**“Faith and Humility” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

“For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.” Romans 12:3. This text indicates that the greater a man’s faith is, the less will he think of himself. As the apostle expresses it, he will “think soberly.” Pride is intoxication. Just as alcohol stimulates a man without building him up, and finally deprives him of reason, so a man, to use a common expression, “loses his head” when he gets to hunting for the good traits in his character. And withal pride, like alcohol, furnishes no nourishment with which to build the man up. If a man is to grow strong, he must receive nourishment from a source outside of himself; but the vain person lives upon himself, and so becomes poorer by what he feeds upon. And as alcohol causes a man to stumble in his walk, and finally brings him to ruin, so “pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.” Proverbs 16:18. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.1}

So the apostle well describes humility as thinking soberly. But why will a man live soberly, according to the measure of faith which he possesses? The answer is not difficult. Faith is that which justifies the sinner. Romans 5:1. If men were not sinful, they would have no need of faith. The only reason for having faith in Christ is to secure pardon for past sins, and freedom from the love of sin. No man will exercise faith in Christ unless he feels himself to be a sinner. It is the sense of sin, which comes by the law, that drives a man to Christ that he may be justified by faith. Therefore for a man to confess Christ, is to acknowledge himself a sinner. Great diseases call for great remedies; the weaker a man is, the more aid will have to be given him. So the more the man feels his sinful condition, the more faith in Christ will he exercise. Therefore it is true that great faith on the part of any person is an evidence that that person feels that he is by nature very weak and sinful, and that without Christ he is nothing. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.2}

But such a feeling is in itself humility, which is nothing else but “a sense of one’s own unworthiness through imperfection and sinfulness.” Such a man estimates himself at his true value, which is nothing. And since faith in Christ cannot be exercised by any except those who “have no confidence in the flesh,” it follows that the man who walks by faith will be a humble man. It is only when Christians lose their sense of unworthiness, and begin to look upon themselves with complacency, that they lose faith. When the individual is nothing in his own eyes, Christ is everything; but when he begins to rise in his own estimation, Christ sinks out of sight. Nothing can produce true humility but a knowledge of one’s natural imperfections. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.3}

In harmony with these ideas, and the text first quoted, are the words of the prophet Habakkuk: “Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him; but the just shall live by his faith.” Habakkuk 2:4. Faith and humility are inseparable. We ask again, Why does a man exercise faith in Christ? Simply because he feels a need of Christ; he has no confidence in his own strength, and feels that without Christ he must perish. It is not natural for the human heart to acknowledge another as superior. “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” Independence, boastfulness, and self-conceit are natural to the human heart. But “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.” He became a new creature in consequence of acknowledging his wretched sinfulness, and pleading for mercy through Christ. This in itself was a humiliation of soul. Now, so long as he continues in that state of justification by faith, he must retain a sense of his own unworthiness, for by the law of faith boasting is excluded. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.4}

Says the beloved disciple: “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” 1 John 5:4. It is only as we exercise faith that God’s strength supplies our lack, and keeps us from falling. And since faith and humility are so closely joined together, Bunyan has beautifully written,- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.5}

*“He that is down needs fear no fall;  
He that is low, no pride;  
He that is humble ever shall  
Have God to be his guide.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.6}*

The man who is lifted up with pride and self-esteem must assuredly fall sooner or later, for the time will come when “the lofty looks of man shall be humbled,” and the Lord alone exalted; but the man who is down cannot fall, for he is already as low as he can be. But such an one shall not always be abased. The promise is “Humble ourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up.” James 4:10. Not in their own estimation, not in the estimation of the world, will such be lifted up, but they will be raised up to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Ephesians 2:6. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.7}

“Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 9:23, 24. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.8}

“But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” 1 Corinthians 1:30, 31. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.9}

Therefore “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.” Galatians 6:14. W. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.10}

**“‘They Stumbled at That Stumbling-stone’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the head of “Hasty Generalizations,” the San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* says:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.11}

“One of the delegates to the recent convention of the Young Men’s Christian Association is reported to have said that nothing but the grace of God could save a young man in this city. The delegate to whom this remark is attributed may have been in San Francisco at the time for as long a period as forty-eight hours. How he could in that brief space have made so thorough an analysis of our social condition as to warrant the statement must remain a marvel.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.12}

One can hardly refrain from laughing as he imagines the honest indignation of the editor of the *Bulletin* when he penned his article repelling the base insinuation that it would require nothing less than the grace of God to save a San Francisco young man. But the matter has a serious side, in that it shows how ignorant many people-probably the great majority-are of even the necessity for a divine Saviour. The world has erected a fictitious standard of goodness, and the man who is “as good as the average,” is esteemed a good fellow. It matters not that the average standard is falling lower and lower, they continue to judge themselves by themselves, and so rest satisfied with their condition. So complacent are they that they regard it almost an insult to be told that they never can be saved without divine assistance; and the minister who should repeat to one of them the words of Christ, “he that believeth not shall be damned,” would be thought guilty of criminal libel. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.13}

It is impossible to imagine what would be thought if one should say that such persons are no better off than heathen, yet we have scriptural authority for just such a statement. Even the Jews who made their boast of the law, were told by Paul that they were no better than the licentious and depraved heathen, because both Jews and Gentiles are “all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;” and that “there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” Romans 3:9, 10, 22-24. No man ever lived on earth who was good enough to be saved without the grace of God, and the man who, in his self-righteous pride, stumbles at that stumbling-stone, will in the end be no better off than the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. See Romans 9:20-32. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 326.14}

**“Exposition of 2 Corinthians 3:7-11” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Several questions have of late been asked us upon 2 Corinthians 3:7-11. As that is a passage which those who are striving to teach the law often find difficult to explain, and which enemies of truth use with great confidence as being opposed to the law, we will try to give a simple scriptural exposition of it. The fifth and sixth verses of the chapter read as follows:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.1}

“Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.2}

It will be noticed that the last clause of verse 5 is an answer to the question, “Who is sufficient for these things?” asked in verse 16 of the preceding chapter. The subject which is under consideration is the Christian ministry, as is seen by verse 6, and the first verse of chapter 4. The apostle is showing its excellence, and in so doing contrasts it with the ministry of the old covenant. The word “testament” in verse 6, means “covenant,” and the statement is that we are made ministers of the new covenant; “not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” Many people seem to have the idea that in this verse Paul is contrasting the two testaments or covenants. The old covenant they call the letter, and the new covenant the spirit. But one who reads the verse carefully cannot fail to see that this is an error. The old covenant is not referred to till we reach the seventh verse. Paul’s statement is simply to the effect that he and his associates were ministers of the spirit of the new covenant, and not of its letter; for the new covenant has its letter as well as the old. On this point Dr. Clarke makes the following pertinent comment:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.3}

“Every institution has its letter as well as its spirit; as every word must refer to something of which it is the sign or significator. The gospel has both its letter and its spirit, and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart. Water, in baptism, is the letter that points out the purification of the soul; they who rest in this letter are without this purification; and dying in that state, they die eternally. Bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, are the letter; the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus, and the grace communicated by this to the soul of the believer, are the spirit. Multitudes rest in this letter, simply receiving these symbols without reference to the atonement or to their guilt; and thus lose the benefit of the atonement and the salvation of their souls.... It may be safely asserted that the Jews in no period of their history ever rested more in the letter of their law than the vast majority of Christians are doing in the letter of their gospel. Unto multitudes of Christians Christ may truly say, Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.4}

In the above quotation it is shown that the letter of the new covenant kills; but the reason why it kills will be made plain after we have made a brief comparison of the two covenants. These two covenants with their ministrations are brought to view in contrast in verses 7 and 8, which read thus:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.5}

“But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.6}

In this verse the old covenant is called the “ministration of death.” Why it was so called is very apparent to one who understands what the old covenant was. We will state it briefly. Before the Lord gave the ten commandments from Mount Sinai, he said to the Jews:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.7}

“Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.” Exodus 19:4-5. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.8}

On the third day after this, the Lord spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all the people: “and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone.” Deuteronomy 5:22. Then Moses went up to the Lord in the mount, and the Lord gave to him precepts growing out of the ten commandments. See Exodus 21, 22 and 23. The confirmation of the covenant, the preliminaries of which are given in Exodus 19:5-8, is related in Exodus 24:3-8. There learn that, {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.9}

“Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do.” After this “Moses wrote all the words of the Lord;” and after he had built an altar and offered sacrifices, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, “All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.” Then “Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” Thus was the covenant confirmed. We learn from this that the old covenant was simply an agreement between God and the children of Israel, concerning the commandments of God. The people on their part promised faithfully to keep the commandments, and the Lord promised to make of them a great nation. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.10}

In connection with this covenant there were “ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary,” Hebrews 9:1. This sanctuary is described in Exodus 25; 26, 27, and 30, and the principal “ordinances of divine service,” are described in Exodus 29:38-42, and Leviticus, chapters 4 and 16. With these facts before us, we may understand why the ministration of the first covenant was called a “ministration of death.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.11}

(1) In this covenant the people had made an explicit agreement to keep the law of God. (2) By this law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 3:20), “for sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. (3) The “ordinances of divine service” connected with the first covenant were for sin; but Paul tells us (Hebrews 10:4) that “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.” Those “ordinances of divine service” were only “a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things,” and therefore the sacrifices which the people offered had no power to make them perfect. Therefore (4) all who had to do with the old covenant alone were condemned to death; “for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God” (Romans 3:23); “and the wages of sin is death.” Romans 6:23. There was in the old covenant no provision for the forgiveness of sins; therefore the ministration of that old covenant, which was performed by earthly priests, was, so far as their work extended, the ministration of death. Only the perfect can have life, and their ministration made nothing perfect. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.12}

It is true that during the time of the ministration of the old covenant, sins were forgiven (Leviticus 4:26, 31, 35), and this forgiveness was real, but it was obtained solely by virtue of faith in the promised sacrifice of Christ, and not because of anything in the old covenant. Paul says of Christ, in Hebrews 9:15, that “he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.” Thus we see that when sins committed under the first covenant were forgiven, they were forgiven by virtue of the second covenant. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.13}

Some stumble over the first clause of 2 Corinthians 3:7, “The ministration of death, written and engraven in stones,” but the Scriptures furnish means for the complete exposition of this. Paul cannot mean that the *ministration* was written and engraven in stones, for that would be impossible, because the *ministration* was the service of the priests. Then it must be that he means that death was written and engraven in stones. But some will say, “This makes nonsense of the text.” Let us see. It is very easy to ascertain what was written and engraven in stone. Exodus 31:18 says that the Lord “gave to Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.” “And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables.” Exodus 32:15, 16. These two tables were broken, and after Moses had, by the command of the Lord, made two other tables, he said, “And he [the Lord] wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly.” Deuteronomy 10:4. These texts show that it was the ten commandments, and the ten commandments alone, that were written and engraven in stones; and therefore by the word “death,” in 2 Corinthians 3:7, Paul must refer to the ten commandments. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 327.14}

But is it allowable to speak of the ten commandments as “death”? Are they death to anybody? It certainly is allowable, for they are death to all men, because all have sinned, and the “wages of sin is death.” The law is the cause of death to every sinner that shall perish, and so by metonymy it is called death. In like manner the sons of the prophets said of the poisonous gourds, “There is death [i.e., a cause of death] in the pot” (2 Kings 4:40); and the Lord said that “the tree of the field is man’s life” (sustainer of life). Deuteronomy 20:19. So when Paul describes his conviction as a sinner, he says of the law, “And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.” Romans 7:10. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.1}

Thus we find that in every case of the word, the ministration of the old covenant was “the ministration of death.” We have found, then (1) that the law, which was the basis of the covenant, was death to all, and (2) that the ministration concerning that violated law offered no relief, but in itself tended to death. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.2}

Notwithstanding all this, there was a wonderful glory connected with the old covenant and its service. The giving of the law was attended with glory the like of which has never been seen on earth before or since, and will not be until the Lord shall come in the glory of his Father with all his angels. When Moses returned from the mount, his face was so glorified that the people could not look at it; and the glory of the Lord was present in the sanctuary to so great a degree that the priests were forced to obscure it with a cloud of incense, lest they should die. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.3}

Now let us briefly outline the new covenant. Paul says that this was established upon “better promises.” Its terms are found in Hebrews 8:8-12, which reads thus:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.4}

“For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.5}

We find here the same condition as in the old covenant,-the people are to obey the law of God. But this covenant is established on “better promises” than the first, in that the Lord promises to forgive their sins, to write the law in their hearts, and to remember their iniquities no more. These things are all accomplished by virtue of Christ, who is the mediator of the new covenant. Hebrews 8:6; 9:15. “The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John 1:7), by securing the remission of past sins (Romans 3:24, 25), and enabling us to walk in harmony with the law. Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 2:10; Hebrews 13:20, 21. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.6}

The law, then, is the basis of both covenants; hence it could not be done away with the old covenant, else there could be no new covenant. The terms of the new covenant leave no doubt on this point, and Christ’s connection with it brings the fact out still more clearly. Thus Christ is the minister of this new covenant (Hebrews 8:1, 2) and is now performing the ministration in the true sanctuary in Heaven. Hebrews 9:24. His ministration has reference to the law, for he came to save sinners (1 Timothy 1:15), and he is offering his blood to save men from sin. Romans 3:24; 1 John 1:7; Matthew 1:21. This redemption we get through faith (Romans 3:24), and faith establishes the law. Romans 3:31. The law itself, having been violated, brings death; Christ redeems us from its curse (Galatians 3:13), and thus becomes our life. Colossians 3:4. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.7}

Now note the contrast between the two covenants: The first had the ministration of death, because everything connected with it tended to death; the violated law was death to the sinner, and the earthly ministration freed no one from that condemnation. The second covenant has the ministration of the Spirit, because “the Lord is that Spirit” (2 Corinthians 3:17), and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and life. Galatians 6:8. But although there is no death in the second covenant, there is in the rejection of it, for the law is still death to sinners, and all who are opposed to Christ are sinners, and condemned to death; so Paul says that the letter of the new covenant kills. The reason is that holding the mere letter of the new covenant,-the performance of the gospel ordinances while not receiving Christ in the heart,-is really a rejection of Christ. Of the Lord’s Supper, Paul says that he who does not discern the Lord’s body, eats and drinks damnation to himself. 1 Corinthians 11:9. He is in the same condition as though he had never heard of the new covenant. But in every case, whether of the sinner under the old covenant, or of one who rejects the new, it is the law that causes his death. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.8}

In the text under consideration Paul contrasts the two ministrations as to glory. If the ministration which could not cleanse from sin, was glorious, the ministration of the Spirit, which gives freedom from sin, must be more glorious. “If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.” And so much more glorious is the ministration of the second covenant than that of the first, that in comparison the first covenant seems to have had no glory. Why the ministration of the second covenant should be so much more glorious than that of the first, is because it is established upon “better promises,” and Christ is its minister. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.9}

“For if that which is done away was glorious, much more than which remaineth is glorious.” 2 Corinthians 3:11. Now what was done away? The answer must be that it is that which was glorious. Verse 9 states that it was the ministration of condemnation that was glorious. Then it must be the ministration of condemnation that was done away; that which remains is the ministration of the Spirit. By no possibility can verse 11 be made to refer to the law, because it contrasts something done away with something that remains. And we have found that the law is the basis of both covenants, and therefore it cannot have been done away; but the ministration of the old covenant as well as the covenant itself was done away, as was indicated by the fading glory upon the countenance of Moses. But it needs no abstract reasoning to show that it is the tabernacle service, and that alone, to which the apostle refers in verse 11 as being “done away,” for he says, “if that which is done away was glorious,” showing by the “if” that he had before called attention to something glorious; and the only thing which he has so designated in this connection, is the ministration of death. Verse 7. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.10}

