**“Something Not Commanded” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Cambridge News*, published at Cambridgeboro, Penn., which contains the synopsis of a discourse on the Sabbath, preached by Rev. Wm. Grassic, of that place. After showing the origin of the Sabbath, its place in the decalogue, its sacredness, and the fact that Christ did not abolish it, but that “Jesus left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it,” he proceeds as follows:- {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.1}

“Come now to the apostles. While under the special influence of the Holy Ghost, planting churches, carrying on revivals, starting missionary enterprises, they changed the time of observance from the seventh to the first day of the week. We believe they were divinely inspired to make the change, and yet wisely directed to make no public decree about it”! {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.2}

Well, now, here’s a conundrum. If the apostles were inspired to make the change in the Sabbath, and yet were “wisely directed” to keep the fact from the public, how did the Rev. Wm. Grassic find it out? We take it for granted that he was not there to see for himself, since what he tells about must have happened fully eighteen hundred years ago. How did he learn of this change? How did the fact leak out? As Mr. Grassic admits, the Scriptures are utterly silent respecting the change. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.3}

Just think of it! The apostle divinely directed to make a change in that institution which God had made and sanctified at creation, and which he had made known at Sinai in thunder tones which shook the earth, and yet cautioned to tell nobody of the change! The statement is so absurd that it refutes itself. The fact that ministers of the gospel are driven to such shifts to account for the present Sunday observance, is sufficient evidence that such observance has not the slightest sanction of inspiration. The Lord does not work in so underhanded a manner. We are told that he will do nothing without revealing his secret unto his servants the prophets (Amos 3:7), and he makes known his will to the prophets in order that they may tell the people. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.4}

Notice also that Mr. Grassic claims expressly that the change of the Sabbath was not effected in the days of Christ, but that he “left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it.” Then if, as he claims, the apostles had made the change, they would have gone directly contrary to the teaching and practice of Christ. If this claim were true, whom should we follow? Should we follow Christ, or the apostles? He, of course, would have us follow the apostles, and thus we see that in order to find a basis for Sunday observance, men are willing to ignore Christ. We do not propose to ignore either Christ or his apostles, for all taught the same thing. They never presumed to do more than to follow their Master. “The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.” {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.5}

One point more: Mr. Grassic tells us that the apostles were “wisely directed to make no public decree” about the change of the Sabbath. That is to say that there was no command given for the observance of Sunday. Now read Webster’s definition of superstition: “Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious *rites not commanded*.” Then according to the common usage of language, and Mr. Grassic’s own admission, we must conclude that the observance of Sunday is nothing but superstition; and the more rigidly its observance is enforced, the more superstition is evinced. How much better it would be to follow the plain commandment of God, even though the world oppose, than to ignore Christ and the Bible in an attempt to find an excuse for following the custom of the multitude. It seems to us that thinking people should need no stronger proof of the falsity of the claims of Sunday, than the excuses which its devotees put forth in its behalf. W. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.6}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. Forgive Us Our Debts” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Forgive Us Our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.” {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.7}

This may be called the crowning petition in this wonderful prayer. In the beginning of these comments we said that this prayer is only for those who have given themselves to Christ,-who can truly say “Our Father.” This proves that still more plainly. We do not mean that it is for none but those who are perfect, but that it is for those who have surrendered themselves to the Lord that he may work in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure. To be able always to pray understandingly and from the heart, “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors,” is something that can be done by but comparatively few who profess to be Christians. The one who can do it is in possession of the greatest of all Christian graces-charity; for “charity suffereth long, and is kind,” “is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil,” and this is the way we would be to have the Lord deal with us. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.8}

A great many people think that they are of a forgiving disposition when they are not. When they have done wrong, and someone takes revenge on them, they think that they are deserving of considerable credit if they can take it patiently; but they think that they are perfectly justifiable in harboring harsh thoughts, at least, if they are injured without cause. This is indicated by the common saying, “If I had done anything to deserve this treatment, I would not say anything; but I have not done anything, and I won’t stand it.” That is as far from the forgiveness that our Saviour taught, as the east is from the west. “For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.” 1 Peter 2:20. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.9}

It has been truly said that to forgive is divine. Certainly it is not human. Human nature knows nothing of forgiveness. Human nature stands upon its dignity, and says, “I’ll have my rights; nobody shall trample on me with impunity.” But the divine Son of God, who did no sin, and in whose mouth was found no guile, “when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously.” 1 Peter 2:23. You who say, “All I ask is simple justice; I demand only my rights,” how would you fare if you should go immediately after such an assertion and repeat the Lord’s prayer, and the Lord should take you at your word? Who could stand if the Lord should mark iniquity? Suppose the Lord should give you simple justice,-just what you deserve, and nothing more,-what would be the result? Not only would you be deprived of eternal life, but your present life would not be continued for another moment; for there is not one of us who deserves a single blessing from the hand of God; “it is of the Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.” Lamentations 3:22. There is in us no good thing; we have all gone out of the way, and are unprofitable (Romans 3:10-12); now when our rights have been invaded, and we cherish resentment, we cannot utter the Lord’s prayer without asking the Lord not to forgive us. What a terrible thing it is not to have a forgiving spirit. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.10}

Nor can we avoid the consequence above indicated, by refusing to use our Saviour’s prayer. Whether we ask or not, we shall be forgiven just as we forgive. Says the Saviour: “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.” Matthew 6:14, 15. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.11}

We have said that forgiveness is not natural to the human heart. Only to the extent that one is partaker of the divine nature, can he exercise true forgiveness. God’s forgiveness is the standard for us. Says Paul: “And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you.” Ephesians 4:32. No one can know how to forgive, unless he knows how God forgives; and nobody can fully understand how God forgives, until he has felt in his own soul the fullness of divine pardon. It will be worth our while to note a few texts which show how God forgives, so that we may know what spirit we should have. Let us read a few texts:- {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.12}

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Romans 5:8. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.” 1 Peter 3:18. “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” “We love him, because he first loved us.” 1 John 4:9, 10, 19. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.13}

We have heard it claimed that we are not required to forgive an offender unless he asks for forgiveness; that until he repents and begs for pardon, we are warranted in holding him off. But the above texts convey a different idea. We are to forgive as God forgives. Now suppose that God had made no movement towards the salvation of rebellious men until they humbled themselves before him; there never would have been any salvation for men. It is only because of his love for us while we were rebels, that we are enabled to come to him. He was under no obligation to mankind; the obligation was all on the other side; yet he took the initiative. God loved the world. He harbored no malice or enmity in his heart, because he had been insulted, and his laws trampled upon, but was filled with love and pity for poor, erring mortals. It grieved him to think that man would pursue a course that would inevitably end in his ruin, and he made the way easy for him to return to his allegiance, and begged him to come and be forgiven. The same spirit should actuate us. No matter how much we may have been misused, we are not warranted in entertaining the slightest feeling of enmity toward the offender. On the contrary, we should have such love for him that our only feeling would be that of sorrow that he should pursue a course so detrimental to himself. The thought of the personal injury we have sustained should be lost sight of in the thought of the greater injury which the offender’s course will bring upon himself. It is not natural for us to do this; we can do it only when we are partakers of the divine nature. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.14}

It may be said that God does not actually forgive men until they repent. This is true; but he desires that they shall receive his pardon, and therefore, so far as he is concerned, he has pardoned them. All that is lacking is for them to accept the pardon which he offers them; if they will not, he is clear, and the responsibility of their ruin rests upon themselves. God could not actually pardon an unrepentant sinner, for the reason that when he pardons it means far more than when we forgive. If a man has maliciously injured us, and we forgive him, it makes no difference with his guilt; but when God forgives the sinner, his guilt is by that pardon taken away; and it is evident that God cannot take away the guilt of a man who has no desire nor intention to abstain from his sins, but who is determined to retain his guilty practices. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.15}

This brings us to another feature of forgiveness. It is very common for people to say that they can forgive but they cannot forget. That is not true forgiveness. The man who does not forget the injury, will brood over it until the bitter feelings will come up again with more than their original force; the harsh feelings are not put away, but only smothered for a time. The man who does not forget an injury done him, has never really forgiven the offender; he has not allowed love for the erring one to eclipse all thought of the injury done to himself, and without this there can be no forgiveness such as God exercises toward us. Divine pardon is justification; God pardons the believer in Christ, by imputing his righteousness “for the remission of sins that are past.” The pardoned one is as though he had never sinned; where there was nothing but guilt before, God beholds nothing but righteousness,-righteousness put there through his own wonderful love. Then if we forgive as God forgives, we must regard the repentant offender as though he had done nothing against us. We must forget that he ever injured us. We must treat him and regard him as though he had done us nothing but good instead of nothing but evil. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 262.16}

The man who forgives in this manner is a true disciple of Christ, because no one can do this unless he has experienced, and does at the time experience, the blessing of divine forgiveness. It is not enough that we have once been forgiven; we must have a vivid sense of the love of God toward us *now*, if we would not forgive as we ought. Under these circumstances the most difficult thing in the world to do, becomes the easiest. Because when we realize how sinful we are, and how much God has forgiven us, it seems a small matter in comparison to forgive the petty wrong done us by a fellow-man. When we contemplate the magnitude of our sin against God, all the wrongs that all men may have done to us, sink into insignificance. We think that the servant who had received a free gift of ten thousand talents from his lord was mean and ungrateful because he would not give his fellow-servant one hundred pence. If he had any sense of what had been done for him, he would have told his fellow-servant to keep the paltry sum, and would have thought no more about it. So if we have any just sense of God’s love to us, we cannot fail to exhibit corresponding love to our fellows. W. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 263.1}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

We call the attention of our readers to the above list of camp-meetings. These are but the beginning of the many that will be held this year. Others will be added to this list, as soon as the time and place of holding them are determined. There is considerable prejudice in many quarters against camp meetings, but all who are situated so that they can attend any one of these meetings, will find it to their interest and profit to do so. At all of them visitors will be welcomed and provided for. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.1}

Of the meetings just held in Oakland, we have space for but few words. It was more largely attended, and was in many respects the most interesting, of any ever held here. The Spirit of the Lord was present, as many can testify. That much good was done there cannot be the slightest doubt; we pray that its effects may be permanent. Important steps were proposed and voted, looking to the advancement of the work. These will be set forth next week in the reports, which, owing to the shortness of the time, could not be furnished for this week’s paper. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.2}

The friends of the cause in the North Pacific and Upper Columbia Conferences, should not fail to attend camp-meeting this spring. In addition to the strong preaching force sent by the General Conference, Brother F. M. Morrison, of the Pacific Press, will attend both these meetings for the purpose of giving instruction to those who wish to engage in the work of canvassing. He is a practical canvassers and teacher, and will render efficient service in this branch. We shall be greatly disappointed if some who think themselves incapable of work, do not at these meetings resolve to give their entire time to it. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.3}

In the *Independent* of April 7, President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, said of the situation in Bulgaria:- {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.4}

