he will possess the throne of his glory, and will come in all the glory of the Father. Matthew 25:31; 16:27. So great will be the glory that it cannot be hid from the eyes of any; so the apostle John says: “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him.” Revelation 1:7. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.14}

The extract which we quoted to begin with, implies that Christ comes at the death of individuals. This idea is overthrown by the Scriptures which we have quoted, but we have direct testimony as to how Jesus will come for his saints. Paul said to the Thessalonians that he would not have them in ignorance concerning their dead friends, and gave them some words of comfort. Did he say, “Christ has come and taken your friends to be with him.” No; he said, “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in* *Jesus* will God bring with him [that is from the dead].... For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” 1 Thessalonians 4:14-17. Thus we find that when the Lord comes he will take all his saints at once and not simply one at a time, and there will be a sound that will not only be heard by all who are upon the earth, but which will penetrate the graves and awake the dead. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.15}

It has been eighteen hundred years since our Saviour’s first advent, but that is no evidence that his second coming is delayed. If a man tells us that he will come to see us at a certain time some distance in the future, we cannot accuse him of delaying his coming until the set time has passed. Christ did not set any time for his coming, but he gave certain signs, as the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars, which should show it to be near. After rehearsing these signs, he said of his coming, “When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors.” Matthew 24:33. And then he added: “Verily I say unto you, This generation [*i.e.*, the generation which should witness these signs] shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.” So long as any are alive who witnessed these things, there is no reason to say that the Lord delayeth his coming; and Christ’s promise that he will come before the generation passes away, cannot fail. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 102.16}

It is true that the signs which the Saviour gave to mark the nearness of his coming, are long in the past. But we are not therefore justified in saying, “My Lord delayeth his coming.” None but the evil servant says that, even in his heart. Matthew 24:48-51. True it is that to that servant the Lord will come “in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder.” Surely this should serve as a warning against any servant saying that our Lord does delay his coming. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.1}

The fact that the signs of Christ’s coming have been fulfilled, should lead us to say, not that our Lord delays his coming, but that it must be very near. If we take this position, and watch, we need not be taken unawares. Said Christ: “And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares.” Luke 21:34. Paul said: “But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.” 1 Thessalonians 5:4. “Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober.” W. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.2}

**“2 Peter 3:10” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother beyond the mountains asks concerning this text, “Does it state that the earth as well as the works is to be burned up? Why is *also* omitted in the Revised Version? May it not be made plain from other scriptures that the earth will not be totally destroyed?” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.3}

We think that “also” is correctly omitted in the Revised Version. The Scriptures are very plain upon the point that the earth will not be totally destroyed. On verse 11 Clarke says:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.4}

“All these things shall be dissolved. They will be *separated*, all *decomposed*; but none of them *destroyed*. And as they are the original matter out of which God formed the terraqueous globe, consequently they may enter again into the *composition* of a new system.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.5}

And Barnes, on verse 10, says:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.6}

“So far as the action of fire is concerned, the *form* of the earth may pass away, and its aspect be changed; but, unless the direct power which created it interpose to annihilate it, the *matter* which now composes it will still be in existence.... The word rendered *burned up*, like the word just before used and rendered *fervent heat*-a word of the same origin, but here *intensive*-means that they will undergo such a change as fire will produce; not, necessarily, that the matter composing them will be annihilated.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.7}

You will be interested and no doubt instructed by reading a sermon by Wesley on this subject. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.8}

A few texts of Scripture will place the matter beyond all doubt. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.9}

The Saviour said (Matthew 5:5), “The meek shall inherit the earth.” Psalm 37 says the same thing and adds, “Their inheritance shall be forever.” Man would never have lost the earth if he had not sinned. By sin the earth is defiled and corrupted; but Paul says of our inheritance that it has been purchased and is waiting for redemption. Ephesians 1:14. This can refer only to the earth. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.10}

We may conclude from the words of Peter that the new earth will bear the same relation to the “earth which now is,” that this bears to the earth which was before the flood. There can be no doubt then, when the “fountains of the great deep were all broken up,” and the “windows of heaven were opened,” that the face of nature was so changed that everything looked new and strange to Noah. And so will it be when the fire has passed upon the earth, melting the elements and turning the “into a lake of fire;” when it comes forth beautified and free from every sign of the curse, well may it be called “a new earth.” The most important point is that we heed the admonition of the apostles in verses 11-14 of this chapter. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.11}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued*.)

The next statement that is made is the following:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.12}

“Sometimes they made collections for the poor. What day did Paul request them to attend to that? Was it the seventh day, the Jewish Sabbath? No; Paul said (1 Corinthians 16:2): ‘Upon the first *day of the week* let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.’ Why should the first day of the week be designated instead of any other, unless it was a special day set apart for religious purposes?” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.13}

Like many other Sunday advocates, Dr. Bailey needs only to find the words “first day of the week” in a text, in order to have an argument for Sunday. No matter what the subject of the text is, if it contains the expression, “first day of the week,” that seems to be sufficient to convince them that Sunday is the Sabbath. On this text we have this to say: Paul did not tell them to attend to the business on the seventh day of the week, because it involved work which should not be done upon the Sabbath. The poor saints in Jerusalem needed help, and Paul had taken upon himself the work of securing contributions from the Gentile converts. See Galatians 2:9, 10. And now in pursuance of this duty, he writes to the brethren in Corinth, directing them to each one by himself lay by in store a certain amount, according as he had been prospered. The amount to be laid by could only be determined by a consideration of the business of the preceding week, so that he might know what his profits had been. There is no more similarity between what he directed them to do and the modern church collection, than there is between daylight and darkness. That these contributions were not taken to the church and there placed in the contribution box, is shown by what Paul wrote to these same brethren in his second epistle a year later. We quote:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.14}

“For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready; lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up before hand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness.” 2 Corinthians 9:1-5. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.15}

