**“‘The Coming of Christ’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under this title, after speaking of the several unscriptural and fanciful interpretations which are given to the promise of our Saviour, “I will come again” (John 14:3), the Methodist Recorder says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.4}

Other interpreters regard it, and we think correctly, as referring it, and we think correctly, as referring particularly to the personal appearing of Christ at the end of the world. It is a broad, comprehensive promise, intended not only for the apostles, but for believers in every subsequent age. It is the same as if he had said, “I will not stay always in Heaven; I will, after awhile, at a time which it is not now proper to reveal, come back to you.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.5}

The object of Christ’s departure from his disciples, as he plainly informs us, was that he might prepare a place for them. And the object of his coming again, he declares, will be to receive them to himself, that where he is, there they may be also. This very clearly shows that his coming again does not refer to his appearance to his disciples after his resurrection, nor to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, but to his second coming, at the end of the world, to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all them that love him. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.6}

This visible, personal coming of Christ is that which was announced by the angels to his disciples at his ascension. “This same Jesus,” said they, “which is taken up form you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.” This is in harmony with the entire teachings of God’s word on the subject. The apostle Paul assures us that “unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” And, “when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” “For,” says he again, “the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.7}

When Christ instituted the last Supper, he commanded his followers to observe it in remembrance of him, until his coming again. The volume of divine truth closes with the blessed assurance of his coming. “He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.8}

This is the glorious hope of the church and of every true believer, the return of the Saviour-the coming of the Bridegroom. The church shall not always mourn her absent Head. Believers in Jesus shall not always be left in orphanage. The Master says, “I will come again.” Blessed assurance and hope! {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 128.9}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued.*)

**THE FATHERS—THEIR UNRELIABILITY**

The next head under which Mr. Bailey “proves” his proposition is the testimony of the Fathers. And right here a quotation from the *Examiner and Chronicle*, a standard Baptist paper, is to the point. Some years ago a correspondent of this paper, signing himself Rev. Philetus Dobbs, D. D., stated that he had received a letter from a young minister, asking how he should prove a thing when there is nothing with which to prove it; and a portion of his reply is as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.1}

“I regard, however, a judicious use of the Fathers as being on the whole the best reliance for anyone who is in the situation of my querist. The advantages of the Fathers are twofold: First, they carry a good deal of weight with the masses; and secondly, you can find whatever you want in the Fathers. I do not believe that any opinion could be advanced so foolish, so manifestly absurd, but that you can find passages to sustain it on the pages of these venerable stagers. And to the common mind one of these is just as good as another. If it happens that the point that you want to prove is one that never chanced to occur to the Fathers, why you can easily show that they would have taken your side if they had only thought of the matter. And if, perchance, there is nothing bearing even remotely or constructively on the point, do not be discouraged; get a good, strong quotation, and put the name of the Fathers to it, and utter it with an air of triumph; it will be all just as well; nine-tenths of the people do not stop to ask whether a quotation bears on the matter in hand. Yes, my brother, the Fathers are your stronghold. They are Heaven’s best gift to the man who has a cause that cannot be sustained in any other way.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.2}

The aptness with which this applies to the case in hand will be seen as we proceed. But first we want to give a few quotations to show in what esteem that Fathers are held by some of the best writers, who are themselves first-day observers. We first quote from Mosheim. Speaking of certain works by Clement, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, etc., he says that these works are lost, and adds:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.3}

“But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words like a nut by the shell; and, neglecting the former as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning.”-*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part. 2, chap. 3, sec. 5*. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.4}

Archdeacon Farrar in his latest work, “History of Interpretation,” says of the Fathers:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.5}

“There are but few of them whose pages are not rife with errors,-errors of method, errors of fact, errors of history, of grammar, and even of doctrine; this is the language of simple truth, and not of slighting disparagement.”-*Pp. 162, 163*. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.6}

On page 164 of the same book, Farrar says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.7}

“Without deep learning, without linguistic knowledge, without literary culture, without any final principles either as to the nature of the sacred writings or the method by which they should be interpreted,-surrounded by Paganism, Judaism, and heresy of every description, and wholly dependent on a faulty translation,-the earliest Fathers and apologists add little or nothing to our understanding of Scripture.... Their acquaintance with the Old Testament is incorrect, popular, and full of mistakes; their scriptural arguments are often baseless; their exegesis-novel in application only-is a chaos of elements unconsciously borrowed on the one hand from Philo, and on the other from Rabbis and Kabbalists. They claim ‘a grace’ of exposition, which is not justified by the results they offer, and they suppose themselves to be in possession of a Christian Gnosis, of which the specimens offered are for the most part entirely untenable.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.8}

Dr. Clarke in his comment on Proverbs 8 says of the Fathers:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.9}

“But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority, nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine their authority is with me nothing.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.10}

Chambers’s Encyclopedia says of the Fathers:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.11}

“Of those who head the list, the Apostolic Fathers-so called from their supposed connection with Christ and the apostles-very little need be said, as their writings, which are mostly of an ascetical character, have come down to us in a corrupt and mutilated state, and as the writers themselves owe their chief celebrity to the times in which they happened to live.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.12}

We might add many more testimonies to the incompetency and unreliability of the Fathers, but we will pass to notice the special ones which are referred to by Mr. Bailey. He begins thus:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.13}

**TESTIMONY OF “BARNABAS”**

“Barnabas was a fellow-laborer with Paul. Several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published, believed by many of the best scholars to be genuine, though not inspired. Yet as a witness of the customs of the early churches, we may believe his testimony. General epistle of Barnabas 13:9, 10: ‘Lastly he saith unto them, Your new moons and your Sabbaths, I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it; the Sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made, when, resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to the disciples, he ascended into Heaven.’ Did not Barnabas know what day the early churches were to keep as the Christian Sabbath?” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.14}

We are strongly of the opinion that Mr. Bailey has never seen a set of the writings ascribed to the Fathers. He says “several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published.” We have two editions of the Anti-Nicene Fathers, and in neither of them is there more than one epistle ascribed to Barnabas. All the church historians of which we have any knowledge speak of “*the* epistle of Barnabas,” but never of the epistles. But that is a matter of no consequence, for if there were forty “epistles of Barnabas” the world would only be so much the worse off. We will now investigate this so-called “epistle of Barnabas,” and its author. Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, in his introductory note to the epistle of Barnabas, published by the Christian Literature Publishing Company, says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.15}

“The writer of this epistle is supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew of the times of Trajan and Hadrian. He was a layman; but possibly he bore the name of ‘Barnabas’ and so has been confounded with his holy apostolic namesake.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.16}

The original introductory note by those who translated the epistle for the Edinburgh edition contains the following:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.17}

“Nothing certain is known as to the author of the following epistle. The writer’s name is Barnabas, but scarcely any scholars now ascribe it to the illustrious friend and companion of St. Paul.... On perusing the epistle the reader will be in circumstances to judge of this matter for himself. He will be led to consider whether the spirit and tone of the writing, as so decidedly opposed to all respect for Judaism-the numerous inaccuracies which it contains with respect to Mosaic enactment; and observances-the absurd and trifling interpretations of Scripture which it suggests-and the many silly vaunts of superior knowledge in which its writer indulges-can possibly comport with its ascription to the fellow-laborer of St. Paul. When it is remembered that no one ascribes the epistle to the apostolic Barnabas till the times of Clement of Alexandria, and that it is ranked by Eusebius among the ‘spurious’ writings, which, however much known and read in the church, were never regarded as authoritative, little doubt can remain that the external evidence is of itself weak, and should not make us hesitate for a moment in refusing to ascribe this writing to Barnabas the apostle.... In point of style, both as respects thought and expression, a very low place must be assigned it. We know nothing certain of the region in which the author lived, or where the first readers were to be found.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.18}

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.19}

“The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.20}

Mosheim says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.21}

“The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was in my judgment the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first] or the next, who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul.”-*Book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 21*. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 134.22}

These last two quotations show how little is known about the man who wrote this epistle. One supposes that he was a Jew, the other a Gentile, and none pretend to know when he lived. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.1}

McClintock and Strong’s Encyclopedia says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.2}

“An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him.... The writer evidently has unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed the blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.3}

Dr. Kitto in his “Encyclopedia of Religious Literature” says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.4}

“He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; his views of the Old Economy are confused and erroneous; and he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at utter variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable that Barnabas, ‘the son of prophecy,’ ‘the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,’ was not the author of this epistle.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.5}

Dr. Schaff, “History of the Christian Church,” sec. 121, says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.6}

“A genuine production of Barnabas would doubtless have found a place in the Canon, with the writings of Mark and Luke and the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, the contents of this epistle are not worthy of him. It has many good ideas and forcible testimonies, such as that in favor of the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but it goes to extremes in opposition to Judaism, and indulges in all sorts of artificial, sometimes absurd and allegorical fancies.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.7}

But what if he does? What if the epistle is a forgery made by some unknown and irresponsible person? What if its writer was an ignoramus who indulged in the most absurd notions? He gives “valuable testimony” in favor of the observance of the “Christian Sabbath,” and that is sufficient to secure the epistle a place in “Christian literature” as long as time lasts. It will not be long, we apprehend, before these principles will be carried out to a greater extent, and the vilest man will be welcome in so-called Christian churches, if he is only zealous in his observance of Sunday, and in persecuting those who do not observe it. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.8}

But what about this “valuable testimony” given by this fellow who steals the name of Barnabas? Why, he says that “we keep the *eighth day* with joyfulness.” Perhaps some admirer of this epistle will tell us when the “eighth day of the week” comes, and how Sunday can be both the first day and the eighth day of a week of seven days. We might quote from the epistle abundance of matter demonstrating the truth of what has been said about it, but much of it is unfit for publication in these columns. We will however give one quotation, which the author of the epistle regarded as much more valuable testimony than that concerning the “eighth day.” In the last part of chapter nine he says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.9}

“Learn, then, my children, concerning all things richly, that Abraham, the first who enjoined circumcision, looking forward in spirit to Jesus, practiced that rite, having received the mysteries of the three letters. For (the Scripture) saith, ‘And Abraham circumcised ten, and eight, and three hundred men of his household.’ What then was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted-ten by I, and eight by H. You have (the initials of the name of) Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace (of our redemption), by the letter T, he says also. ‘Three hundred.’ He signifies therefore Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this who has put within us the engrafted gift of his doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.10}

With this we leave the pseudo-Barnabas. W. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.11}

(*To be continued.*)

**“Sunday-Law Meeting in Oakland” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

According to previous appointment in the newspapers of Oakland and San Francisco, a meeting in the interest of a Sunday law was held in Oakland, on the evening of the 18th ult. This meeting was called for the purpose of “discussing the merits” of the bill which was introduced into the Legislature February 15, by Mr. Knox, of Los Angeles. Unlike the convention that was held in San Francisco, last fall, and which was reported in the SIGNS of December 9, this meeting was remarkable for the unanimity of sentiment expressed. The meeting seemed to have been carefully planned, and everybody knew just what was expected of him. The principal speakers of the evening were Mr. Fox, an Oakland criminal lawyer, and Rev. Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Napa. The stand was occupied by quite a number of the leading clergy of Oakland, who manifested their approval of the sentiments expressed, by frequent applause. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.12}

As showing how careful the managers of the meeting were to secure perfect harmony, we will state that at the close of the meeting some resolutions favoring a Sunday law were read, and, as reported in the papers, were adopted by “a rising and almost unanimous vote.” But we were there, and saw the proceeding. The chairman called for all who favored the resolutions to arise. Perhaps more than half the congregation arose, when the chairman immediately announced, “Carried,” without giving any a chance to dissent except by keeping their seats. This is possibly a good way to get a vote “without a single dissenting voice,” in order to spur on unwilling legislation, but it is not a good way to convince thinking people of the justice of a cause. Any cause that cannot endure a free expression of opinion, and that is not so strongly intrenched in reason and justice as to be willing to court the fullest investigation, ought to fall by its own weight. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.13}

The bill under consideration is known in the lower House as Assembly Bill, No. 520, and reads as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.14}

“SECTION 1. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section two hundred and ninety-nine, which shall read as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.15}

“299. Every person who shall expose to or offer for sale any goods, wares, or merchandise, or shall keep open any store, workshop, or other place of business, bar, or saloon, or shall sell or give away to be drunk as a beverage any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquor, upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.16}

“SEC. 2. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.17}

“300. Every person who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gaming, or other public sports, exercises, or shows, on Sunday; and any person who shall keep open on Sunday any place where such public sports, exercises, or shows are carried on, is guilty of a misdemeanor. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.18}

“SEC. 3. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.19}

“301. Every person who shall either labor himself or compel his apprentice, servant, or other person under his charge or control, to labor or perform any work, other than works of necessity or charity, on Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.20}

“SEC. 4. This Act shall not extend to any person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as a Sabbath, and who actually observes such Sabbath; *provided*, that in the pursuit of his labor or business he disturbs no other person. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.21}

“SEC. 5. Each violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be construed to constitute a separate and complete offense; and for each violation the person or persons offending shall be liable to the penalties provided for any law. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.22}

“SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect immediately.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.23}

Mr. FOX, the first speaker, read the first four sections of this bill, and then announced himself as unqualifiedly opposed to section 4. Said He: “The strongest argument in favor of a Sunday law is based on the law of nature. It is an argument which is presented by God himself. Everything that lives must have a weekly day of rest, or must suffer. This is a divine command, made manifest through all nature. Hence all civilized nations should provide for the observance of that command; and you cannot provide for it unless you make the day of rest universal. Therefore the Sunday law must not except anybody.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.24}

This bit of sophistry was greeted with uproarious applause, the clergy on the stand using both hands and feet vigorously. We cite this to show the spirit actuating those who plead for a Sunday law. We were privately informed by one of the reverend gentlemen who was instrumental in getting up the meeting, that the managers were not responsible for the sentiments expressed by Mr. Fox, and that they did not indorse him. We told him that if that were the case they should have disavowed such sentiments at the time. Instead of a word of dissent, however, the other speaker of the evening came out still more emphatically, mentioning Seventh-day Adventists by name, and said that although he had respect for them as a people, no exemption should be made in their behalf; and this statement was also received with applause. If the advocates of Sunday laws are in favor of justice, they have an unfortunate way of showing it. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.25}

Let the reader carefully examine the proposed law, and then consider Mr. Fox’s “strongest argument,” by which he “proved” the impossibility of making any exception in favor of Sabbath-keepers. The bill provides that no work whatever, except works of necessity or charity, shall be performed on Sunday by anybody, unless he has actually rested on the seventh day of the week. Thus the proposed law, if carried into effect, would insure a weekly rest of one day to every individual in the State; and yet the speaker claimed that the “law of nature” which demands a weekly rest could not be obeyed if section 4 were retained. Is not “sophistry” a mild term to apply to such “argument”? He virtually claimed that this “law of nature” demands that the weekly rest shall fall on Sunday; that if men rest on Saturday instead of Sunday they will suffer physically! The only “law of nature” which demands that men shall rest upon Sunday, and on no other day, is the natural depravity which is in the heart of man, which receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.26}

To say that such a law as was pleaded for at that meeting would not be unjust, and would not result in the persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, is an insult to the intelligence of thinking people. Read the speech of Senator Crockett on pages 131, 132 of this paper, for a refutation of such a claim. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.27}

The speakers were careful to let it be understood that they did not want a religious law, but a civil law. They did not want any law in behalf of religion, but only to help the poor laboring man. This is a bit of sophistry that looks so plausible that it will catch very many. Of course they want a civil law, for a State law could be nothing else. But Sunday is a religious institution; we do not mean that it is a divine institution, but that it is purely a church ordinance, and therefore a religious institution, even though human in its origin. Now a State law compelling men to keep Sunday is a civil law, to be sure, but a civil law establishing a custom of religion. Such laws constitute, so far as they extend, a union of Church and State. Baptism is purely a religious ordinance, but a State law compelling all men to be baptized would be a civil law. But such civil laws are what we protest against. We do not believe in the State stepping out of its sphere to interfere in matters purely religious. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.28}

But it was not possible for those who took part in the meeting to conceal their desire for a law upholding Sunday in its religious aspect. In his opening prayer, Dr. Gray prayed that the people might be made to feel the necessity of “hedging about with legal enactments that holy day which came to us from Sinai.” (?) The Doctor must have misspoken himself, for it is not the seventh day, but the first, that they desire to have upheld by civil law, and he well knows that the Sunday-sabbath has no more connection with Sinai than has the Friday rest of the Mohammedans. But nevertheless he showed what he wanted. He also prayed that the people of this city, and the legislators, might “realize the sanctity of the Lord’s day.” And Dr. Briggs, in his speech, complained that moral instruction was relegated to the churches, and then the people were allowed to go their own ways on Sunday, so that they could not get at them to give the needed moral instruction. That is to say, the gospel which they preach has not power enough to reach the masses, and they want a law enforcing Sunday observance, so that people will be drawn to church on Sunday for want of any other place to go. With such a desire in the minds of the Sunday-law advocates, how long would it be before they would beg for a law compelling all people to go to church on Sunday, if they should find that in spite of the rigid Sunday law, the people persisted in neglecting church privileges? {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 135.29}

We have still further evidence that it is not simply in the interest of good order, and to insure rest for the laboring man, that the Sunday law is wanted. Mr. Fox said: “Strike out section 4 [loud “Amens” from the ministers behind him], because it gives everybody a choice of two days; and then those who don’t want any Sunday won’t have any.” True; pass a law requiring all people to keep Sunday, excepting those who keep the Sabbath, and then those who believe in keeping the seventh-day instead of the first, won’t keep Sunday! Of course not; and that is what some, at least, of these Sunday-law advocates object to. We can inform them that whatever law they pass, those who conscientiously believe that “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,” will not keep Sunday. When civil laws run in direct opposition to the plainly expressed commandment of the Lord, duty is very clear. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 136.1}

We have not space in this article to notice all the “arguments” that were put forth to show the absolute necessity of a strict Sunday law. They were all as strong as those which we have mentioned, and we shall refer to them in future articles. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not antagonize persons, but principles. We do not charge the reverend gentlemen who plead so strenuously for a strict Sunday law, with having a desire to oppress any people because of their conscientious convictions. We are perfectly willing to concede that they are deceived as to what would be the inevitable result of such a law as they desire; and we write for the purpose of enlightening people as to what the result will be. The bill if passed with section 4 struck out, would cause the most bitter persecution to arise against those who observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. It would be persecution of conscience’ sake as much as any persecution instigated by the Inquisition. If the bill should be passed as it stands, it would grant, at the most, religious toleration, and not such religious liberty as should be guaranteed in this land of boasted freedom. It would leave the conscientious Sabbath-keeper liable to be arrested at the instance of every hyper-sensitive person who might fancy himself disturbed by quiet labor on Sunday; and although many of these charges might not be sustained, no end of trouble would be caused. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 136.2}