We think that any read who carefully follows this brief exposition will be able to see for himself, on reading 2 Corinthians 3:7-11 that the apostle is simply contrasting the glory of the service of the two covenants, and that the law of God is not under consideration at all, except by an incidental allusion which goes to show its permanent character. W. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 328.11}

**“Importance of Obedience” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Sabbath, June 18.)**

1. When the angels are sent to gather God’s elect, whom will they take? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.1}

“Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.” Psalm 50:5. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.2}

2. What does God regard more highly than sacrifice? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.3}

“And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” 1 Samuel 15:22. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.4}

3. How is disobedience described? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.5}

“For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king.” Verse 23, {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.6}

4. When Samuel first came to Saul, how did the latter feel respecting what he had done? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.7}

“And Samuel came to Saul; and Saul said unto him, Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord.” Verse 13. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.8}

5. After Samuel reproved him, what did he say? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.9}

“And Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice and unto Lord thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed.” Verse 15. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.10}

6. How was Saul deceived?-*He thought that by making a sacrifice to the Lord he would excuse him for not doing just as he had commanded*. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.11}

7. Was there any way by which the people would benefit themselves pecuniarily by this disobedience?-*They could use these cattle for sacrifice, and save their own for themselves*. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.12}

“But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, and the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal.” Verse 21. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.13}

8. What was the final result of Sauls course? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.14}

“And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou. And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent.” “And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death; nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul; and the Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.” Verses 28, 29, 35. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.15}

9. In what manner was the ark to be conveyed from place to place? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.16}

“But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none; because the service of the sanctuary belonging unto them was that they should bear upon their shoulders.” Numbers 7:9. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.17}

10. By what means was it carried from the Philistines to Beth-shemesh? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.18}

“And the men did so; and took two milch kine, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home; and they laid the ark of the Lord upon the cart, and the coffer with the mice of gold and the images of their emerods.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.19}

11. How were strangers the nation for looking into the ark? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.20}

“And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men: and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.21}

12. What arrangements did David make for taking the ark from the house of Abinadab? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.22}

“And they set the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah; and Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave the new cart.” “And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.23}

13. Why was Uzzah smitten by the Lord? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.24}

“And when they came unto the threshingfloor of Chidon, Uzza put forth his hand to hold the ark; for the oxen stumbled. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, and he smote him, because he put his hand to the ark: and there he died before God.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.25}

14. What was the real sin here committed? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.26}

“For because he did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order.” 1 Chronicles 15:13. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.27}

15. When the ark was removed from the house of Obededom, in what manner was it carried? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.28}

“So the priests and Levites sanctified themselves to bring up the ark of the Lord God of Israel. And the children of the Levites bare the ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves there on, as Moses commanded, according to the word of the Lord.” Verses 14, 15. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.29}

16. If God’s miraculous care was over the ark when it was brought from the Philistines on a cart, why was he displeased when it was placed upon a new cart prepared expressly for that purpose by David? See notes. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.30}

17. What practical lesson can be learned from this?-*Although men may have zeal and care for God’s cause, the Lord will not except that in the place of obedience*. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.31}

**NOTES**

It is a great mistake to presume that our property or anything we possess belongs to us to use upon our lusts. Whatever talents men possess, either natural or acquired, are loaned them of God, and those who are not faithful in that which has been loaned them will never receive the true riches which Christ has purchased for us; for if we have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, none will give us that which is our own. Nothing in this life belongs to us, but an inheritance to eternal life in the kingdom of God has been purchased for us by Christ. We were God’s by creation, and after having lost the privilege of children by the fall, we have been purchased or redeemed by the blood of Christ. We have no right, therefore, to devote our powers or possessions to our own selfish interests. Every sacrifice made to the glory of God will meet its reward in the kingdom of God. Hence God will except nothing but that obedience which proceeds from the heart. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.32}

Saul was a rash man, and his case fitly illustrates the course of many professed Christians at the present time. Although apparently conscientious, he was impetuous, and could not wait for God’s providence being brought into straitened circumstances. He had never learned the important lesson of quiet trust in God, and in consequence, his entire life was one of fitfulness. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.33}

“Saul had not a high and exalted sense of the excellence and terrible majesty of God. He had not a sacred regard for his appointed ordinances. With an impetuous spirit because Samuel did not appear at the appointed time, he rushed before God presumptuously, and undertook the sacred work of sacrifice. While equipped for war, he built the altar and officiated for himself and the people. This work was sacredly given to those appointed for the purpose. This act was a crime in Saul, and such an example would lead the people to have a low estimate of the religious ceremonies and ordinances sanctified and appointed of God, prefiguring the sinless offering of his dear Son. God would have his people have a holy regard and sacred reverence for the sacrificial work of the priests, which pointed to the sacrifice of his Son.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.34}

“God proved Saul by intrusting him with the important commission to execute his threatened wrath upon Amalek. But he disobeyed God, and spared the wicked, blasphemous king Agag, whom God had appointed unto death, and spared the best of the cattle. He destroyed utterly all the refuse that would not profit them. Saul thought it would add to his greatness to spare Agag, a noble monarch splendidly attired; and that to return from battle with him captive, with great spoil of oxen, sheep, and much cattle, would get to himself much renown, and cause the nations to fear him, and tremble before him. And the people united with him in this. They excused their sin among themselves in not destroying the cattle, because they could reserve them to sacrifice to God, and spare their own cattle to themselves.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.35}

“Samuel informed Saul that his rebellion was as the sin of witchcraft. That is, when one commences to travel in the path of rebellion, he yields himself to be controlled by an influence that is in opposition to the will of God. Satan controls the rebellious mind. Those who are thus controlled lose a calm trust in God, and have less and less disposition to yield loving obedience to his will. Satan becomes more and more familiar with them, until they seem to have no power to cease to rebel. In this respect, rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.36}

“Saul’s stubbornness in persisting before Samuel that he had obeyed God, was an iniquity and idolatry. His love to carry out his own will was more desirable to him than to obtain the favor of God, or the approbation of a clear conscience. And when his sin was opened clearly before him, and his wrong definitely pointed out, his pride of opinion, his excessive self-love, led him to justify himself in his wrong course, in defiance of the reproof of Samuel, and the word of the Lord by the mouth of his prophet. Such obstinacy in a known transgression, separated him forever from God.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.37}

“He knew that he had gone contrary to God’s express command; yet when reproved by God through Samuel, he would not humbly acknowledge his sin, but in a determined manner uttered a falsehood in self-justification. If he had humbly repented, and received the reproof, the Lord would have had mercy and forgiven Saul of his great sin. But the Lord left Saul for his stubbornly refusing to be corrected, and for uttering falsehoods to Samuel, his messenger. Samuel told Saul that, as he had rejected the word of the Lord, God had rejected him from being king.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.38}

There is one thing noticeable in the case of Uzzah’s being smitten before the Lord. It cannot be said that David did not have a proper sense of the sacredness of the ark. It seems that a new cart was especially prepared upon which to convey the ark. It probably had never been used for any other purpose. David also sang and gave praises before the ark with all his might. But the sin committed was in the disregard of the law which said that the ark should be borne by the priests. Uzzah was a Levite but not a priest. All the circumstances seemed to be in harmony with the mind of God except this provision for carrying the ark upon a cart, instead of by the proper means, which would have avoided all danger, such as Uzzah apprehended from the stumbling of the oxen, and the shaking of the ark. This incident illustrates the grand truth that a conscientious zeal never can take the place of obedience in God’s sight. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.39}

Another important truth is brought out by this circumstance, namely, that God does not hold people responsible when they do not have the light. God’s miraculous providence was over the ark when it was first sent to Beth-Shemesh, although it was then draw upon a cart; for the Philistines had no knowledge of how the ark should be carried; but to the people of Israel, God had made known the manner in which he was pleased to have it conveyed. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 331.40}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

One of Oakland’s wholesale wine merchants, who certainly is qualified to speak understandingly, says that “more wine is being used in families than ever before.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.1}

At Sacramento, Cal., tent-meetings are being conducted by Elder E. R. Jones, with a good interest and steady attendance. The tent is located on the corner of Sixteenth and I Streets. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.2}

A question that was asked concerning a point in the prophecy of the eight and ninth of Daniel was answered for this number of the SIGNS, but the answer was necessarily held over until next week, on account of pressure of other matter. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.3}

We hope that none of our readers will skip the Home Circle Department this week. It does not contain a story, but it is filled full of good sound sense which will profit all who will heed it. Parents and children both should read it. Don’t skip it because it is long, and doesn’t look like a story. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.4}

We call special attention to the article on the preceding page, concerning the canvassing work. A perusal of it should convince anyone that in spite of the great demand for trashy reading, a living may be made even now by selling good books,-books that are devoted solely to expositions of Scripture. And how much better a man, must feel after selling a good book, which the people need, than after selling something that is worse than nothing. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.5}

Those who have asked for an explanation of 2 Corinthians 3:7 and onward, will find it in the body of the paper this week. We have no idea that the subject is made so plain that anybody can understand it without the exercise of any thought; but we think that a careful reading of this article, and perhaps a little study, will enable any reader to arrive at an understanding of the text. The article is not by any means exhaustive, and if after carefully reading it anyone should find himself still in the dark on any point, we shall be glad to give the matter further consideration, if he will let us know what his difficulty is. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.6}

We have received a letter from a gentleman in San Francisco giving his ideas on evolution, and asking that we state our views on the same subject; or, as our questioner himself puts it: “I ask that you will kindly state what are your views upon the deductions and upon the ideas, or theories, of scientific men, based on scientific facts.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.7}

To answer this question fully would require far too much time and space. We can only say that we have no faith whatever in evolution; it is contrary to the word of God; and as it is not possible that any *fact* should contravene the word of God, the “deductions” of scientific men concerning it are not “based on scientific *facts*.” The world is full of unbelief and all manner of wickedness, but the Bible is full of precious truths which are able to make us “wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” Paul exhorts Timothy to “avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called,” and we cannot do better than to heed the admonition. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.8}

The comprehensiveness of the law of God attests its divine origin. Men make laws, and find after a while that they have to be amended. Why? Because circumstances arise which the framers of the laws did not foresee. But the law of God needs no amending, for infinite wisdom foresaw every circumstance that might arise, and framed commandments which covered every possible case. Take the sixth commandment as a sample. Hatred and anger are violations of this commandment. See Matthew 5:21, 22; 1 John 3:15. Now if the Lord had simply forbidden anger or hatred, or some other thing which the commandment forbids, he would have had to multiply commandments to cover every phase of sin. But it is an axiom that the greater includes the less, and therefore the commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” forbids not only the actual taking of human life, but every thought which if cherished and allowed to work itself out would result in murder. Everything of human make is narrow and imperfect, but the commandment of God “is exceeding broad.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.9}

Very often after a discourse we hear some person say, “I liked that sermon; it is just what I have always believed.” This is usually said with an air which indicates that the speaker thinks he has given the preacher and his sermon a wonderful compliment. It is, in fact, nothing of the kind; the person is simply complimenting himself, and, like all who compliment themselves, he thereby reveals a state of mind which is not at all praiseworthy. When he says he believes, he indicates that no matter how scriptural the sermon might be, he would not like it if it contained ideas contrary to his former belief. It shows a trace of that spirit which Paul said should be so common in the last days, which shall lead men to heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts. 2 Timothy 4:3. Happy is the hearer whose honest desire is to “hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord,” and who will like every scriptural discourse or printed article, even though it is contrary to his preconceived ideas; and happy is that preacher who, regardless of the *likes* of the people, will heed the command of God, to go and preach “the preaching that I bid thee.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.10}

We are told that the new Andover theory in regard to future probation “is working serious injury to the life and activity of the churches.” What else could be expected? If those who have “not had a fair chance” in this life are sure of having the gospel preached to them, after death, in greater purity than it could possibly be done by mortal men, why should the churches worry themselves over the condition of the heathen either at home or abroad? And why should the unconverted be anxious to improve present gospel privileges? The doctrine of probation after death is one of the lies which Satan has invented to strengthen the hands of the wicked, “that he should not return from his wicked way.” Ezekiel 13:22. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.11}

**“Evolution vs. the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

A lecture on “Evolution” was delivered in San Francisco one evening last week by Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, said to be the one “who discovered, independently of Darwin, the laws of evolution.” He claimed that “any other than an animal origin for man’s body is inconceivable and contradictory.” This proposition he proceeded to “demonstrate” in the following manner:- {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.12}

“If all other animal forms have been derived from one another by the natural processes which have been pointed out, and which has brought up the animal structure so near to that of man that, as Prof. Owen remarked, to define what distinguishes the ape from the man is the anatomist’s difficulty, how can he suppose that the final steps never occurred at all, but that by an entirely new process of creation, of which there is no shadow of a proof, man sprang, *de novo*, into existence, yet bearing in every part of his structure countless indications of his animal origin? To believe this is to believe that the Creator of man created him so as to mislead us, and is, to any unprejudiced mind who will study the facts, utterly incredible.” {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.13}

We suppose that in such demonstrations the “if” is spoken under the breath, so that the condition shall have the appearance of an axiom. If the lower animals have been derived from one another by successive steps, then it is incredible but that man must have been similarly derived! Well, we will accept that, but how are we to know that the lower animals were derived from one another by passing from lower to higher forms? Why, we must take that for granted, to be sure; we must accept it because “there is no shadow of proof” that the various animals sprang into existence by a new process of creation. So Dr. Wallace tells us. But must we throw aside that ancient record which says that in the first week of time God caused the waters and the earth to bring forth every living creature, and that out of the dust of the ground he “created man in his own image?” Why, certainly, if you are going to accept evolution; for you must know to begin with that evolution has no use for anything so old-fashioned as the Bible. {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.14}

Yet many professed Christians accept the doctrine of evolution! What can be the condition of men who will exchange the “full assurance of faith,” by which “we know that the worlds were framed by the word of God,” for a theory which entirely denies the Bible, and has no stronger foundation than an “if”? {SITI June 2, 1887, p. 336.15}

**“‘Blessed Are They that Do’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that there is no word in the Bible the meaning of which is more generally misunderstood than the word “conversation.” The reason is that the meaning of the word has changed since the authorized version was made, and the word is now used in a much more restricted sense than it was used with reference to one’s general deportment. From a failure to recognize the fact that the word is used in the Bible in a sense which is now obsolete, many lose very much of the force of the texts in which it occurs. A little examination of the principal texts in which the word is found cannot fail to be profitable, on account of the practical truths which they contain. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.1}

The first time the word occurs in the Bible is Psalm 37:14: “The wicked have drawn out the sword, and have bent their bow, to cast down the poor and needy, and to slay such as be of upright conversation.” The margin has the correct rendering: “The upright of way.” The idea of this text is the same as that of verse 12: “The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth;” or that stated by Paul in 2 Timothy 3:12: “All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.2}

In Psalm 50:23 we have the word again: “Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God.” Here, as before, the correct idea is given in the margin. It should read: “To him that disposeth his way aright, will I show the salvation of God.” This gives a much broader meaning to the text. When we remember that the Judgment will take cognizance not only of words and actions, but of the thoughts, we find that the word here rendered “conversation” covers every duty. They who dispose their way aright, are “the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord” (Psalm 119:1), and the promise in Psalm 50:23 is equivalent to the statements in Matthew 19:17 and Revelation 22:14, that they who keep the commandments will be saved. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.3}

The next occurrence of the word is in Galatians 1:13: “For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it.” Here it is absolutely impossible that the word should be limited to talk. Paul’s wasting of the church of God was not idle talk, but stern reality. He says that his “conversation” when he professed the Jews’ religion was to persecute the church. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.4}

Again we read: “That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.” Ephesians 4:22. Here it is obvious that “manner of life,” as it is in the revised version, or “practices,” as the Syriac version has it, expresses the sense much more perfectly. The “old man” is the “body of sin” (Romans 6:6), and Paul means that the “former conversation” which is to be “put off,” is the past course of sin. In contrast with this “conversation” which is to be “put off,” is the “new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Ephesians 4:24), which is to be “put on.” “Righteousness and true holiness” do not consist of talk, but of deeds, and so that which is “put off” to make room for these, consists of deeds. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.5}