“There seems to be a general impression that we shall have no war this year.... But thus far, from the standpoint of Constantinople, I can see no evidence that the danger has passed. Nothing has been settled. Every cause of war which existed two months ago exists still. Preparations for war are still going on as vigorously as ever, and the relations of Russia with Austria, Turkey, and England are no more friendly. In some directions they are more strained. If the Czar feels that he is ready for war this spring, it will come.” {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.5}

In his report to the Roman Propaganda, concerning the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Gibbons contrasts the religious devotion of the working classes of this country with the religious hostility of the same class in foreign countries, and says that the Catholic workmen of America “are intelligent, instructed, devoted sons, ready to give their blood as they give their means,” for the support of the church. As the *Observer* says, if this assertion means anything, it means that the Pope’s minions in this country are ready to fight for him if need be; that they never become so devoted to any society, not even to their adopted country, that they would not fight at the call of one who blasphemously professes to be head of the church. When it is too late, some who are indifferent now, will realize that while Roman Catholicisim is nominally a religious system, it is primarily a political power, bent on destroying everything that it cannot rule. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.6}

The *Christian at Work* tells us that “fasting is peculiarly an Old Testament institution, and as out of place as we are told new wine is in an old wineskin.” Yet Christ, in the sermon on the mount, said: “Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father in secret shall reward thee openly.” Matthew 6:16-18. And while this institution of the Bible-both Old and New Testaments-is summarily set aside, Papal holidays, such as “Holy Thursday,” Good Friday, Easter, Christmas, Sundays, etc., are coming to be generally observed. Alas for the exchange of real Old and New Testament religion, for those things which are not commanded! {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.7}

“Falsifying the balances by deceit,” is one of the most common things nowadays. An experiment was recently made in Brooklyn, N. Y., with a view of ascertaining whether the coal dealers of that city were in the habit of defrauding their customers. Eighty-two tons of coal, bought of several dealers, were weighed after delivery, and only sixteen of them were of full weight. The remainder showed short weight, some to the amount of thirty pounds, and some as high as three hundred and twenty-six pounds. It is not to be supposed that Brooklyn coal dealers are very much worse than coal dealers in other cities, or that coal dealers are worse by nature than other men; but iniquity abounds, and it is with feelings of sadness only, that we recognize the fact that the great majority of men feel no compunctions of conscience against defrauding when they are reasonably sure that they will escape detection. Thank God that there are still many honest men in the world; and since we cannot judge the motives of any, we should labor in love for the salvation of all. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.8}

The following, which has just appeared in an Austrian paper, is very significant:- {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.9}

“The Vatican favors the following conditions for a reconciliation with the Quiritual: 1. The Pope will advise the royal archducal and ducal families of Naples, Tuscany, and Nicodeaux to renounce all claims to sovereignty in favor of the Holy See. 2. The Pope will crown Humbert king, granting him and his Catholic descendants territory alone in Italy. 3. The king will govern the whole kingdom with full temporal rights, but will acknowledge the Pope as suzerain and pledge himself to rule according to the dictates of the church. 4. The king will reside at Rome. 5. Territory, including Leonine City and part of the Tiber shore, will be allotted permanently to the Pope, with absolute ruling and proprietary right. 6. A special convention will be concluded, fixing the amount Italy shall pay to maintain the Papal household.” {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.10}

That means the absolute supremacy of the Pope over all Italy, the king being nominal ruler, but really the Pope’s vassal. Whether or not Humbert is really for peace on these terms, remains to be seen, but that he will sooner or later accede in order to get the Pope’s assistance in some difficulty, as Bismarck has done, there can be no doubt. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.11}

A bill restricting railroad traffic on Sunday has been passed by the Connecticut Legislature, and has received the governor’s signature. Hereafter no trains can be run for any purpose whatever between 10:30 A.M. and three P. M. Before and after these hours only mail trains, or those required for public necessity, for the preservation of freight, will be allowed to run. The law also prohibits the landing of freight from sunrise to sunset on Sunday. We have serious doubts as to its being enforced. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.12}

**“The Pope in Politics” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope, though nominally without a vestige of temporal power, keeps up most assiduously the forms of civil sovereignty, and his influence is stronger to-day than it has ever been since his temporary overthrow in 1798. When he was elevated to the Pontificate, Leo XIII., was not supposed to be possessed of any great political ability; but he seems to have inherited all the instincts and traditions of the “holy office,” and he has certainly shown himself to be a master in diplomacy; for, though without a foot of territory that he can call his own, or a single subject who rightfully owes him civil allegiance, he is recognized as a sovereign and treated with on terms of equality by almost all the powers of earth, not even excepting the Turks, the traditional enemies of Rome, and the Chinese, the disciples of Confucius. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.13}

But the end is not yet; for, if we may trust the newspaper reports, the crafty Leo will soon appoint a nuncio to the United States! At first thought this seems hardly credible; but stranger things have happened, and in view of the honors shown by this Government, some months since, to the Pope’s delegates who came to Baltimore to confer upon a citizen of this country a princely title and a Papal decoration, it is to be feared that a nuncio would be received at Washington. It is true that such an action would be most ill-advised and unfortunate; but as the Roman Catholic vote in this country is sufficiently large to at least render probable the defeat of any man or party particularly obnoxious to “the church,” it is not likely that the President would have the moral courage to refuse to receive a Papal minister, should one be appointed. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.14}

But whether the nuncio comes just now or not, the Papacy is erelong to make its power felt as never before in American politics; and how easily this may be done is well exemplified by recent events in Germany. However, if Protestants were true to themselves and to their professed principles, we would have nothing to fear from the intrigues of Popery, but with Romanism on the one hand, and National Reform on the other, we may well tremble, for when the two unite, as they will erelong, for the destruction of our free institutions, religious liberty in this country will be a thing of the past. {SITI May 5, 1887, p. 272.15}

**“Can Inanimate Objects Talk?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

“EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Sometime last year I asked you the following questions:- {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.1}

“‘Would it not be wrong, in teaching by allegory or parable, to use one founded on a superstition or false conception of facts, without showing its falsity? Did our Saviour ever use such an allegory or parable?’ {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.2}

“You replied:- {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.3}

“‘An answer to the second question would render the first unnecessary; for if Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong. We have no knowledge, however, that our Saviour ever based any of his teachings on superstitions or false theories. The story of the rich man and Lazarus is not strictly a parable, but an apologue, like that found in Judges 9:7-15. An apologue is the relation of supposed actions of brutes or inanimate objects, and does not convey any wrong impression, because the hearers, knowing that the things referred to cannot do or say the things credited to them, readily understand that some moral truth is intended to be impressed by it.’ {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.4}

“To this I made a brief reply at the time, but as it failed to reach you, I will by request restate some of my objections to your answer. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.5}

“In the first place, you say: ‘If Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong’ as if it would be right under some circumstances to do wrong-for the teaching of false doctrine, if only by implication, is certainly wrong. This position is not a good one. But you say you have no knowledge he ever so taught. Neither have I. You call the story of the rich man and Lazarus an ‘apologue.’ Was it one to the Jews? Certainly not. They believed in the conscious existence of the soul (or spirit) after death, and this story, being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability-a parable-and would surely tend to confirm them in it. If this is an apologue it stands alone as such among all of Christ’s teachings. Even an apologue should have some foundation in fact as Jotham’s did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble. W. M. B.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.6}

To the above we have to say: 1. We did not imply that it would ever be right to do wrong. What we did say was that Christ could not do wrong, and that therefore the fact that a certain thing was done by him, would be sufficient evidence that such act was not wrong. But in that case we should not be able to find anything in the word of God to condemn such action. In the case under consideration, however, we find no evidence that Christ ever used such a method of conveying instruction, and we do find that he could not have done such a thing, for it would have been a sort of deception. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.7}

2. Our correspondent begs the question entirely, when he says that the Jews “believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death, and this story [of the rich man and Lazarus], being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability.” In order to show that the story of the rich man and Lazarus had to the Jews all the elements of probability, our friend ought to *prove* that they believed in the immortality of the soul, which he simply *assumes*. There is not the slightest evidence in the Bible to show that the Jews, as a people, believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death. Without doubt many of them had become so tinctured with Grecian philosophy, from their contact with the heathen world, that they had come to believe in the existence of the soul after death; but the sacred writings of the Jews-the Old Testament-give not the slightest warrant for such a belief, and as a people the Jews still clung, outwardly at least, to the religion of their fathers. Therefore it is entirely an assumption to say that the Jews would either gain wrong ideas, or have erroneous views strengthened, by Christ’s teaching in Luke 16:19-31. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.8}

3. Our correspondent says: “Even an apologue should have some foundation in fact, as Jotham’s did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble.” What foundation in fact did Jotham’s story of the olive, etc., have? Is it true that the trees ever went forth to anoint a king over them? and did anybody in the world ever hear an olive-tree, a fig-tree, a vine, or a bramble utter speech. No; Jotham’s story had not the slightest foundation in fact. Was it therefore calculated to deceive, and to lead the people to think that trees do really talk. Not by any means; for his hearers well knew that it is contrary to nature that inanimate things should talk; they knew that he was using an imaginary instance to illustrate his case, and they saw the point at once. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.9}

So in the case of our Saviour. To illustrate a point he put words into the mouths of dead men. But the Jews knew, both from observation and from their acquaintance with the Scriptures, that it is impossible for dead men to talk or think. They understood the point intended to be conveyed, just as well as the men of Shechem did the words of Jotham; and they were no more likely to imagine from Christ’s words that dead men can talk, than the men of Shechem were to conclude from Jotham’s words that trees can talk. For a dead man to talk would be as contrary to nature as it would be for trees. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.10}

The only way we can understand our friend’s statement that Jotham’s apologue had a foundation in fact, is to suppose that he means to say that in Jotham’s time there were such things as trees, vines, and brambles. Well, so there were such things as dead men in Christ’s time. And so the parallel between the two illustrations is perfect. Neither Jotham nor Christ taught that inanimate objects can talk, and nobody was deceived. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.11}

It is very common for people to read their own beliefs into the Bible. Because the majority of the people of the world believe that the soul of man exists after death, they take it for granted that the Jews always believed so, and that the Bible so teaches. Taken as it reads, and allowed to explain itself, the Bible bears very emphatic testimony against the pagan anomaly of a man being alive when he is dead. W. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.12}

**“Women in the Church” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are asked by a subscriber in Washington Territory to explain how the usages of Seventh-day Adventists, and of many other religious bodies as well, can be harmonized with 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35, and 1 Timothy 2:11, 12. He asks: “Were these commands transient? if so, when did they cease to be binding, and by what authority?” He also asks if 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35, is correctly translated in Conybeare and Howson’s “Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.13}

To the last question we would reply that the Authorized Version gives the sense of the text as well as can be done, and is more nearly literal than is Conybeare and Howson’s rendering. The question on the text itself is worthy of consideration, for many good people think that the Bible forbids women to take part in public religious service. 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35, reads as follows:- {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.14}

“Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.15}

It is worthy of mention that those who are most bitterly opposed to women’s taking part in public service, are inconsistent with their own interpretation of this text. They interpret it to mean that women should never speak in public, either to preach, or to bear testimony in prayer-meeting; yet there is not a church in the land which does not have women singers, and in many of them the singing would greatly languish if it were not for the women. Now it is certain that those who sing do not “keep silence.” We do not think that this is wrong, not a violation of Paul’s injunction; we cite this instance merely for the purpose of showing the inconsistency of those who interpret Paul’s words as prohibiting speaking in meeting, but allowing singing. Now if the injunction to “keep silence” does not prohibit singing, it is reasonable to suppose that it does not prohibit speaking at proper times and in a proper manner, for simple speaking is far more nearly an approach to silence than is ordinary singing. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.16}

And this we shall find to be the case, when we consider a few other texts; for we must always let scripture explain scripture. Read the other text to which our correspondent referred, 1 Timothy 2:11, 12: “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.” This must certainly be considered as parallel to, and explanatory of, 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35. But there is nothing in it which would stop a woman from bearing testimony in social meeting, or even from preaching. Notice that Paul says: “I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man,” the idea being of a women’s setting herself up as superior, and assuming authority which does not belong to her. But a simple testimony for Christ is the farthest removed from the assumption of authority, and even the preacher who usurps authority over his hearers, is out of place. The place of the preacher is not to be a lord over God’s heritage, but to act the part of an ambassador for Christ. From the two texts quoted we must conclude that Paul did not mean to prohibit women from witnessing publicly for Christ, but only to have them act with becoming modesty. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.17}

This conclusion is made positive by other texts. In 1 Corinthians 11:4, 5, 13, the same apostle says: “Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head; for that is even all one as if she were shaven.” “Judge in yourselves; is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.18}

In these verses, and the context, the apostle is giving directions for the proper conducting of public worship. Now if in chapter 14 he meant to teach that women should utter no sound in public service, why did he here give directions concerning their praying and speaking in public assemblies? Certainly no directions are needed for the performance of that which is forbidden, and the fact that Paul tells how women should pray and prophesy in public meeting, shows that such action was not forbidden. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.19}

To forbid women any of the *privileges* of the gospel would be utterly at variance with the spirit of the gospel. Says Paul: “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Galatians 3:27, 28. That means that in the gospel plan there is no difference made for race, condition, or sex. A woman stands before God a sinner, just the same as a man; she is responsible for her own sins, and, if saved, must be saved in exactly the same way that a man is. No Christian would think of prohibiting a person from taking part in meeting, on the ground that he is a servant, or because he is of a different nationality from the majority of the members of the church; then no Christian should prevent a person from speaking to the praise of God, because that person is a woman. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.20}

To interpret Paul’s language in 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35, as meaning that women should bear no part in public worship is to do violence to the Scriptures which, being inspired, must always and everywhere be harmonious. Thus in Acts 21:8, 9, we read that Philip the evangelist “had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.” Paul speaks of Phebe, “a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea” (Romans 16:1), and in Philippians 4:3 bespeaks the care of the church for “those women which labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other fellow-laborers.” And the mighty and eloquent Apollos was instructed in the way of God by Aquila and his wife Priscilla. Acts 18:2, 24-26. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.21}

In the Old Testament we read of “Miriam the prophetess” (Exodus 15:20) by whom the Lord spoke as well as by Moses and Aaron (Numbers 12:1, 2). We read also (Judges 4) of “Deborah, a prophetess” who judged Israel, and whose wisdom and prudence were esteemed so highly that Barak would not go to war without her counsel and her presence. Still later we read of “Huldah the prophetess” (2 Kings 22:14) to whom Josiah sent when he would inquire of the Lord concerning the book of the law which the priest had found. There is something remarkable about this case. At this time Jeremiah had been prophesying for five years, yet the king sent to Huldah instead of to him. Moreover the king’s messengers to the prophetess were, among others, a scribe of the law, and the high priest, whose lips should keep knowledge, and at whose mouth men were accustomed to seek the law. Micah 2:7. Yet it seems that on this occasion no one had the word of the Lord except this woman. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 278.22}

We have considered this matter at this length not only for the satisfaction of our correspondent, but also to meet a very common infidel cavil. There are many men, and more women, of a class who seek to overthrow the divinely-established order of nature, who are accustomed to rail at the apostle Paul as a crusty old bachelor and a misogynist, because of his words to the Corinthians. Hastily assuming that he absolutely forbade women to take any part in public meetings, they think that the present liberty accorded to women is an evidence of the advance which people of the nineteenth century have made over Paul’s antiquated notions. From railing at Paul they naturally come to despise all his writings, and as a natural consequence, they lightly esteem the entire Bible. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 279.1}

But Paul was not crusty, he was not a misogynist, and he was not a bachelor. He was a large-hearted, whole-souled, loving Christian, who treats of the family relation with a knowledge and tenderness not exceeded by any writer who ever lived. Instead of commanding women to say nothing in meetings for the worship of God, he encouraged them even to occupy responsible positions. What he did do was to give instruction that would keep them from being classed with the heathen women who, in their eagerness for notice, divested themselves of that modesty which always characterizes true woman, and which the gospel tends to heighten. W. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 279.2}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the way that prohibition was defeated in Michigan: The *Union Signal* states that one of the northern precincts which has a population of 1,200 men, women, and children, returned 1,800 votes against prohibition. One ward in Detroit returned sixteen prohibition votes, when sixty men stated upon oath that they had deposited prohibition ballots in the box. Such frauds alone would be sufficient to show that the liquor traffic is of the devil. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.1}

The *Independent’s* report of the revival meetings in Cleveland says: “Solo singing will cease to be a feature in these meetings. Perhaps this feature, for a time so popular will be less popular in evangelistic meetings hereafter, and there will be a return to the earlier practice of the time of Finney, Nettleton, Kirke, and Foote. It has been noticeable here that the people have called for familiar congregational hymns. The effect of this congregational singing has been marked. No solo singing could compare with it for moving power.” This will be found always to be the case. Solo singing has no rightful place in the worship of God. We love to hear a vocal artist, merely as an artist, but praise is a part of worship that cannot be done by proxy. “Praise Him, all ye people.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.2}

On the 28th of April, Elder A. T. Jones, of this office, accompanied by Brother M. J. Church, of Fresno, Cal., left Oakland to attend the annual National Reform Convention which was appointed to be held in Pittsburgh, Penn., May 11 and 12. The convention was first appointed to be held in Chicago, but the managers concluded that the atmosphere of Pittsburg would be more congenial. The readers of the SIGNS will be favored with a report of the proceedings and temper of the convention; but the *American Sentinel*, which Elder Jones specially represents, will contain the fullest reports and also reviews of the subjects discussed. The *Sentinel*, true to its name, intends to closely watch the work of National Reform (false so called), and those who wish to keep informed as to the growth and character of the organization which, under the guise of Christianity, aims to overthrow religious freedom in this country, should take that paper. Send your address and fifty cents to *American Sentinel*, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal., and receive the paper for one year. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.3}

We often speak of Roman Catholicism in terms of condemnation. We cannot speak of it in any other terms, if we speak of it at all, because the Bible calls it “that Wicked,” the “mystery of iniquity,” the “man of sin,” the “transgression of desolation,” and has declared it to be “full of names of blasphemy,” “BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” But while this is true, we would not for a moment be understood as speaking against individuals who are classed as members of that body. We speak against the system of iniquity, and not against those who are deceived by it. That God recognizes many of his people among the members of the Roman Catholic Church, and churches which are allied to her, is evident from his call, “Come out of her, my people.” There are still souls in that body who are honest at heart as Luther was; and no one should despise anyone who, as was Luther, is a zealous devotee, for he may be one of God’s people. Indeed, the servant of God is not warranted in despising any man; those who are willfully following error, are deserving of our pity. “For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, and living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.4}

And now comes “a new revelation” which is “vouchsafed to the saints through Joseph Smith the prophet,” which settles the question of Sunday observance, for the present, at least. The “revelation” was given at Kirtland, Ohio, April 11, 1887, and the section to which we refer reads as follows:- {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.5}

“And the Spirit sayeth further: Inasmuch as there has been much discussion in the past concerning the Sabbath of the Lord, the church is admonished that, until further revelation is received, or the quorums of the church are assembled to decide concerning the law in the church articles and covenants, the saints are to observe the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord’s day, as a day of rest; as a day of worship, as given in the covenants and commandments. And on this day they should refrain from unnecessary work; nevertheless, nothing should be permitted to go to waste on that day nor should necessary work be neglected. Be not harsh in judgment but merciful in this, as in all other things. Be not hypocrites nor of those who make a man an offender for a word.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.6}

Now that is something tangible. We are inclined to the opinion that the Mormons are ahead of their Gentile neighbors who are still searching around in the Bible, for some “dark saying” which by ingenious manipulation may be made to serve as an “inference” that Sunday is the day that should be observed. Positive testimony, even from questionable authority, is so much more convenient than no testimony at all from reliable authority, that first-day observers as a class will doubtless erelong take points from the Mormons. Indeed they have long since taken steps in that direction, in the manufactured testimony from the Fathers. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.7}

The *Christian at Work* says:- {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.8}

“Holy Thursday was observed by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of Brooklyn in a union service and a communion celebration in the evening. This shows that harmonious state of feeling among the non-episcopal denominations at least in this vicinity. This, we may add, is not the first service of the kind, as it is pretty sure not to be the last.” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.9}

“Holy Thursday,” indeed! What an expression to be found in a professed Protestant paper! and what a practice for Presbyterians to be engaged in! Whence came its holiness? Oh, “his holiness”-the usurper of Christ’s place as head of the church, the representative of the “man of sin”-has at some time pronounced upon it his benediction, and since the professed Protestants have persistently clung to the Papal Sunday, they are beginning, like consistent persons, to recognize all other Popish festivals. Soon Catholicism and a dead Protestantism that has ceased to protest, will unite on a level (the Catholic level, every time), and then what “a harmonious state of feeling” there will be. No; we are sure that this will not be the last service of the kind. Professed Protestants who *will*, in spite of all reason, persist in observing a counterfeit Sabbath which has no authority but pagan and papal precept and practice, must sooner or later accept all other festivals appointed by the same authority. We rejoice to know that there are yet thousands who will really protest against the abominations of Rome. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.10}

The matter of unfermented wine at communion has been much agitated of late in California. We are confident that many oppose the use of unfermented wine at communions, because they either think there can be no such thing, or else they have seen only poor samples of it. For instance, Dr. Thompson, of Berkeley, stated in a recent discussion: Professor Rising of the University has analyzed several specimens of unfermented wine, and has found that they all contained salicylic acid. He told of a young man who had been poisoned nearly to death by using wine in which salicylic acid had been placed as a preservative. He is reported as saying sarcastically that “some churches preferred salicylic acid to alcohol as a preservative agent in their wines, and he was in favor of allowing them to take their choice.” For our part we shall choose neither. Notwithstanding the sarcastic insinuation that wine can be preserved only by alcohol or by some acid which is not much to be preferred, we know that good wine contains neither the one nor the other as a preservative agent, but consists solely of unfermented grape juice, without the addition of a particle of anything else. We can verify this statement to any who doubt it. There is no excuse whatever for churches putting temptation in the way of the work, or of mocking Christ by using decomposed grape juice to represent his precious blood. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.11}