For this reason, we propose to do all in our power to agitate this matter. It is scarcely possible that a Sunday law can be passed at this session of the Legislature; but the friends of such a law say that they propose to begin now to work the matter up in season for the next session. We shall work with them; and while they show one side, we will show both sides. This is not a local matter, but one that concerns everybody; for the same arguments are used wherever Sunday laws are proposed. We desire that the matter shall be so fully canvassed that no one can be ignorant as to the natural working of Sunday laws; so that when such laws are finally adopted, as the prophecy foretells that they will be, no one need work for them except those who are perfectly willing to see persecution practiced upon the conscientious minority. W. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 136.3}

**“Andrews’ History of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

This highly valuable book, after passing through two editions, has been revised, and enlarged by the addition of another chapter, and now appears for the third time, not in its former small type and plain black binding, but printed in large, clear type and bound in handsome and substantial style. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.1}

As many of our readers are aware, this work, by the late Elder J. N. Andrews, is the most complete history of the Bible Sabbath, and also of the first day of the week, ever written. And as it gives a multitude of facts not published elsewhere in the English language nor in any one book, and not attainable by any except hose who have access to the largest libraries in this and other countries, no one can be said to be thoroughly intelligent upon the Sabbath question till he has read this work. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.2}

As a writer, Elder Andrews had few equals and no superiors in his chosen field; and his “History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week” bears evidence upon every page, not only of is ability to present in a thoroughly readable and interesting manner a subject often considered dry, but also of his ripe scholarship and of his great historical accuracy. Every statement made is supported either by plan and appropriate texts of Scripture, or by the most reliable historical reference. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.3}

Containing as it does a complete history of the Sabbath for 6,000 years, and of the first day of the week from the earliest periods, the book is one of rare value, and it should be in the hands of the people everywhere. The work contains 548 pages, a table of contents, a perfect index of subjects, an index of authors quoted and also one of Scripture texts used, besides a fine steel engraving of the author. The size of the page is 51/2 by 81/2 inches, and the general style and appearance of the book entitle it to a place in the finest libraries; while its literary merits cannot but favorably impress all who read it. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.4}

If the friends of the Bible Sabbath do their duty, hundreds of copies of this book will be sold in the future where scores have been in the past. This work is now in a shape that it can be handled as a subscription book; and in the hands of those whose hearts are in the work, it will no doubt sell as well as any religious publication. The Sabbath question is now being discussed all over the land as never before, and *now* is the time to sell the “History of the Sabbath.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.5}

The book is bound in three styles: cloth, with sprinkled edges, price $2.00; library, marbled edges $2.75; half Morocco, gilt, $3.75. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.6}

For terms to agents, write to Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., general agents for all territory west of the Rocky Mountains, or to *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 137.7}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. ‘Who Art in Heaven’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

**“WHO ART IN HEAVEN”**

The fact that God is in Heaven is often used to indicate his power and majesty. The expression occurring in the model prayer indicates that whoever prays should recognize the greatness of the Being whom he addresses. “He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” Hebrews 11:6. We quote a few texts to show the comprehensiveness of the expression, “Who art in Heaven.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.1}

Psalm 103:19: “The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.” Psalm 115:3: “But our God is in the Heavens; he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased.” These texts show the power of God. The same thing is found in 2 Chronicles 20:6: “O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in Heaven? and rulest not thou over all the kingdoms of the heathen? and in thine hand is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?” Whenever it is designed to indicate the power and majesty of God, his dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.2}

Psalm 11:4: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” Here God’s dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned to show his omniscience. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.3}

Jeremiah 23:24: “Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill Heaven and earth? saith the Lord.” Here the omnipresence of God is indicated, as also in 1 Kings 8:27: “But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the Heaven and Heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded.” And also Isaiah 66:1: “Thus saith the Lord, The Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.4}

Ecclesiastes 5:2: “Be not rash with thy mouth and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in Heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.” Here the fact that God is in Heaven is given as a reason for sobriety and carefulness of speech. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.5}

Thus we find that the expression in the Lord’s Prayer, “Who art in Heaven,” stands for a recognition of the power, the majesty, the omnipotence, and the omniscience of God. All these things should be borne in mind when we approach the throne of grace. This thought will tend to produce reverence and awe. Multiplication of words and “vain repetitions,” for which Christ condemned the heathen, arise from the fact that the petitioner thinks more of himself than he does of the one whom he is addressing. The heathen gods were so contemptible that the heathen worshiper could not help thinking more of himself than of his god; for heathen worship, in its inception, was self-worship. See Romans 1:21-23. But the God whom we worship sits upon the circle of the heavens, and he who has a just sense of his greatness will come with reverence into his presence, and will confine his words to just the things which he needs. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.6}

**“HALLOWED BE THY NAME”**

This follows as a natural consequence of that which precedes. The one who remembers the words, “There is none like unto the God of Jerusalem, who rideth upon the heavens in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky” (Deuteronomy 33:26), will of necessity “fear that glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD.” W. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 139.7}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

For the present, the address of Elder C. I. Boyd, is Battle Creek, Mich. care of *Review and Herald*. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.1}

All communications for the President of the North Pacific Conference or Tract Society, should be addressed to Elder John Fulton, box 18, East Portland, Oregon. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.2}

We hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Ninth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of California, for which we are indebted to our friend, Hon. N. A. Young of San Diego. This report contains some valuable temperance mater of which we shall give the readers of the SIGNS the benefit. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.3}

The *Interior* sometimes views things just as they are, and when it does, the prospect which it sees is not very flattering. Following is an instance:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.4}

“The hope for the suppression of Socialism in Germany obviously does not lie in the Roman Catholic Church. Just now it is not easy to discover where it does lie. It might lie in the Protestant church, if that church would unite, and then, by works of humanity and love, prove that it had not lost both its life and its power. Of such a union and such efforts there seems to be no immediate prospect.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.5}

The same thing might be said of almost any other country. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.6}

It seems that the Pacific Coast is destined to be the place where spiritual manifestations shall most speedily attain the highest development. The *Golden Gate* says:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.7}

“Certain it is that California, and especially the region along the coast, is remarkably favorable for spiritual and mediumistic development. There is probably right here in San Francisco a larger proportion of mediumistic persons than in any other city in the Union, and some of these mediums are equal to the best in the world.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.8}

We presume that this is so; but we regard it as anything but a compliment to California to be told that the devil can work through people here better than he can anywhere else. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.9}

The Rev. Hugh G. Pentecost, of Newark, N. J., preached on a recent Sunday evening on Heny ege. Said he: “For my part it is clear that Henry George is in the straight moral position; and since the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right, the time will probably come when all rents will go to the general Government.” We care nothing about this indorsement of Henry George, but we do object to the idea that “the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right.” We are sorry to see people give assent to such a sentiment. There has not been a century since the fall, in which, the great body of humanity was not wholly wrong. Unless people submit to be directed by the law of God, they must go wrong. And we have not much reason to hope that the great body of humanity will make great progress toward the truth of God when those who should lead them in the way preach on Henry George and kindred subjects, instead of preaching Christ and him crucified. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.10}

The Oakland *Enquirer* of February 20 said: “Last night’s Sunday-law meeting excited considerable enthusiasm among those present, but it would be a difficult thing indeed to pass an act compelling those who regard the seventh day as the Sabbath to observe the first day. This is what all the speakers advocated, but they did not take counsel of discretion in doing it. There is a powerful element in the Christian churches, which would fight to the death against such a proposition.” We would fain believe that our contemporary is correct in its estimate of the feeling in the church in regard to a Sunday law. But not, in their demands that Sabbath-keepers should also keep Sunday, we are very sure that they did not take counsel of justice and religious liberty. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.11}

A correspondent of the New York *Observer* makes this confession, which must be very discouraging to those who are looking for a temporal millennium, when all men will be converted:- {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.12}

“We are compelled to believe by the stern army of facts and figures that at the end of this boasted century of missions, while not 3,000,000 converts, nominal and real, have been won to Christianity in pagandom, the heathen and Mohammedan are 200,000,000 more than they were at the beginning of the century; that the votaries of those faiths increase seventy times faster than the followers of Christ. The church is outstripped on its own methods. They evince in these modern days a propagandism and aggressiveness far superior. The necessity in the foreign field cannot be overtaken on the present line of church work.” {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.13}

Yet many church people will persist in saying that the world is growing better. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.14}

“Against a Sunday law, but in favor of enacting a Sabbath Law,” is the heading of an article that appeared in the Oakland *Tribune* one day last week, protesting against the proceedings at the recent Sunday-law meeting. The heading is most misleading. We do not know any man or body of men who are in favor of enacting a Sabbath law. The Sabbath is upheld by the law of God, and needs nothing more. If it were proposed to enact a law enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, and there was any probability of its carrying, we should vigorously oppose it. Our opposition to the enactment of Sunday laws is not alone on the ground that Sunday has no divine sanction, and is a working day as much as Monday or Tuesday, but because we are against the principle of the State legislating in matters of religion. The enactment of Sunday laws stands for union of Church and State, and this should be opposed by all Christians. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.15}

Some people have queer ideas of what constitutes religious liberty. Here in California the good people are trying to get a law that will compel all people to keep Sunday, even though some conscientiously keep another day; yet the Sunday people do not see in that any infringement upon religious liberty. And now comes the *Christian Church News*, and claims that a constitutional amendment prohibiting the “manufacture, gift, or sale of spirituous, malt, or vinous liquors, except for medicinal, mechanical, chemical, or scientific purposes,” is oppressive because it does not provide for the use of intoxicating wine at communion. The editor says: “It is clearl an infringement upon religious liberty, and an attempt to set aside the conscientious convictions of men.” All of which causes us to conclude that with very many people “religious liberty” means liberty for themselves to do as they please, and compulsion for others to do likewise. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.16}

Said a clergyman to a seventh-day friend: “If you like to keep Saturday instead of Sunday, I could not say you would be breaking the law of God; but the people of God are against you.” Well, that is a little strange. If God is not against us for keeping the seventh day, how can his people be against us? Are not the people of God those in whose heart is the law, and who do his will? God’s people are those who walk with him; and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Consequently his people cannot be against Sabbath-keeping. Moreover, if God is not against the keeping of the seventh day, then it cannot be wrong; for he is against all wrong; and if he is not against it, and it is not wrong, it must be right, and in harmony with his law, and so it is. See Exodus 20:8-11. And if God is not against seventh-day Sabbath-keeping, because it is in harmony with his law, and is right, he must be against Sunday-keeping, and it must be wrong; for two opposite practices cannot be right. We choose every time to be on the side of the Lord, even though we should be opposed by thousands calling themselves his people. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.17}

We hope that no one will delay to read the article beginning on the third page of this paper, entitled, “A Plea for Justice.” The article is a speech by the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, of Arkansas, delivered in behalf of the bill which he had introduced into the Legislature of that State, allowing observers of the seventh day immunity from the penalties of the Sunday law. For two years a rigid Sunday law has been in force in Arkansas, with the result that religious persecution was rampant. We have mentioned this persecution several times, and have given some of the particulars; but we are glad to be able to give this testimony from a disinterested person. We hope that the people of other States where Sunday laws are being pressed, will consider well the experience of the people of Arkansas. Notwithstanding the intolerance of the law, and the persecution which it engendered, there were not wanting professed ministers of the gospel, who wished to have the law remain unchanged. Colonel Crockett, who, by the way, is a grandson of the famous David Crockett, gave the bill in favor of liberty his personal attention in both Houses, and by his energy and eloquence secured its passage in the Senate by a vote of 26 to 2, and in the Assembly by a vote of 55 to 16. The cause of religious freedom is greatly indebted to him for his successful effort in its behalf. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.18}

Our readers are aware that a few weeks since the German Parliament refused to pass the Government measure known as the Septenate, a bill to provide for a large increase in the German army, and to provide for its maintenance for a period of seven years. Immediately upon the defeat of the bill, Prince Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag, and writs were at once issued for the election of a new Parliament. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.19}

The members of this new body have now been elected, and a majority is assured for the Government bill. This was accomplished, however, by the direct interference of the Pope himself. Hitherto the Papal influence has not been wanting in political matters even in our own country, but it has been exerted secretly through bishops and priests; but in this instance the “holy father” himself addressed a brief but mandatory letter to his vassals in Germany, directing them to support the Government candidates; hence Prince Bismarck’s victory. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.20}

The question of passing the Septenate bill was purely a political one, and concerned only the German people, who will be taxed to raise the immense sums which the new Reichstag will be asked to vote, and from whose ranks will be drawn the many thousands of additional men which the iron chancellor demands. And yet the l awful electors of the empire were not left to decide the question; it was decided not in Germany but in Rome; not by the people of a sovereign State but by the foreign head of an alien church. The fact is most significant, and shows how entirely even the great powers of the earth are at the mercy of the Papacy. {SITI March 3, 1887, p. 144.21}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued.*)

**TESTIMONY OF IGNATIUS**

The next Father who is quoted as authority for the observance of Sunday is Ignatius. We quote here all that Mr. Bailey claims for him. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.1}

“Ignatius was the bishop or pastor of the church of Antioch in Syria from the year 70 to 107. He was a disciple of John, and was pastor at Antioch for twenty-five years before John’s death. In his epistle to the Magnesians 3:3 he says: ‘Wherefore if they who were brought up in these ancient laws come nevertheless to newness of hope, no longer observing *Sabbaths*, but keeping the *Lord’s day*, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, some deny. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.2}

“Also Ignatius (quoted by Edwards in ‘Sabbath Manual,’ p. 113) says: ‘Let us Christian no more Sabbatize, keep the Lord’s day.’ ‘Let everyone that loves Christ keep holy the Lord’s day, the resurrection they, the highest of all days.’ {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.3}

“Ignatius was arrested at Antioch when the Roman emperor, Trajan came there about the year 107, and was sent to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom, being torn in pieces by wild beasts. Did this early martyr and a disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch Syria, a church which had the ministrations of inspired apostles-did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord’s day, the Christian Sabbath and a day of worship? Incredible!” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.4}

For the benefit of those who are not acquainted with the Fathers we will state that all of the epistles credited to Ignatius exist in two forms, the longer and the shorter. It is very evident, even allowing that Ignatius wrote any epistles, that both those forms cannot be correct. And there is no question, even among scholars who endorse Ignatius but that the longer form is a corrupt text. In the above quotation the reader will notice that two statements concerning the Sabbath are credited to Ignatius. When we state, however, that these are the same, both being taken from the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Magnesians, the first from the shorter form, and the longer, the reader will see that it is found necessary to multiply even spurious testimony, in order to uphold the Sunday institution. We might state, moreover, what is the case, that in the original text of this so-called epistle by Ignatius, there is no reference whatever to the “Lord’s day.” But inasmuch as that statement, although a truth, must be taken by the general reader upon our word, we will allow the assumption that the epistle has been correctly translated, and will give argument upon which the reader can judge for himself. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.5}

It will be noted that considerable capital is made of the fact that Ignatius suffered martyrdom for the truth, and that therefore his testimony concerning the Sunday Lord’s day must be valued. Thus Mr. Bailey says: “Did this early martyr and disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch in Syria, a church which had the ministration of inspired apostles-did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord’s day, the Christian sabbath and day of worship? Incredible!” To this question we have two answers:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.6}

1. Because a man lived in the days of the apostles, and even in a church which had their inspired ministrations, it adds nothing to the weight of his testimony. Hymeneus and Philetus had the benefit of the labors of the apostle Paul, yet they overthrew the faith of many Christians, by teaching that the resurrection was already passed. 2 Timothy 2:17, 18. Diotrephes was not only one who loved to have the pre-eminence in the church, but he held a position of influence, since he had power to cast people out of the church; yet he openly rejected the teaching of the apostle John, and cast out of the church those who would receive it. 3 John 9, 10. Paul said to the elders of the church at Ephesus: “I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” Acts 20:29, 30. From this we know that very early in the history of the Christian church, men who were pastors in the church began to teach heresies; and that the heresies which they taught were not trivial is shown by Peter, who after writing about the giving of the prophecies said: “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as their shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.” 2 Peter 2:1. The fact that Ignatius was a bishop, and that to in the first century, would not make his teaching any more to be believed than though he lived in the present day. Nay, more. When that teaching directly contradicted the teaching of the Scripture, it would only make him the more blameworthy. But we need not impeach the integrity of the Ignatius, for,- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.7}

2. There is no reason to believe that Ignatius of Antioch ever wrote any epistle at all. In support of this assertion we shall make a few quotations. The translators of the so-called Ignatian epistles, in there introductory notice, after stating that there are fifteen of them, say:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.8}

“It is now the universal opinion of critics, that of the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which work at various dates, and to several special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated bishop of Antioch. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.9}

“But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius (‘Hist. Eccl.’ iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer period. It is plain that one or the other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.10}

“But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. Thus said Lardner, in his ‘Credibility of the Gospel History’ (1743): ‘I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgement of the larger... But whether the smaller themselves are the genuine writings of the Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question.’” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.11}

Mosheim says:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.12}

“A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistle ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it altogether a case of much intricacy and doubt.”-“*History of Christianity,” cent. 1, sec. 52.* {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.13}

Neander says of the so-called epistle of Ignatius: “Even the shorter and more trustworthy addition is very much interpolated.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.14}

Dr. Schaff (“History of the Christian Church,” Vol., sec. 119), says:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.15}

“The doctrinal and churchly views of the Ignatian epistles are framed on a peculiar combination, and somewhat materialistic apprehension of John’s doctrine of the incarnation, and Paul’s idea of the church as the body of Jesus Christ. In the ‘Catholic Church’-an expression introduced by him-that is, the episcopal orthodox organization of his day, the author sees, as it were, its continuation of the mystery of the incarnation and the reality of which he outpoured great emphasis against the docetists; and in every bishop a visible representative of Christ, and a personal center of ecclesiastical unity, which he presses home upon his readers with the greatest solicitude, and almost passionate zeal. He thus applies those ideas of the apostles directly to the outward constitution, and makes them subservient to the principle and institution of the growing hierarchy. Here lies the chief importance of these epistles; and in this respect we have found it necessary to distinguish them already in the section on the organization of the church. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.16}

“It is remarkable that the idea of the episcopal hierarchy should be first clearly and boldly brought out, not by the contemporary Roman bishops, Clement, but by a bishop of the Eastern Church; though it was transplanted by him to the soil of Rome, and their sealed by his martyr blood. Equally noticeable is the circumstance that these boldest documents of the hierarchy seven became so interpolate, curtailed, and mutilated by pious fraud, that it is to-day almost impossible to discover with certainty the genuine Ignatius of history under the hyper- and pseudo- Ignatius of tradition.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.17}

Dr. Killen:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.18}

“It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that, upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe, between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself... Calvin knew that an apostolic must have been acquainted with an apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the productions of an age when the pure white of Christianity was really obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it. ‘There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.’”-“*Ancient Church.” Period 2, sec. 2, chap. 3, par. 12.* {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.19}

