**“Why Will They Say So?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York correspondent of the *Michigan Christian Advocate* recently gave an account of the funeral of Bishop Harris, in the course of which he said:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.1}

“He is not dead. God’s saints don’t die; they only change their modes and forms of life.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.2}

As soon as we read that, certain texts of Scripture came to our mind, and we jot them down for the benefit of those who may have given a hasty assent to the *Advocate* correspondent’s assertion. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.3}

“And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years of; and *he died*.” Genesis 9:29. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.4}

Noah was certainly a saint, for we read that he was “a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God” (Genesis 6:9); and that by his favor and obedience “condemned the world.” Hebrews 11:7. Yet the inspired declaration is that “he died.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.5}

Of Abraham we read:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.6}

“Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years.” Genesis 25:8. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.7}

Of Moses, who was honored of God more than any other man that ever lived, and he was faithful in all the Lord gave him to do (see Numbers 12:6-8), the record says:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.8}

“So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord.” Deuteronomy 34:5. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.9}

Again we read of another great and good man:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.10}

“And it came to pass after these things, that Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, been an hundred and ten years old.” Joshua 24:29. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.11}

Samuel was one the whowas consecrated to the service of the Lord at a very early age. While yet a small child he was employed by the Lord to perform a very delicate task, and his whole life was marked by piety and strict devotion to duty. Of him the record is:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.12}

“And Samuel died; and all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah.” 1 Samuel 25:1. And again: “Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city.” 1 Samuel 28:3. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.13}

Of the prophet Elisha the simple record is:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.14}

“And Elisha died, and they buried him.” 2 Kings 13:20. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.15}

This list might be lengthened indefinitely, for of all the thousands of millions people who have lived on this earth, there have been but two of whom it could be said, “And he died.” These are the words which closed each of the biographies (with one exception) in the fifth chapter of Genesis. But we have selected only a few of whom it could not by any possibility be denied that they were saints. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.16}

Now what shall we conclude? Shall we say that the correspondent of the *Advocate* is correct? If we do, then we contradict the record concerning all those holy men. This we dare not do; so we shall have to conclude that the writer whom we quoted is misinformed. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.17}

But why should he be misinformed? And why should thousands of others coincide with him in his disagreement with Scripture? For there is not a doubt but that more than nine-tenths of the professed Christians of the world, including theological professors and ministers of the gospel, would never think of questioning his statement. We repeat, Why should they be misinformed? What excuse can they have for flatly contradicting the Bible? We confess that we cannot frame any excuse for them. They can read and the ability to do that is all that is required in order for one to know that both good and bad do die. Nay, it is not even necessary to be able to read, to know this fact, for observation teaches it to everyone. “For he seeth that wise men I, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others.” Psalm 49:10. And there is no man so powerful that he can redeem his brother “that he should live forever, and not see corruption.” Verses 6-9. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.18}

Then why will they persist in using such language? If they were blatant infidels, denying the Bible, and even in their mad blindness denying their own existence, we should not be surprised. But it is astonishing that men who profess to love the Bible as the inspired word of God, should so squarely contradict it. The only explanation that we can give is that, not heeding the warning of the apostle, they have been spoiled “through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.” Colossians 2:8. Can anybody give a better explanation? W. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.19}

**“A Superstitious Practice” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The religion journals and teachers of the day have much to say about a slavish obedience to forms, urging that the observance of forms is utterly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Such language is heard especially whenever anything is said about keeping the Sabbath “according to the commandment,” being “*buried* with Christ by baptism into death,” and sometimes even in regard to the Lord’s Supper. The keeping of the seventh day of the week, as the Lord enjoins, is said to be a Judaistic regard for mere form; and whenever it is shown that nothing but immersion is baptism, they will say that to put so much stress upon mere form savors of superstition. We notice, however, that those who thus deprecate form connection with Sabbath observance and baptism, are very zealous sticklers for Sunday observance, and for sprinkling in place of baptism. The natural conclusion is that they have no objection to forms, so long as those forms are of their own choosing. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.20}

Not only is this conclusion just, but it may also be shown that those who thus insist that the form is of no consequence, are indeed most superstitious in their observance of certain forms that are not commanded, and that they regard a mere ceremony much as the heathen regards a charm or an amulet. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.21}

That this is true of the entire Catholic world, needs no proof. It is only necessary to remind the reader of the “relics” which is claimed are possessed of such wonderful healing properties, and of the sign of the cross and the *Ave Marias* which alone are said to ward off all evil spirits. And instance of this superstitious trust in a mere form recently came to our notice in Oakland. A laborer was caught in the shaft of a mill, and was fatally injured. He was carried to the hospital in an unconscious condition, from which he never recovered. A priest was summoned, who administered the “sacrament” of extreme unction to the unconscious man, who died soon after. If that “sacrament” had not been administered, all Catholics would have entertained at least a doubt as to that man’s future; but having received it, the priest can assure them that he is sure of Heaven! {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.22}

Now no intelligent, candid person would dare affirm that “extreme unction” or anything else performed over a man who is really dead so far as consciousness is concerned, could have the least effect on his spiritual condition. Even Catholics themselves, when pressed, will admit that the performance of rites and ceremonies, or the repetition of prayers, is of no avail if unaccompanied by faith. And yet thousands of professed Protestants, who talk so glibly about the slavish obedience to mere form, show themselves to be as superstitious as their Catholic brethren from whom they have borrowed those forms. In proof of this, we will cite only the so-called baptism of infants. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.23}

As a matter of fact, infants are never baptized except in the Greek Church; they are only sprinkled; but if we did not know how easy it is to be inconsistent, we should wonder that people who argue against immersion, on the ground that the form is of no consequence, and that baptism is simply “the answer of a good conscience,” should be so scrupulous in regard to a mere form where it is impossible that there should be any conscience at all. Two instances will suffice to show that infant baptism is simply the result of gross superstition that is not exceeded among Roman Catholics. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.24}

In a recent note on “Children’s Day,” the editor of the *Congregationalist* said:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.25}

“The rite of infant baptism can be made most impressive. Last year a young man of more than twenty, witnessed this ordinance for the first time on Children’s Day. As he watched the pastor take one dear little one after another in his arms to bless them, he said, with deep emotion, ‘If my father and mother had done that when I was a baby, I might have been a different boy.’” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.26}

If the intelligence indicated by that remark was a fair sample of the product of the brain of that “young man of more than twenty,” we should say that he was even then a proper subject for the administration of “infant baptism.” But we must remember that he simply echoed the sentiments of the church people around him, and that his remark is indorsed by the editor of the *Congregationalist*. Now we ask, What would have been the difference if that young man had been “baptized” when he was a baby? If that ceremony had been performed, and he had been a model youth, to what would the *Congregationalist* attribute his goodness? It could not be to any volition on his part, but simply to the magic charm of the few drops of water sprinkled upon him, or to the words uttered by the pastor. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.27}

But we have another case in which the element of superstition is so prominent as to be laughable. In the *Advance* of September 22, A. L. Frisbie, D. D., has an account of a “Sunday with the Stonies,” a tribe of Indians on their reservation near the line of the Canadian Pacific, who have been civilized by missionary effort. He tells of the crowds that flocked to church, of the good order, of the reverence during prayer, and of the enthusiasm with which they sang “Old Hundred,” and continues: “A baby was presented for baptism after the benediction. Fortunately he was asleep, so that he could not express any disapprobation of the proceeding.” And then in all seriousness he goes on to say that mothers and nurses might learn a lesson from the way in which this baby was “put up,” because he was placed in a casket shaped to the tiny form, the whole wrapped and bound, and his limbs, body, and head so snugly cased and held, that he “could not kick if he wanted to.” If he had been awake, he could not have objected to the proceeding except by yelling. “Fortunately he was asleep,” and so the beautiful ceremony was not marred. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.28}

Will anybody tell us how much more solemnity or efficacy there was in that ceremony than in the incantations of the heathen Indian “Medicine Man”? If it is said that this was done in the name of Christ, then we reply that it was simply taking the name of Christ as a charm, and differed not a particle from the act of the seven sons of Sceva. See Acts 19:13, 14. We may add, also, that the mere calling of the name of the Lord Jesus over a person, will have no more effect if done by a Christian minister than if done by a Jewish exorcist. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.29}