**“Only an Echo” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the annual convention of the Baptist Churches of California, recently held in Oakland, there was considerable discussion over the “new theology.” “Probation after Death” was the subject of a paper read by Dr. Frost, who styled that unscriptural theory the “great hypothesis,” and said: “The great hypothesis was first in vogue among the nations of heathendom, and there is reason to believe that probation after death is the inspiration of the prince of the power of the air, of the power of darkness. It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, ‘Thou shalt not surely die.’” {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.12}

Nobody could have stated the case more forcibly and aptly. All talk of the “larger hope” of a probation after death is simply the devil’s device to induce men to slight the gospel and become hardened in sin. It is not a new device, for, as Dr. Frost says, it was popular among the ancient heathen; it has been the strength of Roman Catholicism, but it remained for the present generation to attempt to make it appear to be a part of Protestant Christianity. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.13}

The question that agitates the minds of those who are not willing to see Protestantism wholly paganized is, “How shall we check this growing delusion?” The answer is not difficult, and should be suggested to everyone by the statement which Dr. Frost makes as to its origin. Says he: “It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, ‘Thou shalt not surely die.’” Common sense would say, Stop the preaching from that text, and the echo will necessarily cease. There can be no echo without some noise preceding it; when the noise ceases, the echo will cease. And it is a truth that the theory of probation after death is the legitimate result of the doctrine of the indestructibility of the human soul, which doctrine was first preached by Satan, and which is being repeated by thousands of Christian ministers, who are astonished that there should be any echo. Abandon the unscriptural theory that the soul of man cannot die, and probation after death would need no one to combat it. On the other hand, so long as Christian preachers persistently hold that man is by nature immortal, the hypothesis of probation after death will find a hearing. The echo will not die out so long as that which causes it continues. {SITI May 12, 1887, p. 286.14}

**“Words and Thoughts” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The psalmist prayed, “Give ear to my words, O Lord; and consider my meditation.” Psalm 5:1. How few there are who could from the heart make that request? Who would like to have the Lord listen to all that they say? Certainly not they who blaspheme, or who use vulgar, idle, or foolish words, which they would not want even a good man to hear. Yet whether we wish God to hear our words, or not, we may rest assured that he does consider them, for, says the psalmist, “there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.” Psalm 124:1. And those words are recorded, for the Saviour says: “But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” Matthew 12:36, 37. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 293.1}

Then there is our meditation. That is worse still, for every heart has cherished thoughts that have never been formed into words, because the individual would not betray his real character to his associates. It is the thoughts which mark the measure and character of the man. “As he thinketh in his heart, so is he.” Many people who pass for upright Christians, would be seen to be wholly corrupt, if their thoughts were but laid open to public view. Well, whether we pray that God will consider our meditation or not, we may rest assured that he does do so, “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.” Hebrews 4:12, 13. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 293.2}

The heart of mind of man is to the Lord like a printed page. He knows all its imaginings. And the time is coming when not only the Lord, but all the world, will be able to read the secrets of the heart. The apostle says that when the Lord comes he will “bring to light the hidden thing of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart.” 1 Corinthians 4:5. That will be the time when he who now is lifted up shall be terribly abased. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 293.3}

Who is the one, then, who can ask the Lord to consider his meditation, and who will not be put to shame in the Judgment? It is he whose delight is in the law of the Lord, in which he meditates day and night. It is he whose works are committed to the Lord, and whose thoughts are consequently established. It is he who is pure I heart. What a blessed condition does that man occupy, who can rejoice in the thought that the pure and holy God knows all his thoughts and approves them. Our daily prayer should be: “Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer.” Psalm 19:14. W. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 293.4}

**“‘He Descended into Hell’”**

E. J. Waggoner

This is one clause of the so-called apostles’ creed, which was formulated somewhere between the fourth and the ninth centuries, and which is now adopted by nearly the whole of Christendom. The sentiment was evidently based on the mistranslation of the Greek word *hades*, in Acts 2:27, and a misconception of 1 Peter 3:18-20. In the last number but one of the SIGNS, we showed what this text really does mean, and now, according to promise, we propose to show what it does not mean; that it cannot by any possibility mean that in the interval between his crucifixion and his resurrection Christ went to some unknown region where wicked spirits were confined, and preached to them. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.1}

It cannot be possible that the thousands who are accustomed to interpret 1 Peter 3:18-20 as we have just indicated, as proof that what we call death is not really death, have any idea of all that such an interpretation involves. A few words, however, will suffice to show any candid, thinking person that those who use this text to prove the immortality of the soul, thereby open the door for the introduction of some grievous heresies. If it were true that the “spirits in prison,” of whom Peter speaks, were preached to by Christ in person in the period between his crucifixion and his resurrection, then we should be forced to admit,- {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.2}

1. That there is a probation after death. For preaching is for the purpose of saving those who will believe. 1 Corinthians 1:21; Romans 10:13, 14. It makes no difference whether the ones preached to will believe and repent or not; the fact that they are preached to, shows that there is a possibility of their repenting, and therefore they are still on probation. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.3}

2. We should also have to admit the Catholic dogma of purgatory, for that doctrine is based chiefly on this common perversion of this text. Purgatory and probation after death are practically synonymous. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.4}

3. Prayers for the dead would follow as a necessary consequence. For if souls are in a condition to be preached to, they are on probation; and if they are on probation, there is a possibility that they may be saved; and if there is a possibility that they may be saved, all good people ought to, and will, pray that they may be saved. It is not necessary here to show how unscriptural all these positions are, for nearly all Protestants are agreed that they are unscriptural; what we design is to show those who reject purgatory and prayers for the dead, that they cannot do so consistently without also rejecting the dogma of the natural immortality of the soul. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.5}

Another point: The same ones who use 1 Peter 3:18-20 as proving that the man does not wholly die, use Christ’s reply to the thief on the cross (Luke 23:43) to prove the same thing. From the one they claim that Christ descended into some place where the wicked antediluvians were kept, and preached to them, and from the other they claim that immediately after his death he went to paradise. These two positions destroy each other, for if Christ spent the time between his death and his resurrection in preaching to wicked spirits in purgatory, he certainly did not go to the “paradise of God.” Some people seeing the inconsistency of these two positions, both of which are wrong, have sought to evade it by taking another position equally erroneous, namely, that those wicked spirits were in paradise! As many people are in doubt over this point, we shall, erelong, show from the Bible what and where paradise is. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.6}

But does not the Bible say something about Christ being in hell? It does say that he was in a place which King James’s translation incorrectly rendered “hell,” but which the revisers have very properly left untranslated, namely, *hades*. In Acts 2:25-31 we read the following:- {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.7}

“For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved; therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre 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, neither his flesh did see corruption.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.8}

The words which Peter here quoted, “Because thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*,” are found in Psalm 16:10 where the Hebrew word corresponding to *hades* in the New Testament is *sheol*. Let us now examine a few texts to ascertain the nature of this place, who go there, and their condition while there. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.9}

1. Good people go there. This is proved by the fact that Christ went there. Jacob said to his sons who thought to comfort him after Joseph was taken away, “I will go down into the grave [*sheol*] unto my son mourning.” Genesis 37:35. He expected to go to *sheol*, and he knew that Joseph, if dead, was there. When Christ comes and calls the righteous from their graves, and the saying is brought to pass that is written, “Death is swallowed up in victory,” they will shout, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave [*hades*], where is thy victory?” 1 Corinthians 15:51-55. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.10}

2. Wicked people also go there. David says of the wicked: “Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward. Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer.” Psalm 19:11-14. We read also of the rebellious princes of Israel, that “the ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods. They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; and they perished from among the congregation.” Numbers 16:31-33. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.11}

3. All must go to this place. Says David: “What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave [*sheol*]?” Psalm 89:48. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.12}

4. The souls as well as the bodies of men and likewise animals, go there. See Numbers 16:31-33; Psalm 49:15; 89:48; Acts 2:31, etc. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.13}

5. The wicked who go there are silent. Says David: “Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave [*sheol*].” Psalm 31:17. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.14}

6. The righteous who go there do not call on the Lord. “For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave [*sheol*] who shall give thee thanks?” “The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.” Psalm 115:17. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.15}

7. Not only do the righteous not praise the Lord in *sheol* but no one who goes there can be converted to the truth. Said Hezekiah: “For the grave [*sheol*] cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.” Isaiah 38:18. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.16}

8. It is a land of forgetfulness. “Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?” Psalm 88:10-12. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.17}

9. Finally, it is a place where there is absolutely no consciousness of anything. “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave [*sheol*], whither thou goest.” Ecclesiastes 9:10. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.18}

10. Dead people cannot think. “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm 118:3, 4. See also John 11:21; Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, etc. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.19}

These texts show conclusively that it is absolutely impossible that at the time of Christ’s crucifixion there could have been any of the antediluvian sinners, or any others who had died, capable of listening to preaching, or that Christ could have preached to them or to anybody else, between his crucifixion and his resurrection. In addition to these texts, we may note that Christ’s soul was in *hades*, whence it was rescued only by his resurrection (Acts 2:31); that it was Christ’s soul that was made an offering for sin (Isaiah 53:10); and that his soul was poured out unto death (Isaiah 53:12). Surely lovers of the Bible ought to accept the simple, consistent statements of that book, rather than a view which makes the Bible contradict itself, and brings in a train of pernicious heresies. W. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.20}

**“The Lord’s Prayer. Lead Us Not into Temptation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

This petition cannot well be considered apart from that which immediately follows it: “but deliver us from evil.” Both together form a fitting climax to this wonderful prayer, for they indicate, if used understandingly, the soul’s desire for purity of heart. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.21}

There are two senses in which the word tempted is used in the Bible. The apostle says: “My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations.” James 1:2. Again he says: “But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.” Verse 14. Now it is evident that the apostle would not exhort men to count it a joyful thing to be drawn away of their own lust, and enticed into sin; therefore the temptation of the second verse is different from that of the fourteenth. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.22}

The temptation of the second verse is that which is successfully met, and which leaves the individual stronger than ever. It is the trying of faith. In Ephesians 6:16 we learn that faith is the shield by which the darts of the wicked may be quenched. The office of a shield is to protect the person. If a missle is received upon the shield, the person at whom it was aimed receives no injury; he does not feel it. The temptations, then, which work patience, and which strengthen, are those which meet with no response in our own hearts, but which are instantly repelled. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.23}

The other temptations are those which are entertained in the heart. The sin presents itself, and the mind goes out towards it, and longs for it. It may be that the overt act is never committed, but since “the thought of foolishness is sin” (Proverbs 24:9), the one who only in imagination does the sinful act is in the sight of God accounted guilty. Such temptations as those are natural to every human being, “for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.24}