We might quote much more to the same effect if we had space, but it is not necessary. The argument from Ignatius may be summed up thus: First, the testimony credited to him is in direct contradiction to the Scripture teaching. Second, the whole thing is a forgery. Third, it is quoted twice so as to increase the effect. This is the kind of testimony which is invariably quoted to supplement the so-called argument from Scripture in favor of Sunday. Since it is customary to reserve the strongest argument for the last, this affords a good comment on the strength of the argument from Scripture for Sunday. W. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.20}

(*To be continued.*)

**“Something New But Untrue” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

We thought we had heard all the arguments that could by any possibility be brought against the Sabbath; but we have just come across one that to us is absolutely new. This one comes all the way from Texas, and is the joint product of a Methodist minister, a professor in a college, and an “orthodox theologian.” We find it in a little pamphlet entitled, “The Sabbath Day Examined.” It is our design to give our readers the benefit of everything that is offered against the Sabbath, and so we give this. In deference to the high authority whence the book originates, we do not venture to change the grammatical construction in any particular. The reader will notice from the way the matter is introduced, that it is one of a class of similar arguments:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.21}

“Before leaving this class of arguments, we will introduce one more which is of itself sufficiently strong to preclude the idea of the most sanguine Sabbatarian of going back to creation to begin with number seven for Sabbath. I have before me a little book in which it is stated that an orthodox theologian asked a Sabbatarian, ‘From when do you date your Sabbath?’ ‘From creation, sir,’ was the reply. Now if you will just listen to me, I will prove that you do no such thing. Is the Sabbath a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, the observance of it by Adam would have been a violation of the law which God gave to him. ‘Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat.’ The same as to say, ‘The observance of the Sabbath by Adam before he sinned would have knowledge of good and evil, and of itself a sufficient reason for all the sin and misery that the world has ever known from that day until the present.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.22}

We are not told what reply the Sabbatarian made to the “orthodox theologian” who got off the above. No doubt he was so much overwhelmed by such a torrent of “orthodox” theology and “orthodox” grammar and logic, too, that he could not reply. But we have had time to take breath since we read it, and so we venture to turn the tables on the “orthodox theologian” as follows: {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 150.23}

1. Is marriage a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, then the entering into the marriage state by Adam would have been a violation of the law of God, which forbade him to know good or evil. Therefore Adam, according to our orthodox theologian, was not married until after the fall, and was not in the transgression. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.1}

2. Has God the elements of good or evil in him? Is he good or evil? If either, then if Adam had known anything about him before the fall, it would have been a violation of the commandment which God gave to him, that he should know good or evil. But God is good; he is goodness itself; therefore, according to the argument of that “orthodox theologian,” we must conclude (*a*) that Adam did not know God until after the fall; (*b*) that since he did not know God until after the fall, he never received from God any commandment concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and that (*c*) consequently, Adam never having received any commandment from the Lord, never fell, but continued a clam-like existence, neither good or evil, but half way between both, like Mohammed’s coffin suspended between heaven and earth! {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.2}

But someone who has not had the superior advantages of that college professor or the “orthodox theologian,” may be simple enough to say, “These conclusions directly contradict the plain statements of the Bible.” Of course they do; and so does the conclusion of the “orthodox theologian,” in regard to the Sabbath. So also does every “argument” which is fabricated against the Sabbath which God gave to man in Eden, and proclaimed in thunder tones from Sinai. The lofty theories of many an “orthodox theologian” would tumble to the ground instantly, or, rather, would never be raised, if he should take counsel of the Bible, and should accept its plain statements. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.3}

The tree which was forbidden to Adam was the tree of the knowledge of good *and* evil, and not of the knowledge of good *or* evil. Adam knew good; so long as he regarded the command of the Lord, he could not know anything else, and God did not design that he should; but when he transgressed the Lord’s command, he knew evil as well as good. This transgression, which made him evil, brought “death and all our woe,” and it also brought into the world a flood of just such absurd, contradictory, unscriptural, and wicked “arguments” as that put forth against the Sabbath by that reputed “orthodox theologian.” W. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.4}

**“Discrediting Prophecy” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Another time-setter who would be nothing if he were not sensational, has arisen in New York, and declares that the world will come to an end in the year 1900. Of course all his so-called calculations are the most foolish kind of guess-work; for there is absolutely no prophetic period which reaches this side of 1844. But that will not prevent this man from finding followers; he could, however, acquire no notoriety whatever if it were not for the newspapers, some of which are devoting considerable space to notices of his vagaries. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.5}

The more absurd any proposition is, the more widely it is sure to be circulated by the secular press. If it were not for this fact, weather prophets, perihelion theorists, and time-setters, might about as well go out of business. But as this time-setting is a most fruitful source of unbelief, we can scarcely hope that the devil will allow it to slumber; and it behooves those who have received the truth, and who have an understanding of Christ’s work in the heavenly sanctuary, to give heed to the words of the Saviour: “Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open to him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.6}

**“Unconcealed Infidelity” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

By this term we do not refer to the blasphemous rantings of Ingersoll, but to the infidelity that is preached from Christian pulpits and scattered broadcast by the religious press. This is scarcely a Bible doctrine, or a fact of sacred history that is not positively denied by some professing to be religious teachers. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth; but that truth has been so long and so generally denied by religious teachers, that he believes the simple Bible statement, is considered an old fogy. To believe the simple statement of the Bible is considered a mark of ignorance. Our attention has been especially directed to this matter of late by several noted instances of clerical infidelity, a few of which we will notice. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.7}

An English clergyman has recently published to books on “Christ and Christianity,” in one of which, entitled “A Picture of Jesus,” The following version is given of the miracle at Cana:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.8}

“The Virgin is evidently a little discomposed. The run on the wine is, no doubt, due to the people who came in the retinue of her Son. She cannot bear that members of her own family should put to shame the giver of the feast and so close a friend. “They have no wine, my dear Son—you see there are too many, in consequence of—‘Hush!’ Jesus stops her, with exquisite sensibility and gentle courtesy. He will not have attention called to the fact of there being any deficiency. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.9}

“No doubt Jesus and his disciples had brought wine enough, at least for themselves, *according to custom*. But now, is it not possible-even likely and Christlike-that with loving thoughtfulness, and knowing the extra concourse in consequence of his presence, Jesus may have said to his disciples, ‘If we go, we must not be burdensome to our friends; they are not rich; many will follow us; the sacred rights of hospitality, by which at least a season none may be excluded, must not be put to shame; take plenty of wine, and let it be *good*-the *best* wine. But don’t let it be known; we must not do a kindness to get praise by others, at the expense of wounding our host’s feelings; let us so manage that, if possible, he may not even know that his wine ran short; let us leave our supply *outside*, it need only be used if called for, and then served up out of the *host’s own pots*. The water pots at the door are sure to be empty by that time, it will be most convenient to put our wine in them at the right moment, and no one will be likely to notice that it is not the host’s own wine.’ {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.10}

“So when the wine ‘runs short,’ Jesus himself steals away from the feast-the servants quickly get in the wine, fill up the water pots under his directions-and the whole had been done so quietly that the first thing noticed is that wine is being poured out of pots usually containing water. Some noticed *that*; the *servants*, we are told, knew about it, and could have been the real explanation; but the *ruler* of the feast did not even know that the wine had failed; he only noticed that what was now served was the best wine.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.11}

The above was written by one who writes “Rev.” before his name; and we have seen it printed in a prominent denominational journal, without a word of dissent. Instead of being called a picture of Jesus, his book should have been entitled “a Caricature of Jesus.” For no one who has ever read the simple narrative in the second chapter of John, could believe that the one who wrote the paragraph above had any other motive than to ridicule the Bible account. The evangelist plainly states that the servants, at the command of Jesus, filled the six stone water-pots, and as plainly states that that water was made wine; yet this man professing to give a picture of Jesus, has represented him as using deception in order to perpetrate a very clumsy trick. It is not simply that the miracle is denied, but Jesus is represented as being actually dishonest. No professed infidel ever did more to bring the Bible into disrepute by his coarse jokes upon it, than has this professed minister of the gospel. We cannot believe that a man who presents Jesus in such a light as he does, can have any faith in him or in the Bible. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.12}

In its issue of December 9, the *Christian Union* reprints an article from the *Popular Science Monthly*, which begins thus: “There is no weed weedier or more ubiquitous than the common thistle. In Paradise, it is true, if we may trust John Milton and the Sunday-school books-wise, as usual, beyond what is written-there were no thorns or thistles.” The one who wrote that has read the Bible to little purpose, if he has read it at all, or else he doesn’t accept the Bible as final authority on any subject. The Bible says that at the close of creation, “God saw everything that he had made, and, behold it was very good.” Genesis 1:31. Thorns and thistles are not good. Also we are told that “out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food.” Genesis 2:9. And the growth of thorns and thistles is expressly declared to have been the direct consequence of the sin of our first parents: “And unto Adam he [God] said, Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded the, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of is at all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it brings to thee.” Genesis 3:17, 18. It would be well if many who nowadays presume to write upon Bible subjects had as much knowledge of the Bible as John Milton had; better still if they believed it as fully as he did. The quotation which implies that thistles grew from the beginning, and were in Eden, is perfectly in keeping with the rapidly-increasing tendency to leave God out of the account altogether, and to hold that the world evolved itself. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.13}

Again, in the *Christian Union* of January 20, the editor, Lyman Abbott, makes an exhibition of infidelity in his comments on the current Sunday school lesson. The lesson is upon the call of Abram, Genesis 12:1-9, and is entitled “The Faith of Abram.” We make a few quotations from the article:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.14}

“And so he went out, ‘not knowing, whither he went;’ not knowing, I may add, by whom he was led. He went by faith, obedient to the command of that inward sense which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen. He crossed the Euphrates, passed over the desert and entered the unknown land which he determined should be his home. He pitched his tent and built an altar near to what afterward became Bethel; and initiated his entrance in a new country by a new worship. He called, it is said, upon the name of the gods. In treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture; the conjecture is reasonable that he first introduced into use, and so into the Hebrew Scriptures, the plural form *Elohim*, the gods, as a method of expressing his faith that the many Lord and gods of the Chaldaic religion were but different names or expressions for the one God who is the Master and Maker of all. As Paul commended the altar to the unknown God, and whom the Athenians unknowingly worshiped proceeded to declare unto them, so Abraham, not attacking even by implication the polytheistic beliefs of his father’s house, grouped in thought all the gods of the earth and the heavens together, and took the first up toward a true monotheistic worship by calling on the name of the gods, as though in the many he would recognize but One. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.15}

Some persons may in the above a sample of the advanced theology, but we can see only a sample of advanced in fidelity. The Scripture says, “Abraham believed God;” Lyman Abbott says that Abraham was not sure that there was any God. The Scripture tells us the simple facts about the call of Abraham, where he was when he was called, how old he was, where he went, and where he stopped on the way, and the instances connected with his journey; Lyman Abbott says, “in treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture.” We submit that the only room there is for conjecture is by ignoring the Bible narrative. The writer of the above conjectures that because the word “*Elohim*” is used (not however by Abraham, but by Moses, the historian), therefore Abraham had the gods of Chaldea in mind when he built the altar and worshiped at Bethel. He might as reasonably conjecture that Moses had the many gods of the Egyptians in mind when he wrote, “In the beginning God [*Elohim*] created the heavens and the earth.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.16}

But the writer continues:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 151.17}

“Of course I am well aware that there are able theological writers who suppose that modern theology was furnished to Adam in Eden, and to Abraham in Ur, and to whom this whole rendering of Abraham’s immigration will seem secular, if not profane. To them the plural *Elohim* is an evidence that Abraham believed in the Trinity, and his erection of an altar is conclusive proof that he comprehended the atonement. If religion is something external to man, we may certainly conceive it prepared ready-made and given to him, like the dress of skins which the Lord God made for Adam and Eve in the garden. But if religion is character, if it is what man *is*, not what he *has*, in the crude and ruder states of human development, religion must be simple and crude in its forces; then, as we are content to teach our children the very simplest truth is concerning God, and their duty toward him, and their right of trust in him, so we not only may, but we must, think God has taught the race.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.1}

The trouble is that his theory does not allow that God is the author of religion. In fact, it ignores God entirely. Instead of allowing that God is the teacher of the race, it makes man his own teacher, and religion something that is evolved from his own inner consciousness. If religion is not something external to man, then it is only human and not divine. The Bible says that “faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;” but the writer of the above paragraph, in claiming that religion is something that is developed within the individual man, being crude at first, but becoming more perfect as the man becomes better educated, does away entirely with the necessity for a God. His theory is infidelity pure and simple. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.2}

To show that this charge is well founded, and that the editor of the *Christian Union* has in his comments entirely ignored God, we make one more quotation:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.3}

“So perhaps from this simple story we may get a simple and clear idea of what is that calling and election which has been a theological trouble to so many minds. Abraham was the first in the long line of God’s ‘chosen people;’ and he is himself designated in the Bible as ‘called’ and ‘chosen.’ We are called whenever we feel within an inspiration to a higher life or to some special divine action; we make our calling and election sure when we are obedient to the voice divine. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.4}

“To listen to and obey this voice is faith. Abraham ‘believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.’ Abraham’s creed at this time, if I have read his story correctly, must have been of the simplest kind. He could have believed in no Bible, for he had none; in no divine, atoning Saviour, for he had apparently been told of none; there is nothing to indicate that he knew anything about the future state, nor anything more about God than a general conviction that *Elohim* was one, not many. He knew less than the Magi who followed the star. But, like them, he followed. His inward convictions were very few; what they revealed to him was very simple; but he followed them whithersoever they might lead him.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.5}

We have in the above at least one direct contradiction of the Bible. Paul says (Galatians 3:8, 17) that the Gospel that was preached to Abraham, and that the covenant that God made with him was confirmed in Christ; Lyman Abbott says that Abraham had no belief in a divine atonement, because he had been told of none. But even worse than this is his theory of the call of God, and his comment on the statement that Abraham believed God. This call, we are told, was simply inward inspiration; and his faith was simply obedience to the promptings of his own heart. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.6}

The Bible says that “Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness;” but we are told that what he believed was simply an impulse from within; therefore we must conclude if we except Dr. Abbott’s theory, that the God that Abraham worshiped was himself; and that his faith being counted to him for righteousness was simply his own self-approval! This is the doctrine of Spiritualists and infidels. We never picked up a Spiritualist paper that does not counsel its readers to follow the promptings of their own heart. If following one’s inward convictions wherever they may lead him, with no regard for a supernatural revelation, were what is meant by faith, then there would be multitudes of people upon the earth who could truly claim to be children of faithful Abraham. But that is not faith; nothing is safe except obedience to the plainly expressed will of God. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.7}

It is a matter of very little importance what any single individual believes. We have no controversy with Lyman Abbott. If he wishes to believe that the Bible is a myth, he has that privilege, but we cannot help feeling righteously indignant when we think that such stuff as we have quoted is sent out to tens of thousands of Sunday-school scholars, many of whom will accept it as legitimate comment upon the Scripture. It is a terrible pity that honest students of the Bible cannot be allowed to receive the pure and unadulterated word of God. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.8}

The blindness and infidelity concerning the Scriptures that we find among men in high position, is simply appalling. Yet people will say, “If the seventh day and not the first is the Sabbath, why have not these learned ministers of the gospel found it out and preached it?” We reply, If the Bible is the inspired word of God, why have not these men found it out and why do they not preach it, instead of teaching their own gain imagination? When a man can pervert simple Bible and history as has been done in the quotations we have made, it is not surprising that he cannot see a scriptural duty which interferes with his convenience. And yet these men, not withstanding their unconcealed infidelity, will be blindly followed by thousands. W. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 152.9}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. Thy Kingdom Come” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

**“THY KINGDOM COME”**

In this brief petition is contained one of the most comprehensive requests ever made by mortal man. Thousands have repeated the simple phrase thoughtlessly, and thousands who have pronounced the words with all the reverence possible for them, have had very limited ideas of what they were asking for. Someone has well written:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 154.1}

*“‘Thy kingdom come;’ thus day by day  
We lift our hands to God, and pray;  
But who has ever duly weighed  
The meaning of those words he said?” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 154.2}*

Let us try to weigh the meaning of the words, that we may utter them more intelligently. It is certain that if we know the full meaning of the petition, we shall not lightly make use of it. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 154.3}

First, we will notice that the Lord’s prayer shows the kingdom to be still future. That prayer is for all Christians; it is a model for us, just as much as it was for the personal followers of Christ. We are to pray for the kingdom of God to come; but that would be out of place if the kingdom were already set up. That it was not set up in the days of Christ’s first advent, is shown by the question which his disciples asked as they stood upon the Mount of Olives, just before he was taken out of their sight. Said they, “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” Acts 1:6. Christ did not say, It has already been restored, but “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power.” That is, It is not for the disciples to know when the kingdom will come; but they are to pray for it; if they knew that the time for the kingdom were fixed, it would be useless to pray for it. That God has not made known the time of the coming kingdom, is shown by the statement that he has put it “in his own power.” He is not under obligations to set up the kingdom at any specified time, for he has not appointed any; it is all within his own power. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 154.4}

Many people have the idea that “the kingdom of Christ and of God” is a spiritual kingdom, that it is simply the reign of the Spirit in the hearts of believers. It is true that the gospel plan is termed a kingdom, as in Colossians 1:13 and Revelation 1:9; but that kingdom,-the kingdom of grace,-begun as soon as man fell, as soon as he had need of “the grace of God which bringeth salvation;” but the kingdom referred to in the Lord’s prayer is, as we have seen, still future; consequently that kingdom cannot be the gospel. Moreover, the apostle James says: “Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?” James 2:5. Here he speaks of a kingdom that is *promised* to those who love the Lord,-a kingdom of which they are *heirs* through faith. It is this kingdom for whose coming we are to pray. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.1}

**WHAT THE KINGDOM IS**

When Adam was created, he was made king of the earth, as is shown by these words: “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.” Genesis 1:27, 28. This dominion was forfeited by the fall, and the world passed into the hands of the one who had conquered Adam,-Satan,-who is now “god of this world.” Not that God has no control over the earth; for even when he gave the dominion to Adam, he did not relinquish any part of his own universal dominion; but Satan took as much of the dominion as was given to Adam. He is not able, however, to go beyond the bounds which God sets for him. See Job 1:12, 26. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.2}

When David was king over Israel, God promised him that his throne should be “established forever.” 2 Samuel 7:16. This promise was often repeated, and God said, “My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” Psalm 89:34-37. Yet notwithstanding this promise, it was not long before the whole kingdom of Israel was overthrown, and the people were taken into captivity; and although many of the people were afterward allowed to return to their own land, the kingdom was never restored. The kings who afterward reigned in Jerusalem were simply the creatures of the Roman power, which controlled Judea and all the rest of the civilized world. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.3}