In the instance quoted from the *Advance* the climax of absurdity was reached. There was an intent without power to discern between its right hand and its left; added to this it was bound hand and foot, and then while it was *asleep* the minister surreptitiously sprinkled a few drops of water upon it, and, behold, it was a Christian baby! This fairly surpasses the method by which the Jesuit missionaries in California converted the Indians a century ago. It is said that the Jesuits which would mount their horses, lasso an Indian, force him into the mission building, and “baptize” him, and henceforth he was a child of the church. If sprinkling an unconscious infant is productive of any good, we cannot see what argument can be brought against the forcible “baptism” of adults. No one can fail to see that the element of faith is entirely excluded. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 614.30}

But it is urged when the child is thus baptized, the parents pledge themselves to train it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and to bring it up in the full fellowship of the church. This is not true. The parents may indeed make the pledge, but it is not the so-called baptism that seals the pledge. If it had anything whatever to do with the pledge, then the parents themselves should receive the ceremony in token thereof. Would not the pledge be just as valid if the ceremony of sprinkling was not performed? Certainly; the sprinkling of the infant can by no means affect the parents; so we see still that the act is one of conformity to a superstition. To make this still more emphatic, we have only to cite the numerous cases that are related, where the child sought the company of the vicious as soon as it arrived at years of understanding, and at an early age left home and parents for a wild career, yet after many years he was converted, because he had been sprinkled in infancy. In such a case the same virtues is attributed to the so-called baptism that the savage attributes to the spell of the sorcerer. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.1}

But again, it will be said that in such a case the prayer of the parents fail to bring the erring one into the fold, even though he be absent from them. Very good; we know that “the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,” and we are willing to accept that explanation and the cause of the young man’s conversion; but that explanation nullifies the theory that the sprinkling in infancy was of any virtue. Would not the prayers of the parents be just as effectual without the mockery of “baptizing” an unconscious babe? The assumption on the part of the Pedobaptists who relate such cases, is that they would not be; and so again we see that some mysterious magic charm is attributed to the ceremony performed in infancy. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.2}

We have before us an article from the *Advance* of July 7, which tells of a very godless man whose wife had died, leaving two very young babes, twins. Two neighboring children became interested in the twins, and desire to have them “baptized,” but the father refused his consent. Finally, as he was about to go to the far West, he gave a grudging consent to have the ceremony performed, but said that it should not be done in a church, and that no clergyman should come into his house. The writer relates the brother’s delight at the consent gained, and says:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.3}

“Hurrying home, the young churchman told his sister of his success, adding, ‘And you and I must be sponsors.’ The sister, though sharing his delight and the prospect of bringing these little ones into the fold, shrink from the responsibility of a god-parent where there seemed so little opportunity to fulfill the duties of the office. ‘*We can pray for them*,’ was the brother’s answer.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.4}

Accordingly the ceremony was performed at the home of the brother and sister, and a few days later the babies were taken away, and were not heard of again until twenty years later, when the brother and sister learned that they were active church workers. The writer closes his narrative with the following moral:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.5}

“We who are god-parents may not always be able to use personal influence, or make direct appeal to those for whom we are to take care. But these means failing our honest effort, there remains one mighty resource: *We can pray for them*.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.6}

Of course you can; and you could pray for them just as well if they had not been sprinkled. To say that this is not so is to say the sprinkling acts as a charm. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.7}

We have said that this anxiety for the “baptism” of infants, so that they may be sure to be saved, is a superstition. To show that this is the correct term for it, we quote Webster’s definition of superstition: “Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded.” Some may claim that their scruples for infant “baptism” are not extreme or unnecessary; but we hold that the observance, to any extent, of rites not commanded, is unnecessary, and that if stress is laid on them, as though they were necessary to salvation, then it is superstition. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.8}

We believe that baptism is necessary, for the Lord has commanded it. We would not dare tell any individual that he could be saved without it; indeed, we should tell him that he could not, if, knowing the commands and having the opportunity, he should refuse. But while it becomes us to be baptized, thus to fulfill all righteousness, we remember that “with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;” that there can be no righteousness without belief, and that only “he that *believeth and is baptized*, shall be saved.” We do not decry the observance of forms, if those forms have been commanded. There is no element of superstition in humble obedience to a divine command, no matter how trivial the required act may seem. But when there is no obedience, because there is no command; when, even if there is a command, the act is done by proxy; and when there cannot by any possibility be either belief or obedience, then we say that devotion to a form is gross superstition, and can result only in evil, for no superstition is harmless. W. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 615.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Tennessee camp-meeting will be held October 18-25, at Springfield. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.1}

The Seventh-day Adventist General Conference for 1887 will convene in Oakland, Cal., November 15. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.2}

As the California camp-meeting begins the day this number of the SIGNS goes to press, and continues eleven days, there will be no paper next week. The next number will be dated October 20. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.3}

Wong Chin Foo has contributed an article to the *North American Review*, entitled, “Why Am I a Heathen?” The article is very long, but we have read it through, and are sure that it could all have been answered in one sentence, namely, “Because I don’t know any better.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.4}

Doesn’t it seem strange that almost the first thing a man does when he sets out to prove that the first day of the week is the Sabbath, is to argue that there isn’t any Sabbath at all, and that it doesn’t make any difference what day a person keeps, or whether he keeps any and all makes no difference whatever, provided he is only fully persuaded in his own mind? Can anybody wonder that Sunday is losing its hold, and that the ministers are loudly clamoring for a State or national law to compel people to keep that day? {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.5}

One Mrs. J. B. Rideout has been *riding out* and around, the past summer, in California; and through the columns of the *Occident* is telling about it. Of the size of the towns, she gives exceptionally definite information: as for instance, Cloverdale is a “thrifty little village,” and “Healdsburg is considerable larger than Cloverdale.” Of the people her estimation is equally definite, and as charitable as it is definite. Writing of Healdsburg she say:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.6}

“Here the Seventh-day Adventists have their stronghold. Disregarding the sanctities of the glorious Lord’s-day, they, like the Jews-who do not believe in the divinity of Christ-keep Saturday instead of Sunday.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.7}

How beautifully the grace of charity shines through some people, especially if they be “orthodox!” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.8}

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Association was held in Pittsburg, September 15. The Pittsburgh *Times* of the 16th give us the following notice of the meeting:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.9}

“The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in the afternoon and evening yesterday at the Y.M.C.A. rooms. Several reports were read and accepted and arrangements were made to continue not less than seven district secretaries in the field. It was also decided to employ a secretary to instill into the foreign population a due regard for Sunday observance. Professor McAllister, who will visit Europe next year, was empowered to use his efforts to bring about an International Congress of the friends of Christian civil government. Arrangements were also made to hold a National Reform Training School at Lakeside next summer, under the direction of Dr. McAllister.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.10}

We have no doubt that Professor McAllister will meet with a cordial reception from the officials of the national churches of Europe. But the most cordial of all receptions received there we expect will be that which will be given to him by the Pope; especially as he goes carrying the commission of Dr. Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and their *conferees* of the Saratoga Conference, to bring to the attention of Roman Catholic authorities the matter of using the Catholic Bible in the public schools of the United States, wherever the Catholics are in the majority, and to secure “such a basis of agreement *if possible*.” Of course, as they are to bring this to the attention of the “Roman Catholic *authorities*,” the proper thing to do is to go to the Pope at once. For isn’t he the sole Catholic authority? Dr. McAllister may possibly get the Pope to send a legate to preside at the proposed International Congress. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.11}

One of the most disgusting things we have read lately is the *Christian at Work’s* article on “How Do You Treat the Minister,” in which it roundly scolds those particular people who object to having the minister smoke in the house. It would have people in the invite the minister to smoke even in the guest chamber or the parlor, because the poor man needs all the solace he can get after his arduous labors! The next request will probably be for entertainers to complete the bar-room arrangements, by freely furnishing beer for the tired minister to sip between his whiffs. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.12}

By the way, we notice in the proceedings of the California M. E. Conference, a resolution asking the General Conference to declare that one who uses tobacco shall not be eligible to the office of bishop. That seems to imply that a smoker may now occupy any position in the M. E. Church. We are glad to see that there is a growing sentiment in that church against the use of tobacco by ministers, but why is it tolerated at all? And if it is desired that bishops shall not use tobacco, why should the use of it by anyone be allowed? Ought a bishop to be better than an ordinary minister? {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.13}

