**“‘The Logic of Lynching’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

The latest argument for the existence of an eternally burning hell, is found in the *Interior* under the above heading. The writer recounts a recent lynching case in Colusa, California, where a young Chinaman who had basely murdered his employer’s wife, was taken from jail and hanged, after his trial was over, and he had been sentenced to imprisonment for life. The writer argues that the reason why those citizens hanged the Chinaman, instead of leaving him to spend his life in prison, and to die a natural death, was because they believed in the eternal torment of the wicked, and from this assumption he concludes that the eternal torment must be a certainty. The reader will be interested to learn how easily a modern creature can find in his own imagination a solid foundation for a pagan superstition, so we quote:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.1}

“That crowd of lynchers must have believed that if they hung Hong Di he would have to spend those fifty years in a worse place than the penitentiary. Hence they must believe in hell. If they had been materialists, thinking, with Colonel Ingersoll, that death ends all, or if they had been Universalists, thinking that everybody goes to Heaven as soon as he dies, or if they had been soul-sleepers, thinking that the spirit is unconscious between death and the resurrection, they would have said, Hanging is too good for this fellow. We have him now in our power as long as he lives. We can be sure that he will suffer for a good while at San Quentin. But if we put him to death we put him out of his misery forever, provided that Colonel Ingersoll is right, or we give him rest until the resurrection day, if the soul-sleepers are right, or we send him straight to Heaven if the Universalists are right. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.2}

“If Colonel Ingersoll had gone to Colusa a few months ago, and lectured at fifty cents a head, probably most of the men who engaged in the lynching of Hong Di would have gone to hear him, would have laughed at his witty sophisms, and would have half believed that there is no hereafter. If some eloquent Universalist had visited the place, and preached in the courthouse or in some public hall, denouncing “the partialists” who limit the mercy of God, and contending that he is too good to send anybody to hell or even to have such a dreadful place in his universe, they would have listened with interest and said, That’s the doctrine for me. If the soul-sleepers had held a camp-meeting nearby, and talked, as they do, about the long unconsciousness-the dreamless rest of the tired and troubled spirit until the end of earth and time-they would have welcomed this idea of repose. But when a time of excitement came all such figments of fancy were swept away as chaff before the whirlwind, and the men in Colusa, no matter how godless in their lives or how skeptical in their speculative opinions, found they did believe in hell,-at least for Hong Di. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.3}

“Those lynchers showed that they had faith in God, for what was hanging but taking the murderer away from the control of the judicial system of California, which they regarded as having failed to do full justice in the case, and sending his spirit to God to deal with him as he deserved? If there was no great unseen power in the spirit world to take that guilty man, and to punish him more fully than the jury proposed to, then the lynching was unreasonable as well as unlawful.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.4}

We feel like begging pardon of our readers for filling so much valuable space which belongs to them, with such childish reasoning. But we know that there is quite a general desire to hear “both sides,” and in this case the “other side” is presented by “Obadiah Oldschool,” the ablest writer of the *Interior*, whose good, practical, common sense is very conspicuous when writing on other subjects. Moreover, it is considered so good a presentation of the case, that the ideas have been copied and taken to form the basis of an article by the ablest writer of the *Occident*. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.5}

There is not the slightest possibility that one of the Colusa lynchers gave of a single thought to the future of the Chinaman. They simply knew that a great crime had been committed; they did not think the sentence of the court was severe enough; and so they determined to administer the proper punishment. It is not probable that one in ten of the men has any theory of future punishment; but if they had philosophized as *Interior* writer imagines, that would not in the least affect the facts. The idea that the lynching of a murderer is an evidence of faith in God, is a most novel one. If such transactions are accepted as *evidences* of faith, then, we can readily understand how the National Reformers can soon exhibit this country as a model of the Christian Government; for there are thousands who are willing to show their faith in this way. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.6}

But the simple fact is, those men believed, what all laws recognize, that death is a more severe punishment than any length of imprisonment can be. And how comes it that this opinion is so prevalent? Because the law of life is implanted in the breast of every individual. This statement, “All the man hath will he give for his life,” is none the less true because the devil used it; he was then talking with One to whom it was useless to lie. As long as there is life there is hope; but when life is gone, everything is gone. For this reason men universally regard the death penalty as the greatest penalty that can be inflicted. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.7}

But more than this, is the inspired statement that “the wages of sin is death,” that “the soul of that sinneth, shall die,” and that the wicked “shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*.” Instead of reasoning as the writer in the *Interior* does, that men inflict the death penalty so that God the sooner can begin to torment men, how much more natural to reason that men regard death as the highest penalty, simply because God has decreed, and it is a fixed principle in nature, that death,-the total extinction of being,-*is* the sum of all calamities that can befall a man. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.8}

This would be in harmony with the Scriptures, which declare that the wicked “shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away” (Psalm 37:20); that they shall be “like the chaff which the wind driveth away” (Psalm 1:4); that the chaff shall be *burned up* with “unquenchable fire” (Matthew 3:12); that day shall be “as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney” (Hosea 13:3); and finally, that “they shall be as though they had not been.” Obadiah 16. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.9}

Life, under whatever conditions, is the gift of God. God is the *living* God, and the source of all life. “In his favor is life.” Psalm 30:5. That is, whoever has life, has it by the favor of God, and only those have life, who are objects of God’s favor. We are now living in the day of salvation,-the time of God’s grace to mankind. All people alike share of the favor of God, in that he gives them time to become reconciled to him. “The longsuffering of our God his salvation.” But when the wicked shall have filled up the measure of their iniquity; when even the longsuffering of God cannot wait any longer, because they have become “filled with all unrighteousness,” so that they are only as thorns that cumber the ground;-then further probation will be of no use to them, and the favor of God will be wholly withdrawn. But since only in the favor of God is there any life, it follows that when that favor is withdrawn, life must cease; and this agrees with the inspired declaration: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not sea life; but the wrath of God abideth him.” John 3:36. When God shall judge the world in righteousness then, he will “make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land.” Zephaniah 1:18. He will have a clean universe, and not a corner of it will be defiled by being reserved as a prison pen where blaspheming wretches may be tormented to all eternity. W. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 534.10}

**“The Sabbath—For What, and to Whom?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Exodus 31:13 we read: “Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” Again in Ezekiel 20:19, 20 we read: “I am the Lord your God; walked in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and to them; and hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.1}

These two texts declare the Sabbath to be a *sign* by which the people might know that God is indeed the Lord. The question would naturally arise, How can the Sabbath serve as a sign by which people may know the true God? This question is answered in Exodus 31:16, 17: “Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days of the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.2}

Here it is plainly stated that the reason why the Sabbath is a sign, is that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and rested on the seventh day. Now remembering that the Sabbath is declared to be a sign by which the people may know God, it is pertinent to inquire what there is in the fact stated in the latter part of Exodus 31:17 which would constitute it such a sign. The answer is that the Sabbath brings directly to view and keeps before the mind, the fact that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested upon the seventh, which is the basis of the Sabbath commandment. See Exodus 20:8-11. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.3}

It must not be lost sight of, that God’s distinguishing characteristic is that he is self-existent,-the living God,-and consequently a Creator. The fact that God can create distinguishes him from the “gods many and lords many” which people may worship. It is this, also, which constitutes his sole claim to the obedience of mankind, and, indeed, of all creatures. These points are plainly stated in the sacred word. Thus in Jeremiah 10:10-12, we read:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.4}

“But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and everlasting; at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even day shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.5}

Here the true God is contrasted with the false gods, in that he created the heavens and earth, and continues forever. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.6}

Again in Psalm 96:4, 5 the psalmist exhorts people to declare the glory of God, “For the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised; he is to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the nations our idols; but the Lord made the heavens.” In Psalm 100:2, 3 we read:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.7}

“Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.8}

Here the fact that God has created us, and that he preserves us,-in other words that “in him we live and move, and have our being,”-is given as the reason why we should serve him. And a good and sufficient reason it is too. Indeed, it is the only reason that could be given, or that is necessary, for it is certain that if God had not created us, and did not sustain us, we should be under no obligation to serve him. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.9}

God’s creative power, then, is his distinguishing characteristic, and the one by which he appeals to men to obey him. So long as men rightly consider the creation, so long they will remember God; for God is known by his works. “The heavens declare of the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork.” So Paul says that all that may be known of God is manifest unto the heathen, “for God have showed it unto them;” because ever since the creation of the world the invisible attributes of God, namely, his eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. Romans 1:19, 20. But the Sabbath is the great memorial of God’s power as manifested in creation. When kept aright it necessarily leads the mind back to creation; and the design of the Sabbath is that men may meditate upon God and his works. See Psalm 92:1-6, which is a psalm for the Sabbath day. Thus the Sabbath, being the great reminder of God’s creative power, is emphatically a sign by which men may know the true God. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.10}

It will readily be seen, therefore, that the sincere observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, as set forth in the fourth commandment, is of the very essence of worship to God. One cannot fully keep the first commandment unless he keeps the Sabbath; for if he does not regard the memorial of creation, it must be that he does not properly appreciate the value of God’s creation, nor his power as Creator; and to fail to recognize God to the full extent of one’s intellect is to come short of the requirement (Matthew 22:37, 38); and when a man does not regard God with all his mind, he necessarily regards something else with at least a portion of it. Therefore to simply neglect to keep the Sabbath may be unconscious idolatry; but to willfully refuse to keep it is open idolatry. The individual may not bow down to images, but he worships himself more than he does God. There is plenty of idolatry without image-worship. While an image-worship is necessarily idolatry, idolatry is not necessarily image-worship. This is shown by the fact that there is one commandment forbidding idolatry, and another forbidding the making and worshiping of images. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.11}

In harmony with the thought in the above paragraph, is the fact that Sabbath-breaking and idolatry were inseparable among the ancient Israelites. They went and served Baal, yet it is stated that their captivity was a punishment for their persistent violation of the Sabbath. See 2 Chronicles 36:14-21; Jeremiah 17:27. Now when it is remembered that Baal was the ancient sun god, the same to whom, under the name of Apollo, the Greeks and Romans dedicated Sunday, and that the first day of the week was “the wild solar holiday of all pagan times,” the connection between the Sabbath-breaking and the idolatry of the ancient Israelites will be more apparent. When they joined themselves to the heathen nations around them, and forgot the Lord, they broke his Sabbath and began to celebrate “the venerable day of the sun.” It would not be straining a point to say that the Israelites were punished for observing Sunday, in violation of the command of God. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.12}

But the objection is often urged that the texts which we have quoted refer only to the Israelites, and that therefore there is no evidence that the Sabbath was ever designed by the Lord to be observed by any other than the Israelites. Thus in the paper read before the late Baptist Conference in Oakland, after reference to Exodus 31:12, 13, and Ezekiel 20:12, 20, we find the following statements:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 535.13}

“With these declarations before us we may observed: 1. That the duration of the seven-day Sabbath is at least impliedly limited to the generations of Israel. God says to that the ancient people: “It is a sign between me and you, *throughout* *your generations*.” Why should this language be used if the Sabbath was of universal application, given at the creation of the world, and designed for all time? The inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable, that when Israel’s generations ceased, the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is placed upon the Sabbath and that limit is the limit of his people Israel.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.1}

This is a fair sample of the objection that is raised over these texts, and it *may be* that similar thoughts have sometimes crept into the minds of some who professed transference for the Sabbath of the Lord. For the benefit of such we wish to state a few points which will not only clear the matter of all difficulty, but show that the Sabbath this fixed to all eternity:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.2}

1. We have already shown that the Sabbath is the thing which above all others helps us to recognize God and his power. It is the *sign* by which he may be known. Now while it is true that these words were addressed directly to the literal descendants of Jacob, there is no more reason for supposing that they apply to them alone than there is for supposing that the exhortation, “Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God” (Philippians 2:14, 15), applies to the Philippians alone. God is no respecter of persons, and what he requires of one he requires of all. He certainly desires to be known by all nationalities, as well as by the Jewish nation; therefore, although the language was addressed to one race, it is a fact that it should be heeded by all. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.3}

2. We cheerfully and hardly accept the statement that “the inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable that when Israel’s generations ceased the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is placed upon the Sabbath, and that limit is the limit of his people Israel,” we say that the inference is not “almost” but altogether unavoidable, that when Israel’s generations cease, the Sabbath will cease, but not till then. Now when will Israel’s generations cease? David was certainly an Israelite, and to him the Lord said: “I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations.” Psalm 89:3, 4. Again, “His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of having.” Verse 29. And yet again: “Once have I swore by my holiness that I will not lie and to David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” Verses 35-37. Surely if the Sabbath is to be limited by the limit of the generations of Israel, it has yet a long time to continue. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.4}

Again the Lord says:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.5}

“Thus saith the Lord, which give the sun for a light day, which divideth the sea when the waves of thereof roar: The Lord of hosts is his name; if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever. Thus said the Lord: If Heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth search out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord.” Jeremiah 31:35-37. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.6}

Here is stated in the most positive terms that the seed of Israel shall be a nation forever. Then the Sabbath, even according to the admission of the objector, must continue forever, and so it will. And let it be remembered that it is the seventh-day Sabbath,-the only Sabbath in existence,-which is to continue throughout all the generations of Israel. See Exodus 31:13-17. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.7}

These texts teach that the Sabbath of the Lord is to be kept by the saints throughout eternity. An abundance of texts might be cited to show that the generations of Israel will never cease, but the above are sufficient. Not only is it true that Israel shall never cease, but it is also true that it is the only people whose generations will never come to an end. To Israel alone are the promises (Romans 9:4) and only Israel will be saved. Romans 11:26. Two texts in conclusion must suffice, and they alone prove the proposition just made, that Israel alone shall continue throughout eternity, and that the Sabbath shall exist the same space. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.8}

Isaiah 45:16, 17. “They shall be ashamed, and also compounded, all of them; they shall go to confusion together that are makers of titles. But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with and everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.9}

Isaiah 66:22, 23. “For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the lord, so shall you receive and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord.” W. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 536.10}

**“Solemn Warnings” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

**The Commentary.  
NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(September 18.-Matthew 7:13-25.)**

“Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and a broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” Verses 13, 14. The way to enter into life, according to our Saviour’s own words on another occasion, is to “keep the commandments,”-in other words, to do right,-to “cease to do evil, and learn to do well.” Now the reason why the road to destruction is so broad, is because a person may get there by doing anything not in harmony with the ten commandments. There are thousands of ways in which a person may do wrong; there is only one way of doing right. The way to life is both a strait and straight. Right means straight, direct; as Bunyan expresses it, is a way cast up as straight as a line can make it. The broad way as all the world beside this straight and narrow way, which is not of this world. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.1}