But David himself, it seems, never expected that his throne should be established forever with earthly monarchs upon it. He understood that Christ was the one referred to, who should rule over the kingdom. So Peter, after quoting David’s words in Psalm 16:8-10, said: “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell the grave, neither his flesh did see corruption.” Acts 2:29-31. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.4}

Christ, then, is the one who is to “restore again the kingdom to Israel.” It is to be a literal kingdom for he is to sit upon the throne of David. When the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that she should be the mother of Jesus, he said: “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” Luke 1:32, 33. The coming kingdom must, therefore be as literal a kingdom as was that of David. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.5}

The kingdom is, however, to be different, in that it will be perfect and sinless. Said the prophet, addressing Christ by inspiration; “And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem.” Micah 4:8. And the Lord himself, in his promise to David, said: “Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more.” 2 Samuel 7:10. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.6}

These two texts teach us that the dominion of Christ is to be the same as that given to Adam,-“the first dominion,”-that it will be the earth in its Eden beauty and freedom from the oppression of sin. And so we read the words of Peter, who, after speaking of the fire which shall melt the earth, and shall destroy sin and sinners out of it, says, “Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” 2 Peter 3:13. This promise is recorded in Isaiah 65:17-25. Read those verses, and then read the parallel passage in Amos 9:13-15. Then read Amos 9:11, 12, and you will see that this new heavens and new earth is in the time when the Lord has restored the kingdom to Israel. So we learn that when we pray, “Thy kingdom come,” we are simply praying for God to set up his own reign of righteousness in the earth made new. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.7}

**SETTING UP OF THE KINGDOM**

But let not the subject be dismissed with this simple statement of the truth. Around the fulfillment of this promise cluster the grandest and most tremendously important events. That kingdom is ushered in by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, as Paul indicates in his charge to Timothy: “I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead... his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word.” 2 Timothy 4:1, 2. This kingdom Christ receives before he returns to earth; for he himself compared himself and kingdom to a certain nobleman that “went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.” Luke 19:11, 12. See the account of his receiving this kingdom, in Daniel 7:13, 14. So it is, that when Christ comes in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, he will be sitting upon the throne of his glory, and to the righteous he will say: “Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” Matthew 25:31-34. This again shows that the kingdom which the saints are to inherit is the dominion of the earth. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.8}

In this kingdom righteousness, and that alone shall dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. The prophet says of that time: “Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified.” Isaiah 60:21. Read the verses preceding this one, and then read the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, the last verse of which says: “And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.9}

This state of righteousness will not be brought about by the conversion of all men, for we read that as the end approaches “iniquity shall abound” (Matthew 25:12) and that “evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse” (2 Timothy 3:13); and that in the days when the Son of man shall be revealed, it shall be as it was in the days of Noah and of Lot. Matthew 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30. So when God gives to Christ the heathen for this inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth, for a possession, the first thing he does is to rule them with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel. See Psalm 2:8, 9. Says the prophet: “Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it.” Isaiah 13:9. And we also read that when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, it will be “in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.” 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.10}

Thus we learn that to pray, “Thy kingdom come,” is to pray for the coming of the Lord to destroy the wicked, and to cleanse the earth of everything that defiles, and to give immortality to his people. God is no respecter of persons. Whosoever shall not be found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire. Revelation 20:15. It will avail nothing that men have said, Lord, Lord,-that they have prayed earnestly, even praying for the kingdom of God to come, if in that day any defilement is found in them, they will be cast into the lake of fire. Who is there, then, that realizing what the kingdom of God is, who alone can inherit it, and what will be the fate of those who are unfit,-can pray, “Thy kingdom come,” and still cherish sin in his heart? How carefully and unblamably we must live if we are able to unite, in saying, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus.” W. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 155.11}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Bradstreet’s says that the grand total of wages sacrificed by strikes since January 1, is $3,000,000. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.1}

In this session of Congress, which is just closed, appropriations for coast and naval defenses have been made to the following amounts: Steel for ordnance and armor, and a gun factory, $8,000,000; coast fortifications, $5,000,000; ordnance for naval purposes, $8,000,000; ten steel cruisers, $21,800,000; floating batteries for Coast defense, and torpedoes, $15,000,000. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.2}

Elder J. M. Reese, president of the Tennessee Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, writes us from Nashville that he has good prospect of success in securing the passage of a bill which will relieve Sabbath-keepers of the persecution to which they are subject because of the present unjust Sunday law. We believe that the bill will pass it this time, and that those in Tennessee who keep the commandments, will yet have a little season for unmolested work. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.3}

Immediately after the Sunday law meeting of which we gave a brief review in the SIGNS last week, we published a somewhat extended review of the main points considered, under the heading, “The Sunday law.-An Address to Thinking People.” In the address we quoted Senator Crocketts speech as it appeared in the SIGNS last week. This little document was gotten out principally for circulation here in Oakland, where the meeting was held; but friends of the truth and other places have called for it, so that although it has been printed less than two weeks, more than thirty thousand copies have been distributed. Thus the matter of the Sunday law is being agitated. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.4}

“Is its right for a Seventh-day Adventist, who is the owner of a house, to let it for a grocery store where liquors are sold and cards are played in open day? V. S. N.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.5}

A person undoubtedly does wrong to let a building with the knowledge that it will be used for immoral purposes, such as our questioner describes; but if the person hiring the building gave the order to understand that it was to be used for legitimate business purposes, and after getting possession went to selling liquor, the owner cannot be held responsible for the deception, neither has the power over the building until the time expires for which the building was rented. Then of course the owner can and should refuse to let his house any longer for such purposes. We would add, also, that liquor-selling and card-playing are no worse in open day than under cover of darkness. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.6}

Two weeks ago, in a note with the heading, “A Sign of the Times,” we quoted an indorsement of Catholicism, by the late Dr. Hodge, of Princeton. In the *Independent* of February 17, 1887, we find the following editorial utterance, which confirms our statement that Protestantism is fast turning Catholic. It is this:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.7}

“Our readers well know that we have our eyes open to see the good in the Roman Catholic Church, and that we welcome it as an ally against atheism in religion, and socialism in the State. The religion of Catholicism is that of the Bible, and considerable more; but it is a religion of God and the Bible.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.8}

After such an utterance, the statement that there is no fear that Catholicism will become a controlling factor in this country, is only an evidence of the blindness of the writer. If Protestants accept and welcome the Catholic Church as an ally, they may rest assured that they will have the controlling influence; for Rome never enters into an alliance as second to any other power. In this country, the power that controls may not be *called* Catholic, but whatever the name, the thing will be the same. Protestantism which has repudiated the principles of the Reformation will be no better than Catholicism. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.9}

The hope that was expressed by some that the Dr. McGlynn affair in New York would result in a considerable defection among Catholics in that city, has proved to be vain. The rebellious priest has refused to go to Rome, but he has not, and probably will not, be excommunicated for his disobedience. And now we are told that the Pope has sent him his blessing, and that the Doctor was very much pleased and affected to be thus noticed by “his holiness.” All of which indicates very clearly that McGlynn will not withdraw from the communion of “the church.” If he did, it is by no means certain that he could take with him a single follower. About the only way to rescue a Roman Catholic from the chains of error which the Papacy has cast about him, is to get him converted; and that is not accomplished by partisan fends or socialistic theories. Those who expect to see the Catholic Church, even in a single city, wrecked upon such a rock as the McGlynn trouble, read history and prophecy to very little purpose. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.10}

An error which is clung to most persistently by a great many people, is that the coming of the Lord will overtake all “as a thief in the night.” It is true that the apostle does say (1 Thessalonians 5:2) “that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;” but he immediately adds (verse 4): “But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the days; we are not of the night, nor of darkness.” So it is only those were in darkness that will be overtaken as a thief; and of them the apostle says (verse 3), that “sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.11}

In his description of the recent revival in Boston, the Rev. M. C. Ayers says:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.12}

“At any meeting one might see silk hats and silk dresses in close contact with homespun and overalls; and the wearers of the different grades of apparel manifested absolute consciousness of equality in the one great fact that they were sinners, and thus they were heartily ashamed of their sins.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.13}

“The rich and poor meet together; the Lord is the maker of them all.” Proverbs 22:2. The rich are no better than the poor, and there is no reason why they should not meet on common ground, when they are common sinners. But if they are simply “*ashamed* of their sins,” they will not long keep on that common ground. The frequent use of similar expressions of late, in connection with great revivals, convinces us that we need not hope for any real religious awakening. The man who has no deeper feeling than shame for his sins, and either covers them up and hides them from even his own sight, or he may become lost to shame for them. When Michael stands up, and “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” some of them will awake to shame, and everlasting contempt; all those only who have felt godly sorrow for sin, because they have violated God’s holy law, will awake to everlasting life. Genuine revivals are always connected with something else than shame because of the meanness. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.14}

The *Interior* tells of a Protestant lady who “not long since called upon her pastor, and said she had attended worship in a Catholic cathedral, and wished to say that she was favorably impressed. The priest, in his discourse, had quoted a text of Scripture, and he did it in a way to convey the impression that he was quoting final authority-the truth, having been found in Scripture, was indisputable. That, she thought, was the secret of the priest’s power over the people. He did not doubt, and therefore they did not.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.15}

Of course we are not to understand that Catholics as a rule follow the Bible any more closely than do Protestants, but upon this occasion when the priest did refer to the Scripture his manner was such as to impress this woman, who was evidently not accustomed to hearing texts of Scripture quoted as “final authority.” The principal business of many of the pulpits of to-day is to “explain away” the plain words of Scripture, and to tone down the more plain and cutting truths, so that they may not be offensive to “ears polite.” The *Interior* well says: “Making apologies for the Bible is about the weakest and poorest talk a man can indulge in.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.16}

While reading the article from the *Christian Union*, extracts from which are made in the article in this number of the SIGNS, entitled “unconcealed infidelity,” one thought forced itself upon our mind. It was, Why is the Bible used at all by those who so utterly ignore iTs plain statements? When a writer will take the simple narrative that of the call of Abraham, and will say that in dealing with the subject he is almost wholly in the field of conjecture, and will then add, out of his own fancy, things directly subversive of the Bible narrative, we cannot see why he might not as well make up an entire story, and comment upon that. Indeed it would be far better, for then those who want the original Bible could have it unadulterated by theological fancy, and those who want the conjectural Bible could take it. But this will not be done; no man could get up anything that would compete with the Bible, and they would soon lose their prestige; so they keep close enough to the Bible to lean upon it when their imagination fails,-close enough to seduce our unthinking people into the unconscious infidelity. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.17}

In a late number of the *Occident*, there is a good, homely article by “Rusticus,” about hearing. The closing paragraphs speak of so crying an evil of this time, and contain so much wholesome truth in relation to it, that we give them here:- {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.18}

“There are a great many new things in this world and a great many true things. But it must not be taken for granted that all the new things are true things, and that all the true things are new things. There is a good deal of old-fashion truth-of truth that will never become obsolete. This truth is like daily bread. It is revealed for the permanent nourishment of our souls. We eat it with our ears. And if we refuse to seek it, and prefer unhealthy condiments and stimulants, we must expect to be feeble in faith. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.19}

“If any of my readers are troubled with itching years, I advise them to go at once to the Great Physician and ask him to heal them. I have known the disease to prove fatal in some cases. I do not believe that anyone who is afflicted with it can be happy in the Lord. But alas, in these days it is a fearful epidemic. There are whole churches that suffer from it, and yet don’t seem to know why they have no revivals of religion.” {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.20}

At the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Governor Hoadly of Ohio, related the following, the truth of which he vouched for, having himself inspected the letter referred to: “There is in a certain governor’s office, I shall not say where, the letter press, books, and correspondence of a certain governor, I shall not say who. A friend sought from this governor the pardon of two criminals. The governor gave his correspondent the choice, but refused to pardon both, because, as he said, that county’s quota was exhausted! This was no joke, but the reason seriously given by an earnest governor who distributed pardons by geography.” Such a travesty on justice needs no comment; we note it as a sign of the times. {SITI March 10, 1887, p. 160.21}

**“The Law and the Gospel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

The law of the Father and the gospel of the Son are not antagonistic elements. Instead of the former being superseded by the latter, it is honored, magnified, and established by it. The plan of salvation was devised not to abolish the law, but that God “might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 163.1}

We know that man is a moral being, under the domain of law and directly responsible to his Creator for all his acts. John tells us that in prophetic vision he “saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” And again, we are told that “every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” Nor are we left it in any uncertainty as to the standard of the judgment to which we are all hastening; the wise man says: “Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” While the master himself said to the young man, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 163.2}

But “who then can be saved?” How can any escape death, the wages of sin, “for all have sinned”? And because of what the law says every mouth is stopped and all the world is guilty before God. The question is answered in those matchless words of our Saviour: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believe if in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” And with Paul every humble, trusting soul may exclaim, “I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” And this because there is “no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.” “For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; *that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. Or, as the apostle expresses it elsewhere, God sent his “Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin [margin, “by a sacrifice for sin”], condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” And all this agrees perfectly with the words of our Saviour:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 163.3}

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven [Campbell’s translation, “of no esteem in the sight of Heaven”]; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven.” Matthew 5:17-19. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 163.4}

But let every soul that has named the name of Christ remember “that no flesh should glory in his [God] presence. But of them are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” 1 Corinthians 1:29-31; Philippians 2:13. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 163.5}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued.*)

**THE FATHERS AND THE EARLY CHURCH**

Justin Martyr is next quoted as follows:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.1}

“On Sunday we all assemble in common, since that is the first day which God, and on the same day of our savior Jesus Christ rose from the dead.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.2}

This is an incorrect quotation, inasmuch as it makes Justin speak of the resurrection of Christ as a reason for worshiping on Sunday, when he made no mention of that event. What he really says is this:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.3}

“And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gathered together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits.”-*First Apology of Justin, chap. 6.* {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.4}

This is a minor difference, but it serves to show how even the trashy stuff which the so-called Fathers wrote is garbled in order to bolster up the Sunday. But it may be said that we have here evidence in favor of Sunday observance, since Justin really says that they met on the day called Sunday. To that we reply that we shall not attempt to deny that Sunday was observed to some extent at quite an early period, but the fact that a thing was done, is no evidence it ought to have been done. Within three hundred years after the crucifixion of Christ we can find every abomination of the Papacy in the Christian church. In the preface to the “Ancient Church” Dr. Killen says:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.5}

“In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome-a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament-meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions. Officers for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.6}

Justin then was a Greek who lived in the second century; and concerning the condition of the church in that century has the following:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.7}

“Among the Greeks and the people of the East nothing was held more sacred than what were called the Mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord’s Supper; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms. This practice originated in the eastern provinces; and thence, after the times of Adrian (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins), it spread among the Christians of the West. A large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.”-*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, chap. 4, sections 1-5*. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.8}

If antiquity were to be allowed as evidence of the correctness of the practice, nearly all error would be classed as truth. The question with the us is not what people have done, but what ought they to have done, and the Bible alone can answer the question satisfactorily. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.9}

The next “evidence” that is brought to the support of Sunday is the following:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.10}

“Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about the year 162 says: ‘Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the *Lord’s day*, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead.’ (Edwards’s Manual, p. 114.)” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.11}

It may strike the reader as strange that these testimonies are quoted from Dr. Edwards’s “Sabbath Manual,” and not directly from the Fathers themselves. But this means the responsibility for any wrong quotation is all thrown upon Dr. Edwards’s. On this quotation from Theophilus, all that we have to say is that *it is entirely manufactured*. Not a line of it appears in his writings. He does not use the term “Lord’s day,” and nowhere even mentions the first day of the week. It is evident that Dr. Edwards, who is primarily responsible for this forged testimony, was no novice in the use of the Fathers, and did not stand in need of any instructions from the Rev. Philetus Dobbs. We will say this, however, for the forged testimony from Theophilus, that it is just as good evidence for Sunday-keeping as any that can be found in any of the Fathers; and it is entitled to just as much weight as though Theophilus had actually written it. But the advocates of Sunday have the lack of testimony in its support, and the next quotation given is “equally conclusive” with that from Theophilus. Dr. Bailey says:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.12}

“Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, and the disciple of Polycarp, in the year 167, says that the Lord’s day was the Christian Sabbath. ‘On the Lord’s day everyone of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.’ (Edwards’s Manual, p. 114.)” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.13}

Of the lesson we have simply to say that the term “Lord’s day” nowhere occurs in the writings of Irenaeus. Our readers, though, have doubtless found out by this time that even if one of the Fathers did not happen to speak about a certain thing, it does not in the least invalidate the testimony quoted from him in favor of it. If he had only realized what straits the advocates of Sunday would be in for argument in the ninteenth century, he might possibly have said what they want him to say, and so it is just the same as though he had said it. This seems to be the plan adopted by those who quote the Fathers. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.14}

There is one little thing about the writings of Irenaeus which we never remember to have seen quoted, and while we are on this subject we will mention it here, that our readers may see the straightforwardness of the Fathers in general, and of Irenaeus in a particular area. In the introductory notice of the writings of Irenaeus, we find the following statement by the translators:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.15}

“The great works of Irenaeus, and now for the first time translated into English, is unfortunately no longer extant in the original. It has come down to us only in an ancient version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius. The text both Latin and Greek, is often most uncertain. Only three MSS. of the work ‘Against Heresies’ are at present known to exist. Others, however, were used in the earliest printed editions put forth by Erasmus. And as these codices or more ancient than any available, it is greatly to be regretted that they have disappeared or perished. One of our difficulties throughout, has been to fix the readings we should adopt, especially in the first book. Varieties of reading, actual or conjectural, have been noted only when some point of special importance seemed to be involved. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.16}

“After the text has been settled, according to the best judgment which can be formed, the work of translation remains; and that is, in this case, a matter of no small difficulty. Irenaeus even in the original Greek, is often a very obscure writer. At times he expresses himself with remarkable clearness and terseness; but, upon the whole, his style is very involved and prolix. And the Latin version adds to these difficulties of the original, by being itself of the most barbarous character. In fact, it is often necessary to make a conjectural re-translation of it into Greek, in order to obtain some inkling of what the author wrote. Dodwell supposes this Latin version to have been made about the end of the fourth century; but as Tertullian seems to have used it, we must rather place it in the beginning of the third. Its author is unknown, but he was certainly little qualified for this task. We have endeavored to give as close and accurate a translation of the work as possible, but there are not a few passages in which a guess can only be made as to the probable meaning.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.17}

This assurance must be a great comfort to those who dote on Irenaeus. It must be a great satisfaction to his admirers to know that they have his exact language just as clearly as can be *guessed at* by people living 1,000 years after he died. The plan adopted by the translators is very much like trying to arrive at an exact amount of a certain sum of money by guessing at half of this and multiplying that by two. And this is a specimen of the volume of all the writings of the so-called Fathers. Many of them are wholly forged, and the others have been altered and interpolated and garbled so that the ones who wrote them would not recognize them, if they were alive. As Dr. Mosheim says, it is of no importance that much of the writings of the Fathers has been lost, since they are utterly unreliable. We do not know that they are ever quoted except in support of a cause which cannot be sustained by the Bible. They are simply blind leaders of the blind. To go to them for light on the Bible is like taking the shades of midnight to illuminate the face of the sun. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.18}

We have followed Dr. Bailey thus far in his proofs from the Fathers, not because we thought it necessary to try to refute the so-called argument, but that our readers might see clearly the broken reed upon which the Sunday institution rests for support. We think enough has been said to demonstrate this point, and we will not follow it any further. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.19}

Dr. Bailey says: “How silly and shallow is a falsehood that Constantine changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. “So we say; and we have never heard of a Sabbath keeper who was foolish enough to make such a claim. There was no man who could change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week as Doctor Scott says, the truth is that the change was made gradually. All deviations from the right are made in the same way. But it is true that the change from the seventh to the first day was made by “the man of sin,” “that Wicked,” the mystery of whose iniquity was working even in the days of the apostles; and it was just such perversions of truth as this that made the Papacy the “mystery of iniquity,” “the abomination of desolation.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.20}

But while Constantine did not change the Sabbath, he did have a hand in perpetuating the wicked change that had already been made, and in establishing the Papacy on a firm basis. “Chambers’s Encyclopedia,’ speaking of the custom of the early church, says:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.21}

“Whatever may have been the opinion or practice of the early Christians in regard to the cessation from labor on the Sunday, unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that date is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine 321 A.D.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.22}

We have seen this statement denied by those who asserted that Christ and the apostles changed the Sabbath, but we have never known anyone to quote a commandment for Sunday-keeping earlier than that of Constantine. It is very easy to say that Christ changed the Sabbath, but it is impossible to find a commandment to that effect. W. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.23}

(*Concluded next week*.)