The Pope is a king. He said so himself. And doesn’t that prove it? for isn’t he infallible? In view of his approaching jubilee Leo XIII. has had struck a number of medals bearing the inscription: “Pope Leo XIII., Pontifex *et rex*.” Now *rex* is Latin for king, and that inscription means Pope Leo XIII., Pontiff and king. The Roman police found some of these medals on sale in a shop in the city and promptly confiscated them. At this the Vatican makes a decided protest, and argues that the “law of guaranties” recognizes the Pope’s right to the title of the sovereign; and support this argument with the fact that Bismarck in his letter to the Pope about two years ago plainly address him as “sire.” Now in the language of courts, “sire” means “sovereign”; and as a king is a sovereign, as Bismarck called the Pope “sire,” therefore the Pope is king. Don’t you see? But in the argument there is vastly more of spiritual pride, religious despotism, and political arrogance, than there is of logic. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.14}

The following dispatch from Chicago, dated September 24, tells the story as well as may be:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.15}

“This city has to-day, it is asserted, broken the record in divorce cases. From morning until evening five judges were at work, and over one hundred cases were disposed of. Over two hundred persons, martyrs to wedlock, wanted their matrimonial existence judicially murdered, and four hundred or five hundred sympathizing friends were on hand to witness the executions. It was the biggest day’s work the divorce mills have had in a long time. Marriage knots were shattered with more than the usual celerity of the Chicago divorce courts, and for every possible reason. One of the gray-haired judges, after the adjournment of court, shook his head and said that something was surely wrong these days. He didn’t know what the world was coming to.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.16}

Well might the judge ask what the world is coming to. We think it is fast coming to the state recently desired by the correspondent of an Eastern Spiritualist paper, when the way out of marriage should be as easy as the way in. and that will be a repetition of the times just before the flood, when “they took them wives of all which they chose.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.17}

Right in this line was a case which the dispatches relate as recently occurring in Paris. A boy scarcely fifteen years of age, stole 500 francs from his employer, and eloped with a girl of fourteen, with whom he began living in another city. Soon however, a former lover of the girl, aged thirteen, appeared on the scene, when the fifteen-year-old Lothario, thinking that his mistress was unfaithful to him, stabbed her three times, probably fatally. Isn’t it time to ask, “What is the world coming to?” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.18}

At the celebration of the centennial of the adoption of the Constitution, at Philadelphia last month, the service was opened with a prayer by a Bishop Potter, of the Episcopal Church, and closed by a prayer and the benediction by Cardinal Gibbons. Because Cardinal Gibbons was invited too, and did, perform this part of the ceremony the *Presbyterian Journal* says that its “Protestant blood boils.” But if Cardinal Gibbons had not been chosen at all, and Bishop Potter had both opened and closed the ceremonies, then it is altogether likely that the “Protestant blood” of the *Presbyterian Journal* would not have been increased in temperature to any perceptible degree. While if the Presbyterian preacher had only been chosen in the place of Cardinal Gibbons, it is safe to say that the “Protestant blood” of the *Journal* would have been so perfectly cool that we might fairly conclude that it was actually reduced below the normal temperature. But the Commission had just as much right to choose Cardinal Gibbons as it had to choose Bishop Potter, or anybody else, to pray. This was a celebration of the adoption of the Constitution. The Constitution recognizes no one profession of religion above another, therefore the Commission had perfect right to choose whom they please, or to choose nobody, to pray, and nobody has any business to object. The boiling of the Protestant blood of our Presbyterian contemporary is only a tempest in a teapot. But even this small tempest shows the excellent wisdom of the makers of our Constitution, in forbidding forever the application of any religious test by the nation to its employees, and in forbidding the National Legislature to make any “law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” It is a happy thing for the nation that there is no constitutional channel through which the Protestant blood of the *Presbyterian Journal* may pour its boiling zeal. And it will be a woful day whenever such a channel shall be created. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.19}

Dr. McGlynn’s influence is growing. September he delivered an address, of an hour and a half, before the New York Association of Methodist ministers. There were five hundred ministers present beside others. The report further says:- {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.20}

“He presented the Henry George land theories and defended them as representing the cause of humanity. When the speaker had concluded, a resolution of thanks to Dr. McGlynn was offered for his able, eloquent, and instructive address, and wishing him God-speed in his efforts to diffuse the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This created great confusion, and after a turbulent sceen, which one clergyman characterized as resembling a beer garden, the resolution was amended by a clause that allowed the members to reserve the right of individual opinion concerning the land theories. The resolution was then adopted.” {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.21}

With the fast-growing creed of the worldly power and political preference already displayed by Protestant preachers, we should not be surprised to see yet the Henry George land theories adopted by them, especially in the National Reform compact. {SITI October 6, 1887, p. 624.22}

**“Short-sighted Reasoning” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

Quite recently we read an article entitled “Keeping the Sabbath-day Not a Success,” written by one who was himself once a Sabbath-keeper. The writer spoke of the greater number of Sunday-keepers, and mentioned the other points of a superior prosperity on the part of Sunday-keepers over Sabbath-keepers, and said:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.1}

“If, now, keeping Saturday is so highly pleasing to God, why does he not prosper it more? If Sunday observance is such a sin in the sight of God, why does he so remarkably bless those who persist in it?” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.2}

This is one of the most common arguments against the Sabbath-keeping and in favor of Sunday observance, and it is an argument that doubtless carries more weight with than any other. The reason for this is that it is more easily comprehended than any other; it does not require a logical mind to grasp it. But the style of the argument is by no means new, and we would like to refer our readers, who may be troubled over it, to an instance of the use of exactly the same argument about twenty-five hundred years ago. The circumstances were these: {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.3}

A number of the Jews, disregarding the express command of the Lord, had gone down to Egypt to live, and had fallen in with the customs of the country, and were burning incense to the Egyptian gods. Jeremiah, being divinely inspired, expostulated with them for their wickedness, reminding them of the judges that had been brought upon Israel in the past, for departing from God, and saying that God would bring similar punishments upon them. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.4}

“Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, as for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee. But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine.” Jeremiah 44:15-18. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.5}

This is a fair specimen of worldly reasoning,-of the reasoning of those who think that all accounts must be settled as they go along. The psalmist came very near making the same mistake once. Said he:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.6}

“But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked.” Psalm 73:2, 3. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.7}

And then he goes on to tell how that they have no bands and death, they are not in trouble as other men are, and they have more than heart can wish. But when he went into the sanctuary and understood their end, he learned that God does not settle up his accounts with people as they go along. The people who seemed the most prosperous may be in the greatest danger. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.8}

If prosperity in Sunday-keeping proves that God is pleased with that practice, then the prosperity of the Jews, when they were worshiping idols, proved that God was pleased with such practices. But everyone will say that God was not pleased with them, even though they enjoyed a temporary prosperity. How did they know that? Because God said so; the first commandment forbids the worship of other gods, and the second commandment declares that he cannot endure idolatry. In the same way we know that God is not pleased with Sunday-keeping, even though those who practice it may have prosperity. His commandment enjoins the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord,-the seventh day of the week, the only Lord’s day,-and he is pleased only when his commandment is obeyed. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.9}

The fact is, that wealth and numbers are not real success and prosperity. It cannot be known in this life whether or not any man has made life a success. The successful life is that one which is crowned with life eternal. Only when the Lord comes, and brings to light the hidden things of darkness, and makes manifest the counsels of the heart, will it be known who has made a success of life, or what course of action has been crowned with success. But we may know now what course of action, if faithfully persisted in, will be crowned with success, for God’s word tells us: “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” Therefore, let no one be turned aside from this course by the prosperity of those who are walking in a way of their own choosing. There prosperity is not real, only seeming. “For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.10}

**“The California Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting began Thursday evening, October 6, and is just drawing to close as we write this report, Monday night, October 17. By unanimous vote of the congregation the meeting was held one day longer than the original appointment, and yet it seemed too short for all that needed to be done. In some respects this was one of the most successful camp-meetings ever held in California. The weather was all that could be desired. A hot north wind, the first three days of the meeting, caused some discomfort; but we have never attended a meeting where the weather was more uniformly fine. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.11}