The petition “*lead* us not into temptation,” must be understood as meaning, “suffer us not to fall into temptation;” and it must also be understood as referring to the second class of temptations,-those which proceed from within. The reason is (1) that we are not to ask freedom from trials, but rather to count them a blessing, and (2) that God cannot and does not lead people into sin. The prayer, then, is “suffer us not to fall into foolish and hurtful lust, but deliver us (keep us back) from evil.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.25}

This cannot mean that God will not allow a man to act out the evil that is in him, for that would be impossible; if evil is in the heart, it must show itself, and we are expressly told that at one time God left a man to do what his heart prompted him to do. The man was Hezekiah. After he had been healed, the Babylonian ambassadors came to congratulate, and he showed them all the treasures of his kingdom. 2 Kings 20:12, 13. This action was prompted by pride. 2 Chronicles 32:24, 25. The historian, speaking of this, says: “Howbeit in the business of the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon, who sent unto him to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land, God left him, to try him, that he might know all that was in his heart.” 2 Chronicles 32:31. We must therefore conclude that the petition “lead us not into temptation” does not mean that God is to interpose his mighty power to miraculously preserve us from the wickedness that is in our own hearts. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 294.26}

There can be, then, but one conclusion, and that is that the prayer implies a renunciation and hatred of sin, and a desire to have the heart cleansed from it, and to be strengthened again allowing it to pass the shield of faith, and gain access to the heart. This is the only way that temptations can be instantly repelled, since, as we have read, evil thoughts are natural to the human heart. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.1}

It was to effect this that Christ came into the earth. It is not enough that we be freed from the guilt of sin,-from past transgressions,-but we must be freed from the love of sin. Paul says that Christ “gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.” Galatians 1:1. This “present evil world” does not mean the physical creation, but “all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.” 1 John 2:16. Again we read that he “gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.” Titus 2:14. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.2}

This is what God wants to do for us; it is what we are to ask him to do for us, for he will not do it against our will. What is there to hinder his doing it? Nothing, if we offer the prayer in all sincerity, “lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.” We cannot cleanse ourselves from the defilement of sin, however much we may desire to be freed from it (Proverbs 20:9); but if we do earnestly desire to be kept from sin, God will work in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure (Philippians 2:13), and that will be to make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is good. Hebrews 13:21. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.3}

But while this is in one sense a passive state, in that it is an entire yielding of self to God, it is by no means a state of inactivity. “Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.” James 4:7. “Strive to enter in at the strait gate.” Luke 13:24. There is to be a constant watchfulness against the insidious assaults of the enemy. A reaching out after God implies a drawing away from sin. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.4}

This part of the Lord’s prayer cannot be uttered from the heart, except of him who with the psalmist can say, “I hate vain thoughts, but thy law do I love.” And this cannot be done until the individual realizes that fellowship with God is the only thing to be desired,-that the loving-kindness of God is better than life. Every man in the world will have just what he wants. If he loves the pleasures of sin, he will be left to its lusting enjoyment; but if his heart and his soul cry out after God, the promise is that he shall be filled. W. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.5}

**“Liquor and the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

A case that recently occurred in New York, in connection with the enforcement of the Sunday law, is somewhat significant. Some liquor sellers were brought before the court, when their counsel contended that they had not violated the law, because it forbids selling liquor on *the Sabbath*, and that Sabbath means the seventh day of the week, while they had sold it on the first day. This puzzled the Judge, until he consulted Webster’s Dictionary, where he learned that “the Sabbath of Christians is on Sunday.” Accordingly the men were convicted. We have no sympathy with saloon men, but we note this as showing that in the enforcement of Sunday laws, custom, and not reason is the guide. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.6}

**“Conditional Immortality—What Is It?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the Baptist Convention recently held in this city, one of the essays, written and read by a prominent clergyman, contained the following:- {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.7}

“Two of the foremost nations of the world stand face to face with two great problems. Conditional immortality is leavening the Church of England, and probation after death is sapping the foundation of Congregationalism.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.8}

From the fact that the essayist connected conditional immortality with probation after death, which he regards as a dangerous heresy, we conclude that he regards conditional immortality in the same light. We know, indeed, that many people do regard that doctrine as a pernicious one, and we are forced to conclude that, if they are honest, their aversion is due to ignorance of what conditional immortality is. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.9}

What *is* meant by conditional immortality? Simply this, that immortality, or eternal life, which is the same thing, is conditioned upon the individual’s belief in Christ. It means that “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. It is the doctrine which our Saviour himself taught, when he said: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 3:36. Or as expressed by the apostle: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” 1 John 5:11. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.10}

It is the doctrine which Christ taught to Nicodemus in these words: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. It is the doctrine which gives Christ his rightful title of Life-giver, which he himself claimed, when he said: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” John 10:10. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.11}

To hear the same men talk, one would get the idea that the doctrine of conditional immortality is rank infidelity, and utterly opposed to all true Christianity. As a matter of fact, it is based on the reception of the fact that in all things Christ has the preeminence; that man can have nothing except as he gets it through Christ. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.12}

As a matter of fact, a denial of the doctrine of conditional immortality is to that extent a denial of Christ. Indeed, we may truly say that it is wholly a denial of Christ, since it denies the very thing for which Christ came. He himself declares that his only object, by believing on him, have life. Now the man who says that eternal life is not conditioned upon his believing in Christ, virtually says that man has no need of Christ. This was just what so many of the ancient Jews did, to whom Christ sadly said, “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.” They did not profess to be Christians; they rejected Christ unreservedly. Is it not strange that in these days Christ is rejected in exactly the same way by those who profess to love and honor him? Why should people refuse to acknowledge their indebtedness to Christ for all that they have or hope to have? W. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 295.13}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last Sunday evening (May 15) a series of meetings was begun in a 60-foot tent on the corner of 8th and Myrtle Street, Oakland, with a good attendance. These meetings will continue several weeks during the entire week, and will be devoted to the consideration of the prophecies for this time, and practical Bible truth in general. Preaching will begin every evening and 7:45, except Sunday evenings, when the service will begin at 7:30. Services will be conducted by Elders J. O. Corliss and R. S. Owen. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.1}

The international convention of the Young Men’s Christian Association was held in San Francisco last week. Delegates were present from every state and territory in the union, and from some foreign countries. This week there is a Secretaries’ Conference in Oakland. California is no longer regarded as outside the world, and societies and associations of all classes are holding general meetings here. We are glad to know that the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is going to fall into line and meet here next fall. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.2}

The *Christian Cyneour* says that it is “sorry to see in the *United Presbyterian* a strong apology for Good Friday and Easter, on the ground that the doctrine and fact of the resurrection deserve a prominent place in pulpit instruction, and if a certain time for this is not set apart by the authority of some pope, our pious and godly pastors will forget it.” And in this connection the same paper indorses certain views of Dr. Howard Crosby, and says that he “reasons strongly and truly upon this Easter matter, showing that the popular celebration has no foundation in Scripture, and therefore should not be observed.” Yet the *Cycamore* calls Sunday “the Sabbath” and “Lord’s day,” strangely losing sight of the fact that this festival stands upon precisely the same ground as Easter and Good Friday. The latter have just as much foundation in the Scriptures as the former, and they are vastly less potent for evil, for the reason that they do not displace a divinely ordained day, or render necessary the violation of the law of God, as does Sunday-keeping. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.3}

The *Christian Register* (Unitarian) has published a series of letters from prominent scientific men, in answer to questions as to whether or not the immortality of the soul is proved to any degree by science. The *Christian Union* says of these answers: “A considerable divergence of opinions is exhibited. On the whole, however, the letters are not encouraging reading to a Christian believer. The weight of authority, we should say, appears to be in support of the doctrine that the question lies wholly without the pale of science, properly so-called, though we judge that those who give this answer mean by science simply natural science. One or two of the writers take the position that the doctrine of immortality rests wholly on revelation.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.4}

And this is said to be discouraging reading for Christians. We can’t see how it can concern Christians in the least. Christ brings “life and immortality to light through the gospel,” and he is our life. The fact that science confesses itself ignorant of a future life, should not be at all discouraging to the Christian. The true Christian will not seek to “demonstrate” the immortality of the soul. They who claim inherent immortality for men, seek to rob Christ of his divine prerogative of Lifegiver. It certainly should cause no sorrow to a Christian to know that immortality is unknown outside of Christ. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.5}

The only day of the week which is named in the Bible is the seventh day. That is called the Sabbath. All other days of the week are invariably referred to by their number, but the last day of the week is most commonly known by its title, Sabbath. Since the time when the Bible was written, names have been given to all the days of the week. The first day is called Sunday, the second, Monday, the third, Tuesday, etc. A secular title, Saturday, has also been given to the seventh day, but its only true name is Sabbath. Knowing this, we can see the absurdity of the note in Webster’s dictionary, which says that “the Sabbath of the Christians is on Sunday.” But there is only one Sabbath, and how can that come on Sunday? It would be just as reasonable to say that the Monday of the Chinese comes on Wednesday, or that the Sunday of the Mohammedans comes on Friday. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.6}

The Psalmist prayed: “The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; .... Grant thee according to thine own heart, and fulfil all thy counsel.” Psalm 20:1, 4. That is a comprehensive request, and it would seem that it could not be granted; at any rate there are very few people who have all they want. Yet in the very next psalm we read, “Thou hast given him his heart’s desire, and hast not withholden the request of his lips.” Psalm 21:2. There was one, at least, who had everything he wished for, and we are assured that anyone may fare as well. The psalmist again says: “Delight thyself also in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart.” Psalm 37:4. The condition is, delight thyself in the Lord. now we can understand it. He who delights himself in the Lord, will not delight himself in things which are contrary to the Lord and his righteousness, and if he does not delight in them he will not want them. If he delights in the Lord, he will desire only that which will tend to make his union with the Lord still closer, and the promise is that they who hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.7}

The *Independent* says of the Sabbath-day during which Jesus lay in the tomb: “It was a day not to be recorded; a day to block out of the calendar of history. So none of the evangelists tell us anything of that ever-to-be-forgotten day.” It must be that the editor of that paper has seldom, and possibly never, read Luke 23:55, 56: “And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment.” This is all that is recorded of that day, but it is enough; it is all there was to record. The disciples did not do any thing, they simply rested, and it takes but few words to state that simple fact. All the record we have of the first seventh day of time is that God rested upon it; we are told to remember every seventh day, to keep it holy; and we are also told that these humble disciples kept that one Sabbath “according to the commandment.” What a shout would go up if only one recorded instance of a rest upon the first day, could be found in the Bible. {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.8}

**“A Significant Paragraph” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The “narrative” read at a recent session of the Presbytery of Oregon, contains the following significant paragraph:- {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.9}

“From almost every part of the presbytery comes a bitter lamentation over the excessive worldliness which surrounds and which in too many cases exists in the church. No particular form of evil is spoken of—but simply a general encroachment of the world upon the church, or a kind of indifference upon the subject of religion.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.10}

This is significant, because we know from the Bible that it is characteristic of the last days. “Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold,” said the Saviour, and on every hand we see his words fulfilled to-day. Thousands everywhere are in the condition described by the apostle, “having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof;” and while it is probably true that no one form of evil is particularly prevalent, “the general encroachment of the world upon the church,” and “indifference upon the subject of religion,” indicate that we are in that time when iniquity abounds; but the Saviour added, “He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved;” and we should comfort our hearts with this thought and be assured that “the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.11}