But before the way to life is entered upon, one must pass through the gate leading to it. What is this gate? Said Christ: “I am the door; by me if any man in enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.” John 10:9. The way to life is to keep the commandments; but before a start can be made in this way, the sinner must be delivered from the body of death, which can be done only by Jesus Christ. See Romans 7:14-25. All a man’s efforts to walk in the narrow way without Christ are vain and useless. But the first thing that God does for the sinner when he accepts Christ, is to forgive his sins; therefore pardon for past sins, through our Lord Jesus Christ, is the way into the Christian life. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.2}

When we have entered the door, however, our connection with Christ does not cease, if we walk the narrow way. Says Christ again: “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” John 14:6. How can it be that the keeping of the commandment is the way to life, and that at the same time Christ is the way also? Simply thus: Christ himself is “the truth,” and the law of God is declared to be the truth. Psalm 119:142. Christ is law personified, and he who lives in Christ, and abides in him, keeps the commandments. And he who does not abide in Christ does not keep the commandments, for Christ says: “Abide in me, and I in you. As a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in a divine; no more can he, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing.” John 15:4, 5. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.3}

The same thought is expressed by Paul in Romans 10:1-4: “Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” The righteousness of God is the law of God; the Jews had not accepted Christ, and therefore they failed of attaining righteousness, for Christ is the only way by which the righteousness of the law may be obtained. That Christ is the end or object of the law, in the sense that in him we are enabled to keep the commandments, is evident from the next verse, which says: “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.” So Christ is both the door and the way of life. Whosoever at the last day stands without fault before the throne of God, will be only “complete in him.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.4}

The way is described as a narrow way, and yet it is the only way in which there is any real liberty and freedom of action. Said David: “I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts.” Psalm 119:45. Said Christ to the Jews who were walking in the broad way, and boasting of their freedom: “If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth [the law of God as revealed in Christ], and the truth shall make you free..... Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” John 8:31-36. There is no liberty except in the narrow way. “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.5}

“Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.” Matthew 7:15-17. This warning is especially applicable at this time, for Christ said that one of the characteristics of the last days would be that “many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.” Matthew 24:11. Peter, also, whose second epistle treats especially of the last days, says: “But there were false prophets also among the people [in old time], even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.” 2 Peter 2:1, 2. A prophet is a teacher; of that Peter’s statement that there shall be false teachers in the last days, is the same as Christ’s statement that there shall be false prophets. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.6}

These false teachers will have a wonderful power to counterfeit the truth. Said Christ again: “For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” Matthew 24:24. This has undoubted reference to the phenomena of Spiritualism, whose mediums are enabled, by their connection with the devil and his angels, to counterfeit the miracles of Christ and his apostles so successfully that no man by his unaided senses detect the difference. Some will thoughtlessly ask, “Why does the Lord allow his children to be thus deceived?” He does not. The people of God will not be deceived, and there will be no excuse for anybody’s being deceived; for ample warning has been given. Says John: “Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.” 1 John 4:3. This is of itself a sufficient warning against being deceived by the miracles of Spiritualism. All the miracles and the pretended good of Spiritualism are done for the express purpose of detracting from the glory of Christ as the son of God. If any are deceived by them, it is only because they “received not the love of the truth.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.7}

In the book of Deuteronomy there is a test by which we may be attacked the false prophet. Says Lord: “But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Deuteronomy 18:20-22. That certainly is evidence enough, for the word of the Lord never fails. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.8}

But it will be urged that sometimes the signs and wonders *do* come to pass, and that in such a case nobody can be blamed for not distinguishing between the truth and the false. The Lord has anticipated this objection, for we read: “If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him.” Deuteronomy 13:1-4. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.9}

In this we are directed to the word of the Lord as the greaat counterfeit detector. The whole thing is summed up by the prophet as follows: “And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:19, 20. And this test is not only good in the case of the teacher of Spiritualism, but in the detection of false teachers of the less pronounced type. Whenever a teacher utters a thing that deviates from the plain word of God, he is not to be received. It may be that his error is comparatively slight; but an error is an error, and he who accepts the slightest degree of error, has no warrant against accepting the diabolical teachings of Spiritualism, which is the sum of all errors. Our only safety is then sticking to the word of God. He in whose heart the law of God is, will not slide. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 538.10}

“Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.” Matthew 7:21-23. Men may deceive their fellow-men with a great profession, they may deceive themselves; but they cannot deceive the Lord, who looks upon the heart. The Lord does not condemn the making of a profession of religion, nor prophesying in his name; what he condemns is the lawless lives of many who do these things. A man cannot serve God, with out having a form of godliness; but no perfection of form will save a man who does not do the will of God. The will of God is law of God (see Psalm 40:8, 9; Romans 2:17, 18), and when Christ says, “Depart from me, chief that working iniquity,” he really says: “Depart from me, ye that work unlawful deeds.” Here again we are brought to the fact that Christ is the truth,-the embodiment of the ten commandments,-and that no one can be really in Christ,-a Christian,-who does not keep the commandments. To profess Christianity while living in open violation of the law of God, is the sheerest hypocrisy. False prophets are declared to be a wolves in sheep’s clothing; this hypocritical garb is necessary at first in order that men may be deceived; but sin has so terribly blinding an effect that after error has once been accepted and cherished, the wolves may throw off their mask, and appear in their true character, and still the poor, deluded victims will regard them as friends of the flock. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 539.1}

The sum of the whole matter is to build on a rock. The rock is the truth of God as it is in Christ Jesus, as far distinguished from the slime and mud of worldly things, in which all men grovel by nature. He who builds on anything outside of the word of God, is like the man who builds his house on the sand of the sea-shore at low tide, or who builds in the dry bed of a stream which in winter is a torrent. No matter how beautiful a structure he may build for himself, nor how smoothly the foundation may be laid, “There shall be an overflowing shower; and ye, O great hailstones, shall fall; and a stormy wind shall rend it. Lo, when the wall is fallen, shall it not be said unto you, Where is the daubing wherewith ye have daubed it? Therefore thus saith the Lord God; I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury; and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in my fury to consume it. So will I break down the wall that ye have daubed with untempered mortar, and bring it down to the ground, so that the foundation thereof shall be discovered, and it shall fall, and ye shall be consumed in the midst thereof: and ye shall know that I am the Lord. Thus will I accomplish my wrath upon the wall, and upon them that have daubed it with untempered mortar, and will say unto you, The wall is no more, neither they that daubed it.” Ezekiel 13:11-15. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 539.2}

Then “let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” Ecclesiastes 12:13. Thus shall we be “fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God,” “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets Jesus Christ himself being the chief coroner-stone.” Ephesians 2:19, 20. W. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 539.3}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the Annual Report for 1886-87 of the “Boys’ and Girls’ Aid Society” of San Francisco. The society is now in the fourteenth year of its existence, and of all the societies and institutions for the help of the homeless and unfortunate children and youth there is not one more deserving of the sympathy and charity of individuals and the generous support of the public. Mr. E. T. Dooley, superintendent, corner Baker and Grove Streets, San Francisco. Cal. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.1}

In the *Gospel in All Lands*, the M. E. missionary magazine, for August, there is a letter from a missionary in India in which he speaks of “baptized children not counted as probationers.” Neither are they members. But if they are neither members nor probationers, why then are they baptized? If it be said “for of such is the kingdom of Heaven,” then how is it that they can belong to the kingdom of Heaven, and yet cannot belong to the church either as a member or as a probationer? Is the kingdom of Heaven made up of people who are neither members nor probationers of the church? {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.2}

Mr. Grant Allen says that “the most important result achieved by science in the past fifty years has been the establishment of principles antagonistic to the Biblical teaching of the origin and nature of man, and the history and order of the universe.” But such science as that is not science at all. It is speculation only, and science falsely so called. Yet it is the popular thing, even in the leading pulpits of the world. In fact the “leading” pulpits would not be leading pulpits if they were not first *led* by this anti-Biblical science. “The leaders of this people cause them to err, and they that are led of them are destroyed.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.3}

A San Diego (Cal.) correspondent of the *Golden Gate*, a Spiritualist, of course, closes an article with the following pertinent paragraph:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.4}

“No greater failure has been witnessed in the history of the world than Spiritualism as it has been presented. Not twelve men have been gathered together in one place capable of founding a new church, or any institution, college, or university where mediums may be properly taught. Think of it; after forty years, with thousands of wealthy Spiritualists-not a university in the whole world endowed by the people who rail against the churches. Is it not time to cry, *Halt!* and ask ourselves what all this cant and chaos mean?” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.5}

Spiritualism, being a religion of selfishness, could not be expected to endow colleges and hospitals; but now that it sees the necessity of counterfeiting Christianity, instead of openly combating it, we may expect something of the kind before long. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.6}

The Rome correspondent of the New York *Observer* says that “Pope Leo, the great conciliator, hopes for a reconciliation with Italy before December, 1887, when his jubilee will be celebrated, all Roman Catholic nations sending ambassadors to do him reverence.” And then quotes from the sayings of the Pope himself a paragraph in which are these words:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.7}

“The only road to peace is to place the Roman Pontiff in a condition where he will be subject to no power whatever.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.8}

Yes, that has ever been the ambition of the Papacy, and that is precisely the view which the Bible gives of “That man of sin... who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” No power on earth, or that ever was on earth, except the Papacy, meets the prediction. But the Papacy fulfills it to the letter. {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.9}

What would be thought of a soldier who should carry his weapons confidently and proudly when on dress parade, and throw them away as soon as he came into the presence of the enemy? Or, what would be thought of the soldier who carried the weapons of the ancient time, who would invariably throw his shield away as soon as the darts of the enemy began to fly? Everybody would say that he was most foolish. The weapons are made for the attack, and the shield for the time of danger. And yet scores of Christians act just so foolishly. The Christian’s shield is faith. With this we are told we may quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. With this we may ever see the loving, compassionate Father, and our faithful High Priest, and thus know that the Lord is on our side. But how many there are who have great confidence in God, and hold aloft the shield of faith when all is well, but to, when trials and affliction come, lose all heart, and think that even God has forsaken them? How foolish such a course seems, who has not done so? The faith which enables us to be at peace when the conflict is raging, is the only faith which will gain the victory. And this peace may be ours, for the promise is, “Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on the.” Isaiah 20:3. Therefore “trust ye in the Lord *forever*; for in the Lord JEHOVAH is *everlasting* strength.” So the prophet says: “Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid.” Isaiah 12:2. How true the words:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.10}

*“Oh, peace we often forfeit.  
Oh, what needless pain we bear,  
All because we do not carry  
Everything to God in prayer.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.11}*

In the *Occident* of August is an editorial on “The Righteousness of God without the Law,” that is, the righteousness which God imputes to all that believe,- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.12}

“The righteousness of sinless creatures, though it be a perfect righteousness, well-pleasing to God, can only be available while it continues to be performed. The whole law is binding upon every creature during every instant of his existence. It is evident, therefore, that he can work up no superabounding righteousness to avail him in case of future transgression. The moment he transgresses, all the advantage derived from previous obedience ceases.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.13}

Boston has at last assuredly earned her right, if ever before, to be entitled the seat of culture and the chief city of refinement in the universe. The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union* gives decisive proof of this, thus:- {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.14}

“If hitherto any doubt has existed in any mind that Boston is fairly credited with the title, Hub of the Universe, the event in the Boston Theater last week should be final on that question. The renowned citizen and accomplished John L. Sullivan, the great expounder, whom the New York police interfered with while in the practice of his humane art of making jelly of other people’s faces, was given a magnificent reception and presented with a “golden belt” which cost $10,000. The large hall was crowded to its last limits with representatives from the principal cities of the United States and Canada. His honor Mayor O’Brien and the Aldermen were present by invitation. The location was called a sparring exhibition. The Mayor and Alderman were publicly thanked for granting license to give such an exhibition for the first time in history of the Puritan city. When Mr. Sullivan was presented the orchestra played ‘Hail to the Chief,’ and the immense audience rose and cheered him to the echo. Thus John L. Sullivan the prizefighter, goes to Europe, as he says, ‘to bring back the greatest honors the world ever conferred on an athlete,’ indorsed by the presence of the Boston city government. The belt he will wear abroad, and the honors of the occasion will say to all European municipalities that the municipal authorities of Boston recognize Mr. Sullivan as a worthy citizen, and virtually commend him to foreign countries as an honored American. They virtually send him over the waters as a boxing plenipotentiary, which is refined English for prize-fighter. He sails on this fighting exhibition (please remember the polite synonyms boxing, sparring) with their good-will and farewell blessing.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.15}

Of London’s craze over the “Wild West” people the *Saturday* *Review* says: “This same worship is in close analogy to the later and more rotten days of the Roman Empire, when the gladiators were the favored ones and pets of the Roman ladies.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.16}

Yes, and so is Boston’s craze for the modern gladiator, John L. Sullivan. Ancient Athens was the seat of culture and refinement, and yet her citizens loved to witness the brutal sports of the arena, and their highest conception of *virtue* was the strength and great courage of the champion of the prize ring. Thus it was with Rome. The modern Athens prides itself upon its culture, yet the man whose only claim to recognition is that he has more of the bull-dog in him than any other man in America, is thus officially recommended to the people of the Old World. And Boston is not alone in this sort of hero worship, only her “refinement” makes the comparison with ancient Greece and Rome more conspicuous. How long will it be before gladiatorial contests, possibly with some modifications, will be as popular among the “higher classes” in America as they were among the aristocrats of Rome? Not long, at the present rate of “progress.” {SITI September 1, 1887, p. 544.17}

**“What Constitutes Burial?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The excuses which people can devise in order to bolster themselves up in a wrong practice, are legion. An excuse is not an argument, although it commonly passes for one. The *Congregationalist* of June 2 quotes the following from a tract published by W. Erbury; 234 years ago, saying, for by way of comment, that the writer “pushed immersionists hard for a conclusion more rational than agreeable.” He said:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.1}

“How are you ‘buried with Christ by baptism’ when Christ’s burial was not his going into the earth and rising suddenly as you do out of the waters; but his burial must be *three days and three nights* which is a mystery you know not; *let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I’ll say they are dipt under!*” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.2}

And this is thought to be a disagreeable pressure of immersionists. It must then be considered the strongest argument in behalf of sprinkling. Let us therefore analyze it. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.3}

1. Granting for the moment that his point against immersion is well taken, his argument would amount to this: “Immersion in water is not in the likeness of Christ’s burial, because those immersed do not stay underwater as long as Christ was in the earth; therefore sprinkling *is* a likeness of Christ’s burial!” This is the common way of self-justification. When one is accused of wrong-doing, he points to someone else, and says, “Well, he is doing wrong too;” and then he feels that he has fully cleared himself of the charge brought against him, and proof that he is in the right. Such methods are childish in the extreme. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.4}