The meeting was the largest one ever held on the Pacific coast. Besides the large preaching pavilion, there were three hundred and ten tents pitched. Of this number one tent, 50x77 feet in size, was used for children’s meetings, and for the primary divisions of the Sabbath-school; another, 50x70 feet in size, was divided into twenty apartments for lodgers; a sixty-foot tent served as a bookstand. When the vote was taken last year to purchase a tent 100x150 feet in size, many thought that the move was a little wild, but this meeting proved that it was bought none too soon. On the second Sunday, when Sister White spoke from Matthew 6:24-34, the tent was filled to its utmost capacity, and a large crowd stood outside. A census taken in the early part of the meeting. Showed that twelve hundred and fifty people were encamped; but it afterwards transpired that a few tents have been missed, and quite a number came to the ground afterward. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.12}

The presence of Brother and Sister White, right after the meeting had been in progress four days, added much to the interest of the meeting. Indeed, the large attendance was mostly due to the fact that it had been announced that Sister White would be present. On this account many came who had never attended a camp-meeting before. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.13}

We have never before held a meeting in California which was so well advertised, nor one which was so well planned in all its arrangements. The restaurant tent was arranged so that the helpers could perform their work with less inconvenience than usual; and the healthful food which was prepared was highly appreciated. Two electric lights in the preaching tent, and three more at convenient places outside, afforded all the light that was needed, and saved much trouble that is usually spent in caring for lamps. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.14}

The spiritual interests of the people were looked after as being the main object of the meeting. The large amount of business connected with the Conference, Tract Society, and Sabbath-school, gave less time for this, and for instruction in various branches of work that was desired, yet there were some precious seasons. On each Sabbath of the meeting several hundred came forward in response to a call for those who wished the prayers of God’s people, and the work for them was carried on in the various districts into which the campus was divided. Thirty-nine were baptized, and nearly as many more candidates will be baptized at their home churches. Twice each day a meeting was held for the children, in which many sought and found the Saviour. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.15}

There was a seeming a break in one portion of the meeting, owing to dissatisfaction which the devil had been planting in the minds of some of the brethren; but a thorough investigation resulted in establishing the confidence of the people and the work to a degree probably never before felt; so that although there was some time seemingly lost, all felt that great advancement had been made. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.16}

Sister White eloquently presented the needs of the missions in Europe, and the difficulties under which the work there is struggling, and the people responded with pledges and cash donations to the amount of over $8,500 beside, a goodly amount of jewelry. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.17}

The Sabbath-schools held on the ground were most interesting. The membership the first Sabbath was 1,156, but on the second Sabbath there were 1,307 in the school, and the number of classes was 181. The class contributions the first Sabbath amounted to $207.75, and the second Sabbath to $213.65, making a total of $421.40, which all goes to the South Africa Mission. It being seen that the $1,000 pledged to the African mission by the Association at last year’s session, would be more than doubled by the close of the present year, it was voted by the association to donate at least $2,500 of the Sabbath-school contributions for 1888 to the city mission recently started in London, England, provided the International Association would consent. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.18}

The camp was thoroughly canvassed, and many subscriptions were taken for the various periodicals, but the number has not been ascertained at present writing. The cash sales at the bookstand amounted to over $850, besides the orders which were taken. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.19}

The secretary’s report showed a marked increase in the amount of tithes paid in the Conference, there being more than $12,200 more this year than last year. If the brethren and sisters shall remember the earnest exhortation that was given them on the matter of bringing all the tithes into the storehouse, and also resolutions which they made, as we believe they will, we may see a much greater increase next year. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.20}

It was with regret that the Conference and Tract Society dropped Elder Haskell from the presidency, but it was felt to be imperative, as his full attention will be taken up for the next year at least with the work in England. He has labored long and faithfully for the cause in California, and has taught the people how to work. He will ever be held in loving remembrance, and will be heartily welcomed back whenever his duties will permit him to return. Our prayers shall go up for him and the work in which he is engaged, and we know that he will not forget the work here, even if he is not officially connected with it. The brethren and sisters leave for their homes with good courage in the Lord, determined to gain daily victories by his help. W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.21}

**“Bible Study” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is a vast difference between reading and studying. A person may read the Bible through a hundred times and still know really nothing about it, and may not be able to quote a single verse correctly. To learn a passage or chapter by heart, even, is not necessarily studying; it may be simply parrot work. To study means to closely examine; to apply the mind to a certain thing; to read and examine for the purpose of learning or understanding. A person may be able to relate, when questioned, everything that is recorded in a certain chapter, without having given it any real study. He may learn the bare facts without that close examination that is required to understand the lesson which they are designed to convey. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 630.22}

A person has learned a thing only when he has made it his own-a part of himself; when he can add to things which he has previously learned, and see the relation between them; or when he has it fixed in his mind as a nucleus, around which to gather other facts. The Bible is a book in which the writings of many individuals, covering many hundreds of years, unite to form one harmonious whole. All the different Bible writers have one common object in view; there is a oneness of purpose seen in all their writings. No one portion of the Bible can be isolated from the rest, and its meaning be fully grasped. It is only when we compare Scripture which Scripture, that we get the full benefit of Bible study. If the text of a Sabbath-school lesson is found in a certain chapter, and the pupil confines his attention to that chapter alone, he has not thoroughly studied his lesson. The texts bearing on one subject should be treasured up in the mind, and others added to them, and woven together like the various threads of a fabric, till the whole subject stands out clear and distinct. Then the relation of different subjects should be kept in mind. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.1}

In this way a given amount of study will accomplish vastly more good than the same amount of study without any definite purpose. Of course it will take time to arrive at even a moderate understanding of all the great truths of God’s word, and for this very reason the time should be improved to the best advantage. With persevering study, however, and the wisdom which is promised to those who pray in faith, even the most unlearned may become acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, which alone are able to make us “wise to salvation”-“thoroughly furnished unto of good works.” W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.2}

**“Brief Comments” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

**THE CHARGE TO JOSHUA**

The number of times that the Lord tells Joshua to be strong and of good courage is worthy of note. After telling him that he will be with him even as he was with Moses, and that he will not fail him, the Lord says, “Be strong and they could courage” (chapter 1:6) then follows the assurance that he shall divide the land among the Israelites. In the next verse he says again, “Only be thou strong and very courageous.” Then follows an admonition to do according to all that was written in the law, and to meditate upon that day and night; and then exhortation is again given: “Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.3}

The Lord does not desire that his people should give way to discouragement. The same exhortation that was addressed to those who were about to enter into the earthly Canaan, is applicable to the Israel of God, who are striving for an inheritance in the heavenly Canaan. “Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed.” Why not to be discouraged? Are we not weak? and is not our enemy powerful? Would it not be presumptuous in us to feel strong and confident? Yes; it would if we depended only on our own strength; but unfortunately we have also the same promise that was made to Joshua. It is this: “For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.” And he has also said, “I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee.” The Christian should ever realize this glorious truth: “The eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.” Knowing this, how can he become discouraged? The apostles exhortation is, “Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.” Ephesians 6:10. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.4}

**HOLY THINGS**

It is sometimes claimed that there is no such thing as holy time; that is absurd to think that one day is really any better than another; that men can make any day a holy Sabbath by resting upon it. It would be interesting to hear such ones explain Joshua 5:15. The case is similar to that of Moses at the burning bush. Joshua had seen the man standing by Jericho, and had learned that he was the “captain of the host of the Lord.” “And the captain of the Lord’s host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest holy. And just what did so.” Now did the ground become holy because Joshua took off his shoes, or was it holy before? The answer is, It was holy before, for the Lord said so. Then it seems that there may be a difference between things of the same kind. There was no outward difference between the ground on which Joshua was standing and the ground in other places, yet there *was* a difference. One was holy, on account of the presence of the Lord, the other was not. The ground on which Joshua stood would have remained holy even if he had not removed his shoes. So it is with the Sabbath. The Lord has made it holy, and it will remain holy whether man regards it or not. The failure to discriminate between the holy and the profane is that which brings the judgments of God upon mankind. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.5}

**THE MIRACLE AT GIBEON**

“Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies.” “So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.” Some, in their eagerness to overthrow the Sabbath of the Lord, have found in this occurrence a loss of time. But there was no time lost. It was simply a lengthening of the day. If such a miracle should occur on the Sabbath, it would simply lengthen the Sabbath. Two days were not combined in one, but it was one long day. “And there was no day like that before it or after it.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.6}