**“Antichrist” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

From an editorial in the last number of the *Catholic Mirror*, we take the following extracts reflecting the idolatry which the Papal Church imposes upon those who blindly accept its teachings-: {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.12}

“Devotion to the blessed virgin is the best indication of the faith and sincerity that dwell in the Catholic heart.” “Her office is that of protectoress of the weak and faltering, and the dispenser of mercies and graces, flowing from the fountain of all good.” “It is inconceivable that a Catholic who understands the position of Mary,-the attitude of powerful mediatrix in which she lovingly stands between him, in his ever-recurring lapses from the narrow path, and the justice of God,-should fail to be drawn towards her by the strongest and deepest feelings of reverence and devotion.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.13}

“Devotion to the blessed virgin, we are told by some of the greatest saints who illustrated the truth of this belief in their own lives, is the surest passport to eternal exaltation.” {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.14}

The Bible student will readily see that Christ is left altogether out of the account in this *dictum*, which denies such statements as that the name of Jesus is the only one under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved (Acts 4:12); and that “God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above very name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth and things under the earth.” Philippians 2:9, 10. And yet there are thousands of professed Protestants who are almost ready to stone anyone who says that the Papacy is antichrist! {SITI May 19, 1887, p. 304.15}

**“What and Where Is Paradise?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

“And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Luke 23:42, 43. This language will be recognized at once as the request of the penitent thief who was crucified with Jesus, and the reply of our Lord. It has been the subject of an unlimited amount of controversy, and doubtless will be, as long as men choose to interpret the Bible according to their system of theology, instead of deriving their system of theology wholly from the Bible. We do not design at this time to give a detailed exposition of the text, but simply to note a few points concerning paradise. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.1}

From Christ’s language to Mary, recorded in John 20:17, three days after the crucifixion, it is very evident that he did not go to Heaven on the day when he gave the thief the solemn assurance that they should meet in paradise. On account of this text, many who cling tenaciously to the idea that Jesus did not actually die, argue that Christ did go to paradise that day, but that paradise is not in Heaven. Then they connect this text with their erroneous reading of 1 Peter 3:18-20, and conclude that paradise is a sort of half-way house-an intermediate place between earth and heaven-where all souls, both good and bad, are retained until the Judgment. In short, paradise is made identical with hades. A very few texts will suffice to show that this is a most erroneous conclusion. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.2}

First, however, we wish to call attention to the fact that if this definition of paradise were true, the Saviour’s promise to the thief would be made nonsense. If paradise were only a place where souls remain between death and the final judgment, then Christ’s promise to the penitent thief would amount simply to this: To-day shalt thou be with me in the place of the dead! There would certainly be nothing very comforting about that, and nothing that would require the exercise of much faith, seeing both Jesus and the thief were at that time hanging on the cross; but this is what Christ’s answer meant, if the theory be true that paradise and hades are identical. This fact alone should be sufficient to show the fallacy of such a view. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.3}

There are only three places in the Bible where the word “paradise” is used. One is in the text quoted at the beginning of this article. The second is in 2 Corinthians 12:2-4, which we quote:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.4}

“I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.5}

This text proves conclusively that paradise is not an intermediate place between earth and Heaven, but that it is Heaven itself. In the first place, Paul says that he (for he speaks of himself) was caught up into the third Heaven, and then in repeating the statement for emphasis, he says that he was caught up into paradise. Then Christ’s promise to the thief on the cross involved nothing less than that the thief should be with him in the third Heaven. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.6}

In Revelation 2:7 we find the following promise, given by the Spirit:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.7}

“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.8}

From this text we learn that paradise contains the tree of life. Turn now to Revelation 22:1, 2, and read: “And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life.” Here we learn that the tree of life is in the midst of the New Jerusalem, which contains the throne of God. But the tree of life is in the midst of the paradise of God (Revelation 2:7); therefore we must conclude that the paradise of God is in the midst of the city of God, and that whoever goes to paradise goes into the immediate presence of God. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.9}

“Paradise” is an Anglicized Greek word meaning a park or a beautiful garden. Earthly cities have parks and pleasure gardens, and the heavenly Jerusalem has one also, but as much more beautiful than earthly gardens as the city whose builder and maker is God, is grander than cities built by man. Now compare this with Ezekiel 28:13: “Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold.” Read with this the description of the New Jerusalem, in the twenty-first of Revelation, and it will be seen at once that the Garden of Eden and paradise are the same. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.10}

When Adam sinned, he was driven from the Garden of Eden; nothing sinful could be allowed to remain there. So we read of the New Jerusalem which contains the paradise of God, that “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.” Revelation 21:27. This, together with Revelation 2:7 and 22:14, teaches us that entrance into paradise, and enjoyment of its delights, is to be the reward of those who shall overcome through faith in Christ. But the righteous are rewarded only at the coming of the Lord in his kingdom and the resurrection of the just (Matthew 16:27; 25:31; Luke 14:14); and that was just what the thief asked for in the words, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.” W. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.11}

**“One Probation Enough” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Let favour be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness; in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord.” Isaiah 26:10. This text is of itself sufficient to show the folly of the claims that after death there will be another probation for those who have not accepted Christ in this life. Of course the text does not mean that the grace of God is entirely in vain, and that no wicked persons will turn from their wicked ways, for Paul says that the grace of God does bring salvation (Titus 2:11); and if it were not for the grace of God, as manifested in the gift of his Son, it would be impossible for anybody to repent. But it does mean that those who will not repent in consequence of the ordinary manifestations of God’s favor, would only be hardened still more by greater manifestations of it. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.12}

The case of Pharaoh is right to the point. In the first place he had the same call that is extended to all the world: “Ho, everyone that thirsteth, ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.” This call is to all the world, and included Pharaoh. It cannot be said that he had no chance, for the chosen people of God were right in his own land. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.13}

Then Moses came to him with a message direct from the Lord, saying “Let my people go.” And in order that he might know from whom the message came, miracles were wrought, showing the power of God. Here he had additional opportunity to acknowledge God, but he refused. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.14}

Then God’s judgments began to come, and when the agents of Satan, the magicians, could no longer counterfeit these wonders, the proud king was constrained to beg for the favor of God, whom he had despised. His request was granted, and the frogs were removed: “But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them.” Exodus 8:15. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.15}

Again the power of God was manifested in judgments, and again the king sent for the servants of the Lord, and begged that the plague of flies might be removed. “And Moses went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the Lord. And the Lord did according to the word of Moses; and he removed the swarms of flies from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people; there remained not one. And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go.” Exodus 8:30-32. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.16}

Still closer and closer came the judgments, so that it was absolutely impossible for anyone to doubt the power and majesty of God. The cattle were destroyed, terrible boils broke out upon man and beast, and finally a fearful storm of thunder, hail, and fire, was sent, which destroyed everything in its path. “And Pharaoh sent, and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, I have sinned this time; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked. Entreat the Lord (for it is enough) that there be no more mighty thunderings and hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer.” Exodus 9:27, 28. “And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands unto the Lord: and the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain was not poured upon the earth. And when Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunders were ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants. And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, neither would he let the children of Israel go; as the Lord had spoken by Moses.” Verses 33-35. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.17}

Here we have a perfect illustration of the truth spoken by the prophet Isaiah: “Let favor be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness.” The more favor was showed to Pharaoh, the more hardened he became. It was not until a plague was sent from which there could be no respite, that he relented long enough to let the people go as the Lord had commanded; and even then, when there seemed to be a prospect of no more judgments, he hardened his heart and rushed forth to his own destruction. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.18}

Thus it would be with the wicked if God should grant them a second probation. In this life they have had a chance to see the power of God manifested in both mercy and judgment. Sometimes they have trembled at the near approach of danger, but have hardened their hearts as soon as the danger was past. By and by the Lord will be “revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire.” 2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8. “A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.” Psalm 50:3. Then “the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.” Isaiah 2:11. Everyone will then be willing to confess “that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.19}

Now what would be the result if after all this God should grant the wicked another probation? Both revelation and experience show that they would be worse than they ever were before. To give them another probation, would be worse than casting pearls before swine. The reason for this is, that God never cuts off any sinner while his heart is tender, and when his heart has ceased to be tender, nothing but terrible judgments can make any impression upon him, and the only impression they can make is that of cowardly fear. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.20}

It is true that many of the advocates of a second probation claim that it will be granted only to those who in this life have “not had a fair chance.” That this is a direct charge against the justice of God, will be shown at another time; it is sufficient here to remind the reader that a “second probation” necessarily implies a first, and a probation is a trying, a testing. Therefore to say that any will have a second probation, is to admit that they have been tried once and found wanting. In other words, they have “had a fair chance,” and having refused it, they would count any additional favor an evidence of weakness on the part of God, and would deride him for it. W. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 310.21}

**“The Days of Creation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the notes on the current International Sunday-school Lesson, we find the following comment on the expression, “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth,” etc.:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.1}

“Not in six periods of twenty-four hours; for during the first three, when the sun was not made, there were no such twenty-four-hour days. But divine days (doubtless long periods), beginning from the darkness, and going on with the dawn, or beginning, and to their full maturity.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.2}

The writer thinks that the only reason why the days of creation were not twemty-four-hour days was because (as he says) the sun was not created till after the third was passed. That would imply that after the sun was created the days might be literal days. But if the remaining days were literal days, the first then must have been literal also. Now it is a matter of fact that the sun was made to rule the day; and it would be doing gross violence to the language to say that the word day in Genesis 1:16 means anything different from what it does in every other place where it occurs in the same chapter. But the sun does not rule an indefinite period of time, but simply a twenty-four-hour day. Hence, the days of creation were literal days such as we are familiar with, of which it takes seven to make a week. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.3}

Moreover, the first three days were days of twenty-four hours, just the same as the last four, and every day since. The day is not made by the sun but by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and the earth could revolve if the sun and moon, it did not shine, the language indicates that this was the case. There was “the first day,” “the second day,” and “the third day.” Each of these days was composed of a period of darkness succeeded by a period of light, but the sun did not shine. And the sun and moon were made to be light-bearers, to rule the day and night. The sun was made to rule the day. What day? The day which was already formed by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and which could henceforth be more distinctly marked than before. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.4}

It is a mistaken idea that the sun was not created till the fourth day. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The sun and moon were created “in the beginning,” on the first day, but were not made to be light-bearers until the fourth day. And probably they were not made to assume their present shape until that time. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.5}

There is not a single argument that can be deduced to show that the days of creation were not literal days. The obvious meaning of the text requires that they should be so considered. It is a forced an awkward assumption which makes them long periods,-an assumption which was devised by certain devotees of “science falsely so-called,” in order to avoid excepting the simple truth of the Bible, and which is followed by certain professors of religion, and in order to avoid keeping the Sabbath of the Lord. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.6}