2. Our author not only denies that immersion is baptism, but he denies that immersion is dipping. Says he: “Let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I’ll say they are dipt indeed.” As much as to say that a thing cannot be said to be dipped in water unless it remains there a few days! Our Pedobaptist friends will have to give us a new vocabulary, so that we may know what word to use in the place of “dip,” when we wish to speak of anything placed in the water for only a moment. When Christ was importuned to tell who should betray him, he replied: “He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it.” John 13:26. And the same person continues: “And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.” Would our ancient author, and the *Congregationalist*, which sustains him, claim that the sop remained in the dish three days and three nights before it was given to Judas? Certainly not, for they know that the whole supper lasted but a portion of one evening. But the sop was “dipt,” for the Scripture so declares. Then a thing may be said to be dipped, even though it remains immersed only a moment. It ought not to be necessary to go to Scripture to prove a thing which is proved by the language of common sense; but many people imagine that Bible language has a different meaning from that of common sense. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.5}

3. This also shows the absurdity of supposing that immersion cannot exhibit the likeness of Christ’s burial unless the person immersed remains under water as long as Christ was in the earth. “Baptize” means to immerse, to plunge, to dip; and just as a finger is dipped, even though it remains in the liquid but a moment, so a person is baptized although he is in water but a moment. Christ would have been buried, even if he had been raised immediately after being placed in Joseph’s tomb; so a man who is buried in the water for only a moment is as surely “buried with him by baptism,” as though he remained under the water forever. And added to all this is the tacitly admitted fact that baptism must be a likeness of the burial of Christ, and that nothing but immersion does represent that event. W. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 550.6}

**“The National Reform Association” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

“EDITORS SIGNS OF THE TIMES: In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, as well as in the *American Sentinel*, I frequently see articles in opposition to the National Reform Association for some of its principles. Would it not be well to give your readers an opportunity to see the position of the Society and the principles it propagates? Then the readers can judge for themselves. The true character of the Association can be known by its own Constitution. Below I give you the preamble. It is as follows:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.1}

“‘Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of the Nations and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs; {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.2}

“‘Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established; {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.3}

“‘Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath. Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion; {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.4}

“‘Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and disregard of moral and religious character and those who are exalted to high places in the nation; {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.5}

“‘Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government; {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.6}

“‘We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves,’ etc. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.7}

“The *Object* of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.8}

“‘The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and the other kindred peoples; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.’ {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.9}

“Now, as a friend of truth and of our common country, I respectfully ask you to designate which of the foregoing paragraphs or sentences you believe to be false or erroneous. Then, if it be your pleasure, I will try to defend them; for I believe they contain only the truth. And I am persuaded that the welfare of the nation depends, under God, largely upon their acceptance and practice by the people. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.10}

“N. R. Johnston.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.11}

It is not at all strange that articles in opposition to the National Reform Association are frequently seen in the *American Sentinel*, since that paper is devoted solely to the opposition of the work of the National Reform Association. It is the only paper in existence that has for its sole object the defense of American institutions and for liberty of thought and conscience, and which opposes the work of the National Reform from a strictly Christian standpoint. As a consequence, its readers have had, and do continually have, abundance of opportunity to learn the position and principles of the National Reform Association. The SIGNS OF THE TIMES, however, has necessarily a wider range of subjects to deal with, and although it is opposed to the work of the National Reform Association, it has not, in the little that it has contained upon that subject, given its readers any extended idea of the character of that organization. We are therefore very well pleased to publish the above extract from the National Reform Constitution, and to comply with our friend’s request to designate which of the paragraphs or sentences we believe to be false or erroneous. We shall also be pleased to let our readers see what defense our correspondent can make for them. From personal acquaintance with him we are sure that his defense will be made in a candid and courteous manner; and his position as regular correspondent of the *Christian Statesman*, and member of the National Reform Association, may be taken as an assurance that he will represent that Association in the best possible manner. We shall now proceed to note the points which we believe to be false or erroneous, and to give the reasons for our belief. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.12}

1. The first statement, namely, “that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government,” may be true or false according as it is interpreted. It could be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises over ruling power, or as Daniel says “removeth kings and setteth up kings,” we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority comes direct from God, and that he himself directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any nation whose civil powers was derived directly from God, since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, “the powers that be are ordained of God,” but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily ordained as God’s deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God’s design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Roman was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero was better than anarchy. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.13}

2. With the second statement, namely, that “the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations,” we take direct issue. We have no hesitation whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.14}

(*a*) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. Hebrews 8:1. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as “a priest upon his throne.” Zechariah 6:13. His work now is that of an intercessor. Hebrews 7:25; 9:24. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.15}

(*b*) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that “went into a far country to receive for himself taking them and to return,” and who after a time “returned having receive the kingdom.” Luke 19:11-15. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.16}

(*c*) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, “Sit at thou my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” Psalm 110:1. And Peter (Acts 2:34-36) makes application of this to the present time, when Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.17}

(*d*) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See Daniel 7:13, 14; 12:1. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive “dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him.” The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See Daniel 11:2. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, taking his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time everyone of God’s people shall be delivered. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.18}

(*c*) The Father himself says to the Son, “Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for they possession.” Psalm 2:8. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall “break them with a rod of iron,” and “dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.19}

(*f*) In harmony with these statements, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations are angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard in heaven saying, “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and ye shall reign forever and ever.” Revelation 11:15-18. In Revelation 19:11-21 we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that *then* he bears the title, “King of kings, and Lord of lords.” And Christ himself (Matthew 25:31-46) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the wicked takes place, when the wicked are sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous are called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* “he will sit upon the throne of his glory.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.20}

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show almost conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations; that he will not be the ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his Father just before his second coming in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that men can have any part in getting the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.21}

3. With the statement that “the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs,” we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result; nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contain the whole substance of Church and State union. For, it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of teaching them the true religion. But the religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 551.22}

The revealed will of God cannot by any possibility be of supreme authority in human Governments, for that will require that men shall be perfect not only in our outward actions, but in thought. It requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous, and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreaking sin. Now when it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it

is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.23}

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have a right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.1}

Again, the apostle Paul says: “In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you.” 1 Thessalonians 5:18. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving Day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be a mockery, and it is not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.2}

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the *May-flower*, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organizations of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard with them, we ask them, who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *May-flower* or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything that would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.3}

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if there scheme should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be out-laws and both would be subject to persecution, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.4}

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a qualification for office or citizenship. The appointment of days of thanksgiving and the election of chaplains to pray in legislative bodies, are optional, and are practices that would be far more honored in the breach than in the observance, for they are only a mockery. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government’s connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity for any other religion. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.5}

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of “the moral laws of the Christian religion,” whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, “Whosoever will, let him come.” The ministers of Christ are simply ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs, will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which followed immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.6}

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immortality and corruption, and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men, for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it is expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that “evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse.” See 2 Timothy 3:13; Matthew 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.7}

We said in the beginning that we should be pleased to see what defense our correspondent can make for the aims of the National Reform Association, but we will slightly modify that statement. It does not give us pleasure to see men defending measures, the tendency of which is to lower the standard of Christianity, to give loose rein to bigotry, and to revive the persecutions of the Dark Ages. But if there is a modicum of good concealed somewhere in the National Reform Constitution, we shall be very glad to have it brought to light. W. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 552.8}

**“Love the Fulfilling of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(September 25.-Matthew 14:12-16; Romans 13:8-14.)**

These two portions of Scripture are given respectively as a missionary lesson and a temperance lesson; but it is only by great twisting that either passage can be made to teach anything specially about either missionary or temperance work. We shall therefore take up the second portion of Scripture, and briefly comment on that, taking it in its obvious meaning. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.1}

“Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.” Romans 13:8. Instead of, “He that loveth *another* hath fulfilled the law,” we should read, as in the Revised Version: “He that loveth his neighbor, hath fulfilled the law.” This shows that Paul has reference to the second great commandment, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” This appears more positively by the following verse which reads: “For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” The apostle does not mean that there are no other commandments than these, but that this comprehends all the law of which he is speaking. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.2}

This passage proves beyond all chance for question, that civil governments have nothing to do with enforcing the first four commandments, which define man’s duty to God. For, the verses preceding treat of man’s duty to civil government, showing that men should yield the obedience to the powers that be; and now when he says that when a man loves his neighbor as himself he has fulfilled the law, it is proof that he has fulfilled all law of which human governments are empowered to take cognizance. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.3}

The Bible idea of love differs materially from that held by the majority of people, even among those who profess religion. Love is not a mere emotion, which only the individual himself can feel; but it is an active principle which makes itself felt by others. A person cannot love without *doing*. God’s love to the world was manifested in giving his Son to die for the world. Our love to God is shown by our willing obedience to him; and our love to our fellow-men is shown only by the kindness which we show them. That which does not manifest itself in deeds of service for another, is not love. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.4}

There is so much selfishness in the world, and it is so natural to the human heart, that few have any proper conception of what love is. There is only one true standard of love, and that is the divine. That ye love one another, as I have loved you.” John 15:12. And Paul says that “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Romans 5:8. This utterly overturns the common idea that was embodied in the Pharisaic saying, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemies.” The Bible rule is, “Love your enemies.” Therefore we are justified in saying that the one who loves his neighbor simply because his neighbor loves him, does not love his neighbor at all. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.5}

“Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” Romans 13:10. This does not mean simply that we must refrain from doing actual injury to our neighbors, but that we must do them all the good we can. For if I have power to save my neighbor from any ill, and do not do it, it is the same as though I did him the injury. So Paul says in another place: “As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” Galatians 6:10. To the same intent, Solomon says: “Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it.” Proverbs 3:27. And all is summed up in the Golden Rule: “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.” Matthew 7:12. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.6}

“And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.” Romans 13:11, 12. Much useless speculation is indulged in by commentators, concerning what is meant here by “the night” and “the day.” The following from Dr. Clarke, is a fair sample: “If we understand this in reference to the heathen state of the Romans, it may be paraphrased thus: *the night is far spent*; heathenish darkness is nearly at an end; *the day is at hand*; the full manifestation of the Sun of righteousness, and the elimination of the whole Gentile world, approaches rapidly.” To perceive the fallacy of this conjecture, it is only necessary to remember (1) that the Gentile world have never been illuminated by the Sun of righteousness, and (2) that there is no promise that they ever will be. Moreover, armor is always for defense, and “armor of light” must be for a defense against darkness; but there would be no propriety in an exhortation to put on the armor of light, if the whole world was about to be illuminated. With such a prospect, it would be more appropriate to cheer the people with the charge to prepare to lay off the armor of light, as something no longer necessary. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.7}

The simple truth is that this present evil world is a world of darkness. Says the prophet: “The darkness shall cover thee earth, and gross darkness the people.” Isaiah 60:2. God alone is light. Before the fall, all was light. As men departed farther and farther from God, darkness covered the earth more and more. So we are now living in the night. In this night of darkness, the Bible is given as a light to our feet, and a lamp to our path. Psalm 119:105. It is a gleam from the world of light, which will make the path of them who walk in it, to shine more and more unto the perfect day. Those who are the children of this world, are the children of the night; but those who receive the light from God’s word, are the children of the coming day. 1 Thessalonians 5:4-8. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.8}

But although it is now night, the day which is to dawn for the righteous will be to the wicked a night so dark that all the darkness they have lived in will be thought light in comparison. So the prophet says: “The burden of Dumah. He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will inquire, inquire ye: return, come.” Isaiah 21:11, 12. When the day dawns and the daystar arises in the hearts of the righteous (2 Peter 1:19) it will be impossible then for the wicked to find any light from the word of God (see Proverbs 1:24-32; Amos 8:11, 12), but unto them will be reserved only “the blackness of darkness forever.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.9}

This time is near. No one knows how near, but it is certain that it is nearer than when we first believed. In view of this how necessary to heed the exhortation of the apostle: “Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof.” Romans 13:12-14. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.10}

**“California Camp-meeting” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The time and place of this meeting has been announced for some time, and we have no doubt but even now preparations are being made by many in different parts of the State to attend it. The committee have secured good grounds, easy of access, and quite centrally located. The ground is between Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth and Market Streets and San Pablo Avenue. The Market Street horse-cars pass on one side of the ground, and the San Pablo Avenue cable cars on the other. For several years we have not had a camp-meeting so easy of access by people living in the city where it was held. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.11}

But it is not simply a large outside attendance that we want. We want to see a general turnout of our people from all parts of the State. This ought to be the largest camp-meeting ever held in California. And if it is to be so, it is high time for everybody to be preparing for it. Begin at once to shape your affairs so that you can leave, and when you come leave your homes cares behind you. Come also with the intention of remaining during the entire meeting. Moreover do not imagine that physical preparation is all that is needed; do not think that you will get all the spiritual good you need after you arrive at the meeting. If you would receive the proper benefit from the meeting, you must seek the Lord before coming. Bring his Spirit with you. Do this, not only for your own sake, but for the sake of others. Remember that you should not be content merely to receive blessings, but must be active to impart good to others. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.12}

Perhaps some are thinking that they will wait and attend General Conference. We earnestly protest against any such idea. General Conference cannot be to you what the camp-meeting should be. Most of the time of General Conference must necessarily be devoted to the transaction of business, and you would not be materially edified by simply listening to business, even of the utmost importance, for three full weeks. Moreover, to the brethren and sisters in the California Conference, the business of this Conference is of greater importance than is the business of the General Conference. You are *needed* at the business sessions at the camp-meeting, and must not fail to be present. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.13}

Again we say to everybody, Begin to make the proper preparations now; come early; and stay until the close. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.14}

**“Religious Intolerance” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we gave an account of a Catholic procession in France at which a man was beaten nearly to death for not taking off his hat as the procession went by. It will be remembered that that was given by the *Christian at Work* as proof that France is not a godless nation. In the same paper, August 18, we have an account of another such procession, this time in Spain, as follows:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.15}

“The Spanish Republic under Prim sought to establish religious toleration; and it was so successful that when the revolution came, and Alfonso ascended the throne, he had to accept the fact as a fundamental law. But the new law is not always respected, as the following shows. As the reader doubtless knows, in cases of administering the right of extreme of unction to the dying it is customary in Spain to go in a procession through the streets, the priest carrying aloft the ‘custodia,’ and an acolyte ringing a hand-bell, at the sound of which all passers-by are expected to kneel until the procession passes. Since the establishment of religious liberty in 1868 it is no longer obligatory on all to conform to this custom, and consequently many, from conscientious scruples, refrain from doing so, although, if possible, they endeavor to get out of the way, so as not to give needless offense. But the other day a woman-a member of the Protestant community-was passing through one of the streets of the town, and upon turning a corner came into contact with ‘the procession of the host.’ Not prepared to kneel, and unwilling to appear disrespectful, she stepped aside into a doorway to let the procession pass; but the priest rushed after her, dragged her out, and with great violence endeavored to force her upon on her knees. Not succeeding in this, he handed her over to two policemen, and charged her before the Judge of First Instance with insulting the ‘established religion.’ The judge took the priest’s declaration [in writing], absolutely refusing to hear the poor woman, and ordered her off to prison to await her trial. Heaven knows when this ‘trial’ may come on, and so this poor woman and mother is excluded from her home for an indefinite period. It is gratifying to know, however, that the matter having come to the knowledge of influential parties in London, counsel has been secured and funds raised for the purpose of seeing that the poor woman receives justice.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.16}