Skeptics find an abundance of food for caviling in this miracle, as, indeed, they may in any. But the Bible student need not be troubled about it. To say that it could not occur, is in reality to deny that God is the creator of the heavens and the earth; for if God made the planets it is certain that he can control them. It is said that God instituted fixed laws by which they should be governed. Very true; but did he put those laws out of his own power? The maker of a threshing machine designs that it shall work according to a certain plan; yet he can stop the machine without altering the plan. One thing is certain; the universe did not create itself. Although the mind of man cannot conceive of its extent, nor fathom the laws by which it is governed, there must be a Creator who is infinitely greater than the universe. “He taketh up the isles as a very little thing.” It is evident that the Creator can do as he pleases with what he has created. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.7}

To disbelieve in miracles is to deny the existence of God, for God would cease to be God if he did not work miracles. Do you inquire how this can be? Simply thus: A miracle is a wonder,- something beyond the comprehension of those who witness it. It is entirely contrary to any laws of nature of which we have any knowledge. Even with this definition there are miracles constantly taking place around us, for no man can explain the one-hundredeth part of the physical phenomena which are matters of common observation. Now to say that God cannot perform a miracle is equivalent to saying that he cannot do anything that finite men cannot understand. In other words, it is saying that God is altogether such an one as ourselves. It is a deplorable fact that many professed believers in God and his word will throw discredit upon both by attempting to “explain” miracles. We know not which to pity the more, their ignorance or their presumption. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.8}

If it is asked how it is possible that such a miracle as the stopping of the sun could be performed without disarranging the whole planetary system, I would reply, “I do not know; I cannot imagine; if I could, it would cease to be a miracle.” The disbelieve in miracles arises from the fact that men are too proud to acknowledge that there is anything which they cannot understand. He who believes only what he can comprehend and explain will have a very short creed. It is no shame for man to confess that he cannot by searching by about God. W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 631.9}

**“Thoughts on John 10:27-29” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

“My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.” This Scripture should fill every follower of Christ with encouragement. So long as they hear his voice, and follow where it leads, they are safe. No one, not even Satan, can snatch them away. God is “greater than all.” Though trials and temptations become, “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. Christ also says: “In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.” John 16:33. And to strengthen the assurance, he adds: “I and my Father are one.” When both the Father and the Son unite for man’s salvation, what confidence may we feel! {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 632.1}

But while we gain courage from the fact that he is “able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him,” we are not to be presumptuous. Jesus said, “No man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand,” but he did not say that no man could take himself out. This Scripture has been perverted, and made to teach that no follower of Christ can fall away. That this view is incorrect, is shown by many passages. We are exhorted thus: “Hold that fast which thou hast, at no man take thy crown.” Revelation 3:11. We are told also, “He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” Matthew 24:13. For a positive testimony, see Hebrews 6:4-6. Our Lord says also: “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” John 15:6. See also Revelation 4:2-5; 3:16. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 632.2}

The case, then, stands thus: So long as we hear the voice of Christ, and are content to follow him, trusting him humbly and implicitly, no harm can befall us; his strength will enable us to repel all attacks; but when we begin to trust ourselves, we take ourselves out of his hands; or, if refusing longer to listen to his voice, we are cast out. Let us all heed the words of the apostle Paul: “Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear.” W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 632.3}

**“Not a Prophet, But an Angel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a Spiritualist contemporary we find the following:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.1}

“Did not the angel that appeared to Saul declare that he was one of his brethren the prophets?” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.2}

We once heard of a hackman who attempted to pass himself off as a Quaker at the time of a convention of Friends, in order that he might secure their patronage. He succeeded so far as to give his carriage filled with the visiting Friends, but when he came and asked, “Where’s thous baggage?” they saw that he was unfamiliar with the language of Quakers, and, disgusted with the attempted deception, at once sought another conveyance. In like manner the question above quoted shows that the writer, in attempting to prove Spiritualism from the Bible, has no knowledge of the book. We don’t remember that we ever saw in an infidel or Spiritualist paper a correct reference to any biblical event. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.3}

But the substitution of Saul for John is not so bad as is the statement that the angel declared himself to be one of the prophet’s brethren; and in this version of Revelation 22:9 he who finds himself in a company with a great many professed Bible Christians. And just because there are hundreds of professed Bible Christians who actually taken the Spiritualist ground that the angel who talked with John was one of his fellow-prophets, we will tell just what the angel did declare himself to be. The following is a literal translation of the Greek of Revelation 22:9:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.4}

“And he said to me: See (thou do it not) for I am a fellow-servant of thee and of thy brethren the prophets,” etc. The revised version has it: “For I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets.” The simple meaning is that he was not one to be worshiped, but was a fellow-servant not only of John, but of all the prophets, and of those also who should keep the sayings the book. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.5}

We cannot accuse the Spiritualist editor of knowing better than to quote the text the way he did, for he did not know where the passage is, nor to whom the words were spoken. But we are sometimes forced to question the honesty of ministers of the gospel, whose title of “D.D.” ought to signify that they have at least read the Bible through, and that they know how to translate easy Greek, who will refer to the angel of Revelation 22:9 as one of the old prophets. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.6}

Our Spiritualist editor will no doubt say, “Well, the text doesn’t amount to anything anyway, because we are not dependent on the Bible for our knowledge.” Then why try to make it appear that it teaches Spiritualism? The reason is, that by so doing some professed Christians may be led to wholly accept that delusion, thinking that the Bible favors it. As a matter of fact, there is not a text in the Bible which gives the slightest countenance to Spiritualism; noonday sunlight and midnight darkness are not more opposite than are the Bible and that the doctrine. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.7}

**“Too Significant to Be Pleasant” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following protest we clip from the *Christian Union*, which says that it was written by “a leading Protestant divine.” The protest is just and timely, but that it will have any effect, there is no reason to hope. What indicates this, and also makes the necessity for a protest the more urgent, is the general indifference that is manifested over the matter. The *Christian Union’s* report, in the same issue that contains the protest, makes no mention of the occurrence; and the protest itself is put in the most obscure portion of the paper, as though the editors were ashamed or afraid to have it seen, but inserted it out of courtesy to the “leading Protestant divine.” Are there not more who will vigorously protest against American subserviency to Romish intrigues? or is Protestantism dead? {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.8}

“The celebration of the centennial of the adoption of our Federal Constitution in Philadelphia was an imposing occasion, and no doubt also a very profitable one for the City of Brotherly Love. All the exercises were on a scale commensurate with the greatness of the occasion, and were all successfully carried out. The appropriateness of the monster industrial and military parades, the reception of the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania and of the President of the United States, appealed to everyone’s patriotism. But there was one feature of the celebration made unduly prominent, that impressed many as utterly incongruous and out of place, and that was the place taken by the Roman Catholics as a religious denomination. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.9}

“The formal reception given by Cardinal Gibbons placed him and his co-religionist in a false position before the American people. Why should he have assumed or been granted a more prominent part than any Presbyterian minister or Episcopalian or Methodist bishop? Why should he have had *any* part as the express representative of a religious denomination, especially on such an occasion, when the adoption of an instrument was celebrated, one of whose chief glories is that it acknowledges no ecclesiastical distinctions, and accords absolute religious equality to all? {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.10}

“The whole affair looked very much as if Cardinal Gibbons appeared as the head and representative of a distinct power on a plane with that of the Governors of the several States; in fact, it made the impression that the Roman Catholic Church was, or aspired to be, an organization political in its character, because putting itself on a part and level with other such organizations-the President representing the Union, Governor Beaver, Pennsylvania, and Cardinal Gibbons, the Roman Catholic Church! {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 638.11}

“Is the last-named organization a State within the State? Is it at all analogous to a State of the Union or in the Union? Why was the distinction made for this one denomination more than for any other? Why should it have been made for any? That it appeared very plainly as if some special civil or political significance attached to Cardinal Gibbons and his church no one can doubt who saw the Cardinal in all the glory of his sacred vestments, like a Governor in his uniform, and marked how Mr. Cleveland formally attended his reception just as he did Governor Beaver’s. It was very significant to behold on such an occasion ‘the head of the nation shake hands with the prince of the church,’ as one of the daily papers described the scene. The whole thing was a little too significant to be pleasant.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 639.1}

**“Confessing Christ” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

**The Commentary.
Notes on the International Lesson.
(November 6.-Matthew 10:22-42.)**

“Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.” What is it to confess Christ? This is a most important question, for upon it depends our future happiness or woe. In the parallel passage in Mark 8:38 we read: “Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.” These texts show the importance of confessing Christ. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 639.2}