**“Within Thy Gates” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The fourth commandment says of the Sabbath, “in it thou shalt not do any work.... nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.” On this expression, Peloubet’s “Select Notes on the International Lessons” says:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.7}

“Those who come to live in your village or city. Gates are those of the town, not the doors of the house or yard. If heathen come to live in your cities, they must conform to the Sabbath laws; if strangers can do business on the Sabbath, they will soon lead others to do it.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.8}

This is a new interpretation of the commandment, and shows the influence of “National Reform” teachings. The only fault to be found with it is that it makes nonsense of the commandment, and is untrue. 1. The commandment is addressed to the heathen just as much as it is to anybody. They are under just as much obligation to keep the Sabbath in their own land as they are when in a so-called Christian land. 2. The commandment is addressed to individuals, not to committees or towns. Note the language: “In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter,” etc. This is addressed to the individual, not to the town; for the town does not have any son nor daughter. Then since the “thy” before son and daughter necessarily refers to an individual, and not to a collection of individuals, it follows that the “thy” before “gates” has reference to a single individual, for there is no change in the subject. Therefore, “the stranger that is within thy gates,” means the stranger that is within the gates of any man’s house or yard. 3. This language also applies to the heathen in his own land. He is not only commanded to keep the Sabbath, but to see that the Sabbath is not violated by the stranger who visits him. If he fails to do this, he is guilty. The Sabbath law is as binding in a heathen land as in any other. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.9}

By no legitimate interpretation can the commandments be made to have more than an individual application. It is not necessary that they should be applied to nations, as such, for if they are observed by all individuals, they will be observed by nations, and if any individuals do not observe them, they are accountable to God alone for their sin. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 311.10}

**“‘Great Words’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The prophet Daniel, describing the little horn that came up among the ten horns of the great and terrible beast which symbolizes the Roman power, said: “And, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.” Daniel 7:8. These “great words” were said by the angel who interpreted the vision, to be “great words against the Most High.” Verse 25. The prophet John, in describing the same power under the symbol of a beast like a leopard, says: “And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies.” Revelation 13:5. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.1}

In no other thing have commentators been so fully agreed as they have in applying these words to the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope at its head. As the actual fulfillment of a prophecy is the best proof of whether or not any given interpretation is correct, we quote a few of the titles and appellations which have been given to the Pope at various times by his zealous followers, and which the so-called “Holy Father” has received with complacency as rightly belonging to him. The list from which we quote, contains sixty-two different titles; it was collected by S. Francis de Sales, and may be found in Monsignor Capel’s book entitled, “The Pope: The Vicar of Christ; the Head of the Church.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.2}

“Most Divine of all Heads.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.3}

“Holy Father of Fathers, Pontiff Supreme over all Prelates.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.4}

“Overseer of the Christian Religion.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.5}

“The Chief Pastor; Pastor of Pastors.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.6}

“Christ by Unction.” (That is, the Anointed Christ.) {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.7}

“Abraham by Patriarchate.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.8}

“Melchisedec in Order.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.9}

“Moses in Authority.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.10}

“Samuel in the Judicial Office.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.11}

“High Priest, Supreme Bishop.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.12}

“Prince of Bishops.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.13}

“Heir of the Apostles; Peter in Power.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.14}

“Key-Bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.15}

“Pontiff Appointed with Plenitude of Power.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.16}

“Vicar of Christ.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.17}

“Sovereign Bishop of Bishops.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.18}

“Sovereign Priest.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.19}

“Ruler of the House of the Lord.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.20}

“Apostolic Lord, and Father of Fathers.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.21}

“Chief Pastor and Teacher and Physician of Souls.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.22}

“Rock, against which the proud gates of Hell prevail not.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.23}

“Infallible Pope.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.24}

“Head of all the Holy Priests of God.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.25}

“Head of all the Holy Churches.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.26}

“Chief of the Universal Church.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.27}

“Bishops of Bishops, that is, Sovereign Pontiff.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.28}

In addition to the list of which the above is only a part, Mgr. Capel gives the following quotations from a letter which “the great S. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux,” wrote to Pope Engenius III., A.D. 1150:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.29}

“Who art thou? The High Priest, the Supreme Bishop. Thou art the Prince of Bishops, thou art the Heir of the Apostles. Thou art Abel in primacy, Noah in government, Abraham in the patriarchal rank, in order Melchisedec, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, Samuel in the judicial office, Peter in power, Christ in unction. Thou art he to whom the keys of Heaven are given, to whom the sheep are intrusted. There are, indeed, other doorkeepers of Heaven, and other shepherds of the flocks; but thou art the more glorious in proportion as thou hast also, in a different fashion, inherited before others both these names. The former have the flocks assigned to them each one his own; to thee all are intrusted, One Flock for the One. Not merely for the sheep, but for all the shepherds also thou art the One Shepherd. Whence do I prove this, thou askest? *From the word of the Lord*. For to whom-I say not among the Bishops, but among the Apostles-have the whole flock been committed in a manner so absolute and undistinguishing? ‘*If thou lovest Mr. Peter, feed my Sheep?* What sheep? The inhabitants of this or that city or country, those of a particular kingdom? ‘My sheep,’ He saith. Who does not see that He designates not some, but all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinguished. The power of others is limited by definite bounds; thine extends even over those who have received authority over others. Canst thou not, when a just reason occurs, shut up Heaven against a Bishop, oppose him from his Episcopal office, and deliver him over to Satan? Thus thy privilege is immutable, as well in the keys committed to thee as in the sheep instructed to thy care.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.30}

It would seem as though men had exerted all their ingenuity to invent flattering titles for the Pope. This thing itself would be sufficient to condemn the whole system. Elihu said: “Neither let me give flattering titles unto man. For I know not to give flattering titles; in so doing my Maker would soon take me away.” Job 32:21, 22. And we have no reason to suppose that the giving and receiving of flattering titles is not displeasing to God, for our Saviour himself said: “How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?” John 5:44. The giving and receiving of flattering titles is an evidence of departure from God, for the honor that comes from God only is given only to the humble. 1 Peter 5:5. In this case, however, the titles are not simply flattering, but are blasphemous, and show the one to whom they are applied, to be the “man of sin,” “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” W. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 312.31}

**“Ten Commandments” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

**The Commentary.
NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.
(June 12.-Exodus 20:1-11.)**

The lesson for this week covers the first four commandments. Our notes must be merely suggestive, as each one of the commandments furnishes ample material for an entire lesson. Before entering upon the lesson proper, the student should read carefully the 19th chapter of Exodus, where we have an account of the circumstances attending the giving of the law. These were of the utmost grandeur and impressiveness. The Lord came down upon Sinai amid fire and smoke (Exodus 19:18; Deuteronomy 4:11, 12), accompanied by his angels (Deuteronomy 33:2; Psalm 68:17), and not only the mountain but the earth shook when God spoke. Exodus 19:18; Psalm 68:7, 8; Hebrews 12:25, 26. The circumstances attending the giving of the law were calculated to impress the people with a sense of the power and majesty of God, and, consequently, of the sacredness of his law. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.1}

**THE INTRODUCTION**

“And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.” Exodus 20:1, 2. Here God identifies himself. He is the God that brought them forth from bondage. In giving his law, he makes himself known as their Redeemer. When he sent Moses to call them from bondage, he made himself known to them as “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Exodus 3:15, 16); and he also declared his name to be, “I AM THAT I AM.” Exodus 3:14. This was a declaration that he is the living God, the self-existent One, the Creator of all things. So when from the mount God made himself known to the assembled multitude as the one who had brought them out of Egypt, it would recall the fact that he is the self-existent Creator, who has a right to make and enforce laws. It would also recall his power as manifested in their behalf. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.2}

**THE FIRST COMMANDMENT**

“Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” Exodus 20:3. This was placed at the head because it is the foundation of everything. We may say that all the rest of the law is summed up in this first commandment. For having no other gods before the true God, means sincere heart worship of him, and perfect worship of God means obedience to all his requirements. The first four commandments embody our duty to God, and the last six our duty to man. But the last six are secondary to the first four, since love to God is first. Love to God necessarily presupposes love to man; “for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” 1 John 4:20. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.3}

Paul says that “there be gods many and lords many.” 1 Corinthians 8:5. A god is an object of worship. Worship is reverence; one worships whatever his thoughts center upon. As everyone must think, and must have some object toward which his thoughts and efforts are directed, so everyone must have some god. If it is not the living God, it is some god in his stead. Some trust in riches (1 Timothy 6:17); such make money their god. See Job 31:24-28. In Colossians 3:5, also Ephesians 5:5, covetousness is declared to be idolatry. The covetous man’s mind is absorbed in the contemplation of some earthly object, which shuts out thoughts of God. It is not the rich alone who become idolaters by trusting in uncertain riches instead of the living God, for a poor man may make gold his hope, and long for it to the exclusion of every other object of thought, and thus he is an idolater. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.4}

Others worship appetite and the baser passions. Paul speaks of some “whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.” Philippians 3:19. There are thousands in so-called Christian lands whose principal thought is, What shall we eat? or what shall we drink? Thousands have let liquor deprive them of their hope of eternal life. Thousands who use the filthy weed tobacco, when they learn that God requires purity of flesh as well as of spirit (2 Corinthians 7:1), have said, “Well, I can’t give up my tobacco.” Thus they have made a god of a pipe, or a plug of tobacco. Is not such idolatry fully as debasing as the crocodile worship of the Egyptians? But we have not space to pursue this subject further. Suffice it to say that the first commandment forbids anything that is not done to the glory of God. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.5}

**SECOND COMMANDMENT**

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.” Exodus 20:4-6. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.6}

This commandment does not, as many suppose, forbid the simple making of pictures or statuary. It does not forbid the use of postage-stamps or coins having the mark of some Government. No mechanical art could be carried on without making something that is like something else, and the commandment does not forbid this. What the commandment does forbid is the making of any image for the object of worship. The Catholic Church has omitted the second commandment from the list, claiming that it is the same as the first. But this is an error and is done simply that they may seem to have Bible authority for image worship. When Catholics are charged with worshiping images, as, for instance, images of Christ, they reply that they do not worship the image, but the One who is represented by it. That is just what is forbidden by the second commandment. Ancient heathenism originated in the same way,-God was thought to be *represented* by certain images, while the people knew that the images themselves were not God. This was the case with the Israelites when they made the golden calf. See also Acts 17:29. But such worship necessarily soon degenerated into the worship of the images. Making a graven or molten image, and putting it in a secret place, was one of the things against which a curse was pronounced. See Deuteronomy 27:15. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.7}

The second commandment manifests God’s love and mercy. This shows that the law of God is a law of love. God gave his law in love, as we read: “The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of his saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea, *he loved* the people.” Deuteronomy 33:2, 3. As it is a law of love, so obedience to it is the test of love on our part; “for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.” 1 John 5:3. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 314.8}

In the second commandment we have a refutation of the charge that the law was designed to be merely temporary. The iniquity of the fathers is, as a natural consequence, visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, but the mercy of God is to be shown unto thousands of generations of them that love God and keep his commandments. Compare Deuteronomy 7:9. The world has not yet stood even half of a thousand generations, and so the commandments of God are still the test of loyalty to the Creator. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.1}