France and Spain are two of the European countries in which the *Christian Statesman* and National Reform “cordially and gladly recognize the fact that the Roman Catholics are be recognized advocates of national Christianity and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism,” and which “in a world conference for the promotion of National Christianity could be represented only by Roman Catholics.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 555.17}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to inquiries, we would announce that the articles which appeared in the SIGNS last year, on “The Abiding Sabbath,” will soon appear in pamphlet form. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.1}

If “A Reader,” who under date of August 27 sent us two questions to be answered, will kindly send us his name, we shall be pleased to answer his questions the best we can. We do not wish to publish the name, but we cannot reply to anonymous communications. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.2}

The Rev. F. S. Hatch, of Hartford, Conn., telling in the *Congregationalist* of the success of the Connecticut law forbidding railway trains and traffic on Sunday, says that “Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics have united with Congregationalists in the successful attempt to secure this reform.” He says the condition of affairs is not yet perfect, but that “it is a fresh illustration of the major truth that no evil in our midst can stand against the determination of the united Christian Church.” And if the supposed evil happens to be a good, it is all the same. This is a pointer which shows how this church affair may easily be made national when the work of National Reform shall have progressed a little further. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.3}

There is in California a man by the name of Jesse Shephard, who is said to be a “musical phenomenon,” producing the most wonderful music, both vocal and instrumental, professedly under the inspiration of spirits. His home is now in San Diego, where he is said to have given some marvelous exhibition in connection with masses at the Catholic Church. The *Golden Gate* relates that he was recently in San Francisco, and sang at the nine o’clock mass in the French Catholic Church on Bush Street, and adds:- {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.4}

“The admission of so well-known a spirit medium to a participation in the musical services of a Catholic Church, would seem to indicate that there is less hostility towards the Spiritualism among the Catholics than there is among Protestants.” {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.5}

And why should there not be? The Protestant Churches received the doctrine of inherent immortality, which is the root of Spiritualism as a legacy from the Catholic Church. In a speech in San Francisco, two years ago, Monsignor Capel said that “to Catholics the spirit world was as clear as the light of a gas jet. They walked the streets accompanied by guardian angels. The dead were in their eyes disembodied spirits who surrounded the throne of God. They prayed to them as well as to the saints and angels. To say that they did not hold communication with the spirit world, would be contrary to the whole evidence of the history of the church.” However, Protestants are not far behind Catholics in their acceptance of Spiritualism, as we have abundant evidence to prove. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.6}

An elder in the Disciple Church writes to the *Christian Church News* to know what should be done with members to keep their places of business open on Sunday. As that church professes to take the Bible as the sole guide, and is honest enough to acknowledge that there is no warrant in the Bible for calling Sunday a sacred day any more than other days, it is evident that nothing can be done in such a case. The church will have to wait until there is a law of the land enforcing Sunday observance, and then it will have a basis for the discipline of those who labor on that day. But before that time comes, many members of the churches will recognize the inconsistency of the church having to depend on human laws for the enforcement of its ordinances. {SITI September 8, 1887, p. 560.7}

**“Preachers” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Great harm comes to the church and public morality when preachers and other teachers hide themselves away from sight, become, in other words, recluses. But harm almost as great arises from their too prominent identification with affairs that do not properly belong to them. The latter difficulty is, perhaps, the present one, the many reforms and goodish movements of the period tempting them to help in their advancement. The middle ground is the right one, with a heavy leaning to the side of the gospel as a gospel of salvation. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 565.1}

**“‘That They May All Be One’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is no one thing to which Christians are exhorted more strenuously than they are to unity. Indeed it is the one thing essential. Without unity they have no means of proving to the world the truth of the religion which they profess. Christians are those who are united to Christ, and if they are united into Christ,-members of one body,-they must necessarily be united to one another. Therefore union is the great test of Christianity. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.1}

But when we say this, we do not mean that all who profess Christianity must necessarily be united. We can conceive of union that would be far worse than dissension. We refer to a union upon something contrary to the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Such a union would be no evidence of Christianity, as anybody can see. It must be, therefore, that when our Saviour prayed that all his professed disciples might be one, he designed that their union be a union upon the truth of God as revealed in his word. And this is still more evident from our Saviour’s words in another part of that same prayer, where he said: “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.2}

These thoughts were suggested by reading a letter which we recently received, and which the writer deplored the fact that some are keeping the seventh day of the week,-the Sabbath of the Lord,-while the majority of Christians observe the first day of the week. He wished that there might be unity in this respect, and hoped that the time would soon come when Christians should unite in bringing about the fulfillment of our Lord’s prayer, “that they all may be one.” Inasmuch as he pleaded quite strongly for Sunday observance, we conclude that he wants those who keep the seventh day to unite with the majority, and thus fulfill our Saviour’s desire. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.3}

It is not an unfrequent thing for people to accuse the seventh-day keepers of bringing in dissension, and of being the cause of there being a division among professed Christians. Now to us the case looks very much as follows: a teacher sends her score of pupils out to play, with instructions for them to keep within a certain inclosure, and an express injunction for them to keep together and be united in their play. Very soon they propose a game if carried out would make it necessary for them to go outside the inclosure. They all start over the fence, except two who refuse to disobey their teacher. The others beg them to come along, stating that the teacher will not care, because so many of them have already gone outside, and then they remind the two of the teacher’s injunction that they should keep it together. But still the two refuse to go outside, and so the play is hindered, and the good feeling with which they all started out is marred. The teacher, hearing the dispute, goes out to see what is the matter, and is told by the majority that all the trouble is caused by those two obstinate ones, who refuse to act in harmony with them. Now we think that almost anyone will say that the two are all right, and that the trouble is all caused by the majority who refuse to obey the simple command of the teacher. The teacher also would say that when she enjoined them to keep together, she meant that they should keep it together in the place marked out for them. No one would say that the eighteen ought to be praised for being united in an act of disobedience. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.4}

Well, God has enjoined upon all who profess to be learners from him, that they should be one; but when he tells them that, he expects that they will be one and obey his law. It would be too much to suppose that he would reward them for being united, if they were united in disobedience. Indeed, he has said that union in disobedience is displeasing to him, for we read: “Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished; but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered.” Proverbs 11:21. Numbers do not make a sin respectable in the eyes of God. He had more pleasure in Noah than in all the antidiluvian world besides. In fact, Noah was the only one with whom he was pleased, and the reason is given thus: “For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.” Doubtless Noah was accused of being a disturber of the people; but it was better to be a disturber on the side of right than to be joined to the multitude in error. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.5}

In later times, when the Jewish nation had nearly all gone into idolatry, there was one faithful man, who refused to join their iniquitous union. The Israelites were a very united people at that time, and did not want to have any disturbing element among them. And so when Elijah came to warn them again, Ahab said to him, “Art thou he that troubleth Israel?” Elijah did not accept the accusation, but stated the matter in its true light, saying, “I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house [have trouble Israel], in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.” 1 Kings 18:17, 18. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.6}

We love union, but we hope that we may never accept of any union that will involve a violation of the plain precept of God. Rather would we stand in the law of the Lord, calling the multitude to return and walk in the old paths. W. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.7}

**“Once a Sin Always a Sin” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks us concerning the curse in Deuteronomy 27:23, against a man marrying his mother-in-law, wishing to know if that prohibition is still in force, or if it is part of the law that was nailed to the cross of Christ. He says, “Does all from the 14th verse to the end of the chapter stand good, except the 23rd verse? Is so, why?” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.8}

We say most emphatically, None of it has passed away. The words at the close of the chapter: “Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them,” apply to all the precepts therein recorded, without exception. There is no more reason for saying that verse 23 does not apply now, than there is for saying that the 15th verse is out of date. To say that these verses are part of that which Christ took out of the way, nailing them to his cross, is equivalent to saying that Christ is the minister of sin. For even heathen nations recognize the fact that to set light by one’s father or his mother (see verse 16) is a sin. If this law is done away, then it would follow that it is all right for one to smite his neighbor, provided he does it in such a way as not to be found out. See verse 24. No; these curses are in full force to-day, and it is as surely a sin for one to marry his mother-in-law, as it is to make a graven image to worship, to smite a man secretly, or to take a reward to slay an innocent person. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.9}

The curses recorded in Deuteronomy 27:15-26, are all for violation of some one or other of the ten commandments. This can be seen by an examination of the passage itself and also by comparing verses 11-14 with Deuteronomy 11:26-29. The latter passage reads thus: “Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known. And it shall come to pass, when the Lord thy God hath brought thee in unto the land whither thou goest to possess it, that thou shalt put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal.” Now by reading Deuteronomy 27:11-14, we find that the curses which follow were to be pronounced in harmony with the above injunction, and with the statement that God set a curse before those who should transgress his commandments. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.10}

The simple fact is, and it should be remembered by all, that no man can be blessed now for doing what would once have brought him under the curse of God. God’s will is ever the same. He never pronounced a curse upon any thing except sin, and no one was ever cursed except for sin. And since God cannot change, the standard of right and wrong must ever be the same. Whatever would bring a man under the curse of God four thousand years ago, will bring one under that same curse to-day. Wherever in the Bible you find a curse attached to the performance of a certain thing, be assured that that thing is to be always and forever avoid by the children of men. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.11}

**“‘They Overpass the Deeds of the Wicked’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

These words were used by the inspired prophet (Jeremiah 5:28) concerning the professed people of the Lord in ancient Jerusalem. The careful reader of the context, however, will readily see that their sole application is not to the ancient Jews, but that Jeremiah, while looking at the Jews, saw in prophetic vision far beyond them, and beheld another people in the last days walking in the same path. That the prophecy concerning Jerusalem has equal reference to the church in the last days, may be seen by reading from the beginning of the fourth chapter, and especially verses 19-31 of that chapter. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.12}

If anything more were needed to prove that the iniquity which brought destruction upon ancient Jerusalem will be duplicated in the last days, we have only to quote the plain language of the apostle Paul, in 2 Timothy 3:1-5:- {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.13}

“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.14}

The last sentence shows that these things will be seen among those who profess to be followers of God. Within the past three weeks, three different things have come under our notice, which vividly illustrate some of the things mentioned by the apostle as characteristic of the last days. First of all, as illustrating the phrase, “lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God,” we quote the following which appeared in the column of *Church News* in the Oakland *Tribune* of September 3:- {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.15}

**“A CHURCH ENTERTAINMENT**

“Yesterday afternoon was devoted by the ladies of the Church of the Advent, East Oakland, to the selling of fancy work, toys, candy, and other useful ornamental articles at a bazaar open in Washington Hall. In the evening a short literary programme was given, after which dancing was indulged in until 11 o’clock. Refreshments were served during the afternoon and evening. About 11 o’clock the company was called together to attend an auction of cakes. W. S. Goodfellow acted as auctioneer, and succeeded in getting a goodly sum of money into the church treasury by the sale of the delectable merchandise.” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.16}

Lest some should by any possibility get a wrong impression, we will explain that the “Church of the Advent” is the name of an Episcopal house of worship, and has no reference whatever to Adventist. In regard to the above notice, some may say, “It shows, to be sure that they are lovers of pleasures, but how does it show that they are ‘lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God’?” Just this way: Although professedly for the cause of Christ, the pleasures indulged in were such as are utterly incompatible with love to God. It was a pleasure which is only of the world. Now John says: “If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.” 1 John 2:15. Therefore the indulgence in such amusements at all, at any time or for any purpose, is evidence of absence of love to God. But such things are common nowadays, and we pass to another phase. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.17}

Indeed *New York Observer* of September 1, we find the following item:- {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 566.18}

“Strange things are done in the name of charity. The ‘champion’ prize-fighter of America, Boston delights to honor, recently gave an exhibition of his skill in the fistic art for the benefit of a Roman Catholic benevolent society in Rhode Island. Some charitably disposed persons in Paris, France, have improved upon the Sullivan scheme by instituting ‘a grand cock-fight for the benefit of the poor.’” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.1}

Certainly nothing more than this is needed to prove the correctness of the appellation, “fierce,” those who in the last days are content with only a form of godliness. To be sure the prize-fighter in Rhode Island was under the auspices of the Catholics, but they are now, by the most of the so-called Protestants, recognized as a “branch of the Christian Church.” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.2}

But all these acts of wickedness and worldly pleasures are over past by a thing which was done in Illinois about a month ago. It was a “crazy supper” given by the ladies of the Methodist church. No description could do justice to it, and so we give below as nearly as possible a fac-simile, reduced in size of course, of the hand-bill which announced it:- {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.3}

*The Magic MCON is BREAKING,  
Like a conqueror from THE east,  
THE waiting we Rid awaking.  
To A golden. Fairy feast-shakeSPEARE.  
The LADIES of the M. E. Church,  
assisted by their many friends,  
will give a CRAZY SUPPER At the ARMORY,  
SULLIVAN, ILLINOIS, WEDNESDAY EVE., AUG. 3, 1887  
BEGINNING AT 5:30 O’CLOCK P. m. and  
“We won’t go home ‘till morning;”  
Is it not Written, “Every vacuum must be filled?”  
“Let no guilty man escape?” So come along.  
Hear the words of the Prophet Jerry My Oh,  
“The young MAN and HIS girl can’t live on dry bread alone.”  
So the crzy, maizy MENU will consist, among other things,  
Of Tongue, Chicken Salad, and just Everyday chicken,  
Ham, Pickles, Jelly, Cake, Ice Cream, Tea, Coffee, etc.,  
And will be served in many crazy, mazy, hazy waze.  
“And the light shone down on brave women and fair men.”-Burns.  
Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity,  
to the voice of DAVE, the SWEET RINGER,  
“make a joyful sound on the ‘Psaltery and the Buttery,  
the TIN horn and the Cob Pipe,“  
such excellent music will be furnished.  
ADMISSION AND SUPPER, 25 CTS.  
Friends, Romans, Countrymen, WE come not here to talk,  
But to invite YOU to eat, drink and be merry.  
THE JOHN L. SULLIVAN NEWS PRINT. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.4}*

One of the original bills, of which the above is an exact copy, is in our possession, having been sent us by our friend Elder A. O. Tait, who was holding meetings in the town of Sullivan when the crazy revel took place. The shape of the hand-bill we cannot reproduce, but it is sufficient to say that it is fantastic, and fully in keeping with the matter which it contains, giving evidence that those who got it up were eminently qualified to conduct a “crazy” supper. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.5}