Confessing Christ is something more than acknowledging his existence, or that he is the Son of God. Even the devils do this (Matthew 8:29), but it does not affect their character, nor will it avert their punishment. Neither does confessing Christ consist in making a high profession of Christianity. For, says Jesus, “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. Here we learn that those who have not only made a high profession, but who have been apparently shining lights, and have done much work, will be denied by Christ in the last great day. Then it must be because they have not confessed him; for all who confess him will be acknowledged by him. But he who does not confess Christ, denies him, (see Matthew 12:20), so that our Saviour’s words show us that a man may deny Christ while bearing the Christian name, and being what is called “a pillar in the church.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 639.3}

If now it is desired to know in brief what it is to confess Christ, turn and read Romans 10:9-11: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.1}

Confessing the Lord Jesus is the outgrowth of a heart belief in him. And what is heart belief in Christ? It is such a belief as produces righteousness, “for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” The belief that does not produce righteousness, is no belief at all. Righteousness is right-doing. It is the opposite of sin, for *un*righteousness is sin. 1 John 5:17. But sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John 3:4. Therefore righteousness is obedience to the law of God. So Moses said, “And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.” Deuteronomy 6:25. Therefore we may understand that true belief in Christ leads invariably to keeping the commandments of God; and true confession of the Lord Jesus Christ is the utterance of one who has such a living, acting, practical faith in Christ. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.2}

What a wonderful promise, that if we confess him, he will confess us! And what will he confess concerning us when he comes? Here is the answer: “For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.” Hebrews 2:11, 12. Then when he comes in the glory of the Father, with all the holy angels, Christ will not be ashamed to greet as his brethren all those who have confessed him before men, by their lives of obedience, as well as by their words. He will claim such as members of his own family, heirs of God, and joint heirs with himself. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God.” We are now members of the family of Christ. If so, let us heed the apostle’s injunction to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. Let us not disgrace the family, and cause the Head of it to be ashamed of us. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.3}

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man’s foes shall be they of his own household. Matthew 10:34-36. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.4}

Notwithstanding the above statement, it is true that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a “gospel of peace;” and this loving exhortation should be most carefully heeded: “But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.” 2 Timothy 2:23-25. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.5}

And this: “But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.” Matthew 5:39, 44. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.6}

Then how can there be strife and a sword, as the Saviour said, if these injunctions are followed? They exist just because these injunctions are followed. He does not say that it will be the Christian man who will be at variance with his father. This could not be, for variance is one of the things the possession of which will shut a man out of Heaven. Galatians 5:19-21. But men are naturally prone to evil; and they resent anything which condemns their course. So the sinful son will be at variance with his pious father; the father himself will be at peace with all men. “And a man’s foes shall be they of his own household.” The man will not be a foe to those of his own household, but they will be his foes because of his goodness, just as Stephen was stoned because he was a Christian; just as Daniel was cast into the den of lions, because he prayed to God; just as “all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,” because “evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse.” W. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.7}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The camp-meeting at Los Angeles, Cal., will begin October 26, and will continue twelve days. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.8}

We read in an exchange that “Yankton has been selected as the Roman Catholic sea for Dakota.” We suppose it is called a *sea* because the errors which will be propagated there will drown men in destruction and perdition. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.9}

On page 634 will be found an interesting report from the Central European Mission, by the former editor of the SIGNS, who is now connected with that mission. The laborers in that field have difficulties to contend with of which we in this country realize but little. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.10}

In the *Independent* of August 25, Prof. Norman Fox has a review of Dr. Armitage’s “History of the Baptists,” in which he says: “As to infant baptism, scores of the ablest Pedobaptist scholars admit that it was unknown in apostolic times, while all know that it was not universal till some centuries after the death of the apostles.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.11}

This number of the paper is one day late, owing to the fact that nearly all the work done upon it was done during the camp-meeting, which editors, proofreaders, and compositors attended. It was gotten out under high pressure, much of the work being done in the night after meeting; so we beg the indulgence of our readers if it is not up to the usual standard. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.12}

Something must be done for Iowa. Why? Because since the Prohibition amendment was adopted, the supply of convicts for the penitentiary is diminishing, and the contractors of prison labor at Fort Madison are much embarrassed; they don’t know how to fill their contracts. There’’ nothing like an unlimited supply of whisky to keep state prisons full, and to make prison labor contractors happy. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.13}

A correspondent of the *California Christian Advocate* writes to know if the rule of the church requiring members to kneel during prayer in church cannot be changed so as to allow them to sit. He says that only a few old Puritans kneel before the congregation and that he had supposes they do so only out of respect to the rule; also that kneeling has been found to be a great deal of trouble, and there is often more or less damage to the valuable clothing. The tendency seems to be to make even the *form* of worship which is retained as easy as possible. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.14}

Here is a little story that may be read with profit by a good many:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.15}

“When Livingstone visited England after his great exploring tour, he was much praised for his sacrifices. It was true he had labored much, but what did he reply to this praise? ‘People talk of the sacrifices I made in spending so large a portion of my life in Africa. Can you call that a sacrifice which is only a small payment on that great debt to God which can never be fully discharged? Say, rather, that it is a privilege. I have never made a sacrifice.’”-*Spirit of Missions*. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.16}

And who has made a sacrifice? When we consider the sacrifice of Christ, who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich; and remember that “our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;” who can talk about sacrifices made, much less to boast or mourn over them? {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.17}

In his recent address to the Boston Evangelical Ministers Association, Dr. Josiah Strong related the case of a minister who was pleading with his people for a larger manifestation of sympathy to the poor and destitute around them, when an influential church member rose, and said he wanted none of that class in his pew. The bold rejoinder came at once from him who believed he had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the poor: “I will not cease my plea, till the door of this church swings and to the slightest touch of the needy.” As a consequence of the pastor’s determination to preach the gospel to the poor, he was dismissed from the church. And yet the members of that church doubtless think that they are followers of Christ; they certainly call themselves Christians. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.18}

A call is being circulated for a conference of all evangelical Christians, at Washington, D. C., December 7, 8, 9, 1887, to study principally the following propositions:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.19}

“1. What are the present perils and opportunities of the Christian church, and of the country? {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.20}

“2. Can any of them be met by a hearty co-operation of all evangelical Christians, which, without detriment to any denominational interests, will serve the interests of the whole church? {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.21}

“3. What are the best means to secure such co-operation, and to awaken the whole church to its responsibility?” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.22}

The call is signed by William E. Dodge, John Jay, C. A. Stoddard, Philip Schaff, Josiah Strong, James McCosh, R. S. Storrs, D. C. Gilman, Timothy Dwight, Howard Crosby, Gen. O. O. Howard, J. H. Vincent, Lyman Abbott, W. M. Taylor, and about seventy other ministers and representative laymen. It is expected that at least two thousand delegates will be present. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.23}

We have frequently been accused of a lack of charity, because we have said that Sunday laws are in no sense temperance laws; that the enactment of such laws is solely in the interest of somebody’s special religion, and not all in the interest of temperance; and that, in fact, they tacitly admit that the liquor traffic is alright except on Sunday. The following, which is a portion of a much lauded address recently made before the Young Men’s Christian Association of Oakland, by the Rev. J. H. Hector, pastor of the African M. E. Church of San Francisco, shows that we have not overstated the case in the least:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.24}

“There is needed to tune up the gospel trumpet so that its tones shall sound unmistakably to the world. One thing, and I have noticed it particularly since I came to California, that this gospel trumpet should proclaim is that we must have the Sabbath, and a holy Sabbath. We want you Jews to stop selling second-hand clothing on Sunday. We want you Germans to stop selling your beer and running your beer gardens and picnics on Sunday. We want you Frenchmen to stop selling your wine and strong drink on Sunday. We want all of you who are now raising the devil and destroying our children on Sunday to stop it right off. We want to say to you, that while you may raise the devil and destroy our children six days in the week, you’ve got to rest on the seventh day [first day] and keep it holy.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.25}

We have always known that Sunday laws were not in the interests of morality or good order, but solely to gratify prejudice and bigotry; but we never before saw it so directly admitted. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.26}