**“Why We Keep the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to a request in the SIGNS for someone to send one direct Bible text showing Sunday to be the Sabbath, the gentleman writes: “I do not propose to discuss the subject, for I am not sufficiently versed; but, Yankee-like, I can turn the question by asking you the same in regard to Saturday. Please give chapter and verse to sustain you in Sabbath or Saturday worship.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.24}

This we are very happy to do. “And God said all these words, saying.... Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all the work; but this seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt if not to do any work, thou, nor thy daughter, the, manservant nor maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor a stranger that is within guide takes; for in his six days of the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea at all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; where for the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” Exodus 20:1, 8-11. This is correct, simple, easily understood, and comes direct from Heaven. It is the foundation of all Sabbath observance. It is sufficient of itself. And the Bible contains abundance of corroborative testimony, but not a word for first-day observance. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 166.25}

**“‘Saturday or Sunday’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the title of a fourth-page leaflet having a subtitle, “A letter to Seventh-day believers.” It was written by Mrs. J. C. Bateham, “Supt. Sabbath Observance Department, N. W. C. T.” We give it a place in the SIGNS in compliance with the request which accompanied it, to “please publish.” The letter is as follows:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 167.1}

DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIENDS: Many of you I know and love as conscientious Christian workers in our Women’s Christian Temperance Union and elsewhere, and greatly respect your self sacrificing devotion to principle. I desire your earnest cooperation in efforts to save a weekly Sabbath for our beloved country, that without it must sink to heathenism and ruin. One your own writers, N. V. Hull says: “By comment consent, the weekly Sabbath is a necessary institution. It is in the interest of both civilization and religion, and the world without it would be in darkness and confusion. The loss of a Sabbath would be irreparable.” Yet to-day, so strong is the tide of Sabbath desecration, so determined, and successful the opposition from the liquor traffic and other Sabbath foes, that apparently only the united and earnest efforts of Christians can preserve it. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 167.2}

Surely no Christian should be found on the side of its enemies. Would that we might see eye to eye on the question that divides us, for it is a simple one: *Does the Sabbath day of the Bible necessarily fall on Saturday?* We think not. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 167.3}

In Eden, God set apart and blessed a day, not the seventh of time, but the seventh day, as the Holy Sabbath, we claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week that first Sabbath fell, since their names are not revealed. God’s days were doubtless long ages-*aeons*, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of Gods Sabbath in which he rests from creative work. The Sabbath was instituted after Eve was created. Time is reckoned from Adam’s first day, but how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve’s creation, there is no record. His creation was apparently toward the close, yet he lived single long enough to make the acquaintance of every living thing and give to each a name expressive of its peculiarities, and to find that not one was a suitable companion. Then he slept and Eve was created. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 167.4}

The next day was the Sabbath. It was Eve’s first day, not seventh. Who shall tell how many days or weeks of Adam had lived? If the particular day on which that Sabbath fell was important, God surely would have made it plain. The fair inference is that the particular day is immaterial. God worked in six of his days, then rested one. Man too was to labor six days then rest one. First-day Christians as literally follow Genesis as do seventh-day believers, not accepting the hour of beginning the day, for our revised version says simply of each day, “there was evening and there was morning.” These days being *aeons* the phrase is figurative. A day’s work is ended, a rest as of night follows. Then with the light a new day begins. Nature’s division of time was followed. The phrase is not repeated for the seventh day, since the morning of verse 21, 31 is the dawning of the seventh, showing this sixth complete. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 167.5}

Later in Israelitish history, the observance of Sabbath was apparently and of necessity lost during the 400 years of bitter Egyptian bondage among a people who measure time by tens instead of sevens; and Moses apparently re-instituted it by God’s commandment, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God’s command. Exodus 14. Perhaps God designed thus to show that the particular day was immaterial. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.1}

The fourth commandment at Sinai again enjoins the holy keeping of the seventh day as Sabbath, without telling on what day by name that seventh day fell, and as it had been changed once and may have been changed, or lost, at other times before or after the flood, we can only infer that God commands a day-a whole day-kept holy, and this day itself follows six of work, and thus be the seventh day. The Jewish nation as such had its beginning at the exodus, when God re-instituted the Sabbath and on a new day partly in memory of their birth as a nation. Deuteronomy 5:15. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.2}

The Eden Sabbath was for all mankind to the end of time. Day not known. The Jews since the exodus, so far as we know, have observed Saturday as their Sabbath. Christian nations observe Sunday. When was the change made? No one knows positively, nor is it at all important, as we believe. Had it been of consequence we should have definite information. Proof is abundant that Sunday was observed long before Emperor Constantine, and before the papal church had a beginning, with strong evidence that during the first few centuries both Saturday and Sunday were observed by believers, presumptive evidence that the change must have required high if not the highest authority, and to my mind satisfactory proof of apostolic usage. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.3}

Again, we know it is a geographical impossibility for persons living in different parts of the world to observe the same hour as a holy time. There is a gradual change extending over twenty-four hours, till on the adjacent Alaskan islands the Sunday of one is a Saturday of the other. Which, if either, is the Sabbath of Eden or the exodus, who can tell? More than nine-tenths of the Christian world insist that it is contrary to the spirit of Christianity to be thus bound by the letter (the Jewish usage of the seventh day) when every requirement of the Eden Sabbath for the fourth commandment is as fully met by those who keep their seventh day on Sunday as Saturday. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.4}

The tendency of all Christian growth is toward dropping nonessential and toward fellowship. The essentials to salvation are the atonement, repentance, and faith. The form of baptism or church and government, or the day we celebrate, is certainly not essential to salvation. Success in saving souls and doing Christ’s work, shows God’s hearty co-operation with all. Let us be like-minded. “That they all may be one,” is our Saviour’s prayer, if not all Baptists or Methodists, but one in love and devotion. To this end, agreement in essentials-charity in non-essentials. Is there hope that Saturday will be generally adopted as the Christian Sabbath? Apparently not. Then if the day is a nonessential, but the *Sabbath* of vast importance, there should be hearty co-operation to secure it. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.5}

But you say, How can we support Sabbath laws that oppress us? Exceptions should be made for certain classes. It should be sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor the first day of the week, that “the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a holy time and does not labor upon that day, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other people in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest and religious worship. “With this exception for our present laws are, if well enforced, usually satisfactory. In some States they need revision. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.6}

Law cannot control of religious belief or give us a religious Sabbath. It should give us a civil Sabbath, that is, a non-legal one, wherein governmental and public business shall be suspended, and all labor and recreation so far suspended as not to interfere with the enjoyment of a religious Sabbath off by those who wish it. This is all we ask and less would not protect the Sabbath. Such a law would be burdensome to those who have already abstained from labor one day, but could not violate their conscience, and with the above proviso the burden would be light as possible. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.7}

This burden we ask you to bear from love to God and religion and from motives of patriotism. The irreligious with false notions of personal liberty, object to having their rights infringed upon on any day of the week, but we answer, law must consult the greatest good of the greatest number, and the same rule applies to us all. If we cannot see alike, let us credit each other with candor, honesty, and a desire to obey the Lord of the Sabbath, and may none of us be found shrinking from any self-denial by which we may help preserve the Sabbath, and thus help save a world that Christ loved even unto death. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.8}

**COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE**

The sum of the above letter is this: Nine-tenths of the Christian world insists that it is wrong to rest upon the seventh day of the week, therefore those who believe that it is right so to do ought to throw aside their conscientious convictions and join with the nine-tenths of the Christian world in forcing the non-Christian world to adopt a certain form of religion. The appeal for help from the seventh-day observers is based on the attempted argument to show that Saturday is not the Sabbath, and therefore we will briefly notice the positions taken by Mrs. Bateham. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.9}

1. The claim is made that in Eden God set apart and blessed the Sabbath day, which was no day in particular. Says the writer:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.10}

“God’s days were doubtless long ages, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of God’s Sabbath, in which he rests from creative work.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.11}

The word “doubtless” means, “without doubt or question; unquestionable.” A thing that is so well established that there is no chance for question in regard to it, must be able to present a long array of positive proof. We look around for the proof that the days of creation were long ages, but we find none at all. All that we have ever heard offered is the vain imaginations of skeptical devotees of science falsely so-called, who ignore the agency of an almighty God in creation, and assert that it is impossible that the world should have been created in six literal days. The great body of professed Christians, fearing lest they should be thought ignorant of the “latest deductions of modern science,” have hastened to accept this baseless theory of infidel geologists and evolutionists, forgetting that by so doing they were either limiting the power of God, or else ignoring him as Creator. The idea that the world was formed during long ages of time, is a modern device gotten up expressly for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of admitting the power of God. To be sure, some who hold to this theory admit that God had something to do with creation, that is, that he started it, and that after he had brought protoplasm into existence, the rest of the work did itself. But the logical result of the whole theory is to deny that God had anything to do with the creation of the world. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.12}

One thing is certain, and that is, that it is no greater tax of faith to believe that God created the world in six literal days, than to suppose that he took six thousand or six million years. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth, and we believe it. The first chapter of Genesis informs us plainly what kind of days these days were. They were days composed of an evening and a morning, that is, a dark part and a light part. This succession of light and darkness is caused only by the revolution of the earth on its axis. Those who hold to the *aeon* theory, would confer a favor by telling us what there is besides the revolution of the earth on its axis which causes the succession of light and darkness on the earth, and also how much of each long period was dark and how much was light. Moreover, those days were such days as the sun and moon were made to rule over. See Genesis 1:14-19. Will Mrs. Bateham kindly inform us whether the sun and moon here referred to are the same bodies with which we are so familiar? And if they are, how does it happen that now they rule over days of just twenty-four hours’ length, instead of long periods of time? {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.13}

We are told that “all earthly time is a part of God’s Sabbath in which he rests from creative work? That is to say, that the present time is God’s Sabbath-day. Let us see how well this agrees with the Scripture. In Genesis 2:2, 3 we read that God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, “because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” This brings to view a Sabbath rest completed before the blessing was pronounced upon it. God blessed the seventh day because that in it he had rested. This simple statement of the Bible brushes away all the speculations of men, as an elephant would brush away a cobweb from his path. When the Bible says that God’s rest upon the seventh day was in the past, and that he blessed it and sanctified it because he had rested, we care nothing for the human conjecture that God’s Sabbath-day is all earthly time. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.14}

Once more, the fourth commandment refers to the work of creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, and repeats the statements found in Genesis 2:2, 3. There we learn that we are commanded to rest upon the seventh day because God did so. To sanctify means “to appoint,” as in Joel 1:14. And thus we understand the fourth commandment and Genesis 2:3 to read that God blessed the seventh day and appointed it for man’s observance, because that in it he had rested from all his work. And this allows no other conclusion but that the seventh day which man is commanded to observe, is of the same length as that upon which God rested. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.15}

It seems that Mrs. Bateham is a little confused in her own mind as to this matter, for in the same paragraph in which she says that all earthly time is a part of God’s Sabbath, she also says, “We claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week “the whole period of earthly time” falls. The less cannot include the greater; and if “the whole period of earthly time” should fall on one day of the week, it would crush it to almost as attenuated proportions as Mrs. Bateham’s Sabbath argument. She says also that time is reckoned from Adam’s first day, but of how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve’s creation, there is no record. Then she says: “The next day was the Sabbath; it was Eve’s first day, not seventh day.” She has already told us that that Sabbath-day is all earthly time, yet she says, “If the particular day upon which that Sabbath fell is important, God would surely have made it plain.” So we have two views offered us: One is that Adam and Eve died sometime in that seventh day, and that Adam did not live 930 years, but only a part of two days; also that Eve was created and died within the compass of that seventh day, but her last day. And then coming down to the literal reckoning of time, we are told that the seventh day was Eve’s first day. Thus it is implied that each individual must begin to reckon time for the observance of the Sabbath from the day following his birth. And yet we are requested to join in a movement compelling all people to rest on Sunday, because it is claimed that that is the true Sabbath day. Does Mrs. Bateham believe that everyone was born on Saturday? {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.16}

**THE SABBATH NOT LOST**

2. Then we are told that the observance of the Sabbath was of necessity lost during the Egyptian bondage, because the Egyptians measured their time by tens instead of by sevens. That is as much as to say that if nine-tenths of the people should reckon their time by tens it would be impossible for the other tenth to reckon by sevens. There is not the slightest evidence that the Sabbath was ever lost. It is very probable, however, that the Jews were compelled to labor on the Sabbath during a part, at least, of their Egyptian bondage; but God delivered them from that bondage in order that they might keep his Sabbath; and even allowing that they had lost all knowledge of the day, they certainly had full knowledge of it after God made it known to them in the wilderness. Moses did not re-enact the Sabbath, but he himself said, “See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath.” Exodus 16:29. Mrs. Bateham says that “Moses apparently re-instituted it by God’s command, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God’s command. Exodus 14.” It is quite evident to our mind that Mrs. Bateham has not studied the Sabbath question very extensively; for Exodus 14 says nothing about any long march made by the Israelites, except their passage of the Red Sea, which was made in the night, and it says nothing about the Sabbath; neither does that chapter nor any other say anything about the Sabbath being re-instituted by Moses. With these three exceptions, her statement is correct. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 168.17}

Mrs. Bateham says that although the fourth commandment enjoins the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath, we cannot tell when it comes, because that day is not mentioned by name; and that “it had been changed once, and must have been changed or lost at other times before or after the flood;” and that consequently “we can only infer,” etc. What a delightfully indefinite foundation she has laid upon which to build and enforce the observance of a definite Sunday. But the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the same as that of creation; so it was not changed, and although the Sabbath “might have been lost,” we know full well that it never was lost. It was kept constantly before the Israelites. Dire calamities were threatened them in case they should neglect its observance, and they were finally carried into captivity as a punishment for breaking the Sabbath. No one who believes in the justice of God can claim that he would punish his people for neglecting to observe a day which had been lost. After the Babylonian captivity the Jews never again relapsed into idolatry, and when Christ came he recognized the day which they were observing as the Sabbath. Mrs. Bateham herself allows that the Sabbath has not been lost since that time, because she makes a claim for uninterrupted Sunday observance from that time to this. And so we are sure that the seventh day which we observe is the day which God sanctified in Eden. Neither is it true that when the seventh day was set apart it was not named. God said, “The seventh day is the Sabbath.” That is the name,-“seventh day.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.1}

**SUNDAY AND THE “MAN OF SIN”**

3. A feeble attempt is made to rescue Sunday from its papal parentage, the only argument against its being a Papal institution being that it was observed before the Emperor Constantine, and before the Catholic Church had a beginning. The same argument would prove that purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the sign of the cross, are not Papal institutions, because they were in the Christian church long before the time of Constantine. The fact that Sunday was observed from a comparatively early period, is no more evidence of divine authority for it, than is the fact that the sign of the cross was practiced by Christians in the second century, and that images were worshiped by Christians as early as the third century, any evidence that the apostles enjoined these ceremonies. It may not take much evidence to satisfy Mrs. Bateham, but if she wishes to convince seventh-day believers that Sunday is the Sabbath, she will have to give direct and positive statements of Scripture and not “presumptive evidence.” In a matter of this kind, we dare not presume. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.2}

But we will leave the Sabbath argument and notice briefly the plea for a civil law. On this we will say first, that Sunday legislation has not the slightest connection with the temperance cause, even though the Women’s Christian Temperance Union has gone aside from its legitimate work to form a “Sabbath Observance Department.” A man may observe Sunday strictly and be an intemperate man still. He may be a strict temperance man and not regard any day as the Sabbath. Sunday legislation is in the interest of Sunday alone, and not of temperance. Those who observe the seventh day of the week are uniformly temperance people, but they do not believe that shutting up liquor saloons one day in the week would make any diminution of the cursed liquor traffic. Whenever it is proposed to submit to the people a constitutional amendment entirely prohibiting the sale of liquor, we promise that seventh-day observers will, to a man, work with them. We believe it is a crime to sell intoxicating liquors, and we would have it prohibited just as the promiscuous sale of other poisons is prohibited. And if it is only in the interests of temperance that Sunday legislation is asked for, then entire prohibition would secure that end. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.3}

Second. It is idle to talk of the enforcement of Sunday as a civil institution. Sunday, although not a divine institution, is a religious institution. Its religious character was given to it by human authority; nevertheless, since it was appointed by “the church,” it is primarily and wholly a religious institution. Now under whatever pretext Sunday observance is enforced, it will be a fact that the State is enforcing the observance of a religious custom. The day cannot be separated from its churchly connection any more than a man can be separated from his character. So that to ask us to unite with them in securing laws in favor of Sunday, is simply asking us to help make laws to enforce the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, when it has no shadow of claim to be regarded as the Sabbath. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.4}

