**“Let There Be No Alliance with Rome” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Presbyterian Union of New York City is composed of the Presbyterian ministers of that city. In their meeting February 28, the discussion turned on the question, “How far is the Roman Catholic Church our ally, and how far our enemy.” From a report of the proceedings we take the following points of interest:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 323.1}

Rev. Philip Schaff, D. D., the ecclesiastical historian and professor in Union Theological Seminary, opened the discussion. He said that the origin of the Roman Catholic Church was involved in obscurity. It may have originated on the day of pentecost; it may have originated at Corinth, or it may have originated much later. In any event the precise time could not be fixed. He claimed that the Pope is antichrist, but not the church. That the Pope and the church are not one, and that Second Thessalonians refers to the Pope alone, claiming that this was the view held by Calvin, Melancthon, and Luther. He said that the Roman Catholic Church must hold to all the cardinal doctrines, such as the Trinity, divinity of Christ, justification, sanctification, good works, and others. He emphasized the historic character of the church and that under its claim of infallibility it could not abandon one of the cardinal doctrines and live; that it was the largest church of Christendom, with its 200,000,000 members, and should be the ally of Protestantism. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 323.2}

Rev. Dr. John Hall, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, was the next speaker. Each point that Dr. Schaff raised Dr. Hall answered, and when he said that he could not realize how so learned a man, a professor in the chair of church history in a Presbyterian theological seminary, could advocate an alliance with the historic enemy of truth, justice, and morality, he was enthusiastically applauded. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 323.3}

He held to his clear and logical style of argumentation, but his deep interest and earnest convictions upon this important subject, led him into such bursts of eloquence that he carried his audience before him with irresistible force. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 323.4}

Dr. Hall said that he had lived among Catholics; had preached in a parish where there were three Roman Catholics to one Protestant; he had been to Rome and met the cardinals to whom he had been introduced. He knew Romanists and Romanism, priesthood and laity, better, probably, than any person present. He said the Pope was the church and the church was the Pope, and that both are antichrist, “so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” The Pope and Romanism stand and fall together. Paul demonstrated this antichrist, this son of perdition, as the workman of Satan; that Satan who had overcome the first Adam, and with all the subtlety of his nature endeavored to overcome the second Adam, but had failed. Satan had endeavored to overcome Christ by offers of that temporal power which the Church of Rome now holds out, and the offer was made by the same arch conspirator. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 323.5}

Moses’s fight was continually against apostasy. Satan does not ask the people at first to become atheists, but he asks them to place alongside of the true God other gods also. This is what the Roman Catholic Church asks and does. Satan was satisfied when the Jewish kings set up the temple of the living God, provided they had Baal and Ashteroth in their groves. As to the origin of the Roman Church, a careful reading of history showed that it was from Constantine, who was a shrewd statesman, a politican and murderer, that it had sprung. Out of heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity, were taken those portions of their several services that would appeal to the sensualism of man, and with these playing upon the inborn sentiment of natural religion, Christ was kept out of the heart. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.1}

Dr. Schaff had referred to the decrees of the Council of Trent, acknowledging the divinity, kingship, and priestly offices of Christ. Dr. Hall said that it was true, but it was not fair to quote a portion and not the whole of the decrees. Read them through and in their logical connection, and you would find that they were completely Romish; the doctrine of justification is ignored, Christ’s office as a Saviour is rendered wholly void; and every leading doctrine of the religion of Christ had been manipulated until it was of none effect. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.2}

The decrees of the Council of Trent claimed ten virtues for the priesthood, traditions, penances, purgatory, indulgences, and in Mariolatry, to one in the atonement of Christ. Christ’s divinity was merged in the infallibility of the Pope, the influence of the Holy Ghost merged in the confessional interferences of the priesthood, and instead of bowing to the kingship of Christ, the devotees of the Roman system kissed the toe of St. Peter’s statue. No Catholic is permitted by the decrees of the church to be “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,” and his soul goes blindly into purgatory in order that the church may receive money for saying masses for his soul. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.3}

As to the church’s influence, no devotee of heathenism in Japan but lives a freer life than does the slave of Romanism. There is no truth of the Decalogue that it has not broken, no truth of Christianity that it has not assailed. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.4}

It is claimed that the marriage relationship has been defended by the Romish Church, and yet there has been no greater insult offered to that holy relationship than celibacy and monasticism and their attendant evils. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.5}

It is said that Romanism educates. It does so in places where it has no other way to carry on its aggressive work, and when it does educate, it does so always at your expense; but where it can get along without it, it does not educate. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.6}

It is claimed that the Roman Church holds in check the turbulent spirits that have caused our strike, and that we should join hands with it to keep this power under restraint. That 60,000,000 of people should conciliate 8,000,000 of enemies to their liberties in order to keep in check a small portion of our body politic! No; a thousand times better that these misguided people should strike, and strike, until they learn how to appreciate the laws of our land and their own good, rather than that the iron hand of superstition and spiritual death should be riveted about their arms and souls until they could not move. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.7}

The Presbyterian Church should not form such an unholy alliance. It was our duty to magnify Protestantism, the Christianity of the Bible, and not make an unholy alliance with error. He had no word against the individuals of the Church of Rome, but against that church he should always raise his voice. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.8}

When Dr. Hall had concluded, the Rev. Howard Crosby, D. D., pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, arose and commenced his address with the question, “Why should we not join with the Roman Catholic Church in the fight against infidelity?” He paused and deliberately said, “Because the Roman Catholic Church makes infidelity.” The answer was electrical. The audience cheered and applauded for several minutes. Dr. Crosby continued: “The Roman Catholic Church has been called an historic church, and we are asked to make it an ally because it is such. Look at Mohammedism, Buddhism; they, too, are historic. Shall we join with them on account of their antiquity? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.9}