But while the bill shows the church people who got it up to be “lovers of there own selves,” and “lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God,” it proves to a demonstration that the epithet “blasphemers” is fully merited by these last-day professors. Passing by the extracts from the drunkard’s song, “We won’t go home ‘till morning,” which shows that their revel, beginning at 5:30 P.M., was to last all night, we call attention to the abominable caricature of the language of sacred Scriptures. Isaiah’s prophecy of the forerunner of the Messiah, in which are found the words, “Every valley shall be exalted,” (Isaiah 40:3, 4), is distorted into “Every vacuum shall be filled,” and made to apply to the filling of the stomachs of unholy gormandizers. The name of that holy man who before his birth was designated as a prophet of God, is caricatured as “Jerry My Oh,” and then to him are attributed the words, “The young man and his girl can’t live on dry bread alone.” And then, worst of all, if we can mark degrees in such blasphemy, is the parody of the name of the psalmist, and of the language of the Psalms, in the sentence: “Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity, to the voice of Dave the Sweet Ringer, ‘make a joyful sound on the ‘Psalter-y and the Butter-y, the tin horn and the Cob Pipe.’” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.6}

We venture the assertion that there is not an infidel club in the United States that would dare put forth such a blasphemous caricature of sacred things. Truly the words of the prophet whom they have ridiculed apply to them: “For among my people are found wicked men; they lay wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore they are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine; yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the right of the needy do they not judge.” Jeremiah 5:26-28. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.7}

It is not because we take pleasure in exposing the evil deeds of others, that we give such prominence to these matters, but that we may fulfill the injunction of Isaiah 58:1, and if possible to rouse those who are not wholly given over to such abominations, to the fact that the end cannot be far off. There is another point also, that we should make. When we say that the passage of a Sunday law would result in the persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh day, we are told that fact cannot be, because Christians will not persecute, and worldlings will have no interest in the matter. Leaving “worldlings” aside, what clemency, we ask, can humble commandment-keepers expect from “Christians,” who have no sense of the sacredness of the Bible? What better are such professors than “worldlings”? And when the matter comes to the test, no more zealous advocates for a rigid Sunday law can be found than these same ones who walk in “lusts, ... revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries.” Having no real godliness in themselves, they will think to make up for it by excessive zeal for a form thereof. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.8}

Further, Solomon says, “They that forsake the law praise the wicked” (Proverbs 28:4); and they who praise the wicked must, as a necessary consequence, despise the good; therefore it is as clear as the noonday sun that professors who are guilty of such blasphemy as these which we have noticed, or who suffer them without stern rebuke, well, when the power is placed in their hands, the foremost in persecuting those whose godly lives and teaching condemn their course. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.9}

When the Saviour was on earth he drove from the temple those who made it a place of merchandise. Soon he is coming again, and terrible will be the fate of those who do abominable deeds under the garb of religion. The prevalence of these things of which we have spoken should serve simply to cause the servants of God to humble themselves, to seek righteousness, and meekness, that they might be hid in the day of the Lord’s anger. “Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: Your brethren that he did you, that cast you out for my name’s sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed.” Isaiah 66:5. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.10}

Therefore, “Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares.” Luke 21:34. W. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 567.11}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS of September 1 contained the appointment for a camp-meeting to be held near Caldwell, Idaho Territory, beginning September 13. We have just received word that the date has been changed. The meeting will be held one week later September 20-25. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.1}

A writer in be *Evangelical Churchman*, of Canada, makes a strong plea for the Canadian Legislature at its next session to pass an Act authorizing the Governor-General “to issue a proclamation prohibiting all Sunday railway traffic throughout the entire dominion, at such a date as a similar Act shall come into operation in the United States.” He says that “when the people of the United States know that Canada has passed an Act against Sunday railway traffic, which must remain inoperative until their own Congress passes a similar Act which in connection with the Canadian one would stop all Sabbath desecration by railway and steamboat companies, and when they are appealed to as they will be by pulpit and press, they will say, ‘This thing must be done.’” This appeal by pulpit and press is even now being made, loud enough to be heard even to Canada. How long will it be before the thing shall be accomplished? {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.2}

The question is frequently asked, “Why did God make a devil?” The answer is, He did not. He never made any being who was not perfect and pure. Satan was the chief of the angels who “kept not their first estate” (Jude 6), but who sinned and were delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto Judgment. 2 Peter 2:4. Some unthinking person is likely to ask, “Why did God let him sin?” Simply because God made him an intelligent creature and not a machine. God does not delight in sin, and it is certain that he did not want Satan to sin, but when Satan determined to sin there was no way to prevent it without destroying his identity; for if by almighty power he had been restrained from open rebellion, the desire itself would have been sin all the same. The fact is, Satan sinned, and God’s disapproval of the act has been shown ever since, and will yet be shown in the most marked manner possible, when Satan, with all his hosts, shall be destroyed. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.3}

In answer to the question, “Has it ever been a doctrine of the Presbyterian Church that unbaptized infants were lost?” a correspondent of the *Interior* says: “It has never been. On the contrary, Presbyterians have protested always against the doctrine.” Well, then, we should like to know why they baptize infants. It is very certain that adults are baptized in order that they may be saved; for whatever carping there may be about baptism as a saving ordinance, we have the declaration, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;” also the command, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” See also 1 Peter 3:21, 22. The command is imperative for all who believe to be baptized; there is no exception made. To say that men who neglect baptism stand an equal chance of being saved with those who are baptized, would be to deny the necessity of that ordinance. And so when Pedobaptists admit, what they cannot deny, that infants who are not “baptized” will be saved as well as those who undergo the ceremony, they admit that the ceremony is entirely unnecessary, and if unnecessary, it is wrong. The so-called baptism of infants, which is in reality no baptism at all in any sense of the word, is a gross perversion of a sacred ordinance, and a mockery which has about it none of the elements of solemnity. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.4}

**“What Shall be Done?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

P.A.F. asks: “What is a woman who is a Seventh-day Adventist, and whose husband is an infidel, to do if he requests her to buy or sell on the Sabbath day? Will not sin be imputed to her if she complies? Also her young children desire to keep the Sabbath, but the father will not let them do it. What shall she do? If she should resolve to live apart, she would lose the children entirely.” {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.5}

We do not know everything, and cannot undertake to tell people what their duty is in special cases, but so far as we have any light, the woman’s course seems plain, although not necessarily easy. 1. She should keep the Sabbath. Her husband is not in the place of God to the woman; God’s plain command far outweighs her husband’s request or even command. There is no human obligation which can set aside one obligation to God. 2. Sin would most certainly be imputed to the woman, as well as to anybody else, if she violated the Sabbath. 3. She should do with her children the best she can, by precept and example. If the father will not allow them to keep the seventh as they wish, she cannot help the matter. If she should leave, her influence over them would be at an end. Moreover, she has no scriptural warrant for leaving, and to do so would be unjustifiable, and would bring reproach on the cause. A woman may not leave her husband simply because he is not a Christian. Possibly she herself cannot keep the Sabbath as well as she would if she were alone, but by her quiet, godly life, she may save her children, and possibly her husband too. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.6}

One thing ought always to be remembered; very often fierce lions appear in the path just ahead of us, making it seem impossible to advance; when we push straight ahead, we find that they are changed. People are lost because of trials and dangers which they saw but were afraid to meet, rather than by those which they pass through. All of which is summed up in the words of the apostle Paul: “There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.” 1 Corinthians 10:13. {SITI September 15, 1887, p. 576.7}

**“Christ’s Coming and Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we were requested to explain Matthew 16:28, but the question was mislaid. We will now consider it. For the first reads thus: {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.1}

“Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.2}

That our Saviour did not refer to his coming at the end of the world is evident from the fact that in his discourse on that the event in Matthew 24, he foretold a long period of persecution that was to intervene; and that he did not refer, as some have supposed, to the day of Pentecost or to the destruction of Jerusalem, nor to the spread of the gospel, is evident because (1) Christ did not come in any sense of the word either at Pentecost or at the destruction of Jerusalem; (2) the spread of the gospel is not the coming of Christ in any sense of the word; and (3) the gospel work had already begun by Christ, and had indeed been carried on from the days of Abel. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.3}

In 2 Peter 1:16-18 we are set upon the track of that which are our Saviour did really refer to in Matthew 16:28. That text reads as follows:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.4}

“For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.5}

The apostle here refers to the transfiguration scene which took place about a week after Christ’s statement found in Matthew 16:28, and the account of which immediately follows those words. That accounts for reads as follows:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.6}

“And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here; if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.” Matthew 17:1-5. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.7}

Remembering that Peter referred to this event as proving the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that it follows closely upon Christ’s statement that some standing there should see him coming in his kingdom, and that just before he made that statement he was speaking of his second coming (Matthew 16:27), we must conclude that in the statement made in verse 28, Christ referred, not to his actual coming at the end of the world, but to a miniature representation of that coming. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.8}

Before proceeding to show how fully this was a representation of the second coming of Christ, we will quote some opinions of others. Dr. Geike, after commenting on Matthew 16:24-26, thus paraphrases, in his usual style, verses 27, 28, embodying the parallel passages in Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:26:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.9}

“I shall one day return in a very different form, with the majesty of my Father in Heaven, and accompanied by legions of angels, to recompense everyone according to his works. In that day each true disciple will be rewarded according to his loving devotion and self sacrifice for my sake, and will be received by me, as the Messiah, into my kingdom. But I shall be ashamed of anyone, and call him unfit to enter that kingdom, who for love of life and ease, or for fear of man, or from shame of my present lowly estate, or of my cross, has wanted courage to confess me openly, and separate himself, in my name, from this sinful generation. It may be hard for you to think, as you see me standing here before you, that I shall one day, in heavenly majesty; but that you may know how surely it will be so, I shall grant to you now present, a glimpse of this majesty, not after my death, but while I am still with you, that you may see me, the Son of man, in the glory in which I will come when I return to enter on my kingdom.”-*Life of Christ, chap 46, last paragraph*. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.10}

In his “Life of Our Lord” (p. 321), Samuel J. Andrews made the following clear statement of the case, which is more satisfactory than Dr. Geike’s testimony, because it contains the Scripture references which support the view:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.11}

“The promise that some then standing before him should not taste death till they had seen ‘the Son of man coming in his kingdom’ (Matthew 16:28), or had seen ‘the kingdom of God, with power’ (Mark 9:1), was fulfilled when, after six days, he took Peter, James, and John into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them. These apostles now saw him as he should appear when, having risen from the dead, and glorified, he should come again from Heaven, to take his great power and to reign. They saw in the ineffable glory of his person, and the brightness around them, a foreshadowing of the kingdom of God as it should come with power; and were for a moment ‘eyewitnesses of his majesty.’ 2 Peter 1:16. Many errors still remain to be removed from their minds, especially respecting the time of its establishment (Acts 1:6), but the great fact of its supernatural character they could not mistake.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.12}

Now let us briefly notice the details of this wonderful scene, to see how they agree with what we are told of the second coming of Christ in his kingdom. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.13}

1. “A cloud overshadowed them.” So of Christ is said, “Behold, he cometh with clouds.” Revelation 1:7. He departed in a cloud, and he is to return just as he went. See Acts 1:9-11. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.14}

2. “His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.” Mark says that “his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them;” and Luke says that “his raiment was white and glistering.” So of Christ’s coming we are told that it shall be “in the glory of his Father.” One, prophetically describing that coming, says: “His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had bright beams out of this side.” Habakkuk 3:3, 4, margin. John, who afterward had a view of his coming, said: “His eyes far as a flaming fire.” Revelation 19:12. And Paul speaks of “the brightness of his coming” as being so great as to destroy the wicked. Then but those who have been strengthened by the Lord can behold the glory of his coming and live. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.15}

3. When he comes the second time he comes to take his people to himself, and this he does by raising the righteous dead, and translating the living. Says Paul: “For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. Again he says: “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.” 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.16}

So, then, when Christ comes on his throne of glory, with a cloud of angels, to give reward to the righteous, there will be two great classes of them: those who shall be translated without seeing death, and those who shall be raised from the dead. These, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, shall also appear with him in glory. Colossians 3:4. Now these two classes were with him on the mount of transfiguration. If they had not been, it would not have been a true representation of the “power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,” as Peter says it was. All Bible readers are familiar with the fact that Elijah (the Hebrew form of the name of which in Greek is Elias) was translated without seeing death. See 2 Kings 2:1-11. The record says that as he and Elisha walked on, and talked, “behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven.” So Elijah was there with Christ in the mount as a representative of those who, when Christ comes, shall be caught up to meet the Lord without tasting death. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.17}

Concerning Moses, we have the record: “So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day.” Deuteronomy 34:5, 6. Turn now to Jude 9, where we read: “Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee.” What could cause a dispute between Christ (who is Michael) and the devil, concerning the body of Moses? Only this one thing, that the devil has the power (Hebrews 2:14); he brought sin into the world, and death comes by sin; those who die he considers as his lawful prey, and he refuses to open the house of his prisoners (Isaiah 14:16, 17), which is the grave. He is the strong man keeping guard over his house; but Christ is the stronger than he, who has entered into his house, overpowering him (Luke 11:21, 22) and who now has the keys of death and the grave. Revelation 3:18. This power Christ gained by his death (Hebrews 2:14); but long before his death and resurrection he had this power by virtue of the promise and the oath of God, which were the surety that he would be offered. Knowing these facts, that Christ contended with the devil over the body of Moses, we are forced to the conclusion that their dispute was concerning the resurrection of Moses, Satan claiming that Christ had no right to take him. But in every contest with Satan, Christ has come off victorious, and so Moses was raised from the dead, and appeared with Christ on the holy mount, as the representative of those who, at the second coming of Christ, shall be brought from their graves to ever be with the Lord. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.18}

If there should be a lingering doubt in the minds of any that Moses was really raised from the dead, and they should think that it was only his disembodied spirit that appeared on the mount, we will state (1) that the transfiguration is expressly declared by Peter to have been a representation of “the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,” and that at that time he and James, and John were “eyewitnesses of his majesty,” which shows that it was a view of Christ in his kingly glory; (2) it is absolutely certain that when Christ comes there will be no such thing as disembodied spirits, because, says Paul, he “shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned unto his glorious body” (Philippians 3:20), and this change is performed for both the living and the dead. 1 Corinthians 15:51. When the saints are caught up to meet the Lord in the air, it is with their own bodies glorified like the body of Christ. Therefore, (3) since, as shown above, the transfiguration was a representation, on a small scale, of this glorious event, it is certain that Moses must have been there in person, and not in shadow. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.19}

The transfiguration stands for us, as it did for the apostles, as a sure pledge of Christ’s second coming in power and great glory; and yet “we have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.” 2 Peter 1:19. Let us study this sure word of prophecy, that we may walk in the light, and be prepared for the dawning of the “perfect day.” W. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 582.20}