The same meaning attaches to the word in Ephesians 2:3, where the apostle, after speaking of the children of disobedience, says: “Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind.” He does not mean that once we simply talked with the children of disobedience, but that our manner of life, including words, thoughts, and actions, was the same as theirs. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.6}

1 Timothy 4:12 shows that the word means more than simply talk. Paul exhorts Timothy to be an example “in word, in conversation, in charity.” “In word” covers all that he may *say*, but “in conversation” indicates the whole behavior. It is not enough that a minister should talk well both in the pulpit and out, but his behavior must correspond. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.7}

In the thirteenth of Hebrews the word occurs twice. In verse 5 we read: “Let your conversation be without covetousness.” Covetousness is a sin of the mind, and not of words. The rendering, “Be ye free from the love of money,” or, “Let your turn of mind be free from love of money,” is much more in accordance with the nature of covetousness, and with the exhortation which immediately follows, “And be content with such things as ye have.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.8}

Verse 7 of Hebrews 13 might with more reason be thought to have reference to words, if we did not know that the usage of the Bible is in favor of a more comprehensive application. When the Bible was translated, it is not probable that the word “conversation” was rendered in its present limited sense. It was then used in the sense of the Latin word from which it is derived, namely “turning about,” indicating all the turns of one’s life, or in other words his way or manner of life. So in this text when the apostle says, “Remember them which have the rule over you, ... considering the end of their conversation,” he means that we should consider the object of their manner of life,-why it is that they live as they do. The same thought is expressed in Philippians 3:17; 1 Corinthians 4:16; 1 Thessalonians 1:6. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.9}

In 1 Peter 1:15, 18 it is very clear that if “manner of life” or “conduct” be substituted for “conversation,” the text will read more smoothly, and the one who has always limited the word “conversation” to mere talk, will find a deeper meaning to the text than ever before. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.10}

In 2 Peter 2:7 it is very evident if we regard the context that something more than talk is meant. The text says that just Lot was “vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked.” Now there can be no doubt but that the Sodomites were obscene and vulgar in their talk, but verse 8 is explanatory of verse 7, and that says: “For that righteous man dwelling among them, *in seeing and hearing*, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their *unlawful deeds*.” Here it is shown that the word “conversation” covers both speaking and doing. In this connection it is well to remember that “out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh” (Matthew 12:34) and that as a man “thinketh in his heart so is he.” Proverbs 23:7. So that is a man’s words are evil, it is very certain that his deeds will be no better. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.11}

2 Peter 3:11: “Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness,” is often quoted to show that in these last days our talk ought to be pure and elevated. So it ought, but the text teaches vastly more than that. Many people whose talk is faultless will be left outside the kingdom of God. What Peter wants to impress is the thought that in view of the soon coming of Christ our whole conduct should be holy. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.12}

The faulty rendering of Philippians 3:20 has caused many, perhaps the majority of persons, to lose the force and beauty of that text. It reads: “For our conversation is in Heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.” Now our talk may be of a heavenly nature, or about heavenly things, but it would be absolutely impossible for us to have it in Heaven unless we ourselves were there. When we get to Heaven, our talk will of necessity be there, but not till then. The word here rendered “conversation” is *politeuma*, and means “commonwealth,” or “citizenship.” The reader will no doubt at a glance see the truth of this, since *politeuma* must bring to his mind the word “political,” which has reference to governments. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.13}

In the passage in which this text occurs, the apostle tells the brethren how they ought to walk, or live. The reason why we should not live like the enemies of the cross of Christ, but should reach forth unto those things which are before, is that this world is not our home, but that our citizenship is in Heaven, and we should live as would become people of such high birth. We are not dwellers here upon this earth, therefore we should not live “according to the course of this world;” but if we have been born of the Spirit, we are only sojourners here. In Heaven we have an enduring substance, “a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.” If we are “called to be saints,” we are sons of God, and ought to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. If we should live like the children of disobedience, we should deny our royal birth. The thought that our citizenship is in Heaven, that our names are enrolled in the Great Register of that country, should lead us to study the laws of that place, that we may know how to conduct ourselves when we go there. And since we cannot conduct ourselves properly there unless we have learned how here, it follows that a proper understanding of this text constantly borne in mind will serve as a great incentive to holy living. This is the only place in the Bible where the word rendered “conversation” has this meaning. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.14}

These are not all the instances of the occurrence of the word “conversation” in the common version, but they are the principal ones. It is not merely as a matter of curiosity that one should understand the proper sense of this word in the various places where it occurs, but that he may get the full meaning of the texts in which it is found. Let us be careful not to narrow the sense of the Scriptures, nor give words a meaning which they do not possess. Let us also remember that the Bible lays far more stress on deeds than on words; for while a good talker may be a very poor liver, it will invariably be the case that “a good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things.” The man whose works are committed to the Lord, will have his thoughts established; and the man whose thoughts are pure will talk accordingly. W. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.15}

**“Unity of the Eighth and Ninth of Daniel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

That there is the most intimate connection between the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel, must be patent to anybody who reads that book with even ordinary attention. The eighth chapter records a vision which the prophet had “in the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar.” In that vision Daniel saw the last three great universal empires of the world, under the symbols of a ram, a goat, and a little horn; and at the close, he heard one angel, in reply to the question, “How long shall be the vision?” say, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Then the angel Gabriel received the divine command, “Make this man to understand the vision,” which he at once proceeded to do. He briefly, yet comprehensively, sketched the course of empires from the rise of the Medo-Persian Empire to the overthrow of the Roman power. Verses 20-25 of chapter 8 cover the interpretation of what Daniel *saw*, and in verse 25 the angel begins the interpretation of what Daniel *heard*. Said he, “And the vision of the evening and the morning [compare margin of verse 14] is true.” Then Daniel fainted, and the angel was obliged to postpone any further explanation. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.16}

The commission which the angel had received remained, however, in full force, and Daniel himself was not the one to rest quietly with the vision unexplained. In the first year of Darius, Daniel knew that the time of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon had nearly expired, and thinking, doubtless, that his vision in the third year of Belshazzar, part of which was still unexplained, applied to this time, he engaged in earnest prayer to God. Verses 4-19 of the ninth chapter of Daniel record this prayer, and in the twentieth verse the prophet begins:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.17}

“And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.” Daniel 9:20-23. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.18}

Now note these points: 1. Part of the vision of the eighth chapter was still unexplained. 2. Daniel was pleading for light upon this unexplained portion, as is evident from verse 22. 3. The same angel who had received the commission to make Daniel understand the vision, and who had partially done his work, now came the second time. 4. Daniel identifies him as “the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning,” an obvious reference to “the vision” of chapter 8:5. Almost the first thing the angel said was, “understand the matter, and consider *the vision*.” What vision? Why, the only one that needed considering, the only one to which such matter-of-fact reference could possibly be made,-the vision recorded in the eighth chapter. 6. And lastly, without any further introduction, the angel began the explanation by saying, “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people,” etc. The point in the vision where he had ceased his explanation, was the time portion, and right there he begins. These facts prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that verses 24-27 of Daniel 9 are the completion of the explanation of the vision of Daniel 8. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.19}

The question now arises in many minds, “How long a period of time intervened between the two parts of the interpretation?” This is really an unimportant matter, but since it is asked, it is proper to answer it as well as may be done. According to the chronology of Usher, which is found in the margin of our Bibles, it was fifteen years. The date B.C. 553, in the margin of chapter 8, is based on the supposition that Belshazzar’s reign began in B.C. 555. If that were true his third year would be 553. But comparatively recent explorations show that Belshazzar was not upon the throne of Babylon so early as 555 B.C. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.20}

There has always been a little obscurity about Belshazzar. The fact that Nabonadius was the only name mentioned in the ancient records as coming to the throne of Babylon in 555 B.C., led many historians to discredit the Bible narrative, which speaks of Belshazzar as king; while commentators generally bridged the difficulty by claiming that Nabonadius and Belshazzar were two names for the same man. Thus the matter rested until scholars learned to read the cuneiform inscriptions, when it was discovered that Nabonadius was indeed king of Babylon from B.C. 555 to B.C. 538, and that Belshazzar was his son, whom he associated with himself in the empire, in order that opposition to the encroachments of the Persians under Cyrus, might be made from different points at the same time. By this discovery, the Bible was proved to be historically accurate, and Bible scholars learned why Belshazzar made Daniel only the *third* ruler in the kingdom. Daniel 5:29. It was the highest position to which Daniel could be raised. Nabonadius was first, Belshazzar was second, and Daniel was made third. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.21}

If now we can tell at what date Belshazzar became joint ruler with his father, we can easily determine the length of time between the third year of his reign and the first year of Darius. But that cannot be done with exactness. The “Encyclopedia Britannica” says that “all that is known with any certainty on the matter will be found in Rawlinson’s “Great Monarchies.” Without entering into details as to how he arrives at his conclusions, we will state that Rawlinson regards Belshazzar as the son of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, whom Nabonidius married after he became king. See in “Seven Great Monarchies,” chapter eight (and notes) of Fourth Monarch. He says of Nabonadius: “At the earliest possible moment-probably when he [*i.e.*, Belshazzar] was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government his son Belshazzar, or Belshar-ezer, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar.... He was young and inexperienced, but he had the counsels of the queen-mother to guide and support him, as well as those of the various lords and officers of the court.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.22}

If Rawlinson’s date is correct, the third year of Belshaazar’s reign was his last; and the time between the giving of the vision of the eighth of Daniel, and the first year of Darius, when the interpretation was completed, was very short. Not more than a year could have separated the two installments of the interpretation, and without doubt the whole of the transaction occurred in the same year. This serves to bind the two chapters under consideration almost as closely together in point of time as they obviously are in subject. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.23}

The actual time, however, between the two portions of the interpretation, is, as we have already intimated, a matter of comparatively little importance. There is no escaping the conclusion that the ninth of Daniel is a continuation of the eighth, and the student can connect verse 24 of chapter 9 with verse 26 of chapter 8, and follow the interpretation through without a break. So far as the interpretation is concerned, it makes no difference whether the time between the two parts of it was fifteen years or fifteen minutes. The close connection between the two chapters having been demonstrated, the student or expositor should drop all thoughts of the time occupied in interpreting the vision, and read Daniel 8:20-26; 9:24-27 as one continuous narrative. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.24}

This explanation may serve as an aid to some in the study of one of the most important prophecies of the Bible. W. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 342.25}

**“The Commentary. God Requires Strict Obedience” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(June 26.-Leviticus 10:1-11; Exodus 35:20-29.)**

“And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary out of the camp. So they went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said. And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, Uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled. And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 346.1}

“And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 346.2}

There are two or three points in this portion of Scripture which the student should not fail to notice. The first and most important is that God is very particular, and will not countenance any deviation from directions which he has given. He had specified the kind of fire and incense that should be used in the sanctuary. Exodus 30:9. He himself had kindled a fire on the altar when the first offering was made upon it, and no other was to be used. It might have seemed to Nadab and Abihu that there was no difference between the sacred fire and ordinary fire; but God had made them different, and it was their duty to recognize that difference. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 346.3}

It may seem to many that death was a severe penalty for so slight a deviation from the commandment of the Lord; such must remember that the fact that the death penalty was inflicted by the Lord himself, is sufficient evidence that the offense was not small. The Judge of all the earth will do right. It must also be borne in mind that the heinousness of a sin is not determined so much by the actual quality of the deed itself, as by the spirit in which the deed is committed. Contempt for the Lord may be shown in the willful disobedience of a supposed minor precept, as well as by some act which would be generally recognized as a sin. But the sin of Nadab and Abihu was not a small one. It was the result of lightly regarding the service of the Lord. They engaged in his service as carelessly as they would in some business of their own; and this showed that they had no real reverence for God. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.1}

The same reasoning that Nadab and Abihu may be supposed to have used is indulged in by thousands of people to-day in regard to the Sabbath. The fourth commandment says: “Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; for the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work;” and it gives as a reason for this, the fact that is stated in Genesis 2:3, that “God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it [made it holy]; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Yet in the face of this, there are people who say that there is no difference in days, and that one day is just as good as another; that since all days are alike, it makes no difference which day we observe as, Sabbath, providing it is one day in seven. There is just the same difference that there was in the fire. The two kinds of fire no doubt looked just alike. But one was not holy and the other was. It was holy because God had made it so. So all days look alike; but they are not all alike, for God has made the seventh day holy. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.2}

Refusal to obey any commandment of the Lord, is evidence of a lack of respect for him. In Ezekiel 22:26 the Lord through the prophet says of the church, “Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbath, and I am profaned among them.” Her hiding the eyes from the Lord’s Sabbath is counted as the same sin that Nadab and Abihu committed. Moreover, the Lord says that he is *profaned* because the people have not put difference between the holy and the profane, but have violated his holy Sabbath. This is because God has magnified his word above all his name (Psalm 138:2); disregard of his word dishonors him; and for a man to treat the Lord with disrespect is as bad as to speak disrespectfully of him. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.3}

Some may say that the Lord is not so particular now as he used to be, because he does not destroy people for making no difference between the day which he has sanctified, and common days. This illustrates what Solomon said: “Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.” Ecclesiastes 8:11. But God says, “I am the Lord, I change not.” He is just as particular now as he ever was. But at no time in the history of the world has he executed summary punishment upon all transgressors. If he had, there would have been no people left on earth. Occasionally he has suddenly cut off some terribly presumptuous person, but those were only exceptional cases. “He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness” (Acts 17:31, and he has reserved the unjust “unto the day of Judgment to be punished.” 2 Peter 2:9. The instances in which God has summarily cut off transgressors are simply reminders of how he regards disobedience to his plain requirements. Let us therefore not tempt the Lord, but on the contrary, seek earnestly to know what his will is, and then with diligence do all his commandments. Upon all such a blessing is pronounced. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.4}

The passage of Scripture upon which we are commenting is also a temperance lesson. After Nadab and Abihu were destroyed “the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean.” This seems to indicate that Nadab and Abihu had been drinking wine before they went into the sanctuary, and that this was the cause of their sin. From this we learn that God does not regard drunkenness as an excuse for crime. If a man commits a murder when he is crazed with liquor which he voluntarily drank, he is as guilty as though the crime were premeditated; because he of his own accord took that which he knew would deprive him of reason. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.5}

Whether or not Nadab and Abihu were thoroughly intoxicated, we cannot tell, but we know that their sensibilities were blunted. How many there are who engage in the work of the Lord with their mental faculties all deadened because of intemperance in eating or drinking. Such cannot appreciate the plain word of God. And it is largely because of gross habits that people cannot sense the importance of sacred things. Both their mental and their moral faculties are blunted, so that they can see no difference between things holy and things common. But people who cannot see the truth, because their own wrong habits have blunted their senses, are just as accountable for their disobedience as though they could see the truth and should willfully disobey it. To all the exhortation comes, “Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.6}

Attention is called to just one point taught by Exodus 35:26-29. That is that “everyone whose heart stirred him up, and everyone whom his spirit made willing,” brought an offering for the sanctuary; God had told Moses to take an offering only “of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart.” Exodus 25:2. The result of this willing offering is given in Exodus 36:2-7. The people brought unto Moses “free offerings every morning,” until the overseers of the work said to him, “The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work, which the Lord commanded to make. And Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the ordering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing. For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much.” Such a thing as this is of rare occurrence, but it would not be if the people who profess to be God’s would all give willingly and make free offerings. The cause of God would prosper, and all would be blessed. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.7}