Note the expressions in the above. Paul had boasted of the forwardness of the Corinthian brethren, and had thereby stirred up many to contribute liberally. Some of these liberal brethren of Macedonia were going with Paul to Jerusalem, and he feared that he might possibly arrive in Corinth and find the Corinthian brethren unprepared with their donation. In that case, both he and they would be put to shame before the Macedonian brethren. To guard against this possibility, he sent some of the brethren ahead to gather up the individual contributions, so that everything might be ready when he should come. This text is of itself sufficient refutation of the assumption that in 1 Corinthians 16:2 Paul directed the brethren to make a collection in church on the first day of the week. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.16}

In further proof that these weekly contributions were not to be made in church, we cite the words of the text itself: “Let every one of you lay *by him* in store.” Whoever can see in this a direction to put money in the church contribution box, might naturally be supposed to find in the first clause of the fourth commandment a direction to keep the first day. The man who drops his penny into the box or plate which the deacon passes before him in church, puts his money *away from him*, and not *by him*. The following translations of this clause will be sufficient to convince anybody that the contributions were not to be made in church:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.17}

“Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, ‘by one’s self, *i.e.,* at home.’ Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, ‘*apud soi*,’ with one’s self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martir, Osterwald, and De Sacy, ‘*chuz soi*,’ at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, ‘*bci such scffrest*,’ by himself at home. The Dutch, ‘*by hemslven*,’ same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, ‘*appresso di se*,’ in his own presence at home. The Spanish of Felipe Sico, ‘*en su cusa*,’ in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, ‘*para isso*,’ with himself. The Swedish, ‘*nuce sig sief*,’ near himself. I know not how much the list of authorities might be swelled; for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above.”-*J. W. Morton, Former Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church*. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.18}

The next “argument” from Scripture is the following:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.19}

“In writing to the Colossians, Paul says (Colossians 2:16); ‘Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath day.’ ... This letter to the Colossians was written by Paul thirty years after Christ’s death and resurrection. Thus we see that the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.20}

Here again the Doctor has evidently quoted from memory; for in the text the last expression is plural instead of singular, thus, “of the Sabbath days,” and not “of the Sabbath day.” How from this text he finds his conclusion that “the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week,” is entirely beyond our comprehension; for the text makes no mention of the first day of the week. Let us see what the text really means. We quote it together with the seventeenth verse, which the Doctor found it convenient to omit:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.21}

“Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.22}

Here we have holy days, new moons, and the Sabbath days, which are shadows of things in the work of Christ. This shows that Paul has reference to the ceremonial ordinances which were introduced after the fall and the promise of the Messiah. The twenty-third chapter of Leviticus contains a record of the appointment of these Sabbath days. It will be noticed that they are all connected with meats and drinks (see verse 37); and, further, that they are entirely distinct from the Sabbath of the Lord (verse 38). In the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day of the week, there is nothing shadowy,-which prefigures Christ,-because it was given in Eden when man was first created, and when there was no need of a sacrifice being made. In the text in Colossians Paul has not the slightest reference to the Sabbath of the Lord. In the preceding verse he has stated that the law of types and shadows had been nailed to the cross; since it consisted only of shadows, it necessarily ceased when the substance came; and therefore Paul says that no one need be judged for the performance or nonperformance of its provisions. To show that this conclusion is not a new idea of our own we quote the following:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.23}

“The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals; such as the new moons, and particular Sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere the ‘remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,’ is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time.”-*Clarke, on Colossians 2:16*. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 103.24}

“The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to *the* Sabbath properly so called. There is no evidence, from this passage, that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe *any* holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to declare that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number-‘*the* Sabbath’-it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to affirm that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not on the *moral* law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law-no one of the ten commandments-could be spoken of as “a *shadow* of good things to come.’ These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.”-*Barnes’s Notes on Colossians 2:16*. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.1}

The Doctor’s “Scripture proof” of the proposition that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, closes with the following:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.2}

“In the closing book of the divine record, sixty years after the resurrection, the apostle John, who had leaned on Jesus’s breast at the supper, exclaims, ‘I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day.’ Revelation 1:10. He held it in precious observance; and the Spirit, which was given so abundantly at Pentecost on the seventh Lord’s day, comes again to John sixty years later so richly that he says: ‘I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day.’ Thus not only the Christians at Jerusalem, but at Troas, Corinth, Colosse, and John in Patmos, places many hundred miles apart, are keeping the Lord’s day, the first day of the week, as the Christians’ day of religious worship, or the Christians’ Sabbath. The order of things, as we have seen, was sanctioned by Christ and the Holy Spirit immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and established by the inspired apostles wherever they preached the gospel. I have now presented the scriptural proofs of these facts.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.3}

What does Revelation 1:10 prove? Simply this: that John was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day. The “reasoning” which allows that text to be used as a proof of Sunday sacredness is unworthy of a child. The apostle uses the term “Lord’s day,” and straightway grave doctors of divinity will assume that he must necessarily mean Sunday. And what is the ground of this assumption? Simply this: that a few hundred years after the days of the apostles, men began to call Sunday the Lord’s day, and that custom has obtained quite general sanction in the Christian church. Now because men at the present day call Sunday the Lord’s day, they assume that John must have done the same. Thus they interpret the Bible according to their own ideas and practices, instead of regulating their ideas and practices by the Bible. A more pernicious method of using the Bible cannot be conceived. It is by this sort of reasoning that the Catholic Church upholds the worship of images and all of its other abominations; and from that church professed Protestants have borrowed it in order to uphold the Papal institution of Sunday. Throughout the New Testament we find no sacred title applied to the first day of the week. It is nowhere called the Sabbath, and nowhere is it said to be the Lord’s day or a holy day. It is simply called the first day of the week. If we could find one text stating that the first day of the week is the Lord’s day, that would be sufficient, and we might then conclude that the apostle had reference to Sunday in Revelation 1:10; but in that case we should never hear our Sunday friends quote this latter text in favor of Sunday; they would most assuredly take the text which contained the proof. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.4}

But is it possible for us to know what day is referred to in Revelation 1:10? Certainly. The fourth commandment says: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Exodus 20:10. The Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, expressly mentions the Sabbath as his day, thus: “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day.” Isaiah 58:13. And Jesus, when the Jews had falsely accused him of breaking the Sabbath, said: “The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” Mark 2:28. These texts prove most emphatically that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, the day which the Jews observed,-the seventh day of the week,-is the Lord’s day. No other day of the week is entitled to that appellation. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.5}