**“A View of the Sabbath Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

In compliance with the expressed wish of a correspondent to “Please give your readers this view of the Sabbath day,” we print the following communication. “This view of the Sabbath day” has been given and answered in the SIGNS a great many times, but line must be upon line, and precept upon precept. Besides the SIGNS is continually going to new readers, and we are always glad to let them know on just what foundation Sunday rests. The claims of the Sabbath of the Lord never were so strong as when contrasted with the claims that are put forth in behalf of Sunday. Here is the letter:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.1}

TO THE EDITORS OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: An article recently came to my notice in your excellent paper, headed, “God’s Law and Sabbath, or Man’s Law and Sabbath.” It seems to me that the writer takes an imperfect and one-sided view of the subject. Christians are to look at the spirit of the ancient law as interpreted by Christ. The schism among professed believers is a stumbling-block to the world. Previous to his crucifixion, Christ’s prayer for his followers was, “That they all may be *one*.” Paul says in 2 Corinthians 3:5, 6, “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.” And 2 Corinthians 5:17: “If any man be in Christ, let him be [margin] a new creature; *all things* are passed away; behold, *all things* are become a new.” Again, in Romans 7:6: “But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that [margin] wherein we were held; that we should serve in the newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.” And further, we are to “delight, in the *law of God* after the inward man.” Romans 7:22. Please see Matthew 12:1-14. “The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day.” Verse 8. He came “not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it in the ‘Lord’s day.’” Further, the resurrection of our Lord was on *the first day of the week*. Mark 16:1; Luke 24:1; John 20:1. See Acts 20:6, 7, where Paul says, “And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.” We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Christ, kept the “*first day* of the week.” Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day? And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the *first day* of the week, does it matter which day is kept; as much as that we *agree* to keep one day of rest, holy unto the Lord. E. C. R. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.2}

We do not recollect the article to which our correspondent refers, but no matter; we will consider his so-called proof for Sunday observance. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.3}

1. “Christians are to look at the spirit of the law, as interpreted by Christ.” Exactly so. And his interpretation was that not one jot or one tittle of the law should pass away. Now if our friend would take the fourth commandment, and show that, although it declares the seventh day to be the Sabbath, it really means that the first day, there would be some point to his statement. But see further on this point in next paragraph. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.4}

2. Paul says in 2 Corinthians 3:5, 6, “Our sufficiency is of God; who 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.” This is commonly interpreted as teaching that the letter of the old covenant kills, but the spirit of the new covenant gives life, which is true enough as a statement, but is not what the text says. The text makes no mention of the old covenant, but only of the new. The letter of the new covenant or testament kills just as surely as did the letter of the old, and it is only the spirit that gives life. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.5}

Some, however, and among them our correspondent, seem to get the idea that there is some sin attaching to the observing of the letter of the law, and that it should be kept only in spirit, and not in letter, we would like for someone to have the kindness to tell us how such a thing can be done. It is utterly impossible for any man to keep the spirit of the law if he does not keep the letter. For instance, the sixth commandment says, “Thou shalt not kill.” How could anybody keep the spirit of that commandment if he did not refrain from taking life? None but a Catholic will claim that the spirit of the second commandment can be kept by one who bows down to images. Certainly the spirit of the third commandment cannot be kept by one who uses God’s name unnecessarily. So no man can keep the spirit of the fourth commandment when he labors upon the seventh day, upon which he is commanded to rest. It is sometimes urged that the spirit of that commandment simply requires rest, and that if a man rest on the first day he complies with this spirit as well as though he rested upon the seventh day. With as good reason might the heathen say that the spirit of the first commandment is simply that men should worship, and that he who worships Jupiter for Juggernaut complies with the spirit as fully as does the one who worships Jehovah. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.6}

3. “Again, Romans 7:6, ‘But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter.’ And further, we are to delight in the law of God after the inward man.” Certainly nothing could be farther from proof for Sunday observance than this. The man who keeps only the letter, that is, the outward form of the law, is as though he did not keep it at all, because God requires truth in the inward parts. The law goes farther than mere outward acts, and requires that the thoughts of the heart shall be in harmony with its requirements. A man may keep the letter of the law, and still violate in Spirit; but he cannot keep the spirit, and violate the letter. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.7}

This matter is fully illustrated by Christ in his denunciation of the Pharisees. They were very scrupulous in their outward compliance with the law, but maintained that it made no difference how a person felt or thought. Christ said that they made clean the outside, but within were full of extortion and excess. Said he unto them:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.8}

“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” Matthew 23:27, 28. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.9}

Now hear what Jesus say to us all: “For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Matthew 5:20. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.10}

Notice, he says that our righteousness must *exceed* theirs. Now anything cannot *exceed* another unless it goes just as far as that other, and a good deal further. One man exceeds another in the amount of work done, because he does just as much as that other, and more too. So if our righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Pharisees, we must have all the righteousness that they had, and a good deal more. What did they do? They kept the letter of the law perfectly. What must we do? We must keep the law outwardly and inwardly too. To talk about keeping the spirit of the law while violating its plain precept, is as absurd as to talk of traveling east or going west. So to say that the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day, may be kept by the observance of the first day, is as absurd as to say that man in Chicago obeys an order to go to New York, by going to San Francisco. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.11}

4. “2 Corinthians 5:17: ‘If any man be in Christ he is [or let him be] a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.’” How anybody’s mind can be so twisted as to suppose that this text warrants the keeping of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, is beyond our comprehension. If any man is in Christ *he* is a new creature; it is the *man* that is new, not the law, the Sabbath or any other thing. Before a man is in Christ he does not keep the law. See Romans 7:14-25; 8:1. When he comes to Christ, he forsakes the old life and becomes a new man. As Paul describes it, he puts on “the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Ephesians 4:24. And this agrees with 2 Corinthians 5:17, 18, where Paul, after saying that if they man is in Christ all things are new, he continues, “and all things are of God.” Whereas in his previous life everything was of the world, now everything is of God. This is the exact meaning of the text. But to make it mean that when a man is in Christ everything in the universe that is old has passed away, is equivalent to saying that not only the Sabbath, which is as old as creation, has passed away, but that the whole law, the whole creation, and even God himself, have all passed away, for all are of old. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 583.12}

5. “‘The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day.’ He came ‘not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it into the Lord’s day.’” We know not from whom our correspondent quoted this precious bit of nonsense, but a more self-contradictory thing was never written. It is true that Christ did not come to abolish the Sabbath, but if he had “merged it into the Lord’s day,” he would most effectually have abolished it. Our correspondent says, “to interpret it.” But it needed no interpretation. A child can understand the fourth commandment. It is a legal maxim that the words of the law are to be taken in their obvious signification, and there are none but common words in the fourth commandment. Again he says that Christ came “to ennoble it.” But that were impossible, for it was from the beginning as noble as it is possible for anything to be. “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.” Genesis 2:3. Who can point to an institution more noble than that which was blessed and hallowed by the Lord himself? {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.1}

It is said that Christ merged the Sabbath into the Lord’s day. Impossible again, for the Sabbath was already the Lord’s day. Christ himself said as much in the words, “The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath,” for it was of the seventh-day Sabbath,-the only Sabbath in existence,-that he was speaking. The Lord said, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God (Exodus 20:10), and again Isaiah 58:13 he calls it “my holy day;” and there is no other day that the Lord ever called his day. Therefore the seventh day is and always was the only Lord’s day. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.2}

6. “The resurrection of our Lord was on the first day of the week.” Granted; we wouldn’t for a moment think of disputing it. We might state that his crucifixion was on Friday, and his ascension, was undoubtedly on Thursday. Our correspondent may ask, “Well, what of that?” We reply, Nothing in particular; but just as much importance attaches to these statements, as there does to the statement that Christ rose on Sunday. Why not keep Friday, because of Christ’s crucifixion? or Thursday, because of his ascension? “Oh,” the reply will be, “there is no authority for any such thing.” Of course there is not; neither is there any authority for keeping Sunday, because Jesus rose on that day. The only authority is the Roman Catholic Church. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.3}

7. “We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Paul, kept the first day of the week.” We beg our correspondent’s pardon, but he doesn’t know anything of the kind; and there is not a man on earth who knows anything of the kind; and there never was a man who knew any such thing. We have met assertion with the assertion; he offered no proof of his assertion, and so we have nothing to disprove. But if he will bring us from the Bible a single iota of *proof* that Christ, or Paul, or any other apostle, or any man named in the Bible as a companion or friend of Christ or the apostles, ever kept a single Sunday, we will print it in THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES in red ink, and in the largest type that we have in the office. Don’t be backward with your proof, Brother “R.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.4}

8. “Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath,-the seventh day?” We ask, Why should Christians worship the God of the Jews, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Why should Christians follow the old Jewish custom of reverencing God’s name? Why should Christians obey the old Jewish law that prohibited murder? You say that God was not the God of the Jews exclusively, but “of the Gentiles also.” True; he is the God of all mankind, and consequently his holy Sabbath,-the seventh day,-is the Sabbath for all mankind; for “the Sabbath was made for man.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.5}

9. “And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the first day of the week, does it matter which day is kept?” That’s the way it always ends: It doesn’t make any difference what the Lord says, because people have taken it into their heads to do differently. Just as if the action of ten thousands of people could change the mind of the Lord! {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.6}

This article is already too long, but we wish to call the reader’s attention to one thing: Our friend has not presumed to offer a single Scripture statement to the effect that Sunday is the Sabbath; he has given a few texts which have no more reference to Sunday than they have to the Declaration of Independence, and winds up by saying that it doesn’t matter which day of the week we keep, anyway. And, mark this, he has done as much for Sunday as could be done by the most accomplished minister in the world. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.7}

In contrast with the Sunday argument, notice the simplicity of Bible truth:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.8}

“*The seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in *it* thou shalt not do any work.” Exodus 20:10. “And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, then one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. W. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 584.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

From a single canvasser 594 subscriptions for the *American Sentinel*, accompanied with the money, were received one day last week. There are scores of people who want to “do something in the cause,” who could do as well as this, and we do not know of anything which they could do which would more effectually help in the work. The field is wide, and but a very small portion of it has been worked. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.1}

Active preparations are already being made for the camp-meeting which is to be held in Oakland, October 6-17. Various committees of arrangements have been appointed, and it is the design to have the best arranged camp-meeting ever held in this State. We confidently expect, also, that the attendance will be the largest that has ever been seen at any camp-meeting in California. May the good that shall be done, be in proportion. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.2}

Hon. Washington Bartlett, Governor of California, died in Oakland, Monday evening, September 12. He was sixty-three years of age, and the immediate cause of his death was paralysis, brought on, it is said, by too close application to the details of the business of his office. This is the first time that a Governor of California has died in office. Lieutenant-Governor Waterman has taken the oath as Governor, and has entered upon his duties. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.3}

A London dispatch of September 16 speaks as follows concerning the European outlook:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.4}

“One of the most discouraging signs of the European horizon, which promises no permanence of the present peaceful state of affairs, is the fact that all the great newspapers here and on the Continent are gathering together large staffs of war correspondents, and by buying serviceable horses, and in other ways, are preparing for the great struggle they seem confident is coming. In the meantime statesmen are puffing so ostentatiously the pipe of peace, that suspicion is excited that under the friendly cover of the smoke they are preparing for war.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.5}

A week ago we listened to a sermon against the Sabbath, which differed, of course, in no respect from the average sermon against the Sabbath, having the usual number of contradictory statements. As a specimen, we note the following: The speaker claimed that the observance of the seventh day is anti-christian. Then he went on and applied Paul’s words in Romans 14 to the matter of Sabbath observance, claiming that the Sabbath question is not a matter for controversy, but that everybody should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and do as he pleases. The query arises, If the Bible tells people to choose for themselves which day they will keep, and says that it is a matter of no consequence which they observe, how can there be anything unchristian in the observance of the seventh day? Again, after stating that everybody should decide the matter for himself, and that no man should judge another, the speaker proceeded to plead for a law which should compel everybody to rest on Sunday! And yet we hear grave and learned men eulogize the sermon as a logical effort! {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.6}

There is nothing to which the human mind more readily turns than making excuses. Many find it difficult to believe that the professed church of Christ can ever fall to the depth of depravity portrayed in 2 Timothy 3:1-5. But they forget the facility with which people can persuade themselves that *their* course is all right, and in perfect harmony with the Bible. When Saul had directly transgressed the divine command, he boldly met the prophet, and said, “Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord.” And we have known a man who by his own admission was an adulterer, to quote the seventh commandment, and claim that he had done no wrong. It is the easiest thing in the world for a person to deceive himself. Many persons of professed piety, who have been discovered in a crime, are entirely unconscious that they have been acting the part of a hypocrite. Their moral sensibility has become blunted, and their conscience seared, till they imagine that they really are as good as their profession would indicate. As a matter of fact, it will be found that when the church falls to the position indicated in 2 Timothy 3:1-5, its profession will be higher than at any previous time in its history. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.7}

The latest argument against any law that shall in any way control the liquor traffic, appeared in the *Tribune* a few days ago. The writer says:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.8}

“Besides lessening the number of drinking houses, the law lessens the number of opportunities for the development of self-sustaining moral capacity. What a truly ingenious device it is to institute conditions for the purpose of enabling men to confess in the bosom of their families that their presence at home results only because there remains no place open wherein to make beasts of themselves!” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.9}

All we have to say about this is, that it is a fact that there are hundreds of men who, whether they will confess it or not, cannot or will not refrain from making beasts of themselves, so long as there is any chance for them to do so; and we submit to all candid minds that it would be far better for a man to confess that he is sober from force of circumstances, than to have the circumstances altered so that he will be a brute. His family would say so, at any rate, and their comfort ought to count for something. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.10}

And then the writer has the unblushing impudence to say:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.11}

“It is extremely unwise to attempt to subvert the natural and terrifying conditions under which life has been raised to its present height, and by which it is from day to day sustained.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.12}

The next thing we shall hear will be that the liquor traffic is the only true religion. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.13}

As a fair specimen of the stories which are periodically gotten off at the expense of those who have not advanced so far as to be wise above that which is written, but who are simple enough to believe the truths of the Bible, we present the following, which we clip from the *Golden Gate:*- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.14}

“A preacher of the old school, a Scotch Presbyterian, who held to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, once announced as the subject of his next discourse, ‘Interesting Events in the Life of Noah,’ giving also the chapter he would read illustrative of his subject. A mischievous young man got hold of the kirk Bible and pasted two leaves together, so the minister read on the bottom of one page: ‘When Noah was one hundred and twenty years old he took unto himself a wife, who was’-then turning the page-‘140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide, built of gopher wood and covered with pitch inside and out.’ He was naturally puzzled at this. He slowly read it again, verified it, and then said: ‘My friends, this is the first time I ever met this in the Bible, but I accept it as evidence of the assertion that we are fearfully and wonderfully made!’” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.15}