In his letter to the Corinthians, Paul said: “For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.” 1 Corinthians 1:22-24. And again he said: “For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.” Chap. 2:2. These words were brought in very forcibly to our mind, by contrast, when we read that two ministers in Oakland, who have the largest congregations of any in the city, preached on a recent Sunday evening to young men upon the “Lessons to be drawn from the life of Governor Bartlett.” We do not know anything about the private life of Governor Bartlett; but we do know that if he had been the best man that has lived in the United States since it became a nation, he would not have been good enough to warrant a minister of the gospel in holding him up as a model for young men. Jesus Christ is the only being who ever lived on this earth, whose life is worthy to be taken as a model for men, either young or old, and “Jesus Christ, and him crucified,” is the only thing that can draw men to a nobler life. But the trouble is, that the preaching of Jesus Christ and him crucified is not the kind that “takes” with the people, and fills the churches on Sunday nights. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.27}

**“Humbug Legislation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Saturday half-holiday created by the New York Legislature last winter, has proved a failure. Several of the leading papers have referred to it as such. The *Independent* calls it outright, “a legislative humbug,” and a “silly law,” which is all that it is. The *Observer* says:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.28}

“The indications are that the observance of the Saturday half-holiday as a particular institution will have to be abandoned for the present, or postponed until the world has more leisure than it has now. Business men and trades-people generally are revolting against the custom and refusing to observe it any longer. The fact that Saturday afternoon was constituted a legal holiday by the last legislature makes no difference in the aspects of the case except in banks and exchanges. The enactment of the law was plainly a piece of folly and was done simply as a bid for the favor of the so-called ‘laboring class’ and not from any humane or philanthropic motives.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.29}

The same Legislature, and for the same reason, also made September 5 a State holiday under the title of “Labor-Day,” that is, a day for doing no labor. Of its celebration the reports all show about one way, of which the following account by the *Congregationalist* will give an idea of what Labor-Day amounts to:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.30}

“Labor-Day, so called, because so many people quit labor to parade and drink beer and stronger fluids, didn’t seem practically to amount to much here. Most of the real workers were at work. A large number of men and boys (some have estimated them as high as 25,000), in a go-as-you-please fashion, to the sound of music, carrying banners and various devices; but people generally showed little interest. A good many employers, pressed for those to fulfill their contracts, were irritated over the loss, and very few of the operators seemed very joyful. They had the air of men doing an uncomfortable duty. There was no violence, and little work for the police; but the lager beer and whisky dealers had all they could do to keep the procession up to the proper marching point, and their arms ached sometime after the show was over.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.31}

Of both these laws the *Independent* says:- {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.32}

“The motive prompting the enactment of the Labor-Day Law, like that promoting the enactment of the Saturday Half-holiday Law, was purely political. Governor Hill and the Republican Legislature were fishing for labor votes. This is the whole of it. The next Legislature of this State would to a sensible thing if it were to repeal both of these laws.” {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.33}

Of course it would, but it is safe to say that the New York Legislature will do no such sensible thing. It will be much more apt to do more of just such like, “fishing for votes.” Nor is the New York Legislature the exception. {SITI October 20, 1887, p. 640.34}

**“Information Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Herald of Truth* in noticing a new addition to Sunday literature, said: “Our belief is that the Sabbath or seven-day worship is an institution as old as creation, yet lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days. This we believe to have been the position held by the apostle Paul.” {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.1}

Now that the good Doctor who presides over the columns of the *Herald* has begun to making his “confession of faith,” we would like to have him go on, and also make more clear a few points in his article, for a confession of faith must of all things be most clear. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.2}

1. “We believe that the Sabbath or seventh-day worship is as old as creation.” We will accept that, because we read that “in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Exodus 20:11. Also in Genesis 2:3 we read “God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” If the Doctor had done what we have done for him, viz., given authority, the first part of his statement would have been perfect. Now for the second part. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.3}

2. “Yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days.” We will quote the statement again in full, that the connection may be seen: “The Sabbath or seventh-day of worship is as old as creation, yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, about the formality of days.” That is, “the Sabbath or *seventh-day* worship” has no connection with such formal things as days! Our knowledge of either theology for science is insufficient to enlighten us as to how the Sabbath, requiring seventh-day of worship, can be celebrated on no day at all. We doubt if even the learned editor of the *Herald of Truth* can make this appear. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.4}

This, we are told, is what is accomplished by “the highest Christian thought.” Its seems, then, that the office of “the highest [modern] Christian thought” is to lift things from the real to the unreal; from plain common sense into absurdity. Let us try it on the first commandment: “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” This is the language of Jehovah, and teaches us that the worship of one God, Maker of heaven and earth, as an institution is as old as creation, and much older; but “the highest Christian thought” would lift this above the formality of any specified object of worship. And so the Hindu, whose highest aspiration is to become lost in contemplation of an idea, is the ideal Christian. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.5}

Try it on the seventh commandment. That commandment guards the marriage relation, which, as an institution, is as old as creation (see Genesis 2:21-24); but in “the highest Christian thought” it is lifted above the formality of persons! That is, in “the highest Christian thought” we have seventh day worship without any day at all; we have the worship of one God, without regard to any Being; and we have marriage, without anybody being married! If this be the “highest Christian thought,” we will have none of it. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.6}

Why does the Doctor take a position concerning the Sabbath which involves him in such absurdities? Because he doesn’t know what else to do. His knowledge of the Bible, and his honesty, will not let him make the claim that Sunday was the original Sabbath, and something else will not lead him acknowledge the fact that seventh-day worship, which is as old as creation, is to endure as long as creation lasts. So he takes a position which involves the keeping of no day at all, and thus stultifies himself in his strict observance of Sunday. We know that he has plenty of company in that position, but we can’t imagine how that can help him. If we were on the rack, the fact that a multitude of others were undergoing the same tortures would give us no relief. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.7}

In the same paper from which we extract this partial confession of faith, there is a clipping from the *Occident,* descriptive of the so-called “baptism” of six infants, who, so says the *Occident*, were thus “numbered with the ‘household of faith.’” On this is we find the following comment, which we heartily endorse:- {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.8}

“The *Herald of Truth* wants to know how much faith these six little ones required to belong to the ‘household of faith’? The information would be valuable to its readers in this increasingly intelligent age. Or was it *sponsor* faith on the part of parents or guardians? If so, where is the warrant for it in God’s word? No twisting of Scripture, brother editors of the *Occident*, no ‘*suffer little children to come unto me*,’ is wanted. We are sick of this straining of Scripture ‘clean from the purpose’ of the text itself. Rise up, brethren of the Presbytery of San Francisco, like men, and give us your ‘*Thus saith the Lord*’ for ‘infant baptism,’ or else we will give you a ‘*Mum Social*,’ without the possibility of broken silence.” {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.9}

Suppose we administer to the Doctor a dose of his own medicine. The SIGNS OF THE TIMES wants to know how much “Christian thought” there is in an argument for a practice which takes the Sabbath of the Lord, which was declared by Jehovah himself to be “*the seventh day,*” and lifts it “above formality of days,” and then lets sit down again upon the first day? Where is the warrant for it in God’s word? We cannot accuse the *Herald* of “twisting Scripture,” for it has not made mention of any. But when it does quote, we want the full force of the text. We, too, are “sick of this straining of Scripture ‘clean from the purpose’ of the text itself.” Hitherto that has been almost the sole dependence of the Sunday cause. Rise up, brethren of the Baptist Church of California, and give us your “*Thus saith the Lord*” for Sunday keeping, or else unite with the Presbytery of San Francisco in their “Mum Social” over infant baptism. W. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.10}

**“Who Is Responsible?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a catechism of the Episcopal Church we find the following question and answer:- {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.11}

“*Q*.-What did your sponsors do for you? {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.12}

“*A*.-They did promise and vow three things in my name:- {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.13}

“First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life.” {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.14}

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great that responsibility is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, “in newness of life;” or, as the catechism has it, to “renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh,” and to “keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walking in the same,” all the days of his life. Now is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God’s holy will and commandments. This is well understood, and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make the promise for him. These persons are then called that child’s sponsors. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.15}

The question now arises, Suppose at the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted “the pomps and vanities of this wicked world,” and reveled in “all the sinful lusts of the flesh.” It is barely possible that they nominally believed the “articles of the Christian faith;” but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of “God’s holy will and commandments.” Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them-“sponsors”-indicates that they are. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.16}

A sponsor, according to Webster, is “one who holds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default.” Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, “I bind self as the surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself or will suffer the consequences of such failure.” But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.17}