We have now examined all the Scripture evidence that can be brought to bear in favor of Sunday as the Sabbath. And what have we found? No argument whatever, but evidence to show that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath. But suppose we had found that the disciples had held religious meetings on Sunday; suppose it were true that the meeting on the evening of Christ’s resurrection was a religious service, and that the gathering “after eight days” could be shown to have fallen within the compass of a week of seven days, and that it also was a religious meeting, what would be lacking to couple this argument in favor of Sunday sacredness? The essential element of proof would be lacking. No matter if we might have found the disciples meeting every first day, we could not call it the Sabbath unless the Bible called it so. Without a Bible statement authorizing the change, no man has a right to suppose that any change has been made. Those who would regard Sunday as the Sabbath, might learn a lesson from Balaam of old, who said: “If Balak would give me is house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more.” Numbers 22:18. W. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 104.6}

**“Immortality of Angels” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

In place of the regular Sabbath-school which would be commented upon this week, we occupy the space in answering the following questions concerning the angels. Since the ministration of angels is the subject of the present series of lessons, these notes will not be devoid of interest to the Sabbath-school scholars, as side lights. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.1}

“Do the angels now have immortality? If they do, how are we to understand 1 Timothy 6:15, 16, where it is stated that God only has immortality? This text is often used to prove that no part of man is immortal; why does it not prove the same with reference to the angels, or even of Christ himself?” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.2}

Immortality is unending existence; it is exemption from death. Christ says of those who shall gain the world to come, that they cannot die any more, because they shall be equal unto the angels. Luke 20:35, 36. This indicates plainly that the angels cannot die, and that they are therefore immortal. And yet it is a truth that God only has immortality. This seeming paradox is explained by John 5:26, 27, where we read: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.” God has “life in himself;” he is immortal by nature. He not only has life for himself, but he has life to bestow upon others. “The gift of God is eternal life.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.3}

It is in this sense that God only has immortality. He is self-existent, and his existence is self-perpetuating. He is the source of all life. “In Him we live, and move, and have our being.” The angels, when they were created, were placed upon probation. Some of them sinned, and “kept not their first estate,” and they are kept “in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day,” when they will utterly perish. Others remained loyal to God, and are now confirmed in immortality. But they, just as will be the case with the redeemed saints, depend upon God, the source of life, for their immortality, and they have no power to confer immortality upon others. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.4}

The case of Christ is different. He is the only begotten Son of God. As such he not only possesses immortality, but he possesses the power to confer immortality upon others. Thus we read: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” John 5:26. And again: “For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.” Verse 21. This life which Christ has in himself, and which he can bestow upon others, was not given to him after a successful probation, for Christ was never placed on probation, as created beings are. He was *by inheritance* a more exalted name and station than even the angels. Hebrews 1:3, 4. All that he has, is his by inheritance; immortality, and the power of bestowing it upon others, is his by virtue of his being the Son of God. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.5}

This statement concerning Christ does not at all militate against the statement that God only hath immortality; for Christ is God. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” John 1:1. Whatever attributes belong to the Father, belong also to the Son. When we read that “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” we must understand the term “God” as including both the Father and the Son, for without the Word “was not anything made that was made.” And so the Father “hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.” John 5:22, 23. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.6}

“Is there any Scripture authority for speaking of Gabriel’s trump as the one that shall raise the dead?” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.7}

None whatever. The angel Gabriel is on high in position in the courts of Heaven, as we learn from the mention of him. He was commissioned to make it known to Daniel the interpretation of his visions. See Daniel 8:16; 9:20-22. He was also sent to foretell the birth of John the Baptist, when his words “I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God” (Luke 1:19), seem to imply a more intimate relation to God than that of ordinary angels. From Revelation 22:6 we conclude that the work of revealing secrets to the prophets is intrusted to one certain angel. The angel who showed John the wonders recorded in Revelation, said, “I am thy fellow servant, and [the fellow-servant] of thy brethren the prophets.” Then Gabriel was the one who talked with John. This view is strengthened by Revelation 1:1, where we learn that Christ saw a ... angel to convey his messages. Thus: “The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he [Christ] sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.8}

But it is the voice of the Archangel that shall raise the dead (1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17), and the name of the Archangel is Michael. Jude 9. Michael, the Archangel, is none other than Christ, for it is the voice of the Son of God that causes those who are in their graves to come forth. John 5:28, 29. The trumpet that sounds is the “trump of God.” Only once in the history of the world has that trumpet sounded, and that was when the Archangel, the Son of God, spoke the ten commandments from Mount Sinai. Then the earth quaked. When it sounds at the last day, not only does the earth quake, but heaven also. W. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 107.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

“With what day of the year in the Roman (or common) calendar does the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar correspond? Is it the 22nd of October? If so, please explain. “W. T. H.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.1}

There is no fixed day of the Roman calendar which corresponds to the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month. This is due to the fact that, like our months, Jewish months differ in length, and that every second or third year an extra month is inserted, so that some years have thirteen months. Last year the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar came on October 10; this year it will come on September 28. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.2}

In a recent murder trial in San Francisco, the jury disagreed, ten of the jurymen voting for acquittal. One of the two who held out for the punishment of the criminal, quoted from the Bible in support of his opinion, and the papers are making a great ado about it. One paper says that the dissenting juror, in reply to a question, said that he believed that the sun stood still at the command of Joshua, “and that, as stated in the Bible, the sun went round the earth, and that the earth is flat.” The newspapers furnish us with a great amount of information about the Bible, which we could never find out by the Bible itself. The man who can find the statement in the Bible, that the sun ever “went” around the earth, or that the earth is flat, will be entitled to a hearing through the columns of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.3}

“Is it right for Seventh-day Adventists to join themselves to the Good Templar Lodge? Does the Bible approve of it? A. R.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.4}