“When does an apple get so rotten that it ceases to be an apple?” said the doctor. “Let us not be deceived by the virtues of those who are superior to their religion, into fellowship with that which is unfriendly to our every interest.” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 324.10}

**“The ‘New Law’ Examined” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have been somewhat interested in reading a list of “The Ten Commandments of the New Testament,” as given by one who believes, or professes to believe, that the ten commandments as given upon Sinai were abolished at the cross. We have known quite a number who hold similar views, and as the idea is becoming quite prevalent that the standard of righteousness that existed in Old Testament time has been superseded by a New Testament law, we will give the so-called new law, and examine it somewhat in detail. But first, we will state that the one who gave the list which we quote below, prefaced it with a statement to the effect that Jesus is the lawgiver of the new dispensation, and that the commandments which followed are “the commands given by Jesus.” Here is the list:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.1}

“1. ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.’ Matthew 4:10, and Luke 4:8. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.2}

“2. Little children, keep yourselves from idols.’ 1 John 5:11; Acts 15:20-29; 21:25; Revelation 9:20. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.3}

“3. ‘But above all things, my brethren, swear not neither by Heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath.’ James 5:12; Matthew 5:33-36. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.4}

“4. The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is not in the New Testament. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.5}

“5. ‘Honor thy father and thy mother; he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.’ Matthew 15:4; 19:19; Ephesians 6:1. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.6}

“6. ‘Whoso hateth his brother is a murderer.’ 1 John 3:15; ‘Thou shalt do no murder.’ Matthew 19:18; Mark 10:19; Romans 13:9; Ephesians 5:5; Revelation 21:8. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.7}

“7. Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.’ Matthew 5:28. ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery.’ Matthew 19:18; Mark 10:19; Romans 13:9; Ephesians 5:5; Revelation 21:8. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.8}

“8. ‘Thou shalt not steal.’ Matthew 19:28; Mark 10:19; Ephesians 4:28. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.9}

“9. ‘Thou shalt not bear false witness.’ Matthew 19:18; Mark 10:19. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.10}

“10. ‘Thou shalt not covet.” Romans 13:9; Ephesians 5:5; 1 Timothy 6:10. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.11}

**THE NEW COMMANDMENT**

“‘A new commandment I write unto you.’” 1 John 2:8. “And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God, love his brother also.” 1 John 4:21.” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.12}

Let us examine this list, which is said to constitute the commandments of Jesus, and to take the place of the ten commandments as given upon Sinai: Of the nine quotations, only six of them were made by Jesus. The other three are from the writings of the apostles. So the writer would have, not one lawgiver, but many. Of those that were spoken by the Lord, we note the following points:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.13}

The first one was spoken to Satan, at the very beginning of Christ’s ministry, more than three years before the crucifixion, the time when it is claimed that the ten commandments were abolished. Then if this were a reenactment of the law, we should have the anomaly of a law reenacted three years before it was abolished! But again: Jesus prefaced the statement with the words, “It is written.” He was quoting from the law as recorded in the Old Testament. Then the alleged New Testament commandment is identical with the Old Testament commandment; and consequently, if it were true that the old law was abolished at the cross, we should now have no commandment against worshiping false gods. Wouldn’t it be better for us as Christians to admit that there is still a law requiring all men to worship the Creator of the heavens and the earth? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.14}

The one quoted as the second is from the writings of John, about sixty years after the crucifixion. Therefore if the old law was abolished at the cross, there was a period of sixty years in which it was not sinful to worship idols, because there was no law against it. We trust that few would have the hardihood to declare that such was the case. As a matter of fact, neither the second commandment nor its equivalent appears in the New Testament. The reference in what is given above as the second commandment, is to the first. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.15}

The same thing may be said of the third as is said of what is called the second in the new series. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.16}

The one which is called the fifth was quoted by the Saviour directly from the law as given upon Sinai, together with the announcement of the penalty, which immediately followed; and when Christ uttered it, he showed that he was quoting from the law, by saying, “God commanded, saying,” etc. Again, the fact that the death penalty is not now inflicted for Sabbath-breaking, is often urged as showing that the Sabbath commandment is not binding. But here we have a commandment of the old law, death penalty and all, made a part of the new law. Shall we stone disobedient children? Notice, as in the case of the first, that if the law of Sinai were abolished at the cross, then this one must have gone too, for it is the very same. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.17}

The commandments which are given in the above list as the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth, of the “ten commandments of the New Testament,” were quoted by the Lord direct from the ten commandment law of Sinai. Of these, as of the others, it must be said that if the old law was abolished at the cross, they went too, for they do not simply correspond to the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments of the law, but they are the identical commandments of the law. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.18}

The one given as the tenth was never spoken by Christ, so far as the New Testament record informs us. Paul quotes it about thirty years after the crucifixion, directly from the law as recorded in Exodus, and gives it as a quotation. But if it be held that that law was done away at the cross, and that this was the enunciation of a new commandment, then there must have been a period of thirty years when there was no commandment forbidding coveting. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.19}

The result of our examination is that if it were true that the law given on Sinai was abolished at the cross, and if the above is the law that was given to take its place, then we would have at most only three commandments, since six of the new list were unfortunately given so long before the first were abolished that they were swept away with them! And the three that we have came stringing along at varying intervals during a period of sixty years! Is it not a shame that men will charge the Lord with such folly? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.20}

But what of the new commandment? Why, John says that it is the commandment which we “had from the beginning.” 1 John 2:7; 3:11; 2 John 5. It is simply the summing up of the last six commandments of the Decalogue; for all the law pertaining to our duty to our fellow-men is fulfilled in this, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” And this commandment, together with the six of which it is the sum, has existed among men, in written form, ever since the days of Moses. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.21}