Third. Sunday legislation is not Sabbath legislation. We believe in working for the upbuilding of the Sabbath, but we cannot do it by working for Sunday. It does not matter if the majority do regard Sunday as the Sabbath, that does not make it the Sabbath. As well might the Chinese say to the few missionaries who are in that empire, “There is no hope that Jehovah will ever be generally accepted in this empire as God, then why not join with us in enforcing the worship of Joss, that thus we may work together in unison for the universal worship of deity?” The missionaries would just say, “There is no God but one, and it is not enough that people should worship some being, but if they would offer true worship they must recognize God who made the heaven and the earth.” They would readily recognize the fact that they would not be working in the interest of morality if they should attempt simply to secure the worship of some deity whom the majority would recognize, and not worship God. And so we say if we should engage with our sisters of the National Temperance Union in attempting to secure Sunday laws, we should not be working for the Sabbath. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.5}

It is not enough to be told that we will be allowed to rest upon the seventh day; the question is, Would we be allowed our God-given privilege of laboring on the first day? The answer is that they would allow us to work a little. They purpose to make the burden upon us “as light as possible.” This in itself is an admission that they know that the enforcement of a Sunday law will work injustice to some. Now the law is not simply for the greatest good to the greatest number, but it is for equal justice to all. A law that works injustice to a single individual is an unjust law. A law that cannot be observed by every individual of the commonwealth, without someone being deprived of the privileges which God allows him to enjoy, has no business to be enacted. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.6}

We are willing to give Mrs. Bateham and all her sisters of the Temperance Union, credit for honesty of purpose. We are willing to grant that as an association they would not desire to see a single individual oppressed for the observance of the seventh day. But no matter how kind their intentions may be, when their law is once enacted, their power over it ceases. Then the most bigoted and benighted individual in the country has the power to secure its enforcement, and while they would not wish to injure anyone who observes the Sabbath of the Lord, and might wish to enforce it simply upon non-professors, they could not hinder the bigot from securing its enforcement upon all, thus making it a means of wreaking his spite upon those who differ with him in religious belief. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.7}

More than this, we would not work with them for the enactment of a Sunday law, if we could have a bond given by them collectively and individually, assuring us that they would not only grant us immunity from punishment for laboring on Sunday, but would secure us against all possible molestation. The reason why is this: Sunday is not the Sabbath; it has no claim to be so regarded; the seventh day (Saturday) is the Sabbath of the Lord; God has given a solemn and emphatic command that it should be kept; and we regard it as our imperative duty to enlighten people concerning the nature and obligation of the Sabbath. Now if we should join in a movement to secure the civil recognition of Sunday, we should be only nullifying our efforts to induce men to regard the seventh day and that only as the Sabbath. It would be an agreement on our part to assist in forging chains for others, providing *we* could be allowed to go free, and would be an announcement to the world that while we ourselves purposed to keep the seventh day, we did not regard it as necessary that other people should do so. But we do regard it as of vital importance to keep the seventh day according to the commandment of God, and although but few may listen to the teaching of the Bible on this subject, that does not absolve us from our duty to teach the truth, not alone by our words, but by our acts. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.8}

We repeat: We are willing and even anxious to join in any purely temperance work, but even the so-called “Sabbath Observance Department of the National Women’s Christian Temperance Union” cannot make us believe that Sunday is the Sabbath, nor beguile us into working for a Sunday law under the guise of temperance. “Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird.” Proverbs 1:17. W. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 169.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

Our friends who are so zealous for the civil Sunday Law, tell us that the law ought to be enacted to meet the minds of the majority. How would they like it if they were in China, and a law should be enacted compelling all men to pay homage to heathen gods? They would speedily complain of the intolerance of laws of China. But if their theory of the rights of majorities is correct in one place it must be correct everywhere; and therefore heathen countries actually ought to compel all people within their jurisdiction to worship heathen gods! In Turkey a law enforcing Mohammedanism would meet the minds of the majority, and so, according to the reasoning of our Sunday friends, such laws ought, of right, to prevail in Turkey. But no; they would not suit them. They don’t believe in the rule of the majority unless they form part of the majority. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.1}

At the last session of the California Methodist Episcopal Conference, the establishment of a “summer school of theology” was recommended, and a committee was appointed to carry out the design. This committee has received the co-operation of the University of the Pacific, and the school will be held from May 23 to June 2. In their prospectus a committee say that “the numerous theological vagaries afloat, and the misleading tendency of some literature on the subject, emanating from respectable sources, render this a favorable opportunity to restate and emphasize the great doctrines of our common Christianity, as held by the Methodist Episcopal Church. “We have seen of late so many vague and contradictory theories put forth by prominent members of the Methodist Church, that we shall be glad to have an authoritative declaration of just what that church does believe. And we are anxious to see how far they will indorse the position of Wesley and Fletcher on the law of God. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.2}

Mrs. Bateham says that the day that is observed as the Sabbath is one of the non-essentials. If that is so, we should like to know why she and her brethren and sisters of the National Reform Party are making such frantic efforts to have the observance of Sunday established by law. If they believe the particular day to be observed is a matter of no importance, why don’t they let people do is they please in the matter. We can see in the movement nothing but a stubborn purpose on the part of the leaders to compel everybody to do just as they do. Because with them it is not a matter of *conscience*, but only of *will*, they are determined to believe that it is not a matter of conscience with others; or that if it is with any a matter of conscience, the conscience of the minority must submit to the will of the majority. Thus it was in the days of the Inquisition; and then, as now, all was done in the name of the Lord, and for his glory. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.3}

Under the heading of “Satanic Omnipresence,” the *Golden Gate* attempts to ridicule our statement of the true theory of spiritual phenomena, by saying that there are thousands of persons being influenced at the same time, in different phases of mediumship, and that if there is a personal devil “he must be in thousands of places at once in the same instant of time; hence he must be omnipresent. There is no escaping this conclusion.” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.4}

Those who are familiar with the Bible will readily see that there is no chance for any such conclusion. Says the Revelator, when speaking of the phenomenon of spiritualism: “They are the spirits of *devils*, working miracles.” Revelation 16:14. These devils are “the angels that sinned,” and that “kept not their first estate;” and their name is “legion,” for they “are many.” Mark 5:9-13. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.5}

In our reference to Spiritualism we write with no great expectation that those who have been ensnared by it will see their error, although there is hope even that those who had been taken captive by the devil of and his will, may be recovered from his snare (2 Timothy 2:25, 26); but we write for the purpose of putting the unwary on their guard against this most novel and dangerous delusion of the arch-enemy of mankind. The Bible, and the Bible alone, forewarns and forearms us against it. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.6}

**“A Seasonable Warning” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

“As a madman who castesth firebrands, arrows, and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, Am not I in sport?” Proverbs 26:18, 19. This applies to children as well as to men, and it has special application at the present day. We do not know whether or not the custom of perpetrating “April fool jokes” was in vogue in the days of Solomon; but if it was not, there were people who told lies in sport, and against all such this language is directed. What are called “April fool jokes” are nothing else but lies, and the one who indulges in them proclaims himself a fool. We have seen people professing confidence, who countenance their children in such practices, in doubtless thinking that it was “innocence sport.” If a madman should come into a crowded assembly and begin to scatter firebrands, and shoot poisonous arrows, it would not be called innocent sport; but Solomon says he is just like one who deceives his neighbor, and says, “Am not I in sport?” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.7}

The first of April is just before us, and we write this in hope that the eyes of some thoughtless ones may be open to see that a lie on the first day of April is just as sinful as one on any other day of the year; and that to tell a lie in sport is worse if possible than telling one in anger, because it indicates that the person’s moral sensibilities are so blunted that he can deliberately lie without having a thought of its sinfulness. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.8}

“Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor; for we are members one of another.” Ephesians 4:25. Let parents see that they themselves are not blameworthy in this matter, and let them beware lest their children acquire, in sport, a disregard for truth, which will be difficult to overcome. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.9}

**“Sabbath Observance by Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend in San Francisco, who has read with interest our appeal on the Sunday Law, writes to us:- {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.10}

“The seventh day being the day that God *did* command to be kept holy, what are the objections to making it the universal day of rest?” {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.11}

We reply that there are no objections at all, provided all people are willing to regarded it as a day of rest. On the contrary, it ought by all means to be universally regarded as the day of rest, because God has said, “Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shat thoul labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;” and this commandment is addressed to all the inhabitants of the earth. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.12}

But, sad to say, all people do not regard the word of the Lord as of final authority, and they ignore his commandment for a way of their own devising. Someone will say, “Then why not pass a law compelling people to obey the commandment of the Lord?” That would not solve the difficulty, for it would be forced service, and there would be in it no love for God, nor regard for his word. So that if we once started out on the *legal plan*, we should have to pass another law compelling men to love the Lord! But thoough such a law might be passed, it would amount to nothing, for love is not love unless it comes spontaneously from the heart. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.13}

The obvious conclusion is that the keeping of the Sabbath is purely an act of religious worship of God, and is not within human jurisdiction. God wants all men to repent and come to the knowledge of the truth; and he has commissioned men as ambassadors to beg their fellow-men to be reconciled to God; but he has given no one the authority to attempt the impossibility of forcing men to repent. So he wants all men to acknowledge him, and to show their homage by keeping his Sabbath; and he has committed to men the preaching of the word; but he has given no one authority to try to compel men hypocritically to acknowledge him by a *form* of service. It would indeed be a glorious thing if all men would obey the Lord; but all will not. Our duty is simply to obey him for ourselves, and to use our influence to persuade others to do likewise. Those who will not obey are answerable alone to God, from whom they will at the Judgment receive the punishment which their rebellion merits. {SITI March 17, 1887, p. 176.14}

**“Object of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Rev. F. N. Zabriskie, D. D., wrote a series of articles for the *Congregationalist*, on “The Bible the Workingmen’s Book,” in one of which he said:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.1}

“The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of workingmen, that they should not be deprived of a weekly rest. The Mosaic law of the Sabbath is often misrepresented, and is apt to be misunderstood by those for whom it is specially intended. The Sabbath as our Lord Jesus Christ said, ‘was made for man,’ and being a day of rest, it was, of course, pre-eminently made for the workingman. The essential object which the commandment seeks is rest from unnecessary labor.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.2}

This is an idea which is fast gaining ground, and which cannot be too strongly combated. It is the prevalence of this idea which gives a great impetus to the movement in favor of a Sunday law. Because of this idea, many irreligious persons will vote for a law enforcing Sunday observance, when they would not do so if it were set before them on a purely religious basis. Of course the result is the same, no matter what motives prompt those who work for the law. Sunday being essentially an institution of the church, if observance of it is enforced by civil law we shall have to that extent a union of Church and State, even though infidels may have voted for the law. The idea that God’s design in appointing a day of rest for man was simply for the wants of the physical nature, is a modern device gotten up by the zealous adherents of Sunday observance, with the design of accomplishing a two-fold purpose with respect to the Sunday. If this theory be accepted, its first result is to make men think that the particular day of the week which shall be observed is of no importance, and that the only object is uniformity for the sake of convenience. And the second result is the enforcement of Sunday, the day which has the most adherents, on the basis that the State has a right to legislate for the physical well-being of its citizens. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.3}

The Sabbath was made for man; not for one man simply but for all mankind. The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of the workingmen, only in the sense that God designed that all men should be workingmen. It is true that the Sabbath rest furnishes opportunity for the repair of physical waste, so that man is better able to perform the duties of the week following. But this is incidental; we cannot say that it is even a secondary reason for the giving of the fourth commandment, because it does not enter into the matter at all. The keeping of the Sabbath is primarily an act of worship. The Sabbath was given as a memorial of God’s creative power. It was given that man might ever keep in mind the one true God, whose distinguishing characteristic is that he created the heavens and the earth. It was given to guard men against idolatry; for those who keep the Sabbath according to God’s appointment, and for the reason for which he appointed it, can never worship false gods. Every man will worship the object which to him seems greatest. Some men think there is nothing greater in creation than themselves, and so they worship themselves. They are called atheists, because the god that they worship is so insignificant that they are considered as not recognizing any God. But the man whose mind is drawn out to meditate upon the wonders of creation, and who realizes that the things that are made reveal the existence of the one only true God, will never worship any inferior being. The Sabbath was appointed for the express purpose of giving man an opportunity to meditate upon God and his works, and thus to keep alive the sentiment of real religion. Those keeping the Sabbath have the first principle of worship to God. The man who thinks that it was given for the purpose of securing proper physical rest to man, has no just conception of the nature of the Sabbath. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.4}

But since the Sabbath was appointed by the Creator, that man might recognize him as Creator, and since it is purely a matter of worship and of recognition of the true God, it follows as a matter of course that the rest must be upon the particular day which God has designated as the Sabbath. Otherwise God is in reality ignored. Worship implies submission. Submission is indicated by obedience. When a man refuses to obey another, it is because he considers himself equal to, or superior to that other, and of course there would be no thought in his mind of worshiping such an one. So if men really worship God, they will submit to his will in all respects. If they willfully disobey him, they show that their worship is only a form, and that they think more of themselves than they do of him. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.5}

The Sabbath, as we have shown, is the most simple and direct act of worship to God, and since God has specified the seventh day as the Sabbath, it follows that the keeping of any other day as the Sabbath, is not an act of worship to God. It was the seventh day alone upon which God rested from his work of creation. The seventh day alone was blest by him because he had rested upon it, and it was the seventh day and no other, which God appointed for man’s observance, with the design that as God upon that day had viewed all his works and pronounced them very good, so man should upon that day consider the works of God and should glorify the Creator. W. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.6}

**“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

Dr. Bailey closes up his Sunday argument thus:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.7}

“I present but one additional argument; and this I address to those who read the Greek language. If we translate literally the Greek Testament in all four of the evangelists, when speaking of the resurrection of Christ, it would show that a new order of Sabbaths began at that time. In Matthew 28:1 it reads literally, ‘In the *end of Sabbaths* as it began to dawn towards the *first of Sabbaths*, came Mary Magdalene.’ The word *Sabbath* is *sabbatoon*, genitive plural, with no article preceding; so it is in *end of Sabbaths*; and the word translated *week* is also *sabbatoon*, genitive plural with no article. It reads *eis mian sabbatoon*, towards the *first of Sabbaths*, as if the old order of Sabbaths had passed away, and a new order of Sabbaths had begun. In Mark 16:1 it reads literally, ‘And when the *Sabbath* (singular number) was past, Mary Magdalene,’ etc. Verse 2, ‘Now upon the *first of Sabbaths* they came to the sepulcher.’ The same transition is here marked from the old to the new Sabbaths. In Luke 24:1 it reads: ‘Now upon the *first of Sabbath*, very early in the morning they came unto the sepulcher.’ Luke uses the article, *the first of the Sabbaths*, but his language, like that of Matthew and Mark, indicates a new order of things. John 20:1 reads, literally: ‘The *first of the Sabbaths* cometh Mary Magdalene while it was yet dark unto the sepulcher.’” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.8}

The only mistake in the above, from the Sunday point of view, is in addressing the “argument” to those who read the Greek language. The writer evidently gave it for the effect it would have on those who know nothing of the Greek, for no one who has even a little knowledge of that language would be deceived by statements so palpably absurd. The translation of the passages to which he refers is literally exact in the Authorized Version, and no one having a reputation as a scholar to maintain, would dare attempt to translate them differently. We dislike to refer to the Greek, when writing for the general reader, because those who do not read that language have not the power to verify what we say. But we must notice this perversion of the Scripture, and will try to do it in such a way as to be understood by all. It is true that in Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2, Luke 24:1 and John 20:1, the word rendered “week” is *sabbaton*. On this word Dr. Robinson, who by the way was a Baptist, in his Lexicon of the New Testament said:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.9}

“Meton., *a sabbath*, put for the interval ‘from Sabbath to Sabbath;’ hence a *se’unight, week*; so especially Luke 18:12, *nesteuo dis tou sabbatou*. Elsewhere only after numerals marking the days of the week; Mark 16:9, prote (hemera) sabbatou. Plur., Matthew 28:1, 1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2.-So Heb. shabbathoth, *Scpt., hebdomadas*, Leviticus 23:15. Comp. Deuteronomy 16:9; also the Syriac version Luke 18:12. In the Talmudists the days of the week are written, *chadh beshabboth, sheni besh, shelisha besh’, i.e.*, the first, second, third day in the Sabbath (week). See Lightfoot Hor. Heb. in Matthew 28:1.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.10}

The reader will notice that Dr. Robinson refers to several other texts where the same word occurs, and where it is properly rendered “week.” Let us try Mr. Bailey’s translation on these passages. Take Luke 18:12: “I fast twice in the *week*; I give tithes of all I possess.” The word rendered “week” is *sabbaton*. Dr. Bailey would translate the passage “I fast twice in the Sabbath,” and would explain it that the Pharisee was priding himself because he fasted twice every Sunday! {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.11}

Mr. Bailey claims that in the texts to which he refers, the word *sabbaton* should be rendered “Sabbath,” so as to read, “the first of Sabbaths,” thus indicating, he says, that “the old order of Sabbaths had passed away and a new order of Sabbaths had begun.” But in Acts 20:7 we have the same expression again, in the narration of an event which took place thirty years after the crucifixion. Was this the first of a new order of Sabbaths? If so, what order was it? Mr. Bailey’s rendering would make a new order of Sabbaths to begin at the resurrection, and another order thirty years after, when Paul was at Troas. Still further, the same expression occurs in 1 Corinthians 16:2, where Paul directs the brethren to lay aside money “on the first day of the week.” Mr. Bailey’s rendering of the passage would make Paul direct the churches to lay by them in store on the first of every new order of Sabbaths! Unless a new order of Sabbaths was instituted frequently, their liberality would not be greatly taxed. It might be noted further that Mr. Bailey in his rendering of the expression entirely ignores the word *hemera* (day), which occurs in the text. But it is unnecessary to carry this point further, for anyone can see from the texts cited the absurdity of his so-called argument. Mr. Bailey himself seems to have enough knowledge of the Greek to have some sense of the absurdity of his own position, for he concludes:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.12}

“Thus there is wonderful agreement of the four evangelists in using this singular expression. It seems to me to convey the idea of a grand change from one order of Sabbaths on the seventh day of the week, to another and new order of Sabbaths on the first day of the week. That such a change then and there actually occurred, I have abundantly shown from various other proofs, even if these passages be not literally translated as suggested above.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.13}

Said the Irish barrister: “May it please the Court, if I am wrong on this point I have another that is equally conclusive.” In all Sunday argument the idea seems to be that a good many weak points will make one strong one; that although a dozen statements may be individually fallacious, they will when combined make a true one. That is on the principle that if you add enough ciphers together you will get something of value. The three lines of argument which Mr. Bailey gives from Scripture, from history, and from the Fathers, remind us of the plea in the famous kettle suit. The man who was charged with breaking his neighbor’s kettle, made his defense under three heads, thus: “First, the kettle was cracked when I borrowed it. Second, it was whole when I carried it back. Thus, I never borrowed it.” If one of these points was disproved, he had two others to fall back on. It made no difference if they did contradict each other, it was proof. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.14}