No; it is not right for Seventh-day Adventists, or anybody else professing to be Christian, to join any secret society. There is nothing in the Bible to justify secret societies, but much to condemn them. Said Christ, “In secret have I said nothing.” The church is the recognized body of Christ, and to it is intrusted all reforms. It is the only true benevolent society in existence. It is only when the church loses sight of its legitimate work here on earth that its members join secret societies. Moreover, secret societies are incompatible with true freedom; for whoever pledges himself to something of which he is ignorant, becomes a voluntary slave. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.5}

The *Christian at Work* has settled the question of communion wine. It is confident that unfermented wine ought never to be used, because it claims that unfermented wine is not wine at all. But then it doesn’t think the wine should be strong; if it has anything fermented about it, that is sufficient. Its reason for this is the extraordinary *discovery* that the wine with which our Saviour celebrated the Supper with his disciples, was “a light claret mixed one-half with water”! It beats all how much more some people know than what is written. And now, since the Bible says nothing about wine of any kind at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, but simply mentions “the cup,” and “the fruit of the vine,” will the *Christian at Work* or some other wise body please tell us what kind of a vine produces “a light claret mixed one-half with water”? The only “fruit of the vine” of which we have any knowledge, is grapes, and the unfermented juice thereof. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.6}

A subscriber asks if question 2 of the Sabbath-school lesson in SIGNS of January 20, entitled, “Who the Angels Are,” is answered correctly. We answer, No; angels are not mentioned in any of the following books of the Bible: Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Ruth, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Esther, Proverbs, Solomon’s Son, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Titus, James, and 1, 2, and 3 John. We printed the lesson that week as it was sent to us, without giving it careful examination as we ought. We have not yet got beyond making mistakes ourselves, nor overlooking them in copy furnished by others, but we aim to be correct, and are anxious to make amends when our attention is called to a blunder. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.7}

This mistake, however, does not detract from the truth intended to be taught by the lesson. If angels were mentioned only once in the Bible, their existence would be as fully proved as if they were mentioned on every page. Every statement made by Inspiration is true; and truth cannot be made more true by repetition. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.8}

Sunday morning February 13, the brigantine *Tahiti* arrived in San Francisco, thirty days from Tahiti, bringing home Brother J. I Tay, who has been absent on a missionary tour in some of the islands of the Pacific since the first of last July. He is in good health, and reports a most prosperous trip. We hope to be able to give some items from him next week’s SIGNS. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.9}

**“Sunday in Massachusetts” The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Judiciary Committee of the Boston Common Council, to whom was referred an order for the mayor to petition the Legislature for such modifications of the Massachusetts Sunday law as may be necessary, have reported, and the report, together with the full text of the proposed new act, is printed in the Boston *Herald* of January 28. From the report it seems that the Sunday law of Massachusetts is the same now as when enacted in 1672, except that compulsory church attendance ceased in 1836. The committee say that inasmuch as this law was framed before there was a single city in the State, whereas more than half of the present population is in cities, and inasmuch as the introduction of steamboats, railroads, and other modern inventions has materially changed the habits of the people, the time has come for such a revision of the law as shall recognize existing facts. They say that it is not true that there has been any desire to appropriate any portion of Sunday to the purposes of business, but that while labor organizations demand the reservation of Sunday as a day of rest from toil, there is an equal demand for a cessation of unreasonable and superstitious restrictions. They also claim that the radical difference between town and country life prevents the possibility of any one single law being equally applicable to both. {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.10}

Speaking of those who observe the seventh day of the week, the report says:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.11}

“Nearly all of these persons are Israelites, but the great majority are shop-keepers, and are thereby debarred from earning their living on Sunday, after giving up Saturday as a matter of principle. This large class of our citizens, one which is noted for its sobriety, economy, and respect to our laws, is increasing in number daily, and is entitled to some special legislation. It is a curious anomaly that when the Puritans reestablished the Jewish Sabbath in practice [that is, with respect to the strictness of observance], they selected another day of the week, without any Scriptural warrant therefore. The result is that they especially punish the Israelites, who alone have perpetuated and believed in the real Sabbath of the Old Testament.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.12}

They also enunciate the following truth, which, in the zeal for rigid Sunday laws, is being quite generally forgotten:- {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.13}

“If it be true that mankind is entitled to one day of rest in every week, it is no less true that mankind is entitled to six days of lawful work in every seven.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.14}

In harmony with the above principle, the proposed act provides that, {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.15}

“Any person belonging to any recognized religious sect, who conscientiously and habitually refrains from work on Saturday, may carry on any secular trade or business on Sunday, within his own house, shop, or working place; provided that he does not thereby annoy any religious assembly during their hours of worship.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.16}

There are some other features which we shall notice at another time. We shall await with interest the action of the Massachusetts Legislature on this proposed amendment to the Sunday law of that State. While it grants to Sabbath-keepers the right to quietly labor on Sunday, it guards the day in a very strict manner. It is simply a proposal to make, in a law which is itself unwarranted, a single concession in behalf of justice. If it should be rejected, it will indicate a degree of bigotry which will show that this is anything but an “enlightened age.” {SITI February 17, 1887, p. 112.17}

**“Concealed Infidelity” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

“The gentle Nazarene did not die to become an atonement for the sins of a fallen world, but to set an example to mankind of fidelity to principle, even unto death. His pure life and noble teachings speak to the soul now as never before.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.1}

The above we find in an editorial in the *Golden Gate*. We would like to ask how the writer found out that there was such a person as the “gentle Nazarene;” how he knows that his life was pure and his teachings noble; and where he learned about his death. The answer must be, in the New Testament; for nowhere else do we find any account of Jesus of Nazareth. There are in one or two profane histories, references to Jesus; but if the Bible had never been written, the world would have no knowledge of the life, character, and teachings of Christ. Whoever, therefore, accepts the truth that there was once a person on earth whose name was Jesus, and that his life was the perfection of purity, and his teachings the perfection of wisdom, must do so solely on the authority of the Bible. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.2}

But the same book which gives the history of Christ, tells us the manner and object of his death. Peter says (Acts 2:23) that he was taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain; and he says also, that he “his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness.” 1 Peter 2:24. We read also that righteousness shall be imputed to us, “if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification.” Romans 4:24, 25. We read again, that “God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Romans 5:8. Again we read that we are justified “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 remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.” Romans 3:24, 25. The same book which tells about the life of Jesus says, “But 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. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.3}