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child proved faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty, that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: “When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.” Luke 17:10. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.18}

2. “The wages of sin is death;” since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves: (*a*) What is to become of the one in his stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for he has never accepted Christ, and “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 4:12. Then two men must die for the offense of only one. This would be an injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (*b*) The sponsor has, perhaps, lived a life of a humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then, according to the promise (Romans 10:9; Revelation 22:14), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.19}

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: “Behold, all souls our mind; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth *it* shall die.” “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.” Ezekiel 18:4, 20. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.20}

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they may make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for “every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment,” much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows? {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.21}

The conclusion which anyone can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. “But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?” Wait until he has sin to forsake, and then he will be old enough to make the promise to forsake it if he wishes to. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he is not old enough to know what sin is, and consequently he needs no baptism. When he is old enough to choose, then he is old enough not to act on his own responsibility, and no others need take the responsibility which they cannot by any possibility discharge. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 646.22}

“But the Saviour says, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me,’ and how dare we disobey that command?” You need not. “*Suffer*,” that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come, but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come. But the very word “suffer,” that is, “permit,” “allow,” “refrain from hindering,” shows that the “little children” referred to are old enough to make a move on their own account, if no obstacle is thrown in their way. Moreover the “baptizing” of infants is in no sense obedience to the Saviour’s command, because the infants do not and cannot come to Christ. When Christ says, “Suffer little children to come unto me,” he does not mean infants who cannot come to him for the reason that they cannot know and appreciate him. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 647.1}

The inconsistencies herein shown up should convince all of the folly of what is called infant baptism. But the practice is not simply foolish, it is absolutely wicked. It makes people satisfied that they have complied with the divine requirement when they never have, and it fills the professed church with unconverted persons. In fact, the evils that spring from this perversion of the sacred rite are legion. For all of these, we ask, who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall asks, “Who hath required this at your hands?” W. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 647.2}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Church of the Advent of San Francisco which last year invested $25,000 in a “paper carnival” to get a return of $6,500, is just now engaged in another paper carnival, for “charity’s sake.” We shall see if possible, how the finances if this one will balance. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.1}

Ex-Governor St. John is now lecturing in California on his favorite subject, “Prohibition.” One evening last week he addressed a large and intelligent audience in Oakland, and made some telling points in favor of constitutional prohibition. Although a church member, he unsparingly scores professed Christians who give any quarter whatever to the liquor traffic. As the late John B. Finch used to say, “A thing is never settled until it is settled right,” and “A compromise with evil is a victory for the devil.” {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.2}

Some time ago we received a copy of the *Popular Science Monthly*, accompanied by a postal card stating that the magazine contained some good points which we might be able to use, and requesting that we should return it if we did not use the article. We had already used the article, but we cannot return the magazine, because the sender forgot to sign his name to his postal card, which was mailed from New Orleans. If he will send his name, with the necessary stamps for the return of the *Monthly*, we shall be most happy to comply with his request. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.3}

“Fierce” is one of the epithets which the apostle Paul uses in describing the characteristics of the people of the last days, and there is not a daily paper published in the land which does not in every issue record some of the out-croppings of this trait. It is not simply that men are fierce in battle, or for revenge when they have been injured, but that they exhibit their ferocity without any provocation. Even in childhood is being developed to a marked degree as is indicated in the Academy in Alabama, where an extra force of police is found necessary to protect the Jewish pupils from the causeless abuse of their companions. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.4}

On Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit College in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: “We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail.” If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the political press is any justification, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.5}

A Catholic speaker said the other day in Buffalo, N.Y., that the Baltimore Plenary Council declared that “to turn the Lord’s Day [Sunday is meant] into a day of toil is a blighting curse to a country.” When the National Reform Association secures its coveted close alliance with the Romish Church, the decrees of the Baltimore Council will be excellent campaign material. And just as we are writing this note, a grand Catholic procession of military companies, with three brass bands in full blast, is passing,- a part of “the largest demonstration of ‘the Church’ ever held in Oakland”-it is Sunday too. Yet we are sure that a solitary Seventh-day Adventist who should go quietly about his work of to-day would “disturb” the peoples of Sunday rest more than all this Catholic parade. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.6}

Unbelievers often charge the Jews with having been the most cruel and blood-thirsty people of all ancient times. It is easy enough to disprove this by a comparison with the doings of the other nations of those times. But on this point we have contemporary evidence, and on such a question that is the most valuable evidence. We have it, too, at a time when, if ever, it might be supposed that the change might be well grounded. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.7}

Of Omri king of Israel the Bible record is that he “did worse than all that were before him.” Ahab was Omri’s son, and of him the inspired record is that, “Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him.” 1 Kings 16:25, 30. Ahab it was who married Jezebel, consented to Naboth’s death on the evidence of false witnesses, and persecuted Elijah and his kind. Yet at this very period the kings of Israel were so much better than other kings, that among the surrounding nations they were famed for their mercy. And here is the proof: On a certain occasion, “Ben-hadad king of Syria was defeated by the army of Israel under Ahab. He lost nearly all his army and was himself about to be captured. “And his servants said unto him, Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings; let us, I pray thee, put sackcloth on our loins, and ropes upon our heads, and go out to the king of Israel; peradventure he will save thy life.” 1 Kings 20:31. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.8}

This one point is sufficient to silence forever this charge of cruelty. The evidence is unimpeachable, and proves that the most wicked and cruel kings that Israel ever had were so much better than their contemporaries of surrounding nations that they were famed for being merciful kings. The truth this that the people of Israel from the day that they left Egypt, instead of being the worst, were the best people of all ancient times. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.9}

“But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” 2 Peter 3:18. This is often incorrectly quoted, “Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth,” an expression which is not found in the Bible. But Christ is the truth, as well as the way and the life; and he who grows in the knowledge of Christ, must necessarily grow in the knowledge of the truth. The trouble with many is that they think that growing in the knowledge of Christ, will be accepted as a substitute for growing in the knowledge of the truth; or, rather, professing to believe that Christ is the truth, they make their own feelings the standard of whether or not they know him. The Bible is the only standard of truth, that has ever been given to man, and a summary of all the truth of the Bible is contained in the ten commandments; so that the only standard by which it may be known that we are really growing in the knowledge of Christ, and therefore in knowledge of the truth, is the law of God. The more one grows in the knowledge of Christ, the more perfectly will he keep the commandments of God. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.10}

**“‘Not According to Law and Order’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

There has been for some time quite a contest in Oakland over the saloon business, and many sharp words have been said on both sides. At an indignation meeting held to protest against the course of some councilmen who had violated their pledges to the people, the Rev. Dr. Horton arraigned the saloons as foes of order and good government, which drew out a response through one of the dailies, from an apologist for the saloons. Following is a part of the defense:- {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.11}

“I will only mention one instance as a reason I respect a man that keeps a brewery, a liquor store, a saloon, a restaurant, or a hotel. Some twenty odd years ago, a brewer came into my place of business and said: ‘A certain official is $500 short in his accounts. To-morrow he will be exposed. He is a good man, as you know, a man of family. Ruin and San Quentin stare him in the face. I have a plan of getting him out of this difficulty. Here are ten names on this piece of paper, and yours is one of them; each of us pay $50 by to-night.’ The $500 came forth. One of that syndicate, a brewer, one a liquor man, a hotel keeper, six in all were men with foreign names, ideas, and characters. Four were native-born Americans. So was the one saved, and did not belong to their lodge or church, but he belonged to the human family; he was a man worth saving. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.12}

“Most of that syndicate have passed over the river, whence there is no return. Their lips are closed, never to reveal the secret, and mine have been closed on it that even my own family will first know of it when they read these lines, but never shall I reveal names. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.13}

“This is part of the religion I believe in. I hope Mr. Horton will read this to his hearers at the next indignation meeting, and give them a chance for a tremendous applause, for that act was not according to law and order.” {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.14}

If this is the best defense that could be made for brewers and saloon keepers, thinking people will say that their case is a hard one. Silence would be better than such a defense. It simply shows that they are opposed to law and order; that their sole claim for recognition from the people is that they will combine to save a thief from just punishment. This is exactly in keeping with the nature of the business; it tends only to crime, and to the making of criminals. It is never according to *order*, and is in accordance with *law* only when the law makers, under pressure from the traffic, think to gain a little “revenue” by legalizing sin. {SITI October 27, 1887, p. 656.15}