What was the use of printing this list of so-called New Testament commandments, and noting each one? That people might see what pitiable work men make when they tamper with God’s immutable law. The conclusion all must arrive at, is that unless the original law is binding as spoken from Sinai, then we have no law to guide us. And in that case we would have nothing to judge us, there would be no sin, for sin is the transgression of the law, and there would be no gospel, for the gospel is God’s remedy for sin. But this is not the case. The very effort to construct some other law besides the one which God himself gave, only serves to bring into greater prominence the fact that “all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.” Psalm 111:7, 8. They are the foundation-stones of the throne of God,-the basis of his Government-and instead of vainly seeking with puny hands to overturn them, men would better yield cheerful obedience to them lest when it is too late they are forced to cry for the mountains to hide them from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne. W. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 326.22}

**“The True Israel” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

The throne of David is the only throne promised to Christ; therefore the dominion, the receiving of which is described in Daniel 7:13, 14, must be the kingdom of Israel. It was declared that his everlasting dominion should be over the house of Jacob, yet the prophet, after telling of the destruction of earthly monarchies, says: “And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.” Daniel 7:27. Therefore it must be that all the saints of God will constitute the people of Israel, over whom Christ shall reign. This truth has been referred to before, but now more extended positive Scripture proof is in order. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.1}

1. The promise is: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Revelation 3:21. Now the word “Israel” signifies, “a prince of God,” or “one who prevails.” It was given to Jacob after he had wrestled all night with the angel, and had gained the victory. The Lord said to him: “Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.” Genesis 32:28. Therefore an overcomer is an Israelite; and the promise is that to those who are Israelites Christ will grant to sit with him on his throne. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.2}

2. The natural descendants of Abraham were never considered as the true Israel, and heirs according to the promise, unless they were, like him, righteous. When Christ told the Jews that if they believed in him they should know the truth and the truth should make them free, they replied, “We be Abraham’s seed, and were never in bondage to any man.” John 8:33. But Jesus showed them that they were in a worse bondage than any human slavery, namely, the bondage of sin (verse 34); and to their repeated statements that they were the children of Abraham, he replied: “If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God; this did not Abraham.” “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.” Verses 39, 40, 44. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.3}

In like manner, also, John the Baptist told the wicked Pharisees and Sadducees not to flatter themselves that they were the children of Abraham, because God was able of the very stones to raise up children unto Abraham (Matthew 3:7-9), plainly implying that sooner than fulfill the promise to such unworthy descendants as they were, God would raise up children unto Abraham, out of the stones. That this was not a new idea, is evident from the fact that even in the wilderness, from the very time that the promise was renewed to the Jews, at the exode, the stubborn Jew who refused to humble himself before God, and confess his sin, on the day of atonement, was cut off from among his people (Leviticus 23:28, 29), while a stranger was at any time permitted to identify himself with Israel by circumcision. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.4}

Circumcision was the mark of Jewish citizenship. The man who was circumcised was known to be an Israelite; yet, as has been stated, this rite was administered to foreigners, after which they were considered the same as those that were born of Jewish parents, thus showing that the natural descendants of Abraham did not comprise all Israel. More than this, we have evidence to show that the Lord never regarded the outward mark of circumcision, whether in the person of a native Jew, or a foreigner, as evidence that that individual was really an heir of Abraham. In Romans 4:8-11 we learn what circumcision implied:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.5}

“Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.6}

Abraham received circumcision as a sign that he had obtained “the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.” Circumcision was, therefore, a sign of righteousness. If a person was circumcised, but was not righteous, he was no more a child of Abraham than any other man; and whoever was righteous, like Abraham, was really his child. So Abraham was the father of all that believed, whether circumcised or uncircumcised. That outward circumcision did not make an Israelite, unless a man was righteous, is plainly declared by Paul in Romans 2:25-29:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.7}

“For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.8}

This was true, not simply when the apostle wrote, but from the beginning of the history of the Jewish nation. When the Lord gave laws to his people, from Mount Sinai, he said that if they disobeyed him he would bring desolation upon their land, and they should perish among the heathen; but,- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.9}

“If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me; and that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land.” Leviticus 26:40-42. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.10}

And so it was in the days of Moses, as well as in the days of Christ, that “an Israelite indeed,” was one in whom was “no guile.” John 1:47. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.11}

In the eleventh of Romans the apostle very forcibly illustrates the way in which the promises to Israel could be fulfilled, even though all the literal descendants of Jacob should forfeit their right to the inheritance. In the first and second verses he declares that God has not cast away his people. This might lead us to suppose that literal Israel are yet the chosen people of God, if he did not say in verse 5 that those that remain are “according to the election of grace.” Then he represents Israel by an olive tree. Some of the branches have been cut off, and the Gentiles, a wild olive tree, have been grafted in. This grafting is contrary to nature, for the grafts partake of the root and fatness of the tame olive tree into which they are grafted, and bear the same kind of fruit. He warns those who are thus grafted in not to boast, since they stand only by faith, and that as the natural branches were broken off because of unbelief, so they may likewise be removed. The Jews, the natural branches, may become part of the tree, but if they do, it will not be as original branches, but as spiritual grafts. Thus the people of Israel are only a spiritual people,-those who are Christ’s,-“and so all Israel shall be saved.” W. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 327.12}

**“Learning by Obedience” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

After the plain truth of the Scripture has been set forth concerning the Sabbath, the nature of man and his dependence upon Christ for life both here and hereafter, the coming of the Lord, and kindred subjects, it is very common to hear someone talk something like this: “That seems very clear; but there’s one objection that bothers me; and until it is answered I cannot think of accepting the doctrine that you have been expounding. Now while it is perfectly proper to seek to have everything made plain, such a position as that noted above is not consistent. It is likened to the infidel assertion, “I will not believe anything that I cannot fully understand.” When a person takes that position he effectually cuts himself off from really understanding anything. Very often the acceptance of a thing which we do not fully understand, is necessary to a full understanding of it. the child who should refuse to accept any principle in mathematics until he could understand reason for it, would never advance to the higher mathematics in which the earlier principles are rightly demonstrated. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 328.1}