We cannot help thinking that there were some in the camp of Israel who had not given anything when the proclamation went forth that no more offerings were needed. There are always some who do not intend to give anything. To such it would make no difference whether there was enough or not. Such ones would doubtless congratulate themselves on their prudence, since they had saved their means, and the cause was well supplied besides. But there are always others who do intend to give, but not now. They cling to their means yet a little longer, but fully design to make a liberal donation at some future time. How disappointed such ones must have felt when they learned that their offerings were not needed. So it will doubtless be in these last days. God’s work will close without having been helped by many who designed to help sometime. Too late they will find that while the work of the Lord could get along without their help, they cannot get along without helping the work. The lesson that we should learn is never to put off service of any kind for the Lord. *To-day* is the call to everyone. W. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 347.8}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The report of the proceedings of the North Pacific Conference is of necessity laid over until next week. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.1}

In our reference to Henry VIII., last week, we stated that he cut off the heads of three wives. This is a mistake, he cut off the heads of only *two*-Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard. Wicked murderer and libertine as he was, we would not lay more to his charge than rightly belongs there. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.2}

For several days passed a fair has been in progress in a Catholic Church which has recently been erected in Oakland, the object being to raise money to pay off the indebtedness. The following announcement which was made in one of the Oakland dailies, shows that the Catholic Church will not consent to being outdone by Protestants, in the way of “reaching the masses“:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.3}

“A large attendance is expected at St. Francis the Sales fair to-night, and there will be several fresh attractions. The shooting gallery must do well if it plans its own against some of the crack shots to ring the bell and pocket a good cigar every time. The refreshment department might make the staff of the first-class hotel turn green with envy, so varied an excellent is the bill of fare.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.4}

In a supplemental report of the North Pacific camp-meeting, we learned the following additional particulars. The Sabbath-school, conducted by Professor Granger, numbered four hundred thirty members. Last year there were but two hundred sixty.The class contributions for the day amounted to $47.53. Children’s meetings were conducted daily by Sister Morrison. In this work the Lord especially blessed, and many of the children were converted. Special pains were taken to instruct the children in the simple principles of the Gospel, and those who accepted Christ did so understandably. Of the thirty-one who were baptized, the majority were children and youth. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.5}

A Baptist paper (the *Flag*, of St. Louis, in animadverting recently upon certain remarks of the *Midland* (United Presbyterian), relative to the practice of infant communion, prevalent in the third century and for some time thereafter, says:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.6}

“If Protestant churches receive infant baptism by tradition, why not receive the infant communion, which rests upon the same foundation? However, it would be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.7}

These Protestant churches which “receive infant baptism by tradition” might turn this upon their Baptist critic, by asking, If Protestant churches receive Sunday-keeping by tradition, why not receive infant baptism, which rests upon the same foundation? And no one can give any good reason for receiving the one rather than the other. “It would,” indeed, “be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles,” which gives no more warrant for regarding Sunday as the Sabbath, than it does for baptizing infants or giving them the communion. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.8}

In our report of the Kansas camp-meeting, in another column, we stated that Elder Kilgore was called by telegraph to the capital of Illinois on account of the Sunday law bill which was to be made the special order for Tuesday, May 21, in both houses of the Legislature. Since writing that we have received a note from Brother Kilgore in which he says:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.9}

“I arrived here on Tuesday morning, but the bill did not come up till Wednesday morning. A motion was made to call it back to the second reading but it was defeated by a large majority, and it then passed sweeping through the House by a vote of eighty to forty with cheers. There was more interest shown in it than I had seen in connection with any bill before the house prior to this one, or since it passed. It was then taken up in the Senate and at once placed on the order of the second reading; and now it is still subject to an amendment. We have several senators pledged to us that they will do all they can to support a saving clause in our behalf. But I have learned by the experience of yesterday, that it is vain to trust in the arm of flesh.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.10}

We hope to be able soon to lay before our readers a copy of the proposed Illinois Sunday law, so that they may see what a gentle(?) spirit actuates the Chicago preachers. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.11}

A few nights ago a meeting was held in Oakland, to express sympathy with Ireland. One of the speakers was Father McNally, who in his speech made the following inquiry:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.12}

“When did the Irish people, who have made up for centuries the Irish society, transfer their government to the English tyrant? Where are the deeds of transfer.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.13}

Of course the *Irish people* never transferred their government to the English. But *the Pope* did. He not only transferred the government, but the people and the whole island itself. And if Father McNally, or anybody else, will call at this office we will show him the deed of transfer, in the original Latin. Why don’t Father McNally and his compatriots and fellow sympathizers with Ireland call upon the Pope to give back to Ireland that which he gave away? Is England to blame for keeping what the Pope gave her to keep? {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.14}

The papers announce that “the Pope grants unprecedented honors to Queen Victoria.” It is very kind indeed in the dear good Pope to condescend to “grant” honors, unprecedented or otherwise to the queen of Great Britain. The unprecedented honor in this case is that the Pope has “entirely of his own accord, and without any hint from Cardinal Manning, based a rescript which ordains that on Jubliee day, June 21, high mass and a Te Deus shall be performed in all Roman Catholic Churches in England.” It is said that “his holiness could not have done more in the case of the most faithful Catholic sovereign.” And then it is suggested, very innocently of course, that “the English clergy might return the compliment on the occasion of his holiness’s approaching jubilee.” Yes, they might, nor should we be much surprised if they do so. Of course some such thing as that is just what the Pope is fishing for, if only if it should be so at the official direction of the queen, such a recognition on the part of England would be of great weight in the longed-for universal recognition of the Papal sovereignty. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.15}

**“Sunday Labor and Morality” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The rector of Trinity Church in San Francisco, Rev. Dr. H. W. Beers, was recently called as a witness in a case being tried in Oakland. The Doctor had testified that the defendant in the suit was a man of good moral character. On cross-examination he was asked if his opinion would have been different if he had known that the defendant attended baseball games on Sunday. His reply was, “I know very decent people who attend baseball games on Sunday.” To the lawyer’s question, “If Mr.—attended a baseball game instead of going to church, would it not affect is moral character in your opinion?” the reverend gentleman replied, “It would not affect my estimate of his moral character.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.16}

Well, why should it? Moral character is determined by moral or immoral acts. An immoral act is one that is contrary to the moral law; and since Sunday observance is not required by the moral law, it follows that an act performed on Sunday cannot affect one’s moral character, unless the act itself would be an immoral act if performed on Monday or Thursday, or any other day of the week. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.17}

In saying this, we do not mean to be understood that the time when a certain act is performed has nothing to do with the morality or immorality of the deed. Far from it. There is a day which God has declared holy, and whose observance is enjoined by the moral law. The fourth commandment gives us six days of the week in which to do all *our* work, but commands us to rest from our labor on the seventh day of the week. Now since morality is nothing else but conformity to the moral law, it follows that it would be immoral to do things upon the seventh day, which might be perfectly legitimate on any other day. But aside from the nature of the act itself, no immorality can attach to any deed performed on Sunday. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.18}

**“A Good Description” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The International Sunday-school lesson for June 12 is on the first four commandments, and it is interesting to note the different reasons which different lesson commentators give for keeping the first day of the week instead of the seventh day, as enjoined by the fourth commandment. Dr. Alexander McLaren, of Manchester, England, has an article in the *Sunday School Times*, in which he says:- {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.19}

“We have not the Jewish Sabbath nor is it binding on us. But as men we ought to rest, and resting, to worship on one day of the week. The unwritten law of Christianity moulding all outward forms by its own free spirit, gradually, and without premeditation, slid from the seventh to the first day, as it had clear right to do.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.20}

This is about the best statement of the case that we have yet seen. It is a truth that “we have not the Jewish Sabbath” and that it is not binding upon us, because the fourth commandment knows nothing of any such Sabbath. The Sabbath which we have, and which the fourth commandment enjoins upon us, is the Sabbath of the Lord, which is the seventh day of the week. But what we wish to call especial attention to is the aptness with which the writer describes the change from the seventh day to the first. The law of God did not change, but “the unwritten law of Christianity,” which is another term for the natural inclinations of professed Christians, “gradually, and without premeditation, *did* from the seventh to the first day.” {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.21}

That’s just it; that sentence describes the case as well as a whole volume could. There was no commandment for the change, but the people gradually *slid* over onto the first day of the week. In so doing, they clearly slid away from the commandment, which they had no right to do. If they had heeded the commandment, as they ought to have done, they would not have slid; for Inspiration describes the righteous man thus, “The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide.” Psalm 37:31. When men let go of the commandments of God, they are sure to slide. {SITI June 9, 1887, p. 352.22}

**“Born of God” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are few texts that have been the subject of more anxious inquiry than 1 John 3:9: “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” This is made much of by the self-styled “holiness” people, who use it to bolster up their own claims to perfection. They seem to take it for granted that they are specially referred to in the text, and think that all one has to do to be beyond the reach of sin is to profess to be born again. On the other hand, there are some who think that such a condition as the text describes is impossible in this life, and that it refers to the life to come, claiming that the new birth is at the resurrection. A question having been asked as to the meaning of the text, we take space for a brief exposition of it. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.1}

In the first place we would say that being “born of God” is a change that takes place in this life, and not at the resurrection. John says in this same chapter (verses 1, 2): “Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God.” Men are not by nature children of God. Paul says that the “children of disobedience,” who walk according to the lusts of the flesh, “fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind,” are “by nature the children of wrath.” Ephesians 2:2, 3. To the unbelieving Jews, who sought to murder Christ because he reproved their wicked deeds, the Saviour said, “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.” John 8:44. Now since “all have sinned” and are consequently by nature the “children of wrath,” children of the devil, it follows that those who are now the sons of God have become so by the new birth. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.2}

Again, being born again is a prerequisite to obtaining the life to come. Jesus said to Nicodemus: “Except a man be born again, ye cannot see the kingdom of God.” John 3:3. And he repeated the statement in these words: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Verse 5. These texts not only show that the new birth takes place before the resurrection, but they also set us on the track of what the new birth is. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.3}

We learn that in the new birth both water and the Spirit have a part. This reminds us of what Paul says in Romans 8:11-14: “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.” The possession of the Spirit shows that we are sons of God, and that we are Christ’s. Romans 8:9. It is called “the Spirit of adoption.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.4}

The first work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men, is to “reprove the world of sin.” John 16:8. Conviction of sin, if not stifled, will necessarily drive the soul to Christ (see Romans 7:24, 25; 8:1); and Paul says that “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.” 2 Corinthians 5:17. But if a man in Christ is a *new creature*, it must be that he has had a new birth; therefore we know that one who is born of God is one who is in Christ. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.5}

Now read Romans 6:1-3: “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” And also Galatians 3:26, 27: “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Here we learn, what has already been stated, that sons of God are they who are in Christ; and we learn also that we put on Christ, or are ushered into Christ, by baptism. Now connect with these texts 1 Corinthians 12:12, 13, where baptism and the Spirit are coupled together, as in John 3:5. It reads: “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.6}

Thus the Spirit convicts of sin; the convicted sinner repents and flies to Christ for cleansing from sin; he shows his acceptance of Christ by being baptized, and rises to walk in newness of life, a new creature in Christ, if he abides in Christ. This is the new birth, or, as it is commonly called, conversion. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.7}

But what has this to do with the statement in 1 John 3:9 that whosoever is born of God sinneth not? We shall see, when we have examined one or two texts more which relate to the new birth. We have already seen that the Spirit of God is the prime factor in effecting the new birth. It first works upon the heart, to convict of sin. But how does the Spirit convict of sin? Through what does it operate? In Ephesians 6:17 we are told that the sword of the Spirit is the word of God. Then since the word of God is the Spirit’s sword, it must be by means of the word that the Spirit convicts of sin. In support of this conclusion we read Hebrews 4:12, 13: “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.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.8}

Then the word of God,-and by this the law is specially referred to,-has much to do in the work of conversion, or the new birth. Without it, the Spirit could make no impression on the heart; and so the psalmist ascribes to it a leading place in the work of conversion, saying, “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” Psalm 19:7. Now we are prepared for a text which will bring us right back to the one with which we started. We quote 1 Peter 1:22, 23: “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.9}

In these texts last quoted we find the word of God brought to view as the seed by which men are begotten sons of God. Now read once more the text which we are studying: “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; *for his seed remaineth in him*; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” Why does not such an one commit sin? Because the seed by which he was begotten remains in him. And what is that seed? The word of God and the Spirit of God. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 353.10}

That the possession of the word of God in the heart is a guard against sin, is shown by the psalmist, who, speaking of the righteous man, says: “The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide.” Psalm 37:31. And again he says: “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee.” Psalm 119:11. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.1}

This statement about the law of God being in a man’s heart, reminds us of what the Lord Jesus said, through the psalmist, of himself: “Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:7, 8. Now since David says that the law in the heart keeps a man’s feet from slipping, we will examine a notable instance in the life of our Saviour, to see how it works. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.2}

After Jesus was baptized, he was led into the wilderness to be tempted. After he had fasted forty days and forty nights, the devil said to him: “If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.” Matthew 4:3. How did Jesus meet this temptation? Not with parleying, but with the words, “It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” That settled the question once for all. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.3}

Then the devil took Jesus up and placed him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said, “If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down.” Again the prompt reply came: “It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord th God.” Here again, from the fullness of the word which was hidden in his heart, Jesus drew a weapon which foiled this attack of the enemy. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.4}

Once more the devil plied his temptation. Taking Jesus into a high mountain, he showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, promising them all to him if he would but for one moment worship Satan as God. Quick as though came the words from the lips of Jesus, “Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.5}

Notice that Jesus met every temptation with a text of Scripture. But these temptations were suffered and recorded for our benefit, that we might learn how to resist. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.6}

Again: Faith is said to be the Christian’s shield. Ephesians 6:16: “Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.” But faith cannot be separated from the word, for “faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” Romans 10:17. One’s faith is just equal to the amount of the word that he has-not committed to memory, simply-but hidden in the heart. Now we can understand 1 John 5:18: “We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked on toucheth him not.” The object of a shield is to protect the person from fling missiles. In ancient times, when men fought with swords and bows, the man who received all the blows on his shield kept himself, so that he was not touched. So in the Christian warfare, the one who receives the assaults of Satan upon the shield of that faith which is the outgrowth of God’s own word, will keep himself untouched. Thus it was that Christ came off unscathed in his contest with Satan. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.7}

Once more: In John 15:7 we read: “If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.” That is a comprehensive promise. “Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.” What will be the constant request of the one who abides in Christ? It will evidently be for more of a likeness to him. David expressed it when he said: “One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple.” Psalm 27:4. Dare anyone say that such desires will not be gratified. They must be because Jesus said: “Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.” Matthew 5:6. Not filled with a good, happy feeling; not filled with complacency; not filled with self-conceit; but filled with righteousness-right doing-obedience to God’s commandments; as righteousness is inseparably connected with meekness. Zephaniah 2:3; Psalm 25:9. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.8}

From this brief study it will be seen that 1 John 3:9 does call for perfect obedience. So does the whole Bible. That book makes no provision for a little sin to be retained. Christ died that he might present to himself, that is, find when he comes for it, “a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.” Ephesians 5:27. This is the requirement. And surely if one abides *in Christ*, and if the word of truth by which he was turned from sin, still remains in him, it will continue to have the same effect that it had at first, and will keep him from sin. This does not mean that the individual will necessarily be perfect in knowledge, nor that he will be in a position where there is nothing more to gain; but it does mean that so far as he has knowledge of the law of God he will walk in it. He will be one of the “undefiled in the way.” Psalm 119:1. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.9}

Such an one will never boast of his goodness. He will be too much occupied in keeping from falling, to boast, and how will he keep from falling? “Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.” The more he beholds Christ, the more will he feel his own nothingness in comparison; this will beget humility; humility will beget trustfulness; and trustfulness will bring strength. Thus he will be “strong in the Lord and in the power of his might,” and, going on from strength to strength, will at last appear in Zion before God. W. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 354.10}