These statements concerning the death of Christ might be multiplied indefinitely. They teach plainly that Christ did die as an atonement for sin, and that those who believe in him may be justified from sin. The same book which tells about the noble character and pure teachings of Christ, gives the above reasons for his death. If we accept the first, we cannot reject the other. The one who denies the atonement of Christ, convicts himself of inconsistency when he professes to believe that Jesus lived and taught. The historical narrative includes the death of Christ as well as his life. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.4}

Moreover, Jesus himself said: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.” John 3:16, 17. Now the man who says that the teachings of Jesus were pure and noble, and yet says that he did not die for the sins of the world, stultifies himself, for he virtually asserts that Jesus taught that which is not true. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.5}

Our object in noticing this statement from the *Golden Gate* is to expose a sort of infidelity that is becoming very common. It is a concealed infidelity, with which Spiritualists expect to entrap many professed Protestant Christians. They refer to the historical narrative of the Bible as though they accepted it fully, and thus gain the confidence of the unwary. Having thus concealed their hatred of the Bible, they proceed to undermine faith in it by perverting its teachings. The infidel who denies the Bible as a whole, rejecting even its historical statements, is not half so dangerous as one who professes a portion of it in order that he may more easily undermine its principles. It is simply an aggravated case of Judas betraying his Lord with a kiss. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.6}

It is not Spiritualists alone, however, who do this sort of thing. There are thousands who call themselves Christians, who segregate the Bible, calling this or that portion uninspired and throwing it overboard, if it runs counter to their preconceived opinions or perverse practices. If everyone who makes a profession of Christianity, should awake some morning and find the Bible or Bibles in his possession a perfect blank, with the exception of those portions which he really believed, there would be few whole Bibles in existence, and the supply of blank paper would largely exceed the demand. W. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.7}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

We now come to the examination of “proofs from church history.” Under this head Dr. Bailey begins thus:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.8}

“Mosheim, one of the most reliable of church historians, and chancellor of the University of Gottingen from 1747 to 1775, in Vol. I, p. 45, says: ‘All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the *first day of the week* on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.9}

In Murdock’s Mosheim (book 1, cent. I, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 40, we find a statement somewhat similar to the one which Dr. Bailey credits to Mosheim, but it is not expressed in nearly so strong language. We presume the Doctor quoted from Maclaine’s translation, which is well known to be a paraphrase of Mosheim, rather than a translation. But we will accept the quotation just as it is given to us, for it is of no importance anyway. According to the quotation given, Mosheim states that the observance of the first day of the week was founded “upon the express appointment of the apostles.” Now where did he learn this? Did Mosheim have access to some writings of the apostles that we have not? Is it true that we have only a fragment of the Bible, and that somewhere there are inspired writings hidden away, which no one but Dr. Mosheim has been privileged to see? If there are such documents, and if Mosheim found in them an “express appointment of the apostles,” fixing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, it seems as though he might have had the goodness to give less favored mortals the exact words of that “express appointment.” But we have never heard of any Protestant so bold as to claim that there are in existence inspired writings of the apostles, other than those contained in the New Testament. Now if the apostles did expressly appoint the first day of the week as the Sabbath, that appointment may be read by everybody. Why, then, did not Dr. Bailey quote direct from the apostles, instead of saying that Mosheim says so? Simply because the apostles never made any such appointment. If they had, the reader may rest assured that Dr. Bailey would have given it in his “Scripture proofs.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.10}

Right here it will be worth while to remind the reader that the apostles were not law givers. They had no authority to appoint a Sabbath day. All that they were commissioned to do was to declare the words of Christ. See Matthew 28:19, 20. But even Mosheim does not profess to make the statement credited to him, on the authority of the apostles. He states that it “appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers,” that this example was derived from the appointment of the apostles. We accept Mosheim as a standard church historian, but when he tells us what the apostles did, he is on ground where the most unlearned can judge of the truth of what he says. Although he was a very learned man, there is not a child fourteen years of age who may not be just as well informed as to what the apostles said and did as he was. Mr. Bailey’s argument from history is simply this: He says that the apostles kept Sunday, and appointed its observance. We ask him what authority he has for such a statement, and he says that Dr. Mosheim says so, and Dr. Mosheim says, “The most credible writers” say so. There is altogether too much “they say” about this. We should prefer to hear the apostles themselves speak. They are “the most credible writers” of whom we have any knowledge. Since the custom of the early church has been stated, we might cite a few instances from history. In note 4 of the section before referred to, Mosheim says: “Perhaps also Good Friday, the Friday on which our Saviour died, was from the earliest times regarded with more respect than other days of the week.” Again he says:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.11}

“The Christians assembled for the worship of God in private dwelling-houses, in caves, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the first day of the week, and here and there on the seventh day, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Most of them likewise held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter on which he was crucified.”-*Book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 3*. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.12}

We hope that our friends who observe the first day of the week on the authority of Dr. Mosheim, will show their consistency by keeping also Wednesday and Friday. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.13}

Two or three quotations are also made from Neander, but as they are to the same effect, simply telling what certain professed Christians did, we will not stop to repeat them. We are not so much interested in what some people may have done, as we are in what the Bible commands *us* to do. Even the best intentioned people do not always do what they ought to do. In Galatians 2:12, 13, we find that even the apostles Barnabas and Peter were at one time guilty of dissimulation, but we do not therefore conclude that we ought to do the same. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.14}

Before leaving this part of the subject we will, however, give one of Mr. Bailey’s quotations from Neander with his comments thereon:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.15}

“Again Neander says: ‘Those churches however which were composed of Jewish Christians, though they admitted with the rest the festival of Sunday, yet retained also that of the Sabbath; and it was from these that the custom became general in the Eastern churches of distinguishing this day as well as Sunday.’ That is, the custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first, arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.16}