Doubtless many people have read this story and believed every word of it, have laughed over the simplicity of the honest Scotsman and thereby have imagined themselves wondrous wise. We might believe that such a thing happened, if it were not for two or three little *inconsistencies*: 1. There is no place in the Bible where mention is made of anything “140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide,” etc. 2. The Bible nowhere states that Noah was one hundred and twenty years old when he took unto himself a wife. There is no statement made anywhere in the Bible as to what Noah did when he was one hundred and twenty old, nor is there any mention made of the one hundred and twentieth year of his age. 4. The Bible says nothing at all about Noah’s taking a wife. Because of these things we are forced to discredit the story. These inaccuracies may be explained by a knowledge of the simple fact that people who know enough about the Bible to avoid them, do not give up stories in connection with it. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.16}

At a birthday reception recently given in San Francisco to W. J. Colville, a noted Spiritualist “inspirational” lecturer, the speaker who gave the address of welcome, said:- {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.17}

“In olden times they stoned the prophets that were sent unto them, but we propose to help our young prophet with flowers and benedictions.” {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.18}

If the speaker had read his Bible more carefully he would have learned that only the prophets of the Lord were stoned,-those who brought reproofs for sin, and threatening of coming judgments. But the false prophets, the prophets of Baal, those wo assisted in the devil worship, and the professed prophets of the Lord, who spoke smooth things, and prophesied deceits, and told the people that they were all right, were always received with flowers, and were lauded to the skies. Times have not changed at all. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.19}

The *Christian Advocate* tells of a preacher who “was translated.” But by reading the notice through we find that he fell off a train of cars and was killed. And this is how he “was translated.” Now this is not exactly the way in which Enoch and Elijah were translated. Neither Enoch nor Elijah ever saw death, whereas this man was killed outright. If therefore this man “was translated,” then where has there ever been a person, from Abel to this day, who has passed from this life who was *not* translated. Neither the method or the idea of translation has very materially changed since Bible times. As to which it is that has undergone the change, the person who has respect to the Bible will have no difficulty in deciding. The truth is that it would be difficult to conceive how anything could be farther from the truth of the Bible than are the leading ideas of the theological world of to-day. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.20}

The question is asked, “Was it not cruel for God to send Jesus to die for us?” That question could not be asked by one who had any experimental knowledge of the Bible. “For God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. God did not “send” Jesus in the sense that he compelled him to die; Jesus was a willing offering. Paul says that he “gave himself for our sins” (Galatians 1:4), and Christ himself said “I lay down my life for the sheep.” John 10:15. The Father and Son are one. The sacrifice was equal on the part of each. The Father loved the Son with a love as much greater than the love of an earthly parent for his son, as God is greater than any man. Yet his love for the creatures of his hand was so great that he allowed his to Son to come to earth to die. There was only love in the whole transaction,-love so great that poor selfish mortals fail to comprehend even the faintest shadow of it. {SITI September 22, 1887, p. 592.21}

**“Is There Such a Thing as Death?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

We find on our desk a letter from a professed “holiness” man, the editor of a “holiness paper”, taking us to task in no measured terms for teaching that man is not alive when he is dead. The writer thinks that such teaching is “scientifically devilish,” and says that if there is not a hell there ought to be one for people who will thus deceive the people, which charitable statement he makes for our special benefit. We pass this by as but the natural result of the Pharisaism which says, “Come not near to me; for I am better than thou,” and notice the question at issue, for there is no doubt but that some people do honestly stumble over some of the points which our critic mentions. For the benefit of such we write. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.1}

We will repeat the statements which appeared in the SIGNS, with which fault is found; “Life and death are exactly opposite terms. Life means existence. So long is a man has breath, he has life, no matter what his circumstances may be,” etc. This we reaffirm. For Scripture proof that “life” and “death” our terms exactly opposite in the meaning, we quote the following: “In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live.” Isaiah 28:1. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.2}

Here we find life and death directly contrasted. If Hezekiah had died, he would have ceased to live. Again, read Deuteronomy 30:19:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.3}

“In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.4}

Also Deuteronomy 30:15:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.5}

“See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.6}

Here is life and blessing promised to the good, and death and cursing promised to the evil. Inasmuch as good and evil and blessing and cursing are directly opposite terms, it follows that death and life are also placed in contrast. The contrast is the same as in Romans 8:13: “For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if the true the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.7}

Read also Revelation 20:4, 5:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.8}

“I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reign with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years were finished.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.9}

Note that some who had been dead now “lived,” and more than this, they “lived again,” showing that there had been a cessation of life. There are two periods of living brought to view, separated by an interval of death, or of not living. Here again we seen death placed in contrast to life. Now know what it is that causes life or death. When God formed man of the dust of the ground, he “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.” Genesis 2:7. It is the presence of breath that continues life. Job said: “All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wicked this, my time tongue utter deceit.” Job 27:3, 4. That which is here called the “spirit of God” is, as the margin says, “the breath which God gave him.” Job’s assertion was that he would not utter deceit as long as the breath which God gave him remained with him; in the other words, as long as he lived. He knew that after the breath left him he could not utter either deceit or truth, the same Spirit that inspired Job, also moved another holy man to say: “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath go forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm 146:3, 4. Another writer also said: “The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything.” Ecclesiastes 9:5. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.10}

So then that is the exact opposite of life, in that the living have breath and consciousness, while the dead have no breath, and do not know anything. But now the objection is urged that there are places in the Bible where the word “dead or “death” is used without the meaning of non-existence or unconsciousness. As a sample objection, we quote the words of our “holiness” critic. He says:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.11}

“Will you please inform me if the apostle meant non-existence when he said, ‘Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God’? Did the prophet mean that he was speaking to non-existence when he said, ‘Awake thou that sleepeth, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light’? And the word of God said to Abimelech, ‘Thou art but a dead man,’ he meant to say that he was speaking to a *non-existence?* When the father said, ‘This my son was dead’ (Luke 15:24), he meant he was non-existent? he had been in a state where ‘he had no breath’?-and the apostle meant they had no ‘breath,’ when he said, ‘who were dead in trespasses and sin’”? Ephesians 2:1.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.12}

The trouble with our critic is that he does not seem to know that words may have a secondary meaning, or that there is such a thing as a figure of speech. We have known people to argue the same way about the word “day.” They would deny that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours, because the term “day” is applied to the whole time in which the gospel is preached,-“now is the day of salvation.” That is, because the word “day” is sometimes used for a long period of time, they would deny that it is ever used with reference to a period of twenty-four hours; because a word is sometimes used in a secondary sense, they would deny that it could have any primary application! If our objector should ask us what a stone is, I might answer in the words of Webster’s Dictionary: “A mass of connected, earthy, or mineral matter.” And then he would reply, “Are you not ashamed to try to deceive people with such half truths? When Paul says that Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone, does he mean that Jesus Christ is a mass of concreted, earthy, or mineral matter?” And then he might go on to argue that because Jesus is called a stone, it is utterly misleading to speak of a stone as being a mass of earthy matter. But would he claim that nothing can be called a stone unless it is like our Lord? Of course he would not. Everybody knows what a stone is, and its characteristics. And so when Christ is spoken of as being the chief corner-stone, they recognize at once that the idea meant to be conveyed is that he is something enduring, one upon whom it will do to build. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.13}

Now would the objector claim that when the Lord said to Abimelech, “Thou art but a dead man,” he meant that he was in the same condition that Lazarus was in when the Saviour said of him, “Lazarus is dead?” Or that when Paul says, “Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God,” those to whom he is speaking are in the same condition as were the Assyrians after the angel of the Lord had smitten them, when it was said of them, “They were all dead corpses?” Of course he will not; for the most rabid Spiritualist, who denies that there is any such thing as death, will admit that the man who is in the condition commonly called death, is in a different condition from the one to whom that change has not come. Then it is admitted that there is such a thing as death, and that the dead are not alive. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.14}

Now let us consider each passage that is quoted above. “Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.” Note here that the word “death” indicates the absence of life. And so is the primary idea of death,-absence of physical life,-that the apostle uses in his figure. An entire article would be needed to properly explain the gospel truth here referred to; it would be sufficient here to say that the death is the same as in Romans 6:2, 7; 4, 6, namely, that the person is dead vicariously. He was a sinner under sentence of death, Christ has actually died,-ceased to exist,-for sin; and the sinner has accepted the death of Christ in his behalf, and has indicated such acceptance by baptism, and now the law considers him as though the penalty had been executed, justice is satisfied; the man has been put to death, in Christ, has “risen with Christ,” and is now considered as another man. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.15}

Again, take the texts, “Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give the light,” and, “You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.” “The wages of sin is death.” Romans 6:23. Those who are sinners are condemned already; they have sentence of death in themselves. Their death is sure, unless they repent, and so, by anticipation, they are called dead. The same explanation applies in the case of the word that came to Abimelech: “Thou art but a dead man.” The thing which he had started to do, if persisted in, would surely result in his death, and so he was counted the same as dead already. But notice that these words mean nothing unless there is a fixed, definite meaning to the word “death.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.16}

In the parable of the prodigal son, the father is represented as saying, “This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.” The son had been absent from home for a long time, and his father had had no word from him, nor any trace of him. He had been as completely separated from his father as though he had really been dead. And his father had mourned for him as dead. Therefore the father speaks of him as having been dead. So far as any communication between them was concerned, he was the same as dead. And this again makes prominent the condition of the dead-they are separated from their friends, and are silent; there can be no communication between them. This is the idea that is naturally conveyed by the word “death;” then so common is it that when the father in the parable would convey the idea of utter separation and the long silence that had existed between him and his son, he could best indicate it by saying that he had been dead. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.17}

It is only the fact that words have a fixed, definite meaning, that enables us to use them in figures of speech. If they had no fixed meaning, there would be no meaning conveyed by the figure. The reason why we have no difficulty in understanding the passages of Scripture that are quoted in this article, is because there is a fixed meaning to the word “death,” to which the mind involuntarily recurs. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.18}

And so we adhere to our scriptural statement that death is the opposite of life; that life is existence, and that death is the absence of existence. He who does not accept this, is in duty bound to tell what death is, and to give the texts which we are to depend on as giving the primary idea of death. W. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.19}

**“Baptism, According to Liddell and Scott” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Greek Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, has always been recognized as a standard lexicon of the Greek language. The work has passed through several editions, and the seventh edition has lately been issued by the Harpers, of New York. The work has been enlarged, and has been carefully revised, not only by the authors, but by some of the best Greek scholars of America. It may therefore be considered as representing the best scholarship of the world. It has occurred to us, therefore, that it would be of interest to our readers to know the definition that is given to the word *baptism*, the Greek form of our English word baptize. Messrs. Liddell and Scott are both professors in Oxford University, England, and therefore cannot be accused of being biased in favor of immersion. We give not only the word *baptize* but also kindred words. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.20}

*Baptize*, “a dyer or dipper.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 598.21}

*Baptize*, “to dip in or under water.” The following instances of its use are given (we omit the Greek

terms, and give only the translation): “of ships, *to sink* or *disable* them;” “*to the drenched*;” “*soaked* in wine;” “*over head and ears* in debt;” “*being drowned* with questions, or *getting into deep water*;” “to *draw wine, by dipping* the cup in the bowl;” etc. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.22}

*Baptisis,* “*a dipping; baptism*.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.1}

*Baptisma, “baptism*, the usual form in the New Testament.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.2}

*Baptismos*, “a dipping in water, ablution; *baptism*.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.3}

*Baptistarion*, “a bathing place, swimming bath; the baptistery in a church.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.4}

*Baptistas*, “one; a baptizer;” “*ho Baptists*, the Baptist.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.5}

*Baptos*, “dipped, dyed.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.6}

*Bapto*, “to dip in water, Latin *immergere*.” The word is used by Homer, of a blacksmith who tempers steel by plunging it into water. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.7}

From this we can see that to talk about the “mode of baptism” is absurd, if reference is had to sprinkling or pouring. The term, “the mode of baptism,” can only have reference to whether the individual shall be baptized forward or backward. It would be as proper to call sprinkling *diving* into the water, as it would be to call it baptism. We have seen little children run about in water two or three inches deep, and say that they were *swimming*; that was childish imagination, but it was no more absurd than for one man to sprinkle a few drops of water on another’s head and then say that he has baptized him. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.8}

But strong as is the etymological argument for immersion, it is surpassed by the argument from the nature and object of baptism, as set forth in the Scriptures. When once the design of baptism is understood, the absurdity of calling sprinkling baptism is very apparent. In fact, sprinkling has no significance whatever, and there is not the slightest ground upon which it can be defended, except that it is the custom of the people. But “the customs of the people are vain.” W. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.9}

**“Another View of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Only last week we answered at some length a letter which was written for the purpose of showing that Sunday is the Sabbath. How far short the letter came from showing anything of the kind, our readers can judge. This week we have a somewhat similar task. From a Congregationalist pastor in Wisconsin we have received a very courteous letter stating the reasons why he cannot see that the seventh day is the Sabbath. The ground covered is entirely different from that covered by the letter and answer of last week, and so we present it at once. Certainly no apology is needed for giving line upon line, and repeated explanations, upon so important a subject as that of the Sabbath. Here is the letter:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.10}

“EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES-*Dear Brother*: Your paper was sent to me for several months, and among many articles on the Sabbath question I noticed one in the issue of January 20, entitled, ‘Why Don’t They See It?’ Now I assure you that it is just as wonderful to me why you *do* ‘see it’ as you do. I should like to state a few points, as briefly as I can, in answer to that article and others like it:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.11}

1. The commandment does not say that we are to keep the seventh day *of the week*, but work six days and keep the seventh, *i.e.*, one-seventh of our time, as one-tenth of our income belongs exclusively to the Lord. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.12}

2. Because the Jews had a *certain day* as the Sabbath is no reason why we should keep that day any more than we are bound to keep it just as they did, or observe any other part of the ceremonial law. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.13}

3. The Lord blessed the Sabbath day *by making it a blessing to mankind to keep it*. Those who keep as the Sabbath the first day of the week are just as truly and greatly blessed as those to keep the seventh day of the week. Both keep the ‘seventh day’ and obey the fourth commandment. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.14}

4. Even if there was no other reason for retaining the day that we now observe, and there are most excellent ones, it can be shown from the Bible (our only guide) that Saturday is the day the Jews kept. It is not sufficiently true to warrant a division in the church of Christ. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.15}

5. A men is no better, morally, for keeping the seventh instead of the first day of the week. Obedience to any of *God’s* commands, including the *fourth* in the decalogue, *does* make a man a purer, nobler, better man; but not so with this requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.16}

We will take up these five points in the order in which they are given:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.17}