We have now followed Mr. Bailey through all the windings of his “weighty and timely utterance” in behalf of Sunday. We have done it not with any desire to depreciate Mr. Bailey, but in order to show the inherent weakness of the Sunday cause. We have no doubt that he did the best he could, and that his utterances are just as weighty as any that could be made. In contrast with the vain attempts to put the first day in the place of the seventh as the Sabbath, we present the simple argument for the true Sabbath in the following words: {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 182.15}

“And God spake all these words,” saying, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Exodus 20:1, 8-11. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.1}

“The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.” Psalm 111:7, 8. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.2}

“And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. W. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.3}

**“The Seventh Day of the Week” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Bible Banner* a man who is attempting to *settle* the Sabbath question, says: “This fourth commandment, in itself, says nothing about the ‘day of the week,’ any more than it does of the month or year.” Very well, let us suppose that it refers to the year. Then the words, “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,” would mean that we are to work six days of the year, and rest on the seventh. That would give us only one Sabbath in the year, which might be very agreeable to some; but it would also give us only six days in the year for work! What about the remaining three hundred and fifty-eight days? On them, according to the year theory, no one can either work or rest! We think no one will be foolish enough to deliberately take the position that “the seventh day” of the fourth commandment means the seventh day of the year. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.4}

Well, then, let us suppose that the commandment refers to the month. Thus “Six days shal thou labor, 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,” would mean that work may be done six days in the month, but that the seventh day of the month is the Sabbath, when no work may be done. In this case we should have twelve Sabbaths in the year, and seventy-two days for work. Many people would be hard pressed to know how to earn a living in those seventy-two days; but they would be much more troubled to know how to employ the remaining two hundred and eighty-one days of the year, in which they could neither work nor rest. We believe that no one, even of those who most hate the Sabbath, will claim that “the seventh day” of the fourth commandment applies to the month any more than to the year. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.5}

Well, it must refer to something. Certainly; it applies to a period of time which consists of exactly seven days, six of which are to be used for labor, and the seventh for rest. Now the only period of seven days that is known to man, is the week, and this division of time has been known from the most ancient times. “Seven days make one week,” is one of the first things learned by the school-boy. Therefore when the Lord said, “Six days shalt thou labor, 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,” it is evident that he meant that we may work six days in the week, but that we must rest on the seventh day of the week. And the child of ten years who should profess ignorance of the fact that the first day of the week is Sunday, and that the seventh or last day of the week is Saturday, would be regarded in this age of schools and schoolmasters as a much neglected youth. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.6}

One stock argument of our Sunday friends is that it is very essential that all people should keep the same day, so that there may be no clashing. No one will deny this. Certainly people ought all to keep the same day. And if this is so, it is very evident that God knew it when he gave the commandment. Then he must have commanded all the people to keep the same day. As a matter of fact, all the Jews did regard the same day as the Sabbath. No one will deny this. All will admit that when the Lord gave the commandment, he expected all to whom it was spoken to keep the same day. Then the commandment must refer to a definite day, and to one which all understood. That is, all must have understood “the seventh day” to refer to some specific day; for if they had had the idea that the Lord meant simply that they could rest on any day after six days of labor, and that there was no specific point from which to begin their count, there would have been no uniformity. But there was uniformity among those who regarded the commandment, because the commandment is definite. Two things being granted, the third must follow. Let it be granted that uniformity in the day of rest is essential, and that God knew this when he gave the commandment, and it must be admitted that the fourth commandment specifies a definite day as the Sabbath, and that that day is the seventh day of the week. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.7}

So we find that the fourth commandment does in itself tell what day of the week is the Sabbath. For corroborative proof, we turn to the account of Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection. He was crucified on the preparation day, “and the Sabbath drew on.” Luke 23:54. And the women who followed, and saw where he was laid, “returned, and prepared spices and ointment; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*.” Verse 56. That means that they did exactly as the commandment enjoins. Now the next day after that Sabbath day which they kept “according to the commandment,” was “the first day of the week” (Luke 24:1) and on it they resumed their work. Now since there are but seven days in the week, it inevitably follows that “the Sabbath day” which the fourth commandment enjoins is the seventh day *of the week*. No man on earth can prove anything to the contrary; and no sane man would think of denying so plain a conclusion, if it were not that he wished to turn aside from the simple commandment of the Lord, for a way of his own choosing. W. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 183.8}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. Thy Will Be Done” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that this part of the Lord’s prayer is the least understood of any. The sentence, “thy will be done,” is thought by most people to be applicable only in cases of sickness or other trial, to indicate that the sufferer is willing to endure patiently. But this is but a very limited view of the expression. As a matter of fact there is no more comprehensive sentence in the Bible, or that can be uttered by man, than the simple words, “thy will be done.” It all depends on what the will of the Lord is, which point we must investigate. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.1}

The second chapter of Romans has reference especially to the Jews, to show that they, as well as the Gentiles, are sinners, and in verses 17, 18 the apostle speaks to them directly, in these 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.” How does Paul say the Jew knew the will of God? Because he was instructed out of the law. The obvious conclusion, then, is that the will of God may be known only by a study of the law, which makes necessary the further conclusion that the law of God is his will. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.2}

This conclusion is verified most plainly by the words which the psalmist utters prophetically in behalf of Christ. In Psalm 40:7, 8, we read: “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.” It is first stated that Christ delighted to do the will of the Father; and then to make this statement emphatic, it is added, “Yea, thy law is within my heart.” Out of the heart are the issues of life (Proverbs 4:23); as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he (Proverbs 23:7); that is, a man’s actions correspond to that which is in his heart; he does just what is in his heart. Therefore if the law of God being in a man’s heart, leads him to delight to do the will of God, it follows that the law of God is the will of God. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.3}

In Revelation 22:14 we read that they who keep the commandments shall have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city; and in Matthew 7:21 we read that only those who do the will of God, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Here again we see the identity of the will of God and the commandments. If there is any doubt in anyone’s mind as to what law it is that is the will of God, it may be settled by reading Romans 2:21, 22 in connection with verses 17-20, the first two of which have been quoted. The ten commandments are the will of God. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.4}

Therefore when we pray, “Thy will be done,” we in reality pray that the commandments of God may be kept by us and by all others who dwell on the earth. We pray that they may be kept even as they are kept in Heaven, where the angels “do his commandment, hearkening unto the voice of his word.” Psalm 103:20. It follows, therefore, that whoever utters the Lord’s prayer or a prayer modeled after it, and does not in his heart “consent unto the law that it is good,” and honestly desires to conform to all its requirements, is guilty of mockery before God. Such an one cannot hope to have his petition regarded; and so we may understand the words of the psalmist: “If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me” (Psalm 66:18); and of Solomon: “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination.” Proverbs 28:9. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.5}

When will this petition be granted? When shall the will of God be done in earth as it is now done in Heaven? The preceding clause, upon which we commented in our last article, answers this question. It is when the kingdom of God is established upon the earth; for in the new heavens and the new earth, righteousness alone shall dwell. 2 Peter 3:13. “Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever.” Isaiah 60:21. The law of God, his holy will, is righteousness (Psalm 119:172), and the keeping of it constitutes the righteousness of God’s people. Deuteronomy 6:25. The Lord’s prayer, therefore teaches us to long for the coming and kingdom of our Lord, when the law of God shall be in the hearts of all men, even as it was in the heart of the Son of God when he was on earth. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.6}

But the coming of the Lord, and the establishment of his kingdom, will not bring about this state of things. When Christ comes, the only change which is wrought in men is the change from mortality to immortality. He does not change men’s characters from sinfulness to righteousness, for just before he comes the decree goes forth: “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.” Revelation 22:11. Men will be ushered into eternity with just the same characters that they have when probation closes. Those who inhabit the new earth will all be righteous, simply because the transgressors will have been rooted out of it (Proverbs 2:22), and the perfect will be permitted to remain in it, just because they are perfect in the midst of unrighteousness, even as Noah was. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.7}

This being the case, it follows that to utter the Lord’s prayer with honesty of heart, is to pray that God will work in us that which is good; it indicates a willingness to submit ourselves in all things to the will of God, that we may become like him. Certainly no one who knows what the will of God is, and who knows how it will come to pass that the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in Heaven, could utter that prayer and not really desire to have that law written in his heart. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.8}

Although God’s ways are as much higher than our ways as the heavens are higher than the earth, we have the assurance that every petition offered in humility and sincerity will be answered, and as we may attain to this high standard. They that hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled. “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. W. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 186.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have lately received requests from various quarters for an explanation of 2 Corinthians 3:6-11. We have had an article on that subject in waiting for some time, and it will soon appear in the SIGNS. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.1}

All persons having any business with the Kentucky Tract and Missionary Society will please take notice that Sister Alice C. Scott, of Cecillian, Hardin County, Ky., has been appointed State Secretary, since Brother Harry Rupert resigned. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.2}

People who expect to have their communications attended to, should sign their full name and address. Even though the communication is only a question that does not require a personal answer, but may be answered through the paper, we must know who sends the question before we answer it. Anonymous letters and questions always go direct to the waste basket. No one should ever write anything to which he is ashamed or afraid to sign his name. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.3}

Says the *Golden Gate* of March 12: “That powerful bands of spirits, embracing the wisest and best of the children of men of all past ages, are now organizing for the spiritual unfoldment of humanity, is the uniform testimony of all our mediums.” This is in direct fulfillment of the prophecy: “Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.” Revelation 12:12. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.4}

On the 17th of February, Rev. J. H. Pettengell died, in New Haven, Conn., aged seventy-two. Professor Pettengell was quite widely known as a vigorous writer in behalf of the doctrine of conditional immortality, or eternal life only through Christ. Many extracts from his pen have appeared in the SIGNS, of which he was a constant reader. He retained his connection with the Congregationalist Church until his death, although his pronounced views in regard to conditional immortality, shut him out, years ago, from any pulpit of that denomination. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.5}

Mrs. Bateham, superintendent of the “Sabbath Observance Department” of the National W. C. T. U., has issued a circular to Christian ministers, begging them to preach a sermon on Sabbath observance, “on the first Sabbath of April next.” We have no doubt but this request will be quite largely complied with; we hope it will. For the benefit of those who may be in doubt, we will here state that “the first Sabbath in April” falls this year on the second day of the month. Remember the time appointed for the preaching of the sermon-Sabbath, April 2, 1887. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.6}

Speaking of the probable union of the National W. C. T. U. and the Knights of Labor, Joseph Cook said: “Powderly is a Catholic, Miss Willard a Methodist; if they can join hands, they may, as she says, ‘lift civilization to a table-land across which Christ may walk.’” It is strange how Christ is ignored by so many who profess to revere his name and who desire the advancement of his cause. How ignored? Just in this way: They have the idea of a temporal kingdom of Christ, and they think that upon them devolves the work of bringing the world to such a state of godliness that Christ will come and take possession. This is National Reform doctrine pure and simple, and it is just what is implied in the above-quoted remark. And so the work of Christ by his Spirit, the only means by which people can be made better, is ignored by those who blindly think that they are honoring him. Why will professed Christian workers imagine that they can do what the Spirit of the Lord cannot, namely, make all people Christians? While they are thus employing impotent human agencies, the world is steadily going to destruction. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.7}

At the request of the California Conference Committee, we publish the following sections from the State constitution, which they would like to have well considered by the churches within the Conference, and by those desiring to labor in any part of it:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.8}

“When any church, or scattered brethren, wish ministerial labor in their vicinity, they all should be made to the Executive Committee.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.9}

“Those who may feel it their duty to exercise their gifts as preachers or colporteurs, shall lay their exercises of mind before the Conference Committee, and the committee may license them if they consider them qualified.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.10}

**“‘The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to the question, “Should the Sabbath be kept absolutely holy?” the editor of the *Christian Standard* (March 12, 1887) says:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.11}

“The first day of the week, which is called the Lord’s day, is not the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the seventh day, or Saturday. This day, as is well known, is observed by the Jews, under the teaching of the law of Moses. They do not, and never did, keep it absolutely holy. The first day of the week is made a day of rest for man and beast by the law of the land.... While the first day of the week is not hedged about with the restrictions that pertained to the Sabbath of the law, it is meant that it be especially devoted to religious services-and not to business or pleasure.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.12}

Truly, “their rock is not as our rock.” The Lord says, “Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy;” but the *Standard* says that the Sabbath-day is not to be remembered at all, but that another day, which is not the Sabbath, is to be kept in its place. Let all who read this remember the following truths, which are admitted by this champion of the first-day observance:- {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.13}

1. Saturday is the seventh day. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.14}

2. The seventh day is the Sabbath. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.15}

3. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.16}

4. The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined by the law of God. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.17}

5. The observance of the first day, which is not the Sabbath, is enjoined by the law of the land. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.18}

There is the whole case in a nut-shell. Reader, can you have any doubt as to your duty? {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.19}

**“Training Up Criminals” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

The trial of a young man in San Francisco, for the murder of a girl, has just been completed. The fact that the murder was committed being well known, there was no attempt to conceal it, and the usual defense, insanity, was resorted to. In proof of his insanity his mother testified that from the time the defendant was a baby he had “spells.” “When two or three years of age he would lie down on his back on the floor or on the sidewalk and, without any provocation whatever, would kick, and scream, and cry. He could not be quieted; candy would have no effect on him. As he grew older, these spells would increase.” It was also in evidence that on his way home from school one day, he threw a stone, without any provocation, and broke a window. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.20}

Very natural that these spells should increase. But if, in the place of candy, some of Solomon’s remedy had been judiciously and vigorously administered, there is no doubt that it would have been effectual in stopping that incipient insanity. We have seen scores of children who were subject to just such “spells.” And too often their mothers were training them in it, and preparing the way for their future career as criminals. Everybody is born with greater or less inclination to evil; it is the duty of the parent to counteract this tendency, and by insisting on prompt obedience, to lay the foundation for a law-abiding citizen. But what hope is there for the future, when natural depravity is fostered by parents, and when the very fact that a person is depraved enough to commit a barbarous act is considered evidence that he should not be punished? {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.21}

“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce.” 2 Timothy 3:1-3. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.22}

**“Beginning of the Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Not being clear upon the division of time, I appeal to you for help. It seems to me from some scriptures that the day should begin in the morning. It seems to be more consistent in beginning the day in the morning at the creation. At the resurrection of Christ it says, “As it began to *dawn* toward the first day of the week,” etc. And again it speaks of darkness lasting from the sixth to the ninth hour. Now if the day began in the evening it would be dark all the time, and then it would make the crucifixion of Christ in the night. Please answer through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. C. H. E.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.23}

If our correspondent will read carefully the first chapter of Genesis he will see that it would not be consistent to begin the day in the morning. Time as distinguished from eternity, is reckoned from the first act of creation. The second verse of the Bible tells us that darkness was upon the face of the deep, that is, upon the chaotic mass which had been spoken into existence. The next act of creation is recorded in the third verse: “And God said, Let there be light; and there was light.” This constituted the first day’s work. The evening, the darkness, and the morning, the light, were the first day. Here it is seen that in the first day the dark preceded the light part, and consequently the same order must necessarily follow in all succeeding days. The record of creation is alone sufficient to show that the day begins with the evening. Where our correspondent falls into difficulty is in forgetting that while each day is twenty-four hours long, and is composed of a period of darkness and a period of light, the dark part of the day is called night, and the light part is also called day; so we use the word “day” in two senses: (1) as applying to the whole period of twenty-four hours, and (2) as applying to the part of the day when the sun shines. {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.24}

The Hebrews always began their day at the going down of the sun, but they had a separate reckoning for the hours of the night and for those of the day. The night was divided into four watches of about three hours each; the day was divided into twelve hours. To be sure, at some seasons of the year, there are less than twelve hours of daylight, and at other seasons more, but throughout the year there is an average of just twelve hours of darkness and twelve hours of light in each day. Therefore they reckoned the period of daylight uniformly from six o’clock. Then the first hour of the day would be seven o’clock, the third hour nine o’clock, the sixth hour twelve, the ninth hour three o’clock, and the twelfth hour six o’clock. So at the crucifixion of Christ darkness was from noon until three o’clock. This mode of reckoning is everywhere used in the Bible and yet it is well understood that the day properly began at evening, as we read in Leviticus 23:32, “From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath.” {SITI March 24, 1887, p. 192.25}

**“Fearing the Lord and Serving Idols” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS asks an answer to the following questions:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.1}

“If a person hears ‘present truth,’ and, feeling anxious about it, goes to the Lord for guidance, and receives the answer in a dream that he is to keep both days [*i.e.* Sabbath and Sunday], is it sure to be from God? {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.2}

“Would it be keeping the commandments of God to keep both days?” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.3}

To both the above questions we can say emphatically, No. For what reason? This:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.4}

1. The Lord has plainly declared that “the seventh day is the Sabbath.” That is his “holy day.” Six days of the week he has given to man in which to work, but the seventh day he demands shall be devoted to his service. Now when the Lord has declared one thing in his word, he will not reveal something directly contrary by means of a dream. But if it be urged that if the answer by dream is that both days shall be kept, *that* is not in opposition to the word of God, we answer, {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.5}

2. To do what God has not required, is to do directly contrary to his word. The truth of this will appear when we consider that in his word God has required everything that is right, everything that is duty. There is not a thing which man ought to do, that is not commanded in the Bible. Then if a person does something which the Bible does not require, he evidently must be doing something that is not right, or that is wrong. We repeat: if the Bible requires *everything* that is right, there can be nothing right which is not required in the Bible; but everything that is not right is wrong; therefore everything that is not required in the Bible is wrong. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.6}

The same truth may be stated thus: The fact that a certain thing is required as a duty, shows that something entirely different, and opposed, is not a duty. If God is so careful lest we should do wrong, that he tells us just what he wants us to do, it is evident that if there is something that he does not tell us to do, it is because he does not want us to do it; and to do what the Lord does not want us to do, is just as surely a sin as it is to fail to do what he wants us to do. The man to whom the Lord should sternly ask, “Who hath required this at your hand?” would be as much at a loss for an answer as the one to whom he should say, “Why hast thou not done this?” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.7}

Now just as surely as the Lord does require the observance of the seventh day of the week, he does *not* require the observance of the first day of the week. The commandment says, “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work.” While it is doubtless true that this is not an imperative order that every man must work during the whole of the six days, it is a permission to work on any part or the whole of the six days. The six days are given to man; they are termed “the six working days” (Ezekiel 46:1), in distinction from the Sabbath, which is a rest day. God has laid no more claim to Sunday than he has to Monday or Wednesday; and to do service which the Lord has not commanded, is to follow the commandments of men, “which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; and not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” Colossians 2:23. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.8}