This quotation shows that Christians in the early days observed the seventh day of the week, and Mosheim in the same paragraph from which a quotation has already been made, says that for doing this “*the other Christians taxed them with no wrong*.” This proves positively that those in early church who observed the first day of the week did not do so because of any apostolic appointment, and that they did not know of any such appointment; for if they had, they would have taxed those who did not follow it with doing wrong. These facts prove what Dr. Scott says in his comment on Acts 20:7:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.17}

“The change from the seventh to the first day of the week appears to have been gradually and silently introduced, by example rather than by express precept.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.18}

Mr. Bailey says: “The custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?” We say most emphatically, No, to both sentences. We do not want to follow the example of anybody, in direct opposition to inspired teaching. And we say also that the custom of keeping the seventh day did not arise from “Judaizing Christians,” but from the commandment of Jehovah, who said in thunder tones from Mount Sinai: “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” We would that some people’s professed fear of acting contrary to inspired teaching had more sincerity in it. All of the ten commandments were given to the Jews, who differed no more from the heathen around them in that they kept the seventh day, than they did in that they abstained from blasphemy and theft. Those who refuse to keep the Sabbath, lest they be like the Jews, can be consistent only by rejecting the entire Decalogue. W. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 118.19}

(*To be continued.*)

**“Is It Strange?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time since, a religious writer of considerable prominence, in commenting upon the resurrection of Dorcas, said:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.1}

“Imagine Dorcas’s surprise when she first opened her eyes. Here she was back in the world again. How strange it is to discover that no one of those persons who were raised from the dead ever attempted to tell the story of what they saw or heard.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.2}

The grave is spoken of as that “undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler returns;” but as a matter of fact many have returned, yet none have ever opened their lips to relate what they heard or saw while dead. Now if the dead are conscious, this is passing strange. If it be true that death is simply the separation of the soul from the body, which has acted as a clog to it, restricting its free exercise, why is it that in those instances where the soul has been returned to its lodgment, no note is made of the wonderful things learned while it was permitted to expand unrestrained? {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.3}

We say that it is indeed wonderful that no revelations have been made of what is beyond, if, as the poet says, death is only transition, and the soul is more acutely conscious in death than it ever was during life; but we do not bring forward the fact that no such revelation has been made, as proof that the dead are not conscious. We have proof of a more satisfactory nature, which clears the subject of all doubt, and explains why those who have been raised from the dead were silent as to what took place during their absence from among the living. The testimony is abundant, but we have space here for only following:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.4}

Those who are dead are asleep: “Consider and hear me, O Lord my God; lighten mine eyes, lest I *sleep the sleep of death*.” Psalm 13:3. “It is in vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows; for so he giveth his beloved *sleep*.” Psalm 127:2. “And many of them that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” Daniel 12:2. “In their heat I will make them feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and *sleep a perpetual sleep*, and not wake, saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 51:30. “For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raise; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are perished.” 1 Corinthians 15:16-18. “But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep*.” “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him.” 1 Thessalonians 4:13, 14. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.5}

People who are in a sound sleep are entirely unconscious of what is going on, and the Bible says that the dead are unconscious: “For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything.” “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.” Ecclesiastes 9:5, 10. “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm 146:3, 4. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.6}

Many more texts might be added but these are sufficient for our purpose. They are direct statements of fact, and need no explanation. There are only two things that can be done with them: Either accept them as literally true, or reject them altogether. But if we accept the Bible as the infallible word of God, we are not left to wonder why those who have been raised from the dead never told the story of what they saw or heard. They had none to tell. They were unconsciously sleeping, and were unable to take note of passing events. Then it is not a strange thing after all. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.7}

But there is one strange thing about this matter, and that is how, in the face of all these Bible texts, a Doctor of Divinity could write such a paragraph as that quoted at the beginning of this article. W. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 119.8}

**“Scripture Statements vs. Conjecture” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

We cannot refrain from expressing the wish that the writers of the Sunday-school lesson notes in some of the religious papers, would occasionally read what the Bible says upon the subject of the lesson. If they should, it would save them from some egregious blunders, and would be a mercy to the pupils whose ideas are moulded in large measure by the lesson notes in their favorite journals. The lesson entitled “Lot’s choice” was improved by nearly everyone to moralize on the wickedness of Lot. The *Christian Standard* writer ended his sentimentalism as follows:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 120.1}

“Lot pitched his tent towards Sodom, then entered the city, ceased to be shocked by its gross sins and idolatry, was humiliated by being captured and plundered by the five kings. His soul hardened against even such direct warnings as angel messengers from Heaven. At last forced to flee from the city empty-handed, and look back on what once seemed the garden of the Lord, as a fiery furnace, he makes his home in the caves of the earth, and finally ends life a drunken outcast, dishonored by men and disowned by God.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 120.2}

Now read in 2 Peter 2:4-8 that God condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah with an overthrow, turning them into ashes, “and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds).” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 120.3}

Lot may have been selfish in his choice of territory, although the Scripture nowhere gives any intimation of such a thing. But we do have emphatic testimony to his righteousness, and that he himself was uncontaminated by the horrible wickedness around him, and from which he suffered greatly. Unscriptural morals are among the worst things written. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 120.4}

In this connection we would call attention to the International Lesson Notes that are given every week in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. The writer indulges in no guess-work, but directs the student’s attention solely to the Bible. Sunday-school teachers and students will find it to their advantage to read the Commentary Department in the SIGNS. Those notes alone will more than make up for the price of the paper. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 120.5}

**“The Lord’s Prayer” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ was on earth he prayed often, sometimes spending whole nights in prayer. Of course none of these prayers are recorded. We have, however, the record of several prayers which he offered in public, prominent among which are the prayer at the grave of Lazarus, and the one for his disciples, just before his betrayal and crucifixion. But neither of these is referred to by the term, “the Lord’s prayer.” That prayer is the brief petition which our Saviour gave as a model for all prayers. And a model it is indeed. It comprehends everything that it is possible for man to desire from God. There are no circumstances or conditions in life that are not covered by this petition. Yet this must be understood as applying to followers of Christ, and not to unconverted persons, even though they be convicted of sin. This will appear in the course of our comments upon the prayer. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 122.1}