**THIRD COMMANDMENT**

“Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.” Exodus 20:7. This commandment forbids not only what is called “profane swearing,” that is, the use of blasphemous oaths, but all irreverence. Substitutes for oaths which contain the name of God are condemned equally with the oaths themselves. By this commandment all “by-words” and unnecessary expletives, are forbidden. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.2}

This commandment may be violated even in worship. The unnecessary or vain use of titles belonging to Deity in prayer or exhortation, is taking the name of God in vain. Those who regard this commandment will not use the name of the Creator except when it is absolutely necessary, and then only with great reverence. The repetition of profane expressions which others have used, is also a violation of the commandment. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.3}

In Psalm 138:2 we read: “Thou has magnified thy word above all thy name.” Then irreverence for God’s word, and disobedience of his commandments, are both violations of the third commandment. Perversion of Scripture, and the quoting of texts in jest or to give point to a joke, are gross violations of this commandment. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.4}

Still further, this commandment enjoins reverence for places of worship. The sanctuary of old was a sacred place where God’s name was. Deuteronomy 16:6. To act irreverently in the sanctuary is to dishonor God. When the children of Israel were in captivity, God promised that he would be to them “a little sanctuary.” Ezekiel 11:16. This was equivalent to the promise recorded in Matthew 18:20. Now a place that is sacred because of God’s presence, should be regarded with reverence; and irreverent conduct in such a place is showing disrespect to God; and disrespect to God is a violation of the third commandment, and of the first as well. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.5}

**FOURTH COMMANDMENT**

“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 20:8-11. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.6}

On this commandment we have space for only a few points, whereas pages might be written. It is not because the commandment is obscure that so much might be written upon it, but because it is so comprehensive, and because so many people, either willfully or through wrong education, misinterpret its plain terms. We ask the student to note these points:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.7}

The Sabbath-day is *the seventh* day. Since the Sabbath is to be remembered, that is, it is of constant recurrence, it follows that “the seventh day” means the seventh day of a period of seven days. Hence it must mean the seventh day of the week. That this is so will be seen by comparing Luke 23:54-56; 24:1, where the Sabbath-day “according to the commandment” is the day before the first day of the week, and is, consequently, the seventh day of the week. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.8}

It is contended by some that the commandment does not enjoin rest on a specific seventh day, but on any day that has been preceded by six days of labor. This matter can be readily settled. In Exodus 16 we have the account of the fall of the manna, where the terms “sixth day” and “seventh day” are employed. Now it is very evident that in this place the sixth day means the sixth day of the week, and the seventh day, the seventh day of the week. There is nobody who imagines that the Israelites were left to choose the day of their rest, or that the manna would keep over one day for one family or tribe, and would spoil at the same time for another family or tribe who might not have had the same day of rest. Thus, since the terms “sixth day” and “seventh day” refer to the week in this instance, they certainly must mean the same thing in the fourth commandment. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.9}

Further; all admit that it is necessary that there should be uniformity in the observance of the Sabbath. If each one were to choose the day that pleased him, there would be confusion. But how could this uniformity be secured? Not by the *dictum* of any man, for there is no man whose authority all men would recognize. God alone has authority in matters pertaining to morals, and he alone could direct which day shall be observed as the Sabbath. This he has done. “*The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.10}

From the part of the commandment just quoted, it appears that the Sabbath-which is the name of the seventh day of the week-is the Lord’s day. In Isaiah 58:13 the Lord calls it his “holy day,” and in Mark 2:28 Christ declares himself to be Lord of the Sabbath. He was speaking to the Jews of the day which they observed; hence it is the seventh day of the week which is the Lord’s day. This shows us the impropriety of calling the seventh day “the Jewish Sabbath.” There is not, and never was, anything Jewish about it; it is the Lord’s. But someone may say that it was given to the Jews, and they were required to keep it. So God made himself known to the Jews (Exodus 3:13-16), and declared himself to be their God; and they were required to worship him. But we do not therefore call Jehovah the Jewish God. He is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. Romans 3:20. And since he is the God of the Gentiles, just the same as he is the God of the Jews, he requires the Gentiles to keep the same commandments, that he imposes on the Jews. And he promises rich blessings to the Gentiles who shall keep his Sabbath. Isaiah 56:6, 7. W. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 315.11}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Hebrews standard very aptly says: “There are lots of people who mix their religion with their business, but forget to stir it up well. As the result the business invariably rises to the top.” Such a mixture is no better than none at all. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.1}

“Since these meetings opened,” said Dr. Pentecost speaking of his Cleveland revival series, “fifty young women, and as many young men, have confessed Christ. And not one of those was from a worldly home. Why? It is the curse of unconsecrated property, and of this awful spirit of worldliness.” Truthfully did the great Teacher say, “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.2}

The gifted writers for the *Homiletic Review* find exercise for their minds in the discussion of such subject as, “Where was the Creator before the creation?” The *Independent* disposes of this question in the following eminently sensible manner: “It is a good thing in reasoning the subject of religion, as well as upon other matters, to know what are the boundaries of human thought, and always keep within them. If we get beyond them, we simply overwhelm ourselves in the great deal of our own ignorance.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.3}

We are asked by a subscriber in an Eastern State, whether or not the Bible teaches that the Jews will all return to the land of Palestine just previous to the second coming of Christ. He also wishes us to give our views through the SIGNS, with all the Scripture references on the subject. At some future time we may furnish an article or two on the subject, but it would take more than one article to give all the Scripture references on the subject, with even the briefest comment. We can simply state the fact now, that the Bible does not teach that the Jews will go to Jerusalem before the coming of the Lord. All the passages which speak of the gathering of Israel refer either to the gathering after the Babylonian captivity or else to the gathering of the true Israel to the New Jerusalem, after the coming of the Lord. For a full exposition of this subject see pamphlet entitled, “Refutation of the Doctrine of the Age to Come,” for sale at this office. See advertisement on the preceding page. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.4}

The Sunday closing law is being rigidly enforced in New York City. The *Observer* says of a recent Sunday that it “was probably the most quiet day that these cities [New York and Brooklyn] have seen in many years.” Even the hotels refused to serve wine or other liquors to their guests, and it seems that prohibition does prohibit, at least on Sunday, which shows that it could also prohibit on every day. Morally it is no worse to sell liquors on Sunday than on Monday or Tuesday, but because so many people are idle on that day probably there is more drunkenness where liquor is sold freely, than on other days. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.5}

In this Sunday closing movement, however, we do not see zeal for the cause of temperance, but only legislation in behalf of Sunday. The power which can close saloons on Sunday, can close them every day of the week, if it is so inclined; and the fact that the zealous “reformers” of New York and Brooklyn can close saloons on Sunday, but allow liquor to be sold freely on every other day, shows that they have no special love for temperance. By their action they virtually say to the saloon-keeper, “Your business is all right, and we will find no fault with you, provided you do not pursue it on Sunday.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.6}

The San Francisco *Morning Call*, in answer to a question as to the possibility of keeping the Sabbath in all parts of the world, revives the old threadbare story that if a man who observes Saturday should start from San Francisco and go westward around the world, he would, on arriving at the starting-point, find himself keeping Sunday; but that if he went eastward, he would be keeping Friday. It was not long since that the *Argonaut* had something to the same effect. One would suppose that the writers of such stuff never heard that people do actually cross the ocean and go clear around the world. The fact that observers of the seventh day have crossed the Pacific Ocean in both directions, and each time have found themselves keeping Saturday when they landed, ought to convince anybody that the Sabbath can be kept anywhere. Yet notwithstanding this fact, and the fact that every month people are crossing the ocean from west to east and from east to west, and still find no hitch in their reckoning of the days of the week, certain wiseacres will persist in saying that the thing can’t be done. Perhaps it is not to be wondered at, since there are still some people who believe that “The sun do move.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.7}

**“Horrible Case of Hydrophobia” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The telegraph dispatches bring us full accounts of a hegira of New Yorkers, which took place on Sunday, May 15. Over 250,000 persons are reported to have fled to Jersey City and its suburbs on that day. The following description of the flight shows that the case was extremely urgent, and that the aroused populace did not stand upon the order of their going:- {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.8}

“It was just about church-time when the extent of the exodus began to be manifested. On all the thoroughfares leading to the ferries there were seemingly endless processions of men, women, and children, on foot, and in carriages and street-cars. Around the ferry-houses they spread out into crowds, unceremoniously pushing and scrambling, in their efforts to get through the narrow spaces over which the fare-taker held sway. Even then their petty troubles were not over, for the number of berths was inadequate and people were compelled to remain from fifteen minutes to an hour in poorly ventilated and ill-smelling waiting-rooms.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.9}

But what was the cause of this impetuous flight? Had pestilence broken out in the city, and were the people fleeing for their lives? Not at all; they were going after a drink. What! was there no water in all the city of New York? Certainly; plenty of it, and of a very good quality, too. But no beer or whisky could be obtained in New York on that day, and those people were almost wild with the thought they might have to pass an entire day with nothing to drink but water. It was a warm day, and they were thirsty, so they fled from the pure Croton water, in order to find some liquor which would increase their thirst, thus enabling them to drink more liquor, to aggravate their thirst, in order to drink more liquor, etc. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.10}

Talk about hydrophobia! No brute, except the human brute, was ever afflicted with such a disease. Some unreasoning quadrupeds are occasionally afflicted with a disease which makes it impossible for them to drink when they wish to, but they never fear the water, and they never substitute anything else for it. It is only beings that are made in the image of God, and endowed with faculties capable of the highest development, who can make a god of their belly, and glory in their shame. The old catechism evidently made a mistake in its definition of man’s chief end. A modern catechism, if true to the times, would say that man’s chief end is to glorify himself and to enjoy his depraved appetites. And still God lets the world stand. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.11}

**“A Little Mixed” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* of May 12 gives its readers the astonishing information that “the Supreme Court of Tennessee has decided that a blacksmith belonging to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week *as Sunday*, violates the law by working at his trade on the day observed by the general community as Sunday.” Now we happen to know something about this case, and are sure that the Tennessee blacksmith does not belong “to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week *as Sunday*.” If there is any such sect the members composing it should be carefully collected, and placed in some house for the feebleminded. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.12}

There are thousands of Christian people who observe the seventh day of the week instead of the first, because it is the divinely appointed Sabbath, but that anybody keeps the seventh day *as Sunday*, is a figment of the imagination of people who fail to distinguish between the terms Sabbath and Sunday, and improperly use the one as a synonym of the other. {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.13}

Sabbath is the name which the Bible gives to the seventh day of the week, while Sunday is the heathen name of the first day; and there is no more propriety in speaking of keeping the seventh day *as Sunday*, than there would be in speaking of keeping it as Monday or Friday. There are a great many people who keep Sunday as the Sabbath, which it is not, but it is safe to say that there is no sect the members of which keep the seventh day of the week “as Sunday.” {SITI May 26, 1887, p. 320.14}