**“What Is the Resurrection?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to a question upon the resurrection, the *Christian Union* says: “Resurrection, or ‘rising up’ (as the word means) is the entrance of the spirit into the embodied life of the world to come.” This is Spiritualist doctrine, but it is held by very many who profess to be orthodox. There seems to be a sort of fascination about it, although we cannot conceive wherein the fascination consists, unless it is in the fact that the doctrine contradicts the Bible. Let the reader who is inclined to accept the *Christian Union’s* definition of the resurrection, but who has a regard for the Bible, notice the following scriptures:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.1}

1. Matthew 20:17-19: “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again.” Paul also says that “Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.” 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4. And he also states that this was “the resurrection from the dead.” Romans 1:4. The Spiritualist theory says that the resurrection is the rising of the soul from the body, at death; the Bible says that the resurrection of Christ was not till three days after his crucifixion. Which is more worthy of belief? {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.2}

2. Matthew 27:62-64: “Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead.” Notice the direct contrast between the Spiritualist theory of the resurrection and the Bible teaching. According to the Spiritualist theory, the resurrection of Jesus took place as soon as he breathed his last breath upon the cross. But here we find that the next day after the crucifixion the Jews desired a guard so that the disciples might not steal his body away and so claim that he had been raised from the dead according to his prediction. From this we learn that when Jesus, his disciples, and the Pharisees spoke of the resurrection from the dead, they all had the idea but that some time after death the body should be restored to life. And the Bible nowhere recognizes anything as resurrection, except restoration of the body to life. Just imagine the Pharisees asking for a guard to prevent the spirit of Christ from leaving the body! The Spiritualist theory makes nonsense of the Bible. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.3}

3. John 6:40: “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” These are the words of Christ. The Spiritualist teaching is that everyone is raised at what is called death; Christ says that believers shall be raised *at the last day*. No “advanced thinker” would be so wild as to claim that the spirit does not leave the body of any man until the last day, yet Christ says that that is when the resurrection will take place. And lest some should claim that the “last day” refers to the last day of a man’s earthly life, we quote the words of Christ in John 5:28, 29: “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” This shows that the resurrection is a coming forth from the grave. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.4}

4. 1 Corinthians 15:51-54: “Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” No comment could make it plainer that the resurrection takes place at the last trump, and that it consists in the raising of the body to life. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.5}

We might cite additional texts by the score, showing the same thing. Shall we not believe the Bible doctrine of the resurrection, rather than the Spiritualist theory? Reason alone would say that we ought, since it is the Bible alone that reveals the fact that there will be a resurrection. And does it not seem strange the Spiritualists, and those who follow their teaching without taking their name, will prate loftily about the resurrection from the dead, while all the time they deny that there is any such thing as death? Surely “the legs of the lame are not equal,” and all who depart from the simplicity of Bible doctrine are deplorably lame. W. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 358.6}

**“What Absurd Thing Shall Come Next?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

We had often head of the mind-cure theory, but now we see it. We always thought it was a mess of nonsense, but now we know that such only it is. We have before us the “formula” by which prescriptions are to be compounded for the cure of all diseases that humanity is heir to. What? “humanity” did we say? Oh, no, there is no humanity! It is all divinity. And “diseases” did we say? It is all a mistake. There is no such thing as disease, nor ache, nor pain-all this is a hoax. You get your finger caught as in a vice; it is not pinched, it does not hurt-it can’t hurt, for don’t you know that “matter has no life, and is insensible to pain or pleasure?” You only believe it hurts, and that is all. In fact matter “has no real existence” anyhow, and how can anything be really affected that has no real existence? “Matter is only an appearance like an image in a mirror;” and do you suppose that your reflection in a mirror could have its hand cut with a buzz-saw, or its finger mashed with a hammer? Do you suppose its tooth or head ever aches? Does it ever have the dyspepsia or neuralgia? Why, of course not. Well, then, are you so lost to all true ideas of sense or perception as not to know that “you are not material,” and that that about you which appears to be matter “is only an appearance like an image in a mirror”? And are you so dull as to suppose that an appearance can ache, or swell, or be inflamed, or be sick? If you are, you must get bravely over all that, for “pain and sickness exist only as beliefs, and come from consulting the appearance instead of clinging to the reality? {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.1}

Gentle reader, do you wonder whether we are not just “making this up”? Do you wonder whether there is anybody in this wide world who would put forth in sober earnest, and apparently with the expectation of being believed, such utter senselessness? If you do then you may safely lay aside all wonderment, for such is the case, and it is all sober fact. Let us proceed:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.2}

“The belief you have entertained of neuralgia, constipation, hoarseness, etc., is a profound error from beginning to end.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.3}

We know better, for we have had them all-not all at once, but one or two at a time-and instead of it being only a belief that we had them, it was a painful reality. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.4}

“You are a spirit... you cannot commit sin, be sick, or die.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.5}

Wrong altogether. We are not spirit, we are flesh, subject to all the laws of flesh. We *can* commit sin, and are afraid we shall (especially if we read much more of this stuff), and we often have, and are sorry for it. We *can* be sick, and must be very careful that we be not, as thousands of people are. We *can* die, as everybody, except two persons, has died that ever has lived in this world, and multitudes are dying daily, and as multitudes shall die. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.6}

“You are perfectly well [*yes*, we are], ever have been [no, we have not], ever will be.” Thank you for the conclusion; hope we may be, yet we doubt it much. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 360.7}

“Jesus conquered all these beliefs in false seemings [that is, false, for he died], and was lifted up into a perfect person of the spiritual truth of being, and he said that if he was lifted up, he would draw all men unto him. Therefore, because he did reveal this Christ-life of spiritual truth to man, you have only to follow that thought of his in your thoughts to come, yourself realizing that you are perfectly well and cannot suffer from any inflamed nerves, or irritated vocal organs or bronchial tubes, which you call neuralgia and hoarseness; it is an illusion.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 361.1}

There, that is all we need to quote; there is much more to the same purpose, but this is enough. We can only say that if anything could possibly be more of “an illusion” than this theory of the mind-cure, we should like to know how any conception of it could be conveyed to the human mind. And when we realize that there are men and women who actually believe in such unmitigated nonsense as is set forth in this “formula,” we confess that our confidence in human nature is just about in the last stages of dissolution, for after that what is there, or what can there be, that men may not believe. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 361.2}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In these days when so many people are claiming that the Sabbath law is abolished, we are glad to find some who will testify to the perpetuity of the Sabbath commandment even though they do not observe it. Thus the *Interior* of June 2 says concerning the fourth commandment:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.1}

“Observe (1) this Sabbath law is as old as Creation being found founded on the fact that God rested after he completed his creative work. (2) It will never cease to be binding on man. Christ did not abrogate it anymore than he abrogated the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ or any other precept of the moral law.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.2}

E. C. G. having read the articles on the millennium lately printed in the SIGNS, asks the following questions on Revelation 20:9:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.3}

“How can the wicked compass the camp of the saints about unless it is upon the earth? Does the beloved city come down from Heaven before the wicked are destroyed?” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.4}

The wicked cannot at all compass the camp of the saints about unless it is on the earth. And the text itself shows that it will be on the earth when they do compass it about. “They went up *on the breadth of the earth*, and compassed the camp of the saints about, *and the beloved city*.” And as they compass “the beloved city” before they are destroyed, that of itself proves that the beloved city must have come down from Heaven before they are destroyed. This is at the close of the thousand years. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.5}

We often hear people refuse to make pledges of means for the support of some missionary enterprise, on the ground that they don’t think it right to make a pledge. They always say that they intend to give something, though whether they do give or not is a question. The following from an English paper would seem to indicate that giving is a habit, and that those who have not the habit give nothing, while those who have the habit give to every worthy object:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.6}

“No fewer than thirty-one people of position in England declined to subscribe to the Church House on the ground that they wished to give their money to the fund for the poor clergy; yet it was found a day or two ago, on examining the list, that not one of them had sent a donation to the latter fund. On the other hand, fifty-seven subscribers to the Church House, whose contributions amounted to over 2,450, appeared as donors to the poor clergy fund of no less a sum than £3,630.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.7}

The Vienna correspondent of the *London Times* is the authority for the statement that a second edition of 120,000 copies of Rev. Isaac Salkinson’s Hebrew translation of the New Testament has been published. Of this number 100,000 copies have been bought by one man for gratuitous distribution among Hebrew-reading Jews all over Europe. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.8}

**“Making the Sabbath a Holy Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

In one of the religious weeklies we find the following, which is part of a comment on the fourth commandment:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.9}

“On the seventh day our bodies and minds must rest; and our souls also. Our spiritual nature must hold communion with Heaven, thus making the Sabbath a holy day.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.10}

The thought here expressed is altogether too common. It is a grave mistake to suppose that we have anything to do with the degree of holiness of the Sabbath-day. No man can make a day holy, no matter how holy or how absorbed in spiritual contemplation he may be. If all the Christian people in the world should agree to set apart Wednesday for rest and religious meditation, and worship, that day would not be any more sacred than it is now. The seventh day is a holy day because God made it holy; he “hallowed it.” He alone could do this. It matters not if everyone in the world devoted the day to secular work and pleasure, the day would be just as holy as it was when God hallowed it. But the people themselves cannot be holy. This is the point: The action of people in regard to sacred things makes no difference with those things, but with the people themselves. By constantly reverencing holy things, men become holy; by disregarding holy things they injure themselves, but do not detract from the holiness of the sacred thing. Men cannot make God’s name any the less sacred by blaspheming it; neither could they make the name of Baal holy by reverencing it. So men cannot make the seventh day any less holy by devoting it to secular uses; and all the “*consensus* of Christian thought” that there is in the world, cannot attach a single iota of sacredness to Sunday. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.11}

**“Humility Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

Simulated Christianity is often so nearly like the genuine that it cannot be detected upon a short acquaintance, and yet there is generally something about it that arouses a suspicion that it is not just what it should be. A meek and quiet spirit must characterize every true Christian, and it matters not how loud the profession nor how great the manifestation of feeling, if humility dwells not in the heart, “this man’s religion is vain.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.12}

In view of the maximum of profession, and the minimum of possession, in religious circles to-day, the following truths incidentally expressed in a recent number of the New York *Christian Advocate* are to the point. Speaking of “*De Imitations Christi*,” a book written nearly five hundred years ago, probably by Thomas a Kempis, the *Advocate* says:- {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.13}

“The restless activity of this age needs the calmness of the “*Imitatione*,” and its call to stop and think and look within. The superficial views prevalent as to sin, and the easy-going sort of piety which flourishes, nowadays, need the earnest and penetrating teachings of this little book. And for the cant, narrowness, and pharisaic self-righteousness of much of the present so-called holiness literature-especially that circulated among Methodists-there needs to be substituted the sincerity, freshness, humility, and depth of spiritual insight, which constitute some of the chief charms of the “*Imitatione*,” and which have attracted to it devout minds of all communions.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.14}

**“Scripture Verified” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

Every new discovery by those who are busily engaged in the work of unearthing the monuments and records of antiquity, serves to make more evident the simple, straightforward truth of the Scripture narrative. The statement in Exodus 1:8, that “there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph,” is one that commentators have thought it necessary to almost apologize for. They have given learned explanations, showing in what figurative sense the words were to be taken. But now the mummy of that “new king” has been discovered, and visitors to the Bulaq Museum may gaze upon the features of that mighty tyrant who lived over three thousand years ago. We have not space to tell all the circumstances of the finding (they are given in the May *Century*), but it is sufficient to say that it is quite conclusively demonstrated that this king was not of Egyptian stock at all, but of Assyrian. He was the second of a new dynasty, but as his father reigned but a very few years, and did nothing of note, he was practically the first. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.15}

This fact shows the appropriateness of the expression, “there arose a *new king*,” and the reader can readily see how a foreign usurper would not know Joseph, and would care nothing for the kindred of one who had done so much for Egypt. He owed the Israelites no debt of gratitude, and saw in them only a people whom he could use to advance the glory of his reign, and who, if left to themselves, might prove formidable adversaries. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.16}

And this also throws light upon another text. In Isaiah 52:4 we read: “For thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause.” This verse has been supposed to refer to two distinct independent events, but the discovery shows that it is the statement of simple fact. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.17}

This is only one of hundreds of instances where the correctness of Bible history has been demonstrated by discoveries of ancient records, and should serve to teach people that they need not get scared and begin to reject or apologize for the Scriptures when they find statements that they cannot understand. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.18}

**“Celibacy of the Clergy” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

L. A. T. asks if it can be proved that the Simon spoken of in Luke 4:38 is Simon Peter, the one whom the Catholics claim was the first Pope, and thinks that if it can be so proved, it will be very much against the Papal dogma that the clergy should not marry. We reply that the Simon of Luke 4:38 is none other than Simon Peter, as may be seen by reading Matthew 8:14, 15, where we find the same thing that is recorded in Luke. But this does not affect the Papal doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy. The Catholic Church does not profess to derive that point from the Bible, and consequently nothing that can be drawn from the Bible will have any weight with them. They are very well aware that Peter was married. In fact, it is not probable that there was one of the apostles who was not a married man; and Paul, in giving the qualifications of a bishop, says that he “must be blameless, the husband of one wife.” {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.19}

In the early history of the church, no such thing as the celibacy of the clergy was known. In the third century it began to be taught that a clergyman should not marry the second time. This was from a false conception of 1 Timothy 3:2. In the fourth century, as the “mystery of iniquity” was approaching its full development as the “man of sin,” decrees began to be issued forbidding the clergy to marry. For several centuries there was controversy over this subject, and perhaps the majority of Catholic priests were married, although councils were declaring against them. It was not till the pontificate of Gregory VII., A.D. 1673-1685, that the celibacy of the clergy was fully established in the Catholic Church, that Pope being the first who had the determination and the power to enforce his decrees. Those priests who were married were obliged to put away their wives. Many scandals ensued, and at the time of the Reformation these were so common among the clergy as to scarcely excite remark. There can be no doubt that while celibacy has been a fruitful source of the abominations of the Papacy, it has added to its power, since the priests, having no family ties, may be sent at a moment’s notice wherever their superiors indicate. {SITI June 16, 1887, p. 363.20}

**“Effects of Erroneous Opinions” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is very common for those who are quite loose in their belief, or who do not believe much of anything, to ease their consciences by saying, “God will never condemn a man on account of his opinions; it is how a man lives that determines his condition at last.” How these people acquired such intimate knowledge of God’s plans, so as to be able to speak so definitely of what he will or will not do, is not apparent; for it is very evident from the Bible that a man’s opinions have a good deal to do in deciding his final destiny. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.1}

It seems never to occur to those who use the expression quoted above, that they are strangely inconsistent with themselves. The very ones who use such language will speak very slightingly of one who “has not the courage of his convictions,” that is, one who holds opinions which he dare not act out. Such a man they justly accuse of leading a double life; and yet they seem to think that God will be perfectly satisfied with a man who leads such a life. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.2}

But the great mistake is in supposing that a man can hold opinions which will not to a greater or less extent influence his actions. The statement by Watts, that “the mind’s the standard of the man,” is but another way of expressing the truth uttered by Solomon, that as a man “thinketh in his heart, so is he.” A man cannot entertain vile thoughts and still have all his actions pure. Neither can a man entertain erroneous opinions without acting in accordance with them, unless his circumstances hinder him; and in that case he is entitled to no more credit than the thief in prison is to be commended for not stealing. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.3}

In times past people have suffered severely on account of their opinions. When Paul says, “By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace,” he says in effect that the inhabitants of Jericho perished because they believed not. If they had believed, they might have been saved as well as the harlot Rahab. But they were of the opinion that their gods were stronger than the God of Israel. Somebody might have said to them, “It doesn’t make any difference what ideas you have about God; it is your actions that will determine your final lot.” But their ideas of God had everything to do in shaping their actions and their erroneous ideas led them into practices which caused their ruin. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.4}