There is no other form of words ever devised which can be used as a prayer over and over again for years, and still retain its freshness. This is simply because this one was given by One who knew man’s needs. But our Saviour did not design that his disciples should simply repeat the words which he gave them. This is evident from the introduction: “*After this manner* therefore pray ye.” It was designed as we have said, as a comprehensive model. Let us consider it well, that we may henceforth pray with more of the Spirit and the understanding. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 122.2}

**“OUR FATHER”**

What tenderness is expressed in those words! What infinite condescension it reveals on the part of God to allow poor, frail mortals to address him thus. His greatness is unsearchable and his ways past finding out. Before him, “The nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.” Isaiah 40:15-17. He walks “upon the wings of the wind” (Psalm 104:3); he “hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.” Nahum 1:3. And yet this awful God has the tenderness of a parent, and his ear is open to the supplications of those who whisper, even in faintest accents, “Our Father;” for we are told that “like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.” Psalm 103:13. Although God is the “high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy,” he has assured us that he dwells with him that is “of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.” Isaiah 57:15. Thus the first words of the Lord’s prayer bring us into the most intimate relation with the great Creator. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 122.3}

Even in the first word alone there is a great truth conveyed. It shows the relation of those who can call God Father. They are brethren, having common hopes and needs. Even in his secret devotions, the Christian is not to make his petitions wholly personal. He is not to be shut up to his own needs, but is to remember that he is only one of a great family, whose welfare ought to be with him scarcely second to his own. Paul wrote to the Romans: “For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers.” Romans 1:9. It is possible for a person to be selfish even in his petitions for overcoming grace; but it will be found in that case, as in all others, that selfishness defeats itself. Every Christian will bear witness to the fact that the richest blessings have come to him when, even though almost overwhelmed with a sense of his own need, he has coupled his petition for pardon and strength, with a request for a blessing upon others besides himself. And so, even in the closet, we are to say, “Our Father.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 122.4}

It is not everybody, however, who can say, “Our *Father*.” We hear much of the “Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man,” but the Bible says nothing about such a thing. All men are not sons of God. Paul reminds the Ephesians of the time before they were converted, saying, “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Ephesians 2:12. In the first verses he shows still more plainly that men are not by nature the children of God. He says: “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 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.” Again the apostle warns the Ephesian brethren against the sins to which they had formerly been addicted, saying, “For because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.” Ephesians 5:6. See also Colossians 3:6. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 122.5}

But the plainest statement of all, that men are not by nature the children of God, was given by our Saviour himself. To the wicked Jews who said, “We have one Father, even God,” he said: “If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.... Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.” John 8:41-44. Putting these texts together, we learn that all who know not God are the children of wrath; they are the children, or recipients, of wrath, because they are children of disobedience because they are the children of the devil. Now a person cannot at the same time be a child of God and a child of Satan. Nor is it necessary that one should be as hardened as were the Jews to whom Christ spoke, in order that they may be called children of Satan. “Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.” John 8:34. If a person is a child of disobedience and of darkness, he is not a child of God. “All have sinned;” and therefore none are by nature children of God. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.1}

How do people become children of God? If they are not natural children, it must be by adoption. So Paul says: “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba [Father], Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.” Romans 8:14-17. In like manner he writes to the Galatians: “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. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.” Galatians 4:4-7. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.2}

In the above text it will be noticed that the Spirit is the pledge of our adoption. It is called the Spirit of adoption, because only those who have it are sons of God. Indeed, its reception constitutes us sons of God. If we are children, then we are heirs of God; and so Paul says that the Spirit is “the earnest [or pledge] of our inheritance.” Ephesians 1:14. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.3}

If we are heirs of God, we are joint heirs with Christ. All that Christ has or is to have, we shall have also. He is the Son of God by birth; the only begotten Son of God. Angels are the sons of God (Job 38:7) by creation. Adam was a son of God in the same way, only a little lower than the angels. If he had not sinned against God, his descendants would like him have been sons of God. But he transferred his allegiance to Satan, and so no man from Adam down can be a son of God except by adoption. “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” John 3:3. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.4}

From this brief study of the Scripture it is clearly evident that since the Lord’s prayer begins, “Our Father,” it cannot be used by one who is not a child of God. For those who are in a state of nature, and thus children of wrath, there is another prayer. It is, “God be merciful to me, a sinner.” They cannot address the Creator as Father, but only as God, the Judge who, however, is able to save as well as to destroy. If they have once been adopted into the family of God, and have lost their heirship through sin, the same prayer is applicable. With David, under like circumstances, they may cry: “Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.” “Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.” “Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit.” But only those with whose spirits the Spirit of God bears witness that they are children of God, can with confidence repeat the tender words, “Our Father.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.5}

Yet not a long time must the sinner lie a suppliant at the throne of God, unable to utter those words. God is longing for the world to become reconciled to him. When the prodigal son, who had forfeited his right to a place in his father’s house, said, “I will arise, and go unto my father,” not as a son but as a servant seeking mercy, his father met him while he was yet a long way off. He met him not as a master, but as a father. The humble prodigal did not have time to call himself a servant before he was embraced as a son. And so, although no one in a state of nature can properly repeat the Lord’s prayer, at the first sincere petition for mercy, which the repentant sinner puts up to God, the Spirit of God is sent forth into his heart, and he becomes a son, and can confidently and joyfully say, Father, Father. W. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 123.6}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a significant statement in Kate Foote’s last Washington letter to the *Independent*. She says: “Washington needs hospitals. At present there is only one which receives an appropriation from Congress,-the Catholic hospital.” Straws show which way the wind blows. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.1}

Elder C. I. Boyd, of Oregon, is spending a few days visiting with friends in Oakland and Healdsburg. Last Sabbath he preached to the church in Oakland, on the spirituality of the law of God. Elder Boyd is this far on his way East, whence he intends to start some time in May for his new field of labor in South Africa. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.2}

Last Friday the overland mails which were snowbound in the Sierras for five days began to arrive. The experience of the several hundred passengers who were imprisoned in a snow shed for five days, was not pleasant, but no accident occurred to any. The *Mariposa*, upon which Brother Byron Belden and wife sailed for Australia, was delayed six days after her regular sailing time, awaiting the arrival of the English mail. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.3}