1. For the sake of bringing out a point, we will suppose for the moment that the commandment does not specify which day of the week should be observed. Our brother admits that the ten commandments are all binding, so that the fourth commandment is authority for observing Sunday. But if it does not designate the particular day to be observed, it follows that every man tay decide that matter for himself. If it be true that the commandment requires the observance of only an indefinite seventh part of time, then there is certainly no authority for Sunday-keeping any more than there is for keeping Monday or Tuesday. We do not know just what position our brother would take, but we do know that all Sunday advocates whom we have heard or read on the subject, are quite agreed that it is necessary that all Christians should observe Sunday. Indeed, our brother himself deprecates a division in the church of Christ, on this point. But why should there not be a division? What is there to call for unity? If the only place where Sabbath-keeping is enjoined does not tell us *what day* to observe, what reason is there for being united? Why should not every day in the week be kept by different ones if they feel so inclined? Oh, it is urged, and very justly, too, if everybody should choose his own day, there would be confusion, and it would be utterly impossible for either public or private business to be carried on. Well, then, if it is necessary that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, and we fully agree that it is necessary, then it is necessary that someone having authority should decide which day of the week shall be observed. Now there is no man or body of men that has this authority. If God, in giving the commandment, has given every man the liberty to choose the particular day upon which he will rest, tnohe man has any right to coerce another in the matter. It is self-evident that the only one who has any authority in the matter is the One who gave the commandment. If, as all agree, it is quite essential that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, then to say that God did not recognize this necessity, and provide for it, is to charge him with shortsightedness. The fact that unity is essential (and Christ himself declared that Christians should all be one), shows that God has provided for unity; and where can we find that provision if not in the commandment? {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.18}

Now we claim that the fourth commandment itself very definitely specifies which day of the week shall be observed: “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.” Where shall we begin this round of seven days,-six days of labor and one of rest? Evidently at the beginning of the only division of time which consists of seven days, that is, of the week. Any child who knows that “seven days make one week” would, on reading the commandment without comment, say at once that Saturday is the day which it enjoins. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.19}

But we have an inspired comment on the commandment, which is sufficient to end all controversy. Luke, after giving the account of the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says: “And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath true on.” Luke 23:54. Then he says when the women saw the sepulcher, and how the body was laid, “they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.* Now *upon the first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher,” etc. Luke 23:56; 24:1. From Mark 16:1 we learn that “the Sabbath was past when” the women came to the sepulcher; and from Matthew 28:1 we learn that this “first day of the week,” upon which they came to the sepulcher, was immediately following that Sabbath day they kept “according to the commandment.” But the day before the first day of the week is the seventh day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as words can make it, that to rest upon the Sabbath day “according to the commandment,” we must rest upon the seventh day *of the week*. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.20}

Remember, the question is not as to whether we should keep the seventh day because those women or anybody else did, but simply as to what the commandment requires. Our brother has admitted that the fourth commandment is the sole authority for Sabbath-keeping, and we have shown from the Scriptures that the commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath, and requires all men to keep it. Who can fail to see it? {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.21}

We might stop right here, and consider that all the points have been noticed; for since the commandment clearly implies the observance of the seventh day of the week, all questions of custom, etc., amount to nothing. But we will briefly reply to be other points of the letter. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 599.22}

2. Of course the practice of the Jews is of no authority with us; neither is the practice of the Christian church. If we do not keep the seventh day because the Jews did, but because the Lord commands us to. This is an authority that may not be lightly disregarded. Perhaps our brother is unconscious of the fact, but in his implied statement that the requirement to keep the seventh day is only a ceremonial precept, he is discrediting all the other nine precepts of the decalogue. We should not like to have the opinion become prevalent that the sixth commandment was only a ceremonial precept for the Jews; for in that case this country would not be a safe place to live in. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.1}

3. We have already shown that the commandment requires the observance of just one particular day of the week. The statement that those who keep the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and those to keep the first day of the week, both keep “the seventh day,” is a self-evident absurdity. The statement contradicts itself, and needs only to be repeated to be refuted. The Lord “blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;” and so far as blessing to mankind is concerned, we have no warrant for expecting a blessing except in obedience to the commandment of the Lord. See Deuteronomy 11:26-28. A truly humble person will be blessed even though he is *ignorantly* violating some precept; but the blessing is not for his disobedience, even though it is unintentional, but for his obedience of every known duty. But no one can be blessed because of disobedience; he who has the light, and does not walk in it, may *claim* to be blessed; but he only is blessed whom the Lord approves. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.2}

4. Notice the fallacy of our brother’s fourth point. He claims that it cannot be shown that Saturday is the seventh day, and then says that this is a reason why we should keep Sunday! Mark, he does not say that Saturday is not the seventh day, but only claims that it cannot be shown to be the day that the Jews kept. But that proves nothing for Sunday. Even if it could be positively shown that Saturday is not the seventh day, that would not prove Sunday to be the day to be observed; it would not prove a thing concerning Sunday. Truly the Sunday-sabbath rests on nothing at all, else its friends would give some *reason* for its observance. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.3}

Can our brother show that the Jews are keeping a different day now from the one they kept in the time of Christ, or for two thousand years before that time? Will he dare intimate that they have changed their day of rest? Of course he will not. The Jews who observe any day, still keep the same day, that has always been kept by the Jews. They now keep the day which we call Saturday, and that is the day that they always have kept. Then Saturday is the day that the women kept “according to the commandment,” which Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John call the Sabbath, and which our Lord himself observed “as his custom was.” There is nothing in this world more sure than that the seventh day of the week is the day which God commanded all men to keep holy, and it is equally certain that the day which is commonly called Saturday is that seventh day. To say that God has ever allowed it to become impossible for men to tell why they should obey one of his fixed press precepts, is to charge God foolishly. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.4}

5. All we have to say to this is, that a man *is better* morally for obeying the moral law; and the fourth precept of the moral law declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and requires men to keep it holy. As well might Jonah have said that he would not be any better morally for going to Nineveh than to Joppa. What difference did it make where he went, so long as he went somewhere? Just this difference: the Lord told him just where to go, and when he did not go there he disobeyed the Lord. That was an immoral act, because it was an act of disobedience to the plain command of the Lord. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.5}

We trust that what has already been written shows clearly upon what basis the observance of the seventh day of the week rests. It is not a requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. This paper has no requirements. But it does have an interest in trying to induce men to obey the requirements of the Lord. We heartily agree with our brother that “obedience to any one of God’s commandments, including the fourth in the decalogue, *does* make a man purer, nobler, better man;” and we are sure that that command cannot be obeyed except the individual does just what the requires. We know that obedience does not consist in doing one thing when the Lord has required another; observance of the first day of the week cannot by any possibility be construed as obedience to a commandment which requires the observance of the seventh day of the week. We submit this as a self-evident proposition. He who thinks that it can be so construed, must settle the matter with the Lord, and not with the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It is He that has made the requirement, and not us. W. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 600.6}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have an interesting communication from Elder C. L. Boyd, Cape Town, S. Africa, which will appear next week. Lack of space prevents its publication this week. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.1}

The Youngstown (O.) *Daily Telegram* of September 9 contains an account of the Spiritualist Camp-meeting at Cassandaga, N.Y., which says: “The attendance has been so large on Sundays as to entirely overflow the amphitheater. If Spiritualism should be proven false, the fool killer would have to employ a large force of deputies, for it seems as though the majority of people nowadays believe in it.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.2}

It is stated on good authority that of the 2,500 suits begun in the Circuit Court of St. Louis, Mo., during the past twelve months, 700,-nearly one-third,-were divorce proceedings. The worst feature of the case is stated in the following words, by the same paper that furnishes the above information: “No longer can it be said that the ban of social ostracism is the award of the divorced man or woman, and the world appears to place them on a part with other people relatively situated financially and socially.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.3}

The *Presbyterian* says:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.4}

“Men convince themselves that a thing is so because they would have it so. They sit in judgment upon the plans and purposes of God himself, and, by a ‘helpful treatment of sacred Scriptures’ supply what they conceive to be wanting in God’s administration of the universe himself hath made.” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.5}

This is a serious charge to bring against the “leaders of religious thought,” but the most serious thing about it is that it is well deserved. The Bible is fast losing its hold upon the professed Christian church. When men take it upon themselves to “help” the sacred Scripture, they become judges of it; “but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law but a judge.” To add a single thought or doctrine to the Scripture is virtually to deny the inspiration of the entire book. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.6}

The *Independent* makes the suggestion that every reader make it a standing rule to commit two verses of the Bible to memory, the first thing that he does in the morning of each day, and that during the day he repeat three verses to himself so frequently as to fix them strongly in his memory. We heartily second the suggestion. The task would not be a difficult one, and in the course of a year a good amount of precious matter would be stored in the mind. One who pursues such a course need never be lonely, for no matter where he is, he has something to think about; and we know of nothing else that will so effectually drive away evil thoughts. Try it. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.7}

We commend, also, the *Independent’s* suggestion that the book of Romans be committed to memory in this manner. Seven months would suffice to accomplish the task, which would be performed so easily as to seem no task; and when learned in that way, the constant repetitions would insure that it would never be forgotten. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.8}

Some people decry the committing of scriptures to memory, urging that is better to have an understanding of the sense of a passage than to have the exact words in the mind. Just as if the committing of the exact words would make it impossible to understand the sense! As a matter of fact, we know that having the text in mind, where it can be meditated upon any time, is the very best way to have the full force of it impressed on the mind. And we are equally certain that some portions of the Scriptures and especially the greater part of Romans, and its companion book, the Epistle to the Galatians, cannot be appreciated until they are in just that way. No mere reading will ever unfold their treasures to any mind. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.9}

“When a wicked men dieth his expectation shall perish; and the hope of unjust men perisheth.” Proverbs 11:7. Thus saith the Scripture, and yet grave and learned Doctors of Divinity will persist in telling the people, from the pulpit and through the religious press, that the Scriptures give no intimation that any man’s probation closes at death, and because the doctrine is a pleasing one, and because the assertion is made by men who *claim* that they know all about the Bible, thousands of people are accepting it without taking the trouble to read for themselves what the Bible says. A terrible awaking awaits those who, having intelligence, and the light of truth within their reach, are content to let somebody else to do their thinking for them. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.10}

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Pacific Methodist* which contains a communication “on the Sabbath question,” and suggests that we may want to answer it. An answer is not necessary, for it kills itself. As evidence of this we quote one item. The gentleman, who prefixes “Rev.” to his name, denies that the word “day,” in any place in Genesis 1 or 2, means a period of twenty-four hours, and offers “in proof” the following profound argument:- {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.11}

“The six days of Genesis 1, are each closed by the words evening and morning. According to Dr. Young’s Analytical Concordance, the same Hebrew words, translated the evening and the morning, are used to mark the periods of time both before and after the creation of the sun and moon. With Dr. Young agreed many other competent authorities on this point. The evening and the morning were certainly not measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun before the creation of the sun!” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.12}

Astonishing! But we would like to ask if the day has been measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun at any time since the sun was created. If we are correctly informed, the day is measured by the revolution of the earth on its own axis, without reference to the sun, and that could be done before the sun was made as well as afterwards. The sun was made to rule the day that already existed; but the earth would revolve on its axis once in twenty-four hours, forming the day, if the sun did not shine at all. Who has the next astro-geological “reason” to bring against the commandment of the Lord? {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.13}

Quite recently Dr. Lyman Abbott published a “Confession of Faith” in the *Christian Union*, in which he took the position that there is no close of probation at death any more than at any other time. A Congregationalist pastor in Massachusetts wrote to Dr. Abbott, thanking him for expressing so perfectly his own eschatological views, and added: “I wish such a Confession of Faith could be infinitely manifolded and distributed among those who are cobwebbed with the faith which dwelt in ‘grandmother Lois.’” This faith which dwelt in grandmother Lois, is the faith which was in the Timothy, and which caused the apostle Paul to be filled with joy. See 2 Timothy 1:4, 5. But the “new theology” which counts Doctor Abbott as one of its ablest champions, proposes to emancipate people from all such faith! Could there be a more open confession that the theology which is becoming so popular is contrary to the Bible? To some this may not seem a very serious matter, because, as they say, the issue is simply one of doctrine, and is not practical. But we know that the real question is whether or not the Bible shall be accepted by a professed Christians as of final authority in matters of faith. It is fact being decided that it shall not be. But the Bible is the only thing which gives light in matters of morality, and when it is cast aside, and human reason substituted, what is going to hinder the people from plunging into all manner of immorality? Isn’t it time poor somebody to “cry aloud”? {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.14}

The annual killing of hunters in California and Oregon has begun and is going on at the usual lively rate. Almost every other day the dispatches announce the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or else of a man killing himself by crawling through the brush, or through a fence, or getting out of a boat or wagon, and pulling his gun after him. of course it is all “accidental,” but for none of it is there a particle of excuse. As for the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or for any other piece of game, it ought to be made a crime with a heavy penalty attached. If such hunters were made to realize that the penitentiary stood before them, they would be more careful to see, before shooting, whether the object of their aim was a man, or some other game. It is true that if this were so, there might occasionally a deer escape. But it seems to us that it would be better to kill fewer deer than more men. This may be old fogyish but so the thing appears to us. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.15}

As for those who kill or maim themselves by dragging their guns after them, as they themselves pay the penalty of their own senseless carelessness, of course no laws are needed on that point. But to people who want to go a-gunning without killing themselves, it may be in order to suggest that it is just as easy to put your gun ahead of you and crawl up to it, as it is to put yourself ahead and drag your gun after you. It is just as easy, and *a good deal safer*. Yet it is altogether likely that for the present generation of gunners, this suggestion is gratuitous; because those who have sense enough to handle a gun will keep it before them, and those who have not sense enough will hardly profit by any suggestion that might be made. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.16}

The following item, from the dispatches of September 17, should be published everywhere. If the crime-condoning juries everywhere were treated as were these who so richly deserved it, there would soon be a much more wholesome atmosphere about the criminal jurisprudence of the country. The case occurred in Kansas City. {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.17}

“Judge White’s charge to the jury in the case of John Snyder, charged with attempting to assault Ruth Rollard, aged seven years, was strongly in favor of conviction. After being out about five minutes, the jury return a verdict of guilty and fixed the punishment at six months in the county fail. The clerk had scarcely finished reading the verdict when Judge White, frowning angrily, thumped violently on the desk and exclaimed: ‘Mr. Clerk, read that verdict again.’ The verdict being read, the Judge inquired: ‘So say you all, gentleman of the jury?’ {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.18}

“The answer was in the affirmative and the judge said: ‘Gentlemen, I shall take the liberty to set your verdict aside. If you had found the defendant not guilty I should have nothing to say, but when you find him guilty and assess his punishment at six months, you perpetrate an outrage. If you think men may take female children from the cradle for the purpose of gratifying their lustful desires, and then escape on an imprisonment of six months, you are a disgrace to the civilization of the day. You will all now be discharged from attendance and forever disqualified as jurors in this court.’” {SITI September 29, 1887, p. 608.19}