Again, we read of the children of Israel: “For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he [Christ] grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcases fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.” Hebrews 3:16-19. Here we have the plain declaration that it was the unbelief of the Israelites that shut them out of the promised land. “They could not enter in because of unbelief.” But would they not have been allowed to enter in if they had not sinned? Certainly; and they would not have sinned but for their unbelief. Their sin was a necessary consequence of their unbelief. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.5}

How was it with the inhabitants of Sodom? When Lot, who believed the warnings of the angels, went out to tell his relatives that God was going to destroy the city, “he seemed as one that mocked.” They regarded him as a fanatic; very likely they thought he was losing his mind, and would have to be cared for. But the Lord did destroy the city, and all those who disbelieved perished with it. It was their opinion that they were safe enough, and in consequence of their erroneous opinion they perished. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.6}

We may learn a lesson from them. Indeed their case is recorded for our admonition. Christ says: “Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” Luke 17:28-30. All over the land the coming of the Lord is being proclaimed. The same word of prophecy foretells that his coming is now very near. Yet these things are to thousands as idle tales. Those who preach the nearness of the second advent are regarded as fanatical. It is the common opinion that the world is just in its infancy. Men say, “Well, it doesn’t make any difference how we believe in regard to the coming of the Lord, if we only live right.” But still the truth exists that only “unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” Hebrews 9:28. Why will this be so? Simply because those who do not believe that his coming is near at hand, will not be getting ready for it. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.7}

Let no one delude himself with the idea that he has “a right to his own opinions,” and that he can believe what he pleases and still be safe at last. It is true that so far as other men are concerned, he has a right to his own opinions; that is, he is not answerable to any man for what he believes; but all men are answerable to God for their opinions. No man has a right to hold an opinion contrary to what God has revealed in his word. And those who shall cling to their self-assumed right to believe what they please, will find at the last that it was a dearly-bought privilege. Among those who “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death,” the *unbelieving* occupy a prominent place. “Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.” W. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.8}

**“The New Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

An exchange says: “Many persons seem to think that because the ten commands were done away, we have no moral precepts to guide us. I will, therefore, in a few words, show that nine of the commands-all the moral part-are adopted or re-enacted in the new law (New Testament) which is now our authority in place of the old law that it supercedes and annuls.” There are many people who entertain, just such ideas as are expressed in this quotation, and therefore before we examine that which the writer gives as a substitute for the decalogue, we wish to show how erroneous such assumptions are. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.9}

(a) It is assumed that the ten commandments were done away. But this is in direct contradiction of what the Scriptures say of God’s purpose concerning the law, and of its nature. First read a few statements: “Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever.” Psalm 119:152. “Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.” Verse 100. “The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand [margin, “are established”] fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.” Psalm 111:7, 8. Again, our Saviour said: “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. If it is asked how this can be, the briefest examination of the nature of the law will give the answer. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.10}

(*b*) The law of God is the righteousness of God. This is indicated in Isaiah’s prophecy: “The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make if honorable.” But Isaiah 51:6, 7 shows beyond all question that the law is God’s righteousness. We read: “Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law.” The people who know righteousness are they in whose heart is the law of God; the obvious meaning is that they know righteousness because the law is in their heart; and this will be made still more evident further on. The righteousness which is known by the law of God is God’s righteousness; and when that truth is grasped, we scarcely need to be told that it will not be abolished, for that would be to tear God from his throne. Now we can understand how it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for a particle of the law to fail. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.11}

(*c*) The law of God is his will. Paul says: “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law.” Romans 2:17, 18. This is perfectly in harmony with the statement that the law is God’s righteousness, for God is righteous, and his will must be righteous. That the ten commandments are referred to by “the law” is evident from verses 21-23. Now since the ten commandments are the righteousness of God, and his will, it necessarily follows that they *cannot* be abolished. Be it understood that when “the law” is mentioned, there is no discrimination, but the whole law is referred to. David had reference to the whole law when he said: “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” Now if a part of the law were abolished, it would be no more perfect. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.12}

But it is useless to speak about the possibility or probability of the abolition of any part of the law; for it would be impossible to abolish any portion of it. God himself could not abolish any portion of it; for that would be to abolish his own goodness, and “he cannot deny himself.” So long as God’s throne is in Heaven, and his kingdom rules over all, so long must the ten commandments, the law of his kingdom, remain intact. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.13}

2. It is assumed that only nine of the ten commandments were moral, and that the fourth was not. But this assumption is itself fatal to the assumption that the ten commandments were done away; for a moral law cannot be done away. Moral duties grow out of the nature of God, and they can not be done away so long as God is God. He who admits that nine of the ten commandments are moral thereby admits that they cannot be abolished. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.14}

Let us make this point a little more clear. If a law is abolished, then the duty which it once enjoined is no longer a duty, and that which it forbade is no longer a crime. Now take the seventh commandment. If that were ever abolished, even though it were afterward re-enacted, there must have been a time when it was not an immoral act to commit adultery! So also of the eighth commandment: if that were abolished, then it was not wrong to steal. But no right-minded person can conceive of a time when it would be right to kill, steal, or commit adultery. Now if it could never be right for all people to live promiscuously, as to persons and property, or for human life to be considered as of no value, or for God’s name to be held in no repute, then it follows that the commandments which forbid such things must always be in force. It is impossible for anyone who has any just conception of morality to imagine such a thing as a moral law being abolished. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.15}

Having seen that moral commandments cannot be abolished, let us consider the fourth commandment in particular. It is claimed that it is not moral. Did it ever occur to anyone to wonder why God should insert a non-moral commandment in the midst of moral precepts? It would be much easier to answer the statement that it is not moral, if those who say so would tell us what is necessary to constitute a moral precept. “Moral” is defined as “relating to duty or obligation.” Well, the Sabbath commandment was given by the Creator of the universe, and certainly it is man’s duty to obey. We cannot conceive of anything that could have more effect in making a commandment moral than that it came from God, for he is the source of all morality. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 374.16}

As with the other commandments, so with the fourth; we cannot conceive of a time when to violate it would not be sin. The Sabbath commandment is the first of which we have the record of its being given to man. In Eden at the close of creation it was sanctified. It “was made for man.” It was based on the unalterable facts of creation (Genesis 2:2, 3); so that the only way it could be abolished would be to abolish the fact that the earth was created, which is of course impossible. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.1}

It is sometimes claimed that the fourth commandment is not like the others, because, while they are to be kept every moment of time, it requires a duty only once a week. Such have read the commandment to little purpose. The very first word, “remember,” covers every moment of a man’s life. Not only during the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath is the fourth commandment to be kept, but during all the hours of the week. The man who does not remember the Sabbath every working day, will not keep the Sabbath when it comes. The fourth commandment covers the six days of labor as well as the seventh day of rest; and when we consider that it alone of all the ten, names and specifies the giver of the law, we cannot fail to see that it is the very heart of the moral law. Take it away, and there would be nothing to point out the authority of the lawgiver. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.2}

We will now examine the new law, as given by our exchange. It is as follows:- {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.3}

1-One God; Ephesians 4:6 and 1 Corinthians 8:6. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.4}

2-Idolatry forbidden; 1 Corinthians 6:9; 10:7-14, and 1 John 5:21. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.5}

3-Swearing forbidden; James 5:12. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.6}

4-Sabbath; nowhere enjoined, either by precept or example. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.7}

5-Obedience to parents enjoined; Ephesians 6:1-2, and Colossians 3:20. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.8}

6-Murder forbidden; Romans 13:9; Galatians 5:21; 1 Peter 4:15; 1 John 3:15. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.9}

7-Adultery; Romans 13:9; 1 Corinthians 6:9; Hebrews 13:4; James 4:4. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.10}

8-Steal not; Romans 13:9; Ephesians 4:28. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.11}

9-False witness; Romans 13:9. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.12}

10-Covetousness forbidden; Romans 13:9; 1 Corinthians 6:10; Ephesians 5:5. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.13}

We have copied the above exactly and are not responsible for the reference to Romans 31 (corrected). The first “commandment” of this new law tells us that there is one God. Very well, we can *believe* that, but the mere statement that there is one God does not involve any duty. The devils themselves can and do keep such a commandment as that. See James 2:19. The fact is, the texts cited contain no semblance of a commandment, as anybody can see for himself. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.14}

Those scriptures which are referred to as containing the second commandment, refer simply to the first. The second commandment forbids bowing down to images, or the representation of God, by something in heaven or earth. Nothing to this effect is found in the New Testament. Without the Old Testament it would be utterly impossible to convict the Catholic of sin when he makes obeisance to the image of the Virgin Mary or of Christ. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.15}

The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments, as given in the “new law,” are simply quotations from the Decalogue given upon Sinai, and do not purport to be anything else. We are told that, just as the new constitution of California contains many things that were in the old one, so the new law contains many things that were in the decalogue of Sinai, and that therefore we must consider these commandments as part of the new law. But now that the new constitution of California is in force, men do not quote anything from the old one; whereas Paul is quoting directly from the ten commandments of Sinai, and is not giving a new law, nor quoting from some other law in the New Testament. Moreover he declares (Romans 7:7) that long before this was written, he was convicted of sin by the law which says, “Thou shalt not covet.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.16}

As to the fourth commandment, we find it taught by the example of Christ and the apostles (Luke 4:16; Acts 13:14; 17:2; 18:4), and also by precept. Matthew 24:20. But this is not why the Sabbath should be kept. It should be kept because “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.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.17}

One more point should be noticed concerning this alleged new law. That is, that it is quoted from four different men, who wrote about thirty years after Christ. Allowing that they had a right to make laws, and that the scriptures quoted constitute the new law, we should have a period of about thirty years between the crucifixion, when it is alleged that the old law was done away, and the giving of the new law. Thirty years in which there was no moral law whatever! Thirty years in which it was not wrong to swear, kill, steal, lie, and commit adultery! To such lengths of absurdity will men go in their attempts to evade a plain but unpleasant duty. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.18}

But the simple fact is that Peter, James, John, and Paul had no more authority to enact or re-enact moral precepts than the Pope of Rome has. “There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.” James 4:12. Isaiah tells us who this “one lawgiver” is; “For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us.” Isaiah 33:22. If any of the apostles had presumed to speak anything on their own authority, or to enact or re-enact any moral precept, they would have been acting the part of the “man of sin,” “the son of perdition; 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.” To say that the apostles presumed to institute moral precepts, is to basely slander them. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.19}

From this examination of the matter, and if space allowed it might be made much more thorough, we find that if there is any moral obligation in the world at the present time, it is by virtue of the ten commandments. If they have been done away, then there is no such thing as morality or immorality; there can be no such thing as character. But they have not been abolished; they cannot be abolished; and therefore to fear God and keep his commandments still constitutes the whole duty of man. He who presumes to sit in judgment on the law, and to absolve himself from obedience to any part of it, will find to his sorrow that there is one Lawgiver who is able to destroy. W. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 375.20}

**“Faith and Works” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber says: “Please harmonize James 2:24, 25 with verses 22 and 23 and verses 17 and 18 of the same chapter.” This is easily done, or, rather, there is no necessity for doing it, as they are already in harmony. The statement in each is practically the same. Beginning with verse 15 we read: “If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.1}

Verses 15 and 16 forcibly illustrate the truth that words, without corresponding deeds, amount to nothing. Professions of sympathy for the distressed are worthless, unless some practical sympathy is shown. A man may, for a short time, get the reputation of being charitable, simply because of his fervent professions of sympathy for the poor; but if he is never known to render them any assistance, people soon come to regard his professions of sympathy as false, and become disgusted with them. Just so it is with faith, says the apostle. A man may profess faith in Christ, but if no works are manifest, there is no faith there. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.2}

In the eighteenth verse he supposes a case. The man who has works may say to one who professes faith without works: Show me your faith without works, and I will show you faith *by* my works. But, according to verse 17, a man cannot exhibit faith without works; if he has no works, it is an evidence that he has no faith. But the fact that a man has good works is of itself evidence that he has faith, for good works are the invariable result of living faith. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.3}

This is shown by verses 21-23: “Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” Some have thought that this contradicts Paul’s statement that a man is justified by faith only; but it does not. James explains how a man is justified by works, by the case of Abraham. His faith was manifest by works, and by works was made perfect. That is, his works showed that he had perfect faith. By proceeding to offer Isaac upon the altar, he showed his faith in the power of God to raise him from the dead, and thus to fulfill the promise, “In Isaac shall thy seed be called.” See Hebrews 11:17-19. James himself says by the offering of Isaac the scripture was fulfilled which says, “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness,” thus showing that he was justified by faith and not by works; and so when he says that Abraham was justified by works, it is in a secondary sense, since it was the works alone which showed that he had saving faith. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.4}

It was the same with Rahab. James says, “Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way.” James 2:25. Paul says, “By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.” Hebrews 11:31. Now both are strictly correct. Rahab was justified by faith; but she would not have been justified by faith if her faith had been merely a simple assent to the fact that God was leading the Israelites. Such a belief as that would not have been real faith. But she had so strong a faith in what she had heard about God’s leading the Israelites into the land of Canaan, that she did the works required of her, and so in a secondary sense she was justified by works, since it was her works that testifies to the reality of her faith. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.5}

These scriptures show how inseparable are faith and works. So closely united are they that the possession of one presupposes the possession of the other. Yet it must not be forgotten that faith is first. There can be no works where there is no faith. We read: “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith,” and, “the just shall live by faith.” This is literally true. It is also true, as Paul says, that “if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” Romans 10:9. Also when the jailer asked, “What shall I do to be saved?” Paul answered him truly, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” Acts 16:31. This may be said to comprise all that is necessary for salvation, because works are included in faith; they follow it as surely as flowers follow the showers of spring. If a man has the faith of Abraham, he will do the works of Abraham; if a man really believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, he will bring forth works “meet for repentance.” W. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 376.6}

**“The Lord Not Slack” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

“But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.” 2 Peter 3:8. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.1}

This is a much abused text. It has no doubt been quoted, in part, at least, by thousands who have never read it; and of the thousands who have read it, probably comparatively few realized its force. We say the text is much abused, because it is almost always referred to to sustain some erroneous opinion. One will quote it as proof that “the day of the Lord” (see verse 10; 1 Thessalonians 5:2, etc.) is a thousand years long; but the text does not intimate anything of the kind, and from other texts it may clearly be shown that “the day of the Lord” is not a thousand years long. Another will quote it as proof that the days of creation were not literal days, but that they were periods of at least a thousand years. This is even worse than the other; for the sacred record shows beyond the possibility of an intelligent doubt that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. Still others hold that the text shows that the coming of the Lord may not come for a thousand years or more. This also is a gross perversion. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.2}

The real force of the text can only be learned from the context. The chapter is devoted wholly to the second coming of Christ. The apostle tells us that some will say, “Where is the promise of his coming?” The word “promise” here is evidently used in an accommodated sense, as meaning the prospect of the fulfillment of the promise; they can easily read the promise in the Bible, but they are skeptical as to its fulfillment, as is shown by their saying, “For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.3}

The apostle cites the case of the flood, and says that the same word that formed the earth a liquid mass in the beginning, and stored up within it the elements of its destruction, still keeps it stored with fire reserved against the day of Judgment, and perdition of ungodly men. Just as surely as the world was once destroyed by water, so surely will it again be destroyed by fire. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.4}

But, then, the objector will urge that it has been a long time since the signs which Christ gave (see Matthew 24) were fulfilled, and there seems to be almost as much to be done now as then. He is like the “evil servant” who says in his heart, “My Lord delayeth his coming.” To all such the apostle says that “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.” What does this mean? Simply this, that God, being infinite, and inhabiting eternity, does not regard time as we do, whose lives are but a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then passeth away. A thousand years are in his sight as one day. That is, compared with his eternity, a thousand years is but as a day would be to us. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.5}