Many things which when we were children we look upon trust, we find ourselves able to fully analyze as our minds become mature. And so it is in matters of religion. It is utterly impossible that we should understand all the truth of God at once. If we accept as much as we can see, the way till be prepared for greater light to come to us. “The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith.” And when we arrive at a state of more mature spiritual judgment, we shall find that what we thought were objections are not objections at all. There were many people to whom the whole matter was perfectly clear, even while it seemed to us an insuperable objection; but it was an objection to us because of our own ignorance, and because of our immature judgments in spiritual things they could not explain it to us. The Christian must grow in knowledge, and this presupposes the fact that he doesn’t know everything when he first starts out. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 328.2}

**“The Commentary. Moses Sent to Egypt” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON 24.—SABBATH, JUNE 16**

1. When Moses went out the first time to deliver Israel, by slaying the Egyptians, what did he manifest?-*Pride and self-sufficiency*. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.1}

2. What must we conclude was his idea of the way deliverance would come?-*That the people would rally around him, and that under his military guidance they would fight their way out of bondage*. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.2}

3. In that case who alone would have received the glory? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.3}

4. What was God’s design? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.4}

“And I, behold, I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians, and they shall follow them: and I will get me honour upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen. And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord, when I have gotten me honor upon Pharaoh, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen.” Exodus 14:17, 18. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.5}

5. While Moses was keeping sheep in the wilderness, what did he learn? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.6}

“Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.” Numbers 12:3. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.7}

6. When he went with the Lord’s commission, how was he regarded? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.8}

“And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants, and in the sight of the people.” Exodus 11:3. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.9}

7. How did the Lord appear to Moses, when he would send him to Egypt? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.10}

“And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I.” Exodus 3:2-4. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.11}

8. When Moses went to see the burning bush, what was said to him? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.12}

“And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I. And he said, Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.” Verses 4, 5. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.13}

9. Who was it speaking form the bush? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.14}

“Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.” Verse 6. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.15}

10. What other instances can you name where people were required to put off their shoes on account of the presence of God? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.16}

11. What did the Lord say he had seen and heard? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.17}

“And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows.” Verse 7. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.18}

“I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people which is in Egypt, and I have heard their groaning, and am come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt.” Acts 7:34. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.19}

12. What did he say he now proposed to do? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.20}

“And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites. Now therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me; and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them. Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt.” Exodus 3:8-10. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.21}

13. How eager was Moses now to go? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.22}

“And Moses said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?” Verse 11. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.23}

14. What did the Lord say? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.24}

“And he said, Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain.” Verse 12. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.25}

15. What question did Moses ask? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.26}

“And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?” Verse 13. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.27}

16. What did the Lord reply? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.28}

“And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.” Verse 14. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.29}

17. What did God say of this name? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.30}

“And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.” Verse 15. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.31}

18. What is its meaning?-*It means “the One who is,” that is, the self-existent One, thus expressing the distinguishing characteristic of God*. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.32}

19. What objection did Moses still interpose? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.33}

“And Moses answered and said, But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee.” Exodus 4:1. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.34}

20. What three signs did the Lord give him by which he might prove that he had a divine commission? Verses 2-9. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.35}

21. Was Moses ready to go then? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.36}

“And Moses said unto the Lord, O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant; but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue.” Verse 10. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.37}

22. What reply did the Lord make! {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.38}

“And the Lord said unto him, Who hath made man’s mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I the Lord? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say.” Verses 11, 12. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.39}

23. What did Moses still say? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.40}

“And he said, O my Lord, send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send.” Verse 13. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.41}

24. How did the Lord regard this continued refusal? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.42}

“And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses.” Verse 14, first clause. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.43}

25. What help did he provide for Moses? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.44}

“And he said, Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well. And also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee; and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart.” Verse 14, last clause. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.45}

26. Who did he say should instruct them both? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.46}

“And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth; and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God.” Verses 15, 16. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.47}

27. What confidence may the Lord’s servants have in this age as they go to preach the gospel? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.48}

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Matthew 28:18-20. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.49}

**NOTES**

Some people confuse meekness with weakness. They suppose that a meek person must be what is popularly known as “soft,” and so they have a mild contempt for meekness. But Moses, whose very name has become a synonym for meekness, was not a milk-and-water man. Brought up in the Egyptian court, he was “mighty in words and in deeds.” His summary punishment of the Egyptian who was striving with a Hebrew, shows the impulsiveness of his nature. His firmness and fearlessness were shown when he stood up in defense of the daughters of Jethro, against the ruffianly shepherds. When he finally went before Pharaoh to demand the release of the Israelites, he showed intrepidity. Indeed, all through his life he showed a firmness that is rarely seen. He possessed a strong character, yet he was meek. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.50}

When God sent Moses back to Egypt, he gave him the best commission that was every given to man. “This shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM sent me unto you.” God made himself known as the self-existent one-the living God. He is the living God, in contradistinction from all other gods of every kind. He has “life in himself,” he is the Author of life. The title, “I AM” comprises all that may be said of God, for that he is the Creator of all things is necessarily conveyed in the idea that he alone lives by his own power. The possession of life, inherent life, marks Deity. The man who claims to have life in himself, whether he has faith in Christ or not, actually claims to be God. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.51}

On the changing of the rod into a serpent, “Speaker’s Commentary” says:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.52}