More than this, the Sabbath is the great sign of which we are to indicate our allegiance to the true God. Sunday, “the wild solar holiday of all pagan times,” has been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church as the badge of its power, and as the sign by which men may indicate their allegiance to the Papacy. As a Catholic writer says, in keeping Sunday Protestants do homage, in spite of themselves, to the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore if a man observes both Sabbath and Sunday, he thereby professes allegiance both to God and to the Pope. But Christ says, “No man can serve two masters.” God requires undivided service. Such worship as was rendered by the Assyrians who were placed in Samaria, is not acceptable to God. They “feared the Lord and served their graven images.” Such ones need an Elijah to say to them as he did to the Jews who were running after Baal, the sun-god: “If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.” 1 Kings 18:21. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.9}

A few words about going to the Lord for “guidance” in regard to the commandments. We cannot regard it as anything else than an insult to the Lord. When God has plainly revealed his will, it is certainly, to speak plainly, impudent to turn right around and ask him if he means what he says, and if he will not make an exception in the case of the petitioner. Balaam tried that once. The Lord told him not to do a certain thing; but Balaam went to the Lord again and again until at last he actually received permission to go. The end, however, to which Balaam came should serve as a warning to others who feel inclined to ask the Lord to give up his way for theirs. When God has spoken, let man hold his peace. W. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 198.10}

**“Creation and Redemption” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following extract represents a view of these great events which is exceedingly common:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.1}

“The work of creation cost but a word. ‘He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.’ The work of redemption cost infinitely more than creation. It cost the *death of Christ*. As the work of redemption is grander than that of creation, so the *Lord’s day*, which commemorates its completion, is higher, *holier, grander* than the Jewish Sabbath, that commemorates the completion of the creation.” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.2}

We never read such a statement without a feeling of sadness at the thought that it represents the limited ideas of the work of God, which are entertained by the great majority of people. Such statements do not indicate that the ones making them have exalted ideas of the work of redemption, but that their ideas of the work of creation are extremely narrow. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.3}

It is the height of presumption for anybody to compare creation and redemption; for both are infinite, and far beyond human comprehension. Suppose you take a person who is unacquainted with geography, and place him in an elevated position on the Isthmus of Panama, where he can view at the same time the two oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. Now ask him which is the larger; if he expresses an opinion, it will be only a conjecture based on no foundation whatever; for he cannot see any difference. His eye can take in just as much of one as of the other, and for aught that his observation teaches to the contrary, they both stretch away into infinite space. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.4}

Stand at the base of two mountains, whose peaks towering up into the sky, are lost in the clouds. Now tell, if you can, which is the higher. You say that you cannot, because you cannot see to the top of either one; and even if you could, your eye could not measure the difference between them, if there should be any. So it is with creation and redemption. Both works are the product of infinite power combined with infinite love, and could have been accomplished by nothing less. But if nothing but infinite power and infinite love could create or redeem the world, certainly nothing less than infinite wisdom can comprehend either one, must less grasp both in one thought, so as to compare them. “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” Hebrews 11:3. Does that text say that we understand creation? Not at all; it says that we understand that the worlds were formed out of nothing, by the word of God. How do we understand this? Through faith; we know it simply because we believe the word of God, which declares it. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.5}

“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth,” “for he spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast.” Psalm 33:6, 9. Here we have the statement of the fact which we understand only by faith. God spoke, and the worlds came into existence. How easily it was done! says one. Easily done? Yes, easily done by infinite power; but who can conceive of power that could by a word cause that to exist, which previously had no existence? Because God so easily accomplished the work of creation, are we therefore to esteem it a light thing? Far from it. Says the psalmist: “Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him.” Why? “For he spake, and it was; he commanded and it stood fast.” The power of God as manifested in creation is a most stupendous thing, calling for wonder and awe. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.6}

Let the one who thinks that the work of the creation was a comparatively small affair, try to create something. Let him attend to make a grain of sand. Let him attempt to make something out of nothing. Attempt! How can he attempt? What would be the first step? All the power of all the created intelligence in the universe is not equal to the creation of the smallest atom of matter. All the combined intelligence of men and angels cannot approach to the shadow of an imagination of how such a thing could be done. Yet God did it with a word. Does that statement depreciate the work of creation? Not by any means. It simply shows the inconceivable power of God. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.7}

The Sabbath was given to men in order that he might contemplate the power of God, and so lead to greater reverence for him. But someone may say that it would be monotonous to meditate week after week upon one thing. Not unless the man is in one of the classes mentioned in Psalm 92:6. The creation of God, like himself, is infinite; and as men by searching cannot find out God, so as to know the Almighty to perfection (Job 11:7); so no man can ever fathom God’s creation. Only when we rightly understand the object of the Sabbath, can we appreciate the psalm for the Sabbath day:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.8}

“It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most High; to show forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night, upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery; upon the harp with a solemn sound. For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands. O Lord, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep. A brutish man knoweth not; neither doth a fool understand this.” Psalm 92:1-6. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.9}

It would be folly to attempt to convey to anyone, by words, any sense of the work of creation. All that we can do is to tell the reader to meditate upon it. But let no one think that the work of creation was simply a manifestation of power. In the creation, God’s love is also manifested. Was it not unselfish love that caused God to create beings in his own image, capable of the highest pleasures, and setting before them an eternity of life, in which their mental and spiritual natures could continually develop, so as to make them capable of still higher enjoyment? Those who fail to see the love of God in creation, should remember that the great work of redemption is only for the purpose of bringing men to the enjoyment of that for which he has created. We are not comparing redemption with creation, for that is impossible; but we are showing that in the creation God manifested love as well as power. But if it is admitted that the love of God combined with his power, in creation, it must be admitted that the creation was the result of infinite love as well as of infinite power; for God, the infinite, must love to an infinite degree. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.10}

The Sabbath,-the seventh day,-was instituted as a memorial of creation. This is necessarily admitted in the claim that Sunday should be kept instead of Saturday because redemption is greater than creation. Now the man who says that the Sabbath ought no longer to be kept, thereby says that God’s power and love should be no longer remembered. And that is equivalent to saying that God himself ought to no longer be remembered! And that is still further equivalent to saying that the work of redemption ought not to be considered; for God is Redeemer as well as Creator. In other words, no one can speak slightingly of the Sabbath as the memorial of creation, without disparaging the work of creation; but he who has narrow views of the love and power of God in creation, necessarily has narrow views of God himself; and he who has narrow views of God, cannot place a high estimate upon the work of redemption. And now we can better understand these words: “Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctifieth them.” Ezekiel 20:12. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.11}

Of the greatness of redemption it is not necessary to speak here particularly. They who affect to compare creation and redemption, profess to adore the infinite love and power manifested in the gospel; although, as we have shown, they can have exalted ideas of this only in proportion as they entertain exalted views of God’s love and power in creation. Enough to say that the redemption of man is accomplished at an infinite cost. Says Paul: “Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Chri* st.” Ephesians 3:8. And Peter says that even the angels desire (but in vain) to comprehend the love of God as manifest in the gospel. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.12}

Should not so great a work as this be commemorated? Should not men leave something to keep the great work of redemption in mind? Most assuredly, but not at the expense of the memorial of creation. The idea that men cannot show their appreciation of the plan of salvation without despising the work of God in the creation, is as monstrous as the idea that is sometimes advanced, that men cannot worship Christ without turning away from their allegiance to God! On this matter of recognizing the work of redemption, by some act, we have the following points to offer:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.13}

1. The work of redemption, instead of having been completed at the resurrection, is not yet completed. Redemption is complete only when all the effects of the curse have been obliterated. When redemption is completed, there will be no further work to be done for man. That is the crowning act in the great plan of salvation. Christ is made unto us, “wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” Redemption is the last of all. It includes not only salvation from sin, but from death and the possibility of it. It includes also the renovation of the earth. Read a few texts:- {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.14}

Ephesians 1:13, 14: “In whom [*i.e.*, in Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.” Here we see that the Spirit is given to those who believe, not because they are redeemed, but only as a pledge of their future redemption. Now read a still more direct statement concerning those who have this witnessing Spirit. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.15}

Romans 8:22, 23: “For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for* the adoption, to wit, *the* *redemption* of our body.” What this redemption of the body is, Paul shows in Philippians 3:20, 21: {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 199.16}

“For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.1}

Then it is utterly impossible to commemorate completed redemption, because we are yet waiting for redemption. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.2}

2. The work of redemption must be kept in mind, but by the appropriate ceremonies. There is not an intimation in the entire Bible, that God would have us keep Sunday or any other day in commemoration of the work of redemption either partial or complete. When people do what the Bible does not tell them to do, they always make mistakes. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.3}

In Ephesians 1:7 and Colossians 1:14 we are told that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. But his blood was shed upon Friday; must we therefore conclude that we must keep Friday? By no means. After giving the manner of celebrating the Lord’s supper, Paul says: “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do the show the Lord’s death till he come.” 1 Corinthians 11:26. There is a divinely appointed ordinance by which we can commemorate so much of the work of redemption as has been completed. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.4}

But is there nothing as a memorial of the glorious resurrection of Christ? Indeed there is. Says Paul: “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Romans 6:3, 4. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.5}

In baptism we have a memorial both of the death and the resurrection of Christ. “Oh, but,” says one, “that is only a single act; we want a constantly recurring memorial of the resurrection.” We submit that the Lord knows what we want, far better than we do; but it is a mistake to say that the remembrance of the resurrection lies only at the beginning of the Christian life. Read again: “That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk [every day] in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also [all our lives] in the likeness of his resurrection.” So the whole Christian life, if it is indeed a Christian life, is a constant likeness of the resurrection of Christ. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.6}

We have only touched upon this great theme, but we have indicated the proper lines for thought upon it. We find that we do not have to belittle one part of God’s work, in order to greatly appreciate another part. On the contrary, we cannot properly appreciate one part of his work without exalting every other part, for all are related. Both creation and redemption are to be ever kept in mind. By the Lord’s Supper we show the Lord’s death till he come, to redeem us; and then we will “sing the song of Moses the servant of God [Exodus 15:1-19,] and the song of the Lamb.” (Revelation 15:2, 3)-celebrating redemption completed. And then will creation itself be commemorated as it should be, for then will men properly appreciate the love and power of God; therefore “it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord.” Isaiah 66:23. W. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 200.7}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

**“GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD”**

Nothing less than divine wisdom could have framed this petition, so simple and so reasonable is it. Human greed would ask for enough to-day to supply all possible wants for the future; but if that were granted, the person could use no more of it to-day than he would use if he had only enough for to-day’s needs. Not only so, but human greed would overreach itself. Thus, if the man should to-day receive enough for all time, he would have no occasion to ask for anything to-morrow. He would trust in his possession instead of God, and would soon forget God. Thus cutting himself off from the only power that can bestow and preserve, he would soon lose what he has, and then have nothing either for to-day or to-morrow. Riches make to themselves wings and fly away. But the man who every day asks for provision sufficient for that day, with the assurance that he will receive it, is far better off. He has enough for to-day, and that is all he could use anyway. And then he does not wear himself out in the vain effort to take care of property that he has stored up for the future. His future supply is in the hands of God, who thus becomes his banker. Surely the man who has all he needs, just when he needs it, while someone else takes care of that which he does not actually need, is far better off than the man who has only what he needs to-day, but who is burdened with the care of a lot of stuff that he may never need. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.1}

This petition teaches contentment. The conclusions in the preceding paragraph are in harmony with the teaching of the apostle Paul. Said he: “But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.” 1 Timothy 6:6-10. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.2}

Here the apostle brings out an additional danger from not trusting God for our daily bread. It is that the man having more than he needs for to-day, is tempted to use more than he needs. Thus his thoughts become centered entirely on self and the gratification of his own desires and lusts, which increase and multiply with the gratification, until he is finally drowned in perdition. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.3}

The apostle continues: “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy.” This is in harmony with the petition which the Lord has taught us. We are not taught that to have riches is sin, for the Lord gives some men power to get wealth, but that the sin comes in setting one’s heart upon them. The possession of riches is a great danger for Christ says: “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!” This is because it is next to impossible for one who has riches to keep from setting his heart upon them, and so neglecting to trust in the living God, and forgetting that it is God who gives us all things richly to enjoy. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.4}

This is taught by the parable in Luke 12:15-21. “The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully.” Here we see that it was not the man’s superior skill that brought him his wealth, but the providence of God in giving “rain and fruitful seasons.” And the man thought: “What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, ‘This will I do. I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits, and my goods, and I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry.” If he had listened to the Lord, he might have known what to do with his goods. Says the inspired word: “Charge them that are rich.... that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.” 1 Timothy 6:17-19. Instead of this, the man trusted in his riches, and had nothing. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.5}

“But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?” Why is the man called a fool? Because the fool, according to the Bible, is one who says in his heart, “There is no God.” This man acted as though there were no God, because he assumed that he must take care of himself, and left God out of the account altogether. He may have been a professor of religion, but he was practically an atheist. There are thousands of such men in the world to-day. But no matter how much they exalt themselves (for the man who by his actions assumes that his prosperity depends upon himself alone, virtually puts himself in the place of God), they will in the end be put in fear, and be made to know that they are but men. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.6}

“So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.” We have already read from Paul the injunction to rich men to lay up store for themselves “a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.” In the Sermon on the Mount Christ said: “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.” Matthew 6:19-21. Neither of these texts implies that the kingdom of God can be bought with money. But they both teach that no man can reach Heaven unless he has his treasure there. It is not that his wealth buys him a place in the kingdom of God, but that his thoughts are of God and Heaven, and thus he prepares for Heaven. In all his ways he acknowledges God, and thus God directs his paths. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 203.7}

At the present time the principle contained in the petition, “Give us this day our daily bread,” needs to be taught; because the tendency of the last days is all against it. We read: “Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.” James 5:1-3. This does not apply to the millionaires alone, but to all who are heaping treasure. That is, to all who allow their treasures to “heap” up or accumulate. Some time ago we saw a gold piece that was discolored by rust. We asked what caused it, and learned that it had been paid out by a woman who, having a little more money than she needed, had buried the surplus in the ground. She was not a rich woman, but we could not help thinking of the words of James. But the principle of heaping up treasure was there, which showed distrust of God. And what made it worse was that the woman professed to believe in the soon coming of the Lord. Whether we are poor or rich, let us “beware of covetousness; for a man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth;” and let us not fear to trust the Lord, knowing that if God clothes the grass and the lilies of the field in beauty, and provides for the sustenance of the birds of the air, he will much more care for those whom he has bought with the blood of his own dear Son. The sacrifice of Christ is the pledge of God’s care for us. “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” Romans 8:32. W. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 206.1}

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

E. J. Waggoner

The Knights of Labor are beginning to join the clamor for enforced Sunday observance. At the meeting which they recently held in Chicago, to consider this matter, “Mr. McFadden, of District 57, representing 10,000 men, said that his assembly had passed resolutions forbidding any member to buy or sell on Sunday.” The Knights will be a valuable. Reinforcement to the “National Reform” cause. We shall now have a chance to see whether the devotion of the National Reformers to anti-secret society principles is strong enough to lead them to refuse to cooperate with the Knights in working for a Sunday law. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.1}

We learn that the Massachusetts Legislature has been discussing a local option Sunday Law, the idea being that a uniform law cannot be enforced, and that each town should in this matter legislate for itself. We suggest as a better plan, an individual option law. Let Sunday be kept by each individual who wants to keep it. Then if there is a community where all want to keep Sunday, they will have a Sunday law. But don’t compel a few people to keep Sunday, against their conscience, because the majority have not conscience enough in the matter to keep it without making a law to compel themselves to keep it. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.2}

Newspapers that deal largely in gossip and sporting news usually make that work when they venture to make a statement on a subject connected with the Bible. The S. F. *Chronicle*, speaking of the liberation of Freeman, the Pocasset child murderer, says: “A head of a family who adopts the Mosaic doctrine that he has the right of life for death over his offspring, is better behind bars.” We fully agree, that a man who thinks he has a right to kill his children, is a dangerous man to be at large; but we would like to know the whereabouts and the writings of Moses there is any such doctrine as that a father has the right of life or death over his offspring. People hold the Bible accountable for a good many things that exist only in their own brain. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.3}

In answer to the question, “Do we get our immortality through belief in and acceptance of Christ, or is it inherent in the entire race?” The *Christian Union* recently said: “We are not prepared to answer this question dogmatically; neither opinion has some support from Scripture. Belief in what is called a conditional immortality is comparatively modern, we believe, but has certainly grown within the last quarter-century.” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.4}

The answer (?) is correct with the exception of two points: Inherent immortality finds no support whatever in the Scriptures; and the belief in conditional immortality is by no means modern; it is as old as the knowledge of gospel truth among men, and is taught all through the Bible. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.5}

The San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* has an editorial entitled, “The Reign of Peace.” The second sentence of which reads thus: “It is now evident that there will be no war in Europe for a least a few months.” And then the writer adds: “It will be happy circumstance of the duration of peace can be measured by years.” Here is a good text for those who preach a temporal millennium of peace and safety. It is actually certain that, if something unexpected does not happen, there will be no war in Europe for a few months! It is quite probable that there will be no fighting until the weather becomes more favorable for the movement of troops. And this is “the reign of peace.” {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.6}

Religious liberty has had a narrow escape in Texas. A rigid Sunday law bill had passed the Assembly and had been favorably reported upon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, before those who would be most affected by it-the Sabbath-keepers-were aware that there was any effort on foot to secure a Sunday law. By prompt action the insertion of a section making an exception in favor of observers of the seventh day was secured, and at last reports it was thought that this amendment would be accepted by both Houses. The principal opposition to making this provision for Sabbath-keepers came from a member who is a clergyman. Yet some people will persist in declaring that there is not the slightest possibility of religious persecution in this country. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.7}

**“The Arbiter of Europe” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is stated upon the authority of the *Journal des Debats* that the Prussian minister at the Vatican has suggested that the Pope convene a European Congress to settle the Eastern and Egyptian questions. “This,” says the *Catholic Mirror*, “would be ‘a consummation devoutly to be wished.’” Certainly all Catholics do devoutly wish for everything that will in any way intend to the restoration of the temporal power of the Papacy, and a congress of the kind proposed with a long step in that direction. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.8}

There is certainly a growing disposition among the great powers of the earth to confer honor upon the Pope; and while there is not the slightest chance that the peace of Europe can be permanently preserved, stranger things have happened than that an effort be made to close forever the temple of Janus by making the Bishop of Rome arbitrer, not only of Europe, but of the world. {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.9}

It was only a few months ago that “his holiness” was called upon to decide the dispute between Germany and Spain relative to the Caroline Islands, and within a few weeks past he has meddled in German politics to the immense satisfaction not only of Prince Bismarck and Emperor William but of President Grevy as well. In close connection with this comes the proposition of Austria that the “holy father” should act as referee in the Bulgarian difficulty; and now to cap it all comes this proposition from Germany that he shall be acknowledged as the arbiter of Europe. Is not the world about to fall down at the feet of the Papacy and worship “the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live”? {SITI March 31, 1887, p. 208.10}