Does this, then, give any color to the idea that the coming of the Lord may be perhaps thousands of years distant? Not by any means; for the Scriptures plainly teach that after certain signs have taken place, Christ’s comning is near, “even at the doors.” Those signs have been seen; and now to the one who says that at the rate the truth has been going to the nations of the earth, it will require many, many years for all people to be warned, the apostle says that “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years.” That is, in one day he can accomplish as much as in a thousand years, if he so chooses. He has infinite resources at his command, and he has promised that he will “finish the work and cut it short in righteousness,” and will make a short work on the earth. He who is able to raise up children to Abraham, of the stones of the earth, is able to raise up laborers sufficient to do in one week as much work in warning the world of Christ’s coming as has been done in the last hundred years. What he has promised he is able to perform; he has all time for his own; and since he has given his word, we may *know* that Christ’s coming is “at the doors,” no matter how much appearances may be to the contrary. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.6}

The fact that a thousand years are with the Lord as one day, shows that “the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” Instead, therefore, of caviling at the promise of God, or wickedly saying in our hearts, “My Lord delayeth his coming,” we should thank God for his longsuffering in waiting for us to get ready for the coming of the Lord, and should cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light, knowing that the night is far spent, and the day is at hand. W. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 379.7}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

J. T. C. writes: “As Oregon is about to vote on an amendment to the constitution, to prohibit the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, what should Seventh-day Adventists do,-vote for it, or sit still?” We answer unhesitatingly, Vote for it, by all means. When prohibition is joined to a political party, there are many temperance people who cannot conscientiously vote for it, and this is especially true, when, as is usually the case, the party favors Sunday laws. But when the question of prohibition comes before the people on its own merits, as a simple amendment to the constitution, and not as a political issue, every good citizen should use all his influence in favor of it. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.1}

The New York *Observer* remarks that there are at least two classes in that community who can “look upon the record of the last Legislature with feelings of profound satisfaction. They are the liquor dealers and the pool-sellers.” There is yet another class who, along with these two, ought to look upon that Legislature with profound satisfaction. To satisfy a capricious demand of the churches, that same Legislature made the Sabbath of the Lord a half-holiday. Perhaps, however, the satisfaction on their part will not be so profound as is desired until the Sabbath is made wholly a holiday, and the Sunday rigorously enforced upon all people. But with politics as it is, and with the start that they have, it is probable that their supreme satisfaction will not be long delayed. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.2}

June 4, Cardinal Gibbons arrived in Baltimore from Rome, whither he went to receive the red hat from the Pope. His return was in such state as befitted “a prince of the church.” It is true that the Government did not send a revenue cutter to meet him, as was done for the Papal ablegate last fall, but the railroad company provided a special car for him, and all the officials of the city of Baltimore headed the immense procession which turned out to do him honor. After parading the streets to the music of no less than eleven bands, the procession halted at the cathedral; “his eminence” entered, and sat down upon *his throne*, when the clergy were graciously allowed to approach him and kiss his great ring. And all this was an “informed reception” tendered to a “prince” who “reigns” in Republican America. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.3}

One of the chief characteristics of the denomination known as Disciples, is its teaching that the moral law is abolished. It is therefore with equal surprise and pleasure that we find the following in the *Christian Standard*, the leading journal of that denomination:- {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.4}

“All of the commands of the stone tables are ‘thou shalt nots’ and warnings. But there is the same love in the law as in the gospel. The difference is only one of expression, as when I warn one against venturing into a roaring flood, and when, on his leaping madly in, I follow to save him. In the law love warns; in the gospel it plunges in and saves.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.5}

The truth on that point could not be more clearly and tersely put. It expresses the exact relation of the law and the gospel. The law warns the man of the danger; when its warning has been unheeded, the gospel pulls the man out; then the law still warns him to keep out. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.6}

Says Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., in the *Sunday School Times* of May 28:- {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.7}

“The obligation of the Sabbath is based upon the Lord’s example in the work of creation, and his blessing the Sabbath-day (Genesis 2:3), which, like every other blessing connected with creation, was pronounced at the time, and not deferred until the promulgation of the fourth commandment from Mount Sinai. The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27), not for the Jews alone. This command is of universal obligation, as truly as any other in the decalogue.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.8}

These statements do not derive their truth from the fact that they are made by Professor Green; they are true whether anyone believes them or not. They are a part of the Bible truths concerning the Sabbath, which the SIGNS is constantly teaching. Perhaps some who do not dare to trust their own judgment as to the truth of any statement, may accept what Professor Green says as a foundation upon which to build positive knowledge for themselves on the Sabbath question. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.9}

It is a fixed principle that a law must always carry with it a penalty; and of course the law-making power must prescribe the penalty. It is also true that the one who makes a law has the right and the power to pardon the transgressor. Now let us apply these principles to the idea that the apostles made laws for the guidance of Christians. If it is claimed that the apostles did enact the moral laws which people are now to follow, then it must also be claimed that they had power to execute the penalty of the law upon the transgressor, or to forgive him. But they are dead, and therefore if they were lawgivers, and their laws are to be enforced, they must either be somewhere administering the government of the earth, or else they must have committed their power to someone else on earth. This savors considerably of Catholic doctrine, and of Popery; but it is not the worst error into which they fall, who claim that the apostles made laws to take the place of the law of God. If they made laws which superseded the Sinaitic law, then of course the sacrifice of Christ, who was offered for the transgressions of the law, can be of no avail under the new law. Therefore it follows that if the law of God be done away, and a new law made by the apostles be in force, one of three things must exist: either there is no pardon for transgressors, or another sacrifice has been made, or else every sinner atones for his own sins. But neither of these can be the case; for besides the name of Christ, “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 3:12. There is no salvation in any other. It seems strange that people with reasoning faculties should say that the apostles made the laws which we are now to obey. Even a child must see that so long as God is king and judge of the universe, so long must the entire universe, not excepting the inhabitants of this little earth, be subject to his law. And he has but one law, and that is the perfect, holy, just, and good law which was spoken from Mount Sinai. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.10}

When we speak slightingly of the “advanced thought” of this generation, we must not be understood as deprecating new ideas. There are two kinds of advanced thought. One is the kind which does not begin to advance till it has turned aside from the truth. When a man turns his face from the word of God, every step of his advance must be into deeper darkness. The farther he goes with his face from the word, the deeper is his darkness, and consequently the more “advanced” ideas he has, the greater is his exhibition of human folly. But the man who clings to the law may advance as much as he pleases. He will find in it enough for constant meditation. To such, knowledge is promised: “If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.” John 7:17. “For the Lord giveth wisdom; out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous; he is a buckler to them that walk uprightly.” Proverbs 2:6, 7. And “the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” Proverbs 4:18. The man who clings close to the law, may welcome new ideas; yea, he may earnestly pray, “Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.” Psalm 119:18. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.11}

In the May *Missionary Review* Dr. McCosh tells the story of two young men, graduates of Princeton, both of whom were sons of missionaries, and were born in India, who started out last fall to visit the various colleges and theological seminaries, and invite students to declare themselves to be “willing and desirous, God permitting, to be foreign missionaries.” As the result of their work, 1,800 students, out of about 100 educational institutions, have signified their desire to become missionaries. Dr. McCosh thinks that the majority, at least, of those who have offered themselves are sincere and thoroughly in earnest, and says that if the movement is genuine it lays a great responsibility on the church. The point is that the church expects to convert the world, and can with difficulty secure the funds to support those who are already in foreign fields. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.12}

**“‘The Eighth Day’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is no greater cause for wonder in this age of wonders, than the inventions which men devise to bolster up Sunday keeping. We know of no so-called argument that has ever been invented that is more wonderful than that which makes Ezekiel 43:26, 27 a basis for Sunday observance. The wonder is that people with the ability to read and reason for themselves should seriously entertain it. The verses read as follows:- {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.13}

“Seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it; and they shall consecrate themselves. And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt offerings upon the altar, and your peace offerings; and I will accept you, saith the Lord God.” {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.14}

This reference to “the eighth day” is said to be a prophetic statement that Sunday should be kept. We wonder (1) how people who cannot locate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, can so readily tell on what day the seven days of purification were to begin, so as to make the eighth day come on Sunday; (2) how, after they have so begun their count as to make the eighth day fall on Sunday, they would manage to have the next eighth day come on Sunday also; (3) how they make “upon the eighth day, *and so forward*” refer to every eighth day; and (4) how they can find in a Jewish sacrificial ordinance the slightest reference to a rest-day of any kind. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.15}

The argument from this text is so flimsy, so far fetched, and so absurd, that it seems like folly to notice it, yet honest people who were groping for light, have stumbled over it. One text will show the absurdity of the argument. In Leviticus 22:27 we read: “When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lorrd.” Now according to the Sunday argument from Ezekiel 43:27, this means that the young sheep or goat should remain with its mother seven days, and that on every eighth day afterward it should be offered for a burnt-offering! That is absurd, it is true, but no more so than it is to talk about keeping Sunday on every eighth day. {SITI June 23, 1887, p. 384.16}

**“What Condemns Men?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Solomon, the man to whom God gave wisdom such as none ever had before or since his time, sums up everything as follows: “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14. There is a very close connection between these two verses. The statement in verse 14 depends upon that in verse 13. To fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man; and the necessity of performing this duty is enforced by the statement that God shall bring every work into judgment, *with every secret thing*. From these verses, then, we learn: (1) That the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man; there is no duty outside of them; (2) That the ten commandments are the standard by which men shall be judged; for they are to be judged according to what they have done, and the ten commandments is what they are required to do; (3) That the Judgment will take into account every work, and every secret thing; and (4) That therefore the ten commandments cover every work and every secret thing, that is, every thought. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.1}

From the nature of the law of God we know that it must of necessity cover every work or thought for which it is possible for God to call men to account. 1. It contains the *whole duty* of man. 2. “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” Psalm 19:7. If it is perfect, the man who obeys it strictly must also be perfect, and God requires nothing more than this. Matthew 5:48. 3. Above all, it is the statement of God’s character, which is perfect righteousness. God himself calls his law “my righteousness.” Isaiah 51:5-7. It is the will of God. Romans 2:17, 18. Now since all God requires of men, in order that he may admit them into his eternal kingdom, is that they should do his will (Matthew 7:21), therefore there can be no duty for man outside of the ten commandments. It is utterly impossible to conceive of any sin which is not forbidden by some one of the commandments. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.2}

When this statement is made, people sometimes cite the case of the ancient Israelites, who were required to bring offerings and make sacrifices for sin. On the day of atonement an offering was to be made for the whole congregation, to atone for the sins of all the people; and it was declared that whoever should not afflict his soul on that day should be cut off from among the people. Now it is asked which one of the ten commandments was violated by the man who refused to regard the day of atonement; and the idea intended to be conveyed by the questioner is that there are moral duties outside of the ten commandments. Again we are cited to the ordinance of baptism as something which the Lord requires, but which the commandments say nothing about. Both these objections are the same, and are covered by the question which we have been asked, “What commandment does a man violate by not having faith in Christ?” We think it can be shown that although death will be the portion of those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, their destruction comes primarily and solely because they have not kept the commandments. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.3}

1. In Romans 6:23 we read that “the wages of sin is death.” Wherever there is death there must have been sin, for without sin there is no death. But “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4), and therefore it is certain that all who shall be “punished with everlasting destruction,” will be punished because they have broken the law. But the law to which the apostle refers is the ten commandments, for Paul says that it was only the law which says, “Thou shalt not covet,” that convicted him of sin. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.4}

2. We are also told that “all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Romans 3:23. “Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Romans 5:12. “There is none righteous, no, not one.” Romans 3:10. All men then are condemned to death, and condemned solely by the law of God. When Christ was upon earth, he was not acting as judge, but as reconciler, and therefore he did not condemn sinners. He did not come to condemn, but to save. He himself said: “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” John 3:17, 18. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.5}

3. This being true, it follows that nothing which pertains to Christ’s work of saving men, can condemn them. Christ came to save the world, not to condemn the world. Therefore nothing in his work of saving the world can condemn the world. Let the reader bear in mind the reason why Christ did not come to condemn. It was not because he had any sympathy for sin, but because he came to save. Now the very fact that he came to save, shows that they were lost. They had violated the law of God, and consequently were “condemned already.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.6}

4. The ancient sacrifices, like baptism and the Lord’s Supper, were connected with Christ’s work of saving men. They were part of the gospel. Men who are “condemned already” may be justified by believing in Jesus. Romans 3:24-26. Christ has died, and we are saved by faith in him. Our faith in him brings strength to overcome (1 John 5:4), but first we must have the “remission of sins that are past,” which is given in return for simple faith in Christ’s sacrifice. Now all the ancient sacrifices of the Jews were simply means by which they showed their faith in the Messiah, whose blood could take away sin. In like manner baptism and the Lord’s Supper are ceremonies by which we show our faith in Christ’s death and resurrection. Someone may say that many of the Jews did not understand the full meaning of their sacrifices, and did not fully understand the work of Christ. Very true, and so thousands of professed Christians do not understand the full meaning of baptism and the Lord’s Supper; yet the fact remains that these ceremonies are for the purpose of manifesting faith in Christ, and the object for which they were designed is not affected in the least by the ignorance of any who may use them. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.7}

5. From the above, it will readily be seen that a refusal to offer sacrifices, or to take part in the exercise of the atonement day, indicated a lack of faith in Christ as the Saviour of sinners. Since Christ has ordained that men shall show their faith in him, if they have any, by the ordinances of the gospel, it follows that those who reject those ordinances, do so because they reject Christ and his sacrifice. In other words, they refuse pardon and salvation. All such, without any doubt, will suffer destruction; but it must be remembered that the penalty which they suffer is not as a punishment for failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they might have been freed by accepting the gospel. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.8}

Let us illustrate this by something which is more common. Here is a murderer who is under sentence of death. He is told that the Governor will pardon him if he will acknowledge his guilt and make application for pardon, promising, of course, to obey the law in the future. But he refuses to do this, and the law is allowed to take its course, and the man is hanged. Now why is the man hanged? Is he hanged because he refused to sue for pardon? Of course not. He is hanged for the murder. There is no law saying that a man *must* apply for pardon, and making death the penalty of refusal, but there is a law against murder, and death is the penalty for its violation. Whoever commits murder is condemned, and is subject to the penalty. If he is hanged, even though a pardon has been offered and rejected, he is hanged solely for the murder. No part of the penalty is inflicted because he refused the pardon, although every particle of the penalty would have been remitted if he had accepted the pardon. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.9}

Carry the illustration a little farther: Here are two murderers in their cells awaiting execution. Both are equally guilty; their crime is the same. Now suppose that pardon is freely offered to one, but not to the other. The one who has been offered pardon refuses it, and both he and the one that had no pardon offered him are hanged. Now which is the guiltier man of the two. When they were put in their cells, both had the same degree of guilt. Has the one who refused to be pardoned acquired additional guilt by that refusal? Not by any means. If he is hanged, he is hanged for precisely the same reason that the other one is,-because he has broken the law. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.10}

So it is with the sinner in his relation to the law of God. He is “condemned already.” Now Christ comes, offering pardon; if the sinner accepts it, he may be saved; but if he refuses pardon, then the curse of the law, death, is allowed to fall upon him. God *invites* men to be saved, but he has no law to *compel* them to be pardoned. The refusal to receive the pardon is not that for which men are destroyed, but it is the sins which they committed and which condemned them even before the way of salvation was made known to them. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.11}

Now if it is borne in mind that a failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, whether in the so-called old dispensation or in the new, is simply a refusal to receive the pardon which the gospel brings, it will be seen that the fact that men were cut off for not afflicting their souls on the day of atonement, is no evidence whatever that the death penalty is inflicted for anything save violation of the ten commandments. As Christ said, “He that believeth not is condemned already.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.12}

“Sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 4:3. “All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” Romans 3:23. Not merely have all men broken the law as a whole, but all men have broken every portion of the law, as it is written: “There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” Romans 3:10-12. We read also that “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” Romans 14:23. Therefore if we were asked, “What commandment does a man violate if he doesn’t have faith in Christ?” we should reply that he breaks them all, or rather that he is a breaker of all of them, and that his punishment will be inflicted for such violation and not for his lack of faith. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.13}

Once more: Sin is active and positive. Failure to have faith is not an act at all. It is the absence of action. It is a passive condition, which leaves him exposed to punishment for sin, but it is not of itself a sin for which he is to be punished. But enough has been said to make the point clear, that violation of the law of God, and that alone, brings punishment. Let no one think that we lightly regard the ordinances of the gospel. We do not. No one can lightly regard them if he has any just conception of the law of God. But they are not primary duties. The punishment which will be inflicted upon the finally impenitent will be death, just what would have been inflicted upon man if the gospel had never been introduced. The gospel, with its ordinances, furnishes the way by which man may escape the wages of his sins, and therefore it is of the most vital importance. To those who imagine that a belief that men are punished only for violation of the moral law must be at least a partial ignoring of the gospel, the following words are in place:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.14}

“And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to *his deeds*.” Romans 2:3-6. W. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 390.15}

**“Cut Off from Among His People” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Just as we were writing the article, “What Condemns Man,” in which we made reference to the cutting off of those who would not afflict their souls on the day of atonement (Leviticus 23:29) the following question was received:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.1}

“In Leviticus 23:29 it is said that ‘whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people.’ Does this mean that they were to be killed, or only separated from the people?” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.2}

We think the text means that they were to be killed, and the following are some of the reasons for so thinking:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.3}

1. Where the expression “cut off” is used in other similar instances, it is known to mean death. In 2 Samuel 7:9 we read that the Lord had cut off all the enemies of David out of his sight. There can be no question as to the meaning of this. Again, the Lord promised to send an angel before the Israelites, and to “cut off” the Amorites, the Hittites, the Canaanites, etc. Exodus 23:23. And in Joshua 23:3, 4 we read that the great nations had been cut off. We know that those nations had been exterminated. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.4}

In 2 Chronicles 32:21 we read thus of Sennacherib, who had invaded Judah: “And the Lord sent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land. And when he was come into the house of his god, they that came forth of his own bowels slew him there with the sword.” Compare this with 2 Kings 10:35-37, and it will be seen that this cutting off of the mighty men of valor, was the killing of one hundred and eighty-five thousand men. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.5}

More positive proof is found in Exodus 31:14: “Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.” Here we see that being “cut off from among his people” is the same as being put to death. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.6}

In Numbers 15:30, 31 we are told that the soul that should do aught presumptuously should be “cut off from among his people,” and again that he should “utterly be cut off;” and in the verses following we are told that one who presumptuously profaned the Sabbath was stoned to death with stones. Read now the sins that are forbidden in Leviticus 18:7-26, of which it is said: “For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people.” Verse 20. And then read in Leviticus 20:2-16 the same list of sins, where it is stated of each one that those who do them “shall surely be put to death.” These passages, with many others that might be mentioned, show clearly what meaning usually attaches to the expression “cut off,” or “cut off from among his people.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.7}

2. This is still more apparent when we consider the meaning of the day of atonement, and the whole Jewish sanctuary service. The Jewish priests served “unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.” Hebrews 8:4, 5. Each year of service closed with the day of atonement, and was a type of the whole gospel dispensation. The day of atonement, closing the year of sanctuary service, was a type of the general Judgment, closing the period of human probation. In the work of the sanctuary service the Jews had before them continually a graphic representation of the penalty of the law and of the great propitiation. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.8}

When the sinner brought his victim to the door of the sanctuary, and, having confessed his sins upon it, killed it, he signified (1) That the wages of sin is death; (2) That he himself was worthy of death because of his sins; and (3) That he believed in the Lamb of God, who should take away the sin of the world. When the offering was placed upon the altar and entirely burned up, the fate of the victim that was offered for sin showed them what the sinner himself justly merited; and thus they learned that “the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away.” Psalm 37:29. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.9}

At that time God was leading his people directly. The Jewish Government was a pure theocracy. Consequently when outbreaking crimes were committed, the offenders were at once put to death. This was not meant to take the place of a final judgment, but was an indication of how God would deal with sinners. So when we come to the closing up of the Jewish service, to the day when the priest made an atonement for the people, to cleanse them from all their sins, the man who obstinately refused to humble himself, with contrition of heart, was cut off, put to death, just as will be done to those who, at the close of the real Judgment, shall be found impenitent. The people of Israel were the people of God; they had his law and his gospel. To be cut off from Israel was to be cut off from God as a worthless branch, and the death penalty was inflicted at once, and thus the type of the real work connected with the sanctuary in Heaven was completed. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.10}

It is very common to speak of the finally impenitent, that when the Judgment closes they are found with their sins upon them. This is strictly true, and shows the contrast between the sinner and those whose sins have been washed away in the blood of the Lamb. There is an expression in Numbers 9:13, which, while it does not refer to the day of atonement, does have reference to an important feature of the sanctuary work, and shows just why those who refused to take part in any of the ceremonies of the sanctuary were cut off. The passage reads thus:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.11}

“But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people; because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.12}

The Passover represented the sacrifice of Christ, our Passover. The man who was not hindered by absence or sickness, or some other unavoidable circumstance, from celebrating the Passover, and who should indifferently let it pass by, was to be cut off. Why? “Because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin.” From this we may learn again, what has before been proved, that failure to accept the gospel, as indicated by neglect of its ordinances, simply left the man to bear his sins, and it was for those sins that he was cut off. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.13}

“Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation.” Hebrews 2:1-3. W. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.14}

**“Who Are the Sadducees?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber enters a mild protest against the doctrine taught in the SIGNS, that when man dies his soul, or spirit, or any part of him, does not continue to live, and he adds: “Are you not becoming modern Sadducees?” We have often heard it charged that those who do not believe that there is any life for the dead except by means of the resurrection, are Sadducees; but whenever we hear such a charge, we conclude that the one making it has very little idea of what the Sadducees were. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.15}

The Sadducees were the cultured aristocracy of the Jewish nation. Two texts of Scripture plainly tell their belief concerning the state of men after death. Read Matthew 22:23: “The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection,” etc. Their question and Christ’s answer, which we will comment upon next week, taken with this statement, show that the Sadducees did not believe that there would ever be any life for the dead. Again we read in Acts 23:6-8: “But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both.” In direct opposition to this non-resurrection doctrine of the Sadducees, we teach that “there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” Acts 21:15. We believe that “the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his [Christ’s] voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” John 5:28, 29. We believe that “the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible” (1 Corinthians 15:52); “for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise.” 1 Thessalonians 4:16. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.16}

Now we would like to ask our friend who holds that those whom we call dead are not really dead, what he believes in regard to the resurrection. If the righteous dead are not dead at all, but are alive in Heaven, how can Christ come to receive them to himself (John 14:1-3)? and how can he call them from the graves, to clothe them with life and immortality? Is it not clear as noonday that they who hold that the soul of man is by nature immortal, thereby deny the necessity for, or the possibility of, a resurrection? And now, reminding our readers that the distinguishing characteristic of the Sadducees was that they denied the resurrection, we leave them to decide who in modern times most nearly represent the Sadducees-whether it is those who teach that there can be no resurrection, or those who hold that “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 6:23), to be bestowed “at the resurrection of the just.” Luke 14:14. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 391.17}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

By an inadvertence the Bible-reading which appeared in last week’s SIGNS was not credited. It should have been credited to Mrs. A. W. Heald. The conclusion of the subject appears in this issue. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.1}

We are sorry that this week again, as well as last week, we are unable to furnish the regular Sabbath-school lessons, for we know that many of our readers looked anxiously for them; but we have received non to print, and therefore had no alternative. We are sure, however, of the lessons for the next two weeks, and we hope that the Sabbath-school machinery will soon get in such a good running order that the lessons may be furnished to us without any break. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.2}

The series of tent-meetings that has been in session in Oakland for the last six weeks, closed Sunday evening, June 26. The attendance has been very good through the entire series, and we think that solemn impressions have been made upon of the hearers. Seventeen have taken their stand for the truth, and others are almost persuaded to obey. While the tent-meetings are being continued in another quarter of the city, the interest started by the late effort will be followed up with personal labor; and it is hoped that several more will be gathered in. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.3}

In a private letter, Elder G. B. Starr, of Springfield, Ill., says:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.4}

“Well, you may rejoice with us that the Sunday bill failed to become a law. Our friends in the Senate never allowed it to go to a second reading. We feel sure that God worked for us, and held the winds for the work here a little longer. Several urgent petitions were read in the Senate and an effort was made to get the bill through; but the Senate, by a vote of 21 to 14, refused to suspend the rules to consider it. We feel very grateful to God, and shall try to consecrate ourselves anew to his service, to work harder while the day lasts.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.5}

We do rejoice that there are men who love justice so well that they will not listen to the voice of bigotry, but will stand against those who preach that no definite day, but only one day in seven, is required by the Lord, but will try to force others to keep a definite day of which their conscience disapproves. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.6}

From reports and comments and lesson helps (?) received at this office there can hardly be a doubt that the Sunday-school children throughout the land have actually been taught that the manna did not fall *on Sunday*, and that it would keep only over Saturday night and Sunday. Now even though the subject were a mere matter of history, and nothing more, such teaching could not be excused from the imputation of downright dishonesty, nor would it be by any intelligent person. How much less then can it be excused when the subject is one of divine truth, given by inspiration of God, and which deeply concerns the eternal interests of every human soul. Then, such teaching becomes not only dishonest but it is wicked deception, and is simply teaching rebellion against the Lord by causing the people to trust in a lie. Jeremiah 28:15, 16. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.7}

It has been a standing assertion among a certain class of people that wine drinking tends to temperance, because where wine is freely drunk there will be less whisky consumed. The logic of this has never been very apparent, even though it be allowed that wine drinking diminishes the amount of whisky drinking; for wine itself is an intoxicant, although not so powerful as whisky. But now the falsity of the assertion has been demonstrated. France has always been noted as the great wine country of the world; and if the assertion just noted be true, it ought to be the most temperate. But now we learn that the drinking of spirits has assumed such proportions in that country that the Senate has decided that steps must be taken to diminish it. Drunkenness is getting so common that it cannot be endured. And this will prove to be the invariable result. The desire for stimulants always increases as it is gratified. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.8}

Just before Cardinal Gibbons returned from Bonne, a Baltimore priest named J. L. Andreis preached to his congregation, in St. Levi Church, a discourse which was simply a mass of servile flattery of the Cardinal. It was not simple flattery, either, for the following paragraph from the “sermon” contains blasphemy as great as any that ever issued from the mouth of the beast:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.9}

“The importance of the threefold reception is equal to the meaning. The clergy will spontaneously be made to ask, ‘Who is this that cometh from Rome with dyed garments, this beautiful one in his robe, walking in the greatness of his strength? And why is his apparel red, and his garments like them that tread in the winepress?’ The answer to them will be that he is their own archbishop, whom the Vicar of Christ has made his immediate counselor, and as such has clad him in red robes,” etc. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.10}

Those to whom the blasphemy is not apparent will be able to realize it by comparing the paragraph with Isaiah 63:1-3. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.11}

The report of the “Committee on the Sabbath,” at the late Reformed Presbyterian Synod, says:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.12}

“Sunday saloons robbed the working classes of their weeks’ pay, and turn the working man’s home into a very healthy.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.13}

Indeed! It is the Sunday saloon bar robs people. It is the Sunday saloon that turns people’s homes into a hell! What a wicked thing that Sunday saloon is! Annihilated it by all means before next Sunday comes, so that the working classes may be perfectly secure in their money, and the working man’s home may be made happy. But by all means let the dear, good, honest, week-day saloon, that makes gentle the British husband, that makes kind the cruel father, that protects the promising youth, that turns the working man’s home into a paradise-let it remain, and touch it not, for a blessing is in it. Robbery and hell are found alone in the Sunday saloon. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.14}

But what makes the Sunday saloon so intensely bad that it must be denounced more than any other saloon? Any saloon at all is an unmitigated curse. Then why condone it on weekdays by condemning it only on Sunday. If the Sunday saloon can be abolished, why cannot all be abolished? There is quite a large class of people who, realizing that the sale of intoxicates cannot yet be absolutely prohibited, propose to cut off as many saloons as possible by high license. This the Prohibitionists denominate “a covenant with death and an agreement with held.” Very well. Then the same prohibitionist will loudly denounce the Sunday saloon and demand laws that shall close the saloon on Sunday but let them run full blast all the rest of the week. What is that then but “a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,” just as much as is the other? The high license folks say, “If we can’t yet abolished all, we will abolish all we can.” This the Prohibitionists denounce in the unmeasured terms, and then say the same thing, only in other words. We wish the Prohibitionists would stick to their text, and not so stultify themselves. Prohibition absolute, everywhere, all the time, and forever, say we. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.15}

**“The Truth Told” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago a friend sent us a copy of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* of April 3. It contained an article on “Sunday Legislation” by Rev. John Snyder, of St. Louis, who, while he believes in Sunday and Sunday rest, does not favor hasty legislation on the subject. He believes that Sunday should be kept because man needs a rest-day, and Sunday seems to have the majority in its favor, and he knows that the Sunday-sabbath stands on no other foundation than this. He says:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.16}

“The truth must be spoken, and the truth about the Sunday question is simply and briefly this: If we would preserve the day of rest for wholesome and rational use, if we would make it truly a day of peace and worship, it must frankly be placed upon a sure and solid foundation. Every instructed man knows that the Christian Sunday and the Jewish Sabbath are not identical. That the sanctions of the one cannot be transferred to the other. If there is anything plain in the Bible, it is that not ‘any day,’ but one particular day, is sanctified by the older law, and testified to by miracles. That day is the seventh and not the first day of the week. Every instructed man knows that the Catholic Church gave to the Christian world the Sunday, and determined the manner in which it should be used. And when Protestantism threw off the authority of the Catholic Church it abandoned the only ecclesiastical foundation upon which the Sunday can logically rest.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.17}

**“Is There Room Enough?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

“It is asserted that there is not room enough on the earth for all the people who have ever lived on it. Is there anything in print on the subject? J. M. D.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.18}

Yes; the folly of assertion has been shown scores of times, yet it is made with as much confidence as ever. It is a standing objection with infidels against the possibility of a general resurrection, and evinces just about as much learning as the usual run of infidel objections to the Bible. We think that the falsity of the assertion will be apparent to all who read the following brief calculation:- {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.19}

“The present population of the world is, in round numbers, 1,400,000,000. The earth has been standing about six thousand years. It is true that many people claim that the earth is much older, but they do not claim that it has been inhabited by man for a much longer period. Now we will allow that the entire population has changed every thirty years, and that there were just as many people the first thirty years and every thirty years after, as there are now. This is an exceedingly liberal allowance, for there were but two people in the beginning, and but eight after the flood. The whole number of people, then that have lived on the earth, would be 1,000,000,000,000 or 2,000,000,000,000. Now if we should allow each one of these people a square rod of land for standing room, they would occupy only 2,734,316 square miles. The area of the United States and Territories is 3,442,198 square miles. Therefore all the people who have ever lived on the earth could be accommodated in the United States, with ample room for everyone and there would be more than 800,000 square miles of land to spare.” {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.20}

Don’t be afraid when infidels prate about the impossibility of things which the Bible says shall take place. There was never an infidel assertion that could stand for a moment against the Bible. All the arguments brought to bear in the Bible have had less effect than so may feathers would have upon the rock of Gilbraltar. {SITI June 30, 1887, p. 400.21}