“This miracle had a meaning which Moses could not mistake. The serpent was probably the basilisk or Uracus, the Cobra. See Tretram, Nat. His., p. 271. This was the symbol of royal and divine power on the diadem of every Pharaoh. It was a poisonous snake, as is shown by the flight of Moses, and by most passages in which the same word occurs, *sehash*, derived from hissing. This snake never attacks without first inflating its neck, and then hissing; on the monuments it is always represented with its neck enormously swollen. The conversion of the rod was not merely a portent, it was a sign, at once a pledge and representation of victory over the king and gods of Egypt.” W. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 330.53}

**“The Sabbath and the Resurrection” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

“In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week,” etc., Matthew 28:1. Here we have New Testament testimony upon the subject of what day should be called the Sabbath. It is the day that immediately precedes the first day of the week, therefore the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week. This is just what the commandment says: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” And Luke, in speaking of the Sabbath day which immediately preceded that first day of the week in which Christ arose from the tomb, says that the women “rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment.” Luke 23:56. This item alone should be sufficient to firmly establish anyone who may be wavering concerning the Sabbath in the New Testament. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 331.1}

But some may say that this Sabbath was past before the resurrection, and that the change in the day could not take place until Christ had risen and appeared to his disciples. We reply that the resurrection of Christ has nothing to do with the matter. The gospels were all written years after the occurrence of the events which they record, and the names which they give to things must be the names by which the Holy Spirit wishes those things to be known throughout the entire Christian age. With one accord they speak of the seventh day of the week-the day immediately preceding the first day of the week-as “the Sabbath.” The first day of the week they call simply “the first day of the week,” and nowhere in the Bible is it given any other title. Now when the Bible says that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and throughout both the Old and the New Testament it is called the Sabbath, by what authority do men give that title to the first day? How dare men take such liberties with the word of God? The Lord looks with favor only on those who tremble at his word. See Isaiah 66:1, 2. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 331.2}

Facts must outweigh conjectures; yet even in the face of the uniform testimony of Scripture, some will argue that “redemption is greater than creation.” Well, suppose for a moment that it is; what has that to do with the Sabbath? How is it possible to find any connection between the alleged fact that redemption is greater than creation, and the Sabbath day. The seventh-day Sabbath rests upon the great fact that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh, and that he afterwards blessed and sanctified that day. Now to make the redemption argument apply to the alleged change of the Sabbath, people must argue like this: “Redemption is greater than creation, therefore the Lord did not bless and sanctify the seventh day.” But says one, “That is nonsense.” Of course it is, and so it is nonsense to argue that anything in God’s plan of redemption can possibly affect the day which he himself has made holy, and commanded all men to observe. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 331.3}

But who knows that redemption is greater than creation? Has it been revealed in the Bible? No. Then what man has known the mind of the Lord so well that he could declare it? Who can fathom infinity, so as to compare two infinite works? No power less than that of an infinite God could create a world, and it required is power to redeem it. And no mind but the mind of God can ever comprehend either work. Then it well becomes poor, ignorant mortals to accept the judgments of God, as “righteous altogether,” and not try to do for him that which he has not done. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 331.4}

The idea that men can commemorate finished redemption by resting on Sunday is a wild one. In the first place is has never been commanded, and that alone is sufficient to condemn it. If it had been commanded, then we should have to observe two days, for no power can ever annul the fact that the seventh day is the sacred rest-day of the Lord. But God has not required another day of rest. The resurrection of Christ is a pledge of the final redemption of all who believe in him; but it did not mark the close of redemption. Paul says that “the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.” Romans 8:22, 23. And he also says that the possession of the Spirit is simply the pledge of our inheritance, until the purchased possession is redeemed and given to us. See Ephesians 1:13, 14. Only when the saints shall stand around the throne of God, in the kingdom of glory, can they celebrate redemption completed; and those who share that triumph will have lived not according to their own views or preferences, but “by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” W. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 331.5}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths.” Proverbs 3:5, 6. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.1}

Among the prominent men who have been elected to the office of bishop in the M. E. Church, by the General Conference now in session, are Drs. J. H. Vincent and John P. Newman. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.2}

At the Presbyterian General Assembly, now in session in Philadelphia, Dr. Howard Crosby opposed to adoption of a resolution denying church membership to liquor sellers. Dr. Crosby has doubtless given more encouragement to the liquor traffic than any other man in America. In spite of his opposition, however, the resolution was adopted with a large majority in its favor. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.3}

The members of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, have extended a unanimous call to Dr. Lyman Abbott to become permanent pastor. Dr. Abbott has been temporarily filling the position since the death of Mr. Beecher, and will accept the call. The Doctor has all of Mr. Beecher’s “liberality,” that is, conformity to infidel ideas in the interpretation of Scripture, besides some extra heresies of his own. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.4}

In the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterians, in session in Baltimore, the case of Dr. Woodrow, of Georgia, was considered. It will be remembered that charges were brought against him some time ago for teaching evolution to the students under his charge. The assembly gave a practical indorsement of the evolution theory, by sustaining Dr. Woodrow by a vote of thirty-four to nineteen. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.5}

The Oakland *Enquirer* speaks of a Spiritualist paper which was recently mentioned in these columns, as “a religious journal.” This results from too narrow a classification. It is quite customary to classify newspapers as religious and secular, but this does not cover the ground. A better classification would be religious, irreligious, and secular. To the first belongs the papers which are devoted to religion, are devoted especially to politics and the news of the day. But there is a class of papers, like the one mentioned week before last, that are devoted to denunciation of the Bible and of Bible morality, that try to show their puny hatred for God by spelling the word with a small “g,” and that exercise all the brain power that God has given them in inventing new forms of blasphemy. Such papers must be called irreligious. That which they call religion is a religion that tends to promote immorality. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.6}

One of the “Seven Modern Wonders of the World,” according to Joseph Cook, is the “establishment of a scientific supernaturalism.” In plain English, “scientific supernaturalism” is Spiritualism, and it is this which Mr. Cook lauds as a modern wonder. But he doesn’t call it by that name. Nominally he doesn’t believe in Spiritualism any more than do thousands of others who preach against it, but, like them, he believes not only in natural immortality, which is the foundation of Spiritualism, but also in spirit communication. We believe most heartily in a supernaturalism, but not a “scientific supernaturalism.” Science, as men use the term, knows nothing of the supernatural. When men try to penetrate the deep things of God by “scientific” methods, they are sure to follow that philosophy which is only “vain deceit.” Those who take their ideas of immortality and supernaturalism from the Bible alone, are safe, and none others are. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.7}

**“An Uninspired Psalm” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

It may be interesting to our readers to note the difference in tone between apocryphal and inspired Scriptures, and so we give them the following, which, with the introduction, we clipped from a recent number of the *Independent*. While it is true as to fact, the psalm has no likeness whatever to the genuine psalms of David. It simply lacks inspiration. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.8}

“From a Syriac manuscript, formerly belonging to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, but now deposited in the University Library at Cambridge, Prof. W. Wright translates the following apocryphal psalm:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.9}

**“PSALM CLI. A THANKSGIVING OF DAVID**

1. I was youngest among my brethren And a youth in my father’s house. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.10}

2. I used to feed my father’s flock, And I found a lion and a wolf, and I slew them and rent them. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.11}

3. My hands made an organ, And my fingers fashioned a harp. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.12}

4. Who will show me my Lord? He, my Lord, is become my God. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.13}

5. He sent his angel and took me away from my father’s flock, And anointed me with the oil of anointing. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.14}

6. My brethren, the fair and the tall, In them the Lord had no pleasure. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.15}

7. And I went forth to meet the Philistine, And he cursed me by his idols. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.16}

8. But I drew his sword and cut off his head And took away the reproach from the children Of Israel.’” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.17}

This sounds very much like the self-praise of the ancient Assyrian kings, but not at all like the songs in which the sweet psalmist of Israel praised God. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.18}

**“What of the Bible?” The Signs of the Times, 14, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

An investigation to ascertain whether or not a certain woman was sane, occupied the attention of one of the courts in Oakland for several days lately. It was in evidence that she was a Spiritualist, and in the course of the investigation the following question and answer passed between a lawyer and a witness who also professed faith in Spiritualism:- {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.19}

“You say you are a member of the Presbyterian Church, how can you reconcile that faith with you belief in Spiritualism?” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.20}

“I will reconcile it with the statement that one week ago our clergyman, Dr. Horton, made, that Spiritualism was the only proof that we had that we are immortal.” {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.21}

Dr. Horton is one of the most prominent Presbyterian clergymen on the coast, and is now in the East as the representative of the denomination in the General Assembly, and this utterance which is attributed to him, and which we must accept as a correct report, since it was made under oath, and by one of his friends, is truly significant. It is another indication of how the way is being prepared for Spiritualism to take possession of the churches. We do not expect that Spiritualism, under that name, will ever become much more popular than it is now; but we do expect, and have good reason to believe, that under the guise of Christianity, every principle of it will very soon be avowed by all the great religious bodies of the world. It will be the active agent in forming a union of the denominations and the union of Church and State. {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.22}

This utterance of Dr. Horton’s should give pause to those believers in the natural immortality of man who truly love and reverence the Bible. If the Bible does not teach that man now has immortality-if those who hold the theory are forced to go to Spiritualism, which repudiates the Bible, for “evidence” in its favor,-is it a safe doctrine to be held? Is it not worth while to examine this matter carefully, and bring our belief into strict harmony with the Bible? {SITI June 1, 1888, p. 336.23}

**“Judged by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 14, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

In an article concerning Seventh-day Adventists, which appeared in the *Christian Oracle* about two months ago, we noticed the following statement:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.1}

“With them, instead of being judged by the gospel, the New Testament, all men are to be judged by the tables of stone, or the ten commandments.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.2}

We quote this statement, not for the purpose of controversy, but simply as a text for a short article, that those who have fallen into the same error that the editor of the *Oracle* seems to have fallen, may recognize that the article is for them. It may be that there are very many who suppose that all who have lived since the days of Christ will be judged by the gospel. If so, they have entirely mistaken the nature of the gospel. The apostle Paul says that the gospel is “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” Romans 1:16. It is God’s means for the salvation of sinners. All must admit that if there were no sinners in the world, there would be no need of the gospel. But when we say that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation-that it is the good news of a way of salvation for sinners-we thereby assert that there was sin before there was any gospel. Now when a person is accused of sin, he must be judged by the thing which he has transgressed; and since sin existed before the gospel, it is absolutely certain that sin is not the transgression of the gospel, and therefore the sinner cannot be judged by the gospel. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.3}

This truth was stated by Christ when he was making the gospel known to Nicodemus. Said he:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.4}

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” John 3:16-18. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.5}

There is the whole thing in a nutshell. The whole world was in a lost condition. All men were doomed to destruction. But God had such love for them that he sent his Son, so that whoever would believe on him should be saved from destruction. Then the Saviour emphatically asserts that he did not come to condemn men, but to save those who were condemned already. It was not necessary that he should condemn them; on the contrary, it was absolutely necessary that he should not, if they were to have salvation; for the gospel cannot at the same time save and condemn. If men were to be judged by the gospel, then it would be the case that they are now condemned by the gospel; and in that case the gospel would be the power of God to condemnation, instead of to salvation. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.6}

The gospel brings pardon, on condition of belief in Christ. But a pardon cannot condemn. A pardon presupposes a man already condemned; it comes to free him from condemnation. Now if there were a lot of man already condemned, and under sentence of death, and a messenger should come bearing a pardon from the governor, and that pardon should also condemn them (supposing such a thing were possible), then they would indeed be in a pitiable case. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.7}

“But,” says the objector, “it is the gospel itself that condemns; we do not admit that there is anything back of the law, in this age, that condemns men, or by which they must be judged.” Surely that is spoken without thought. If there is nothing back of the gospel, then there is no need of the gospel. If men are not sinners already, then there is no chance for the gospel; for the gospel is for the purpose of saving men who are lost. See Matthew 18:11. What would be thought of a governor who should issue a pardon to a company of honest, upright citizens? It would be considered an insane freak. But if, worse still, he should say that this pardon issued to honest men was going to condemn them first, in order that it might have a chance to pardon them, he would be thought wholly insane. And if, in addition to this, these men should be brought into court, and tried by that pardon, no words could express our sense of the folly of the act. And yet men actually charge God with such folly as that, by saying that the gospel condemns men. For let it not be forgotten that men are condemned by the very same instrument that judges them. If the gospel is to be the rule of judgment, then it must condemn some people, unless everybody is to be saved. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.8}

Says Jesus, “This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.” John 3:19. Then the condemnation which men were under already, before the gospel came, was because of evil deeds, because of sin. But says the apostle John, who was the latest New Testament writer, “Sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. Then men were condemned because they were violators of the law, and it must be the law by which they are to be judged. Indeed, nobody ever heard of people being judged by anything else but by law. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.9}

We pass by some plain testimony in the Old Testament, and consider only a little in the New. The apostle Paul is very explicit. Says he: “For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” Romans 2:12, 13. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.10}

Nothing can be plainer. Those who have sinned having full knowledge of the law shall be judged by the law. If the doers of the law shall shall be justified, then it is plain that the breakers of the law shall be condemned. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.11}

The apostles James, in the second chapter of his epistle, has something to say of the law. We quote:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.12}

“If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.” James 2:8, 9. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.13}

This is a plain statement of what it is that condemns men. By a certain course of action, men are “convinced of the law as transgressors.” Then the apostle enters into a brief argument, in the course of which it appears that he is speaking of the law of ten commandments. He says:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.14}

“For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.” Verses 10, 11. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.15}

And then he adds this exhortation:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.16}

“So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.” Verse 12. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.17}

Here again we have the plain declaration that the law of ten commandments is that by which men are to be judged. Certainly anybody who believes even the New Testament, ought to be satisfied with this evidence. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.18}

One thought: If men are to be judged by the gospel, then what is going to save them? Cannot the reader see that to say that men are going to be judged by the gospel, is equivalent to saying that there must be “another gospel”? The Catholic Church has provided this, in her deification of the Virgin Mary. It teaches that Christ is the stern judge, the one who condemns, and that it is by the intercession of the Virgin Mary that he relents and allows men to be pardoned. But this is a most dangerous error, and a curse has been pronounced upon those who teach it. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.19}

There will be a time when Christ will come as a judge to execute sentence upon the ungodly; but the sentence which he will execute will be that which has been pronounced as the result of judging men’s acts by the law. Now, however, Christ is our Advocate, and those who would escape his wrath when he comes as Judge, should accept the pardon for past sins, which God so freely offers through him, and then, through continued faith in him, live so that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, even as it shone out in his spotless character. W. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.20}

**“An Alarming Proposition” The Signs of the Times, 14, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

And still they travel the road to Rome. We have frequently of late given in these columns instances of the way in which Catholicism is absorbing Protestantism, or, rather, the way in which Protestantism is plunging headlong into Catholicism, and now we have another step to record. In the *Christian at Work* of April 12, Prof. Charles A. Briggs, Lt. Lt., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, had an article which was continued in the *Christian at Work* of April 19. The article was entitled, “Is Rome an Ally, an enemy, or Both?” Starting out with the assertion that “the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches are agreed in nine-tenths or more of the contents of Christianity,” Doctor Briggs makes some statements concerning the Reformation and then says:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.21}

“We are agreed as to the essentials of Christianity. Our common faith is based on the so-called apostles’ creed, and worship on the Lord’s prayer, our morals upon the ten commandments, and the sermon on the mount. Who will venture to say that the Roman Catholic Church is not as faithful to these foundations of our common religion as Protestants? Taking our stand on the apostles’ creed, we must add to the articles of faith on which we are agreed, all the doctrinal achievements of the church for fifteen centuries, the doctrine of the unity of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the holy Trinity, original sin and human depravity, salvation by divine grace, the absolute need of the atonement of Jesus Christ. On all these great doctrines of our religion Romanism and Protestantism are one. Here we are allies, and it is our common task to proclaim these doctrines to the heathen world, and to overcome by them all forms of irreligion and infidelity in Christian lands. And differences about justification by faith, and salvation by the divine grace alone, and the authority of the church as regards the determination of the canon of Scripture, and its interpretation, ought not to prevent our cooperation and alliance in the great work of indicating and proclaiming the common faith. Our conflict over the doctrines in which we differ would be more fruitful in good results if our contest should be based upon concord and alliance in the common faith. If our contest could be narrowed to the real points of difference, and that contest could be conducted in a brave, chivalrous, and loving manner, the results would be more fruitful. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.22}

“Taking our stand upon the Lord’s prayer we observe that as to the greater part of Christian worship we are agreed. We worship God in common, in morning and evening assemblies, by prayer, songs of praise, the reading and preaching of the Scriptures, and the celebration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. All this is common. Furthermore, we take the liberty of affirming that the matter of all this worship is for the most part common in both these great bodies of Christians. I have heard sermons in Roman Catholic Churches of Europe which were more evangelical and less objectionable than many sermons I have heard in leading Protestant churches in Berlin, London, and New York. It is well known that the Protestant books of liturgy contain a considerable amount of material derived from the old mass-books, and they are all the more valuable for that. Roman Catholic baptism has many superstitions connected with it, but the essentials of baptism are there in the baptism by the minister in the name of the holy Trinity. Roman Catholic observance of the Lord’s Supper is connected with the worship of the materials of the supper under the doctrine that they are really the body and blood of the divine Lord; but who can deny that pious souls by faith really partake of the body and blood of Christ in this holy sacrament, notwithstanding the errors in which it is enveloped? If we look with eyes of Christian charity upon the Lutheran and Zwinglian views, which are regarded as serious errors by the standards of the reformed churches, and would not deny to the participants real communion with Christ, why should we deny such communion to pious Roman Catholics? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 342.23}

“In all matters of worship we are in essential concord with Roman Catholics, and we ought not to hesitate to make an alliance with them so far as possible to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath as a day of worship, and to proclaim to the world the necessity of worshiping God in his house, and of becoming members of his church by baptism, and of seeking union and communion with the Saviour by Christian worship, the study of the Scripture, and the observance of the Lord’s Supper. With this recognition of concord, Protestants can then debate with Romanists in a friendly manner, and seek to overcome their errors, remove the excessiveness they have heaped upon the simple worship in the spirit and in truth which seems to us more in accordance with the Scripture and the wishes of our Saviour. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.1}

“We should also note that in the great constituent parts of prayer, invocation, adoration, thanksgiving, confession of sin, petition, intercession, and consecration. Roman Catholic and Protestant worship are agreed, and consequently the matter of prayer is essentially the same, the differences are less than most people imagine. In Christian song the differences are still less. If our hymn-books were stripped of hymns from the ancient and medieval church, and from modern Roman Catholics, they would be bare indeed. Looking now at the sphere of morals we take our common stand on the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. As to the vast majority of all questions of morals, Romanism and Protestantism are agreed. It is true there is a great deal of immorality in the Roman Catholic Church in some countries, and we think it may be shown that as a rule Protestantism is productive of better morals than Romanism; but this, after all, is a question of more or less, and to say the least, Protestantism has little to boast of. On all these questions it is of the highest importance that the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant churches should make an alliance. Their joint efforts would have an influence upon public and private morals such as the world has not yet witnessed. We may agree to differ and debate on all questions of morals where there is discord. But when we are agreed on the vast majority of questions that come before the public it is sheer folly for us to waste our energies in antagonism, when cooperation and alliance would be productive of vast good. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.2}

“We hold, therefore, that the Roman Catholics and the Protestants ought not to hesitate to ally themselves for the maintenance and the preparation of those great principles of Christian doctrine, Christian worship, and Christian morals that they hold in common.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.3}

The proposed alliance with Rome, the necessity for which Doctor Briggs reiterates so often, is a noteworthy sign of the times, and we could not ignore it and be true to our name. The Doctor seems to base his plea for alliance quite largely upon the fact that Protestantism is about as bad as Catholicism. He says above that Protestantism has little to boast of over Roman Catholicism, in the way of morality, and elsewhere in the same article he says:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.4}

“Why should we complain of the persecutions that our ancestors suffered from Rome, when we have to lament that others of our ancestors were merciless to Roman Catholics? Roman Catholic intolerance and bigotry may be matched by Protestant intolerance and bigotry. I doubt whether God looks with any more favor upon these detestable vices in the one than in the other.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.5}

This is, no doubt, a valid reason why Protestantism and Roman Catholicism should join, for when Protestantism becomes as bad as Catholicism, we can see no necessity for maintaining a separate existence. For ourselves we think that there is yet quite a difference between the two bodies; but when a prominent professor in one of the leading theological seminaries in the land can see no difference between the Lord’s Supper as celebrated according to the divine command, and the Roman Catholic mass, and when he indorses “all the doctrinal work of the [Catholic] Church for fifteen centuries,” the point of perfect union cannot be far off. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.6}

What an array of names we now have in favor of Protestant union with Catholicism,-Doctors Hodge, Hitchcock, Schaff, Patton, Briggs, Field, etc. But who has heard or read of a Catholic priest clamoring for Catholic union with Protestantism? Nobody. Why not? Would not the Catholic Church be willing to enter into such an alliance as these Protestant doctors of divinity propose? Most certainly it would be, but the movement must all be made by the Protestants. The Catholic Church will gladly receive the Protestant churches to her bosom, or she will accept their aid in the furtherance of her peculiar schemes,-but she can afford to wait till they come of their own accord, for if they make the proposal, she can dictate the terms. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.7}

One more thought. What must we conclude will be the effect of an alliance between Protestantism and Catholicism, when we remember that one of the strongest pleas for such an alliance is not that Catholicism is as good as Protestantism-but, that Protestantism is nearly, if not quite, as bad as Catholicism? Those who know anything of Rome’s peculiarities, do not need to have an answer given them. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.8}

Some may say that we are alarmists. Indeed we are; and we think that anyone who sees such danger approaching and does not sound an alarm, deserves to suffer all the ill that may follow. Our only wish is that we might sound the alarm so loud that it would awaken the thousands who seem to be asleep, and who are in danger of being taken in the snare. W. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 343.9}

**“The Death of Adam” The Signs of the Times, 14, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

We find on our table a question concerning the death of Adam. The writer quotes God’s words, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” and thinks there is some plausibility to the objection that they were not fulfilled, and that the devil told the truth when he said, “Ye shall not surely die.” But the fact is, Adam did die, for the record says that “all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died.” Genesis 5:5. This therefore disposes of the supposition that Satan told the truth. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 344.1}

Now how about the words of the Lord? Adam did not die that day, but lived nine hundred and thirty years. Our answer is found in the words of Christ: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. To say that God ought