Just as we were closing up this number of the SIGNS, we received a copy of the *Weekly Gazette*, of Little Rock, Arkansas, which contains the speech of Senator Crockett in behalf of those whose conscientious observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, has caused them to be oppressed by the present unjust Sunday law of that State. The Senator speech is in support of a bill which he had introduced, granting immunity to those who keep the Sabbath, and which is referred to by our correspondent, in another column of this paper. We shall publish the speech in our next issue. It is an able effort, and well worth reading. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.4}

An Eastern paper says: “A strong temperance movement has been developed in London.” And the reason for the statement is formed principally in the fact that upon “a recent Sunday all the drinking places in that great city were closed.” But as the saloons continue running as usual six days in the week we fail to see that any great strength has been developed in behalf of *temperance*. To close saloons only on Sunday is to tacitly admit that the liquor business is legitimate on all other days. “Sunday closing” and “high license” are not in the interests of prohibition; for the more “respectable” and law abiding the saloon business becomes, the more dangerous it is, and the harder to suppress altogether. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.5}

Some time ago we were taken severely to task for designating as Mormons those people who masquerade under the high-sounding and pretentious title of the “Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints.” A late number of a paper published in Oakland by one of this sect has found its way into our hands, and in it we find a long eulogy of Joe Smith, the founder of Mormonism, an extract from the “Book of Mormon,” and a fierce onslaught upon Congress and the Federal Courts for the “persecution” of the Utah polygamists. Surely this *is* Mormonism. It should be understood by all, that any who eulogize Joe Smith, and who profess to be is followers, must be, theoretically, at least, in favor of polygamy, for he introduced the Turkish harem into the United States, as the “Book of Doctrine and Covenants” plainly shows. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.6}

Last Friday evening, February 18, a meeting was held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, to discuss the merits of the Sunday bill which is now before both Houses of the California Legislature. Addresses were made by Lawyer Fox and Dr. Briggs, of Napa. Two leading clergy of Oakland occupied the stand. The bill now under consideration prohibits all labor on Sunday, but provides for the exception of those who conscientiously believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and who actually observe it, provided they do not disturb any Sunday observer by their labor. We have not space to give any report of the meeting, but will simply say that the remarks which elicited the most applause, both from the clergy and the people, were those in which the speakers declared that no exception should be made in favor of anybody, even though they kept Sabbath strictly, and did not disturb anybody by their labor on Sunday. The section exempting Sabbath-keepers was severely criticized. They do not expect the bill to be passed at this session of the Legislature, but they say that they must agitate the matter so thoroughly that the next Legislature will not dare to refuse what they want. Agitate, agitate, agitate, is their cry. We propose to help them. Next week we shall give some space to the bill and to their discussion of it. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.7}

It is no slight testimonial to the care with which our news columns are gotten up, that our exchanges copy the items quite largely. Some of the most “live” papers sometime transfer our news matter almost bodily to their columns, and thereby show their good taste. It is doubtless enterprise like this which makes them live papers. None of our matter is copyrighted, and we are glad to be of use to others. We think we can say to our patrons, without fear of contradiction, that there is no other weekly paper that furnishes the news of the day so fully and so accurately, and at the same time so concise and free from all irrelevant matter, as the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It contains all the news that you could learn from a daily paper, and is free from sensational and vulgar rubbish. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.8}

Said Dr. Briggs at the recent Sunday Law Meeting: “The saloon on the ‘Lord’s day’ [Sunday] is full of deadly peril.” Well, isn’t it full of deadly peril on other days? Is it ever anything else but an unmitigated curse to society? Does it not make paupers and criminals whenever it does anything? Certainly it does, for it has no other work but to make criminals. Then why single out Sunday as the time when it is full of deadly peril? Would Dr. Briggs say, “A murder committed on Sunday is a terrible thing?” If he should it would be true, but would it be any more terrible than if committed on Monday? Such an expression would seem to affirm that it would be. And so his statement concerning saloons on Sunday implies that they are harmless on other days. Yet it is claimed that the Sunday movement is in the interest of temperance! We can demonstrate that it not only is not, but that it tends to the strengthening of the liquor traffic. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.9}

The *Interior* says that it would “admit a colored man to membership in our church without hesitation, provided there were no such church of his own accessible; but if there were, we would advise him to go to his own. If this be wrong, then there is no limit this side of the perfect fusion of the two races into a yellow mass inferior to either of them.” The *United Presbyterian* calls this “strained reasoning.” It is worse than that. It is based on the rapidly growing theory that the church is a society into which none but those of “our set” can be admitted, and that church fellowship is equivalent to admission into “good society.” We pity those who have so limited an idea of what Christian fellowship means that they would receive none but those who have been as highly favored by nature as they. The apostle Paul says of those who have “put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him,” that “there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all.” What the churches need is more of Christ and less of “society.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.10}

He who is satisfied with simply believing the truth, is not entitled to the name Christian. The prayer of the Saviour, Father, “sanctify them through thy truth” (John 17:17), was for all in every age who should believe; and the soul in whom that petition is not being answered may well doubt that he is born of God. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 126.11}

**“A Sign of the Times” The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the Princeton *Review* for January, there is an article by the late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., of Princeton, on “Religion in the Public Schools,” in which the following significant words occur:- {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 128.1}

“All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants-disciples of a common Master-to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teachings of our public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics.” {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 128.2}

The *Occident*, of San Francisco, says of Dr. Hodge’s article, “It may be considered a dying legacy of this able and lamented minister.” And of the portion in which the above paragraph occurs, it says: “These suggestions are worthy of earnest consideration.” Here we have the spectacle of one of the leading Presbyterian divines in the content advocating virtual union with Catholicism, and admitting that Catholics have as much truth as Protestants, and the whole thing approved by his brother Presbyterians. Shades of Knox and Calvin! Where is Protestantism? It has already turned, or is fast turning, Catholic. What the end will be, it needs not a prophet to foresee. {SITI February 24, 1887, p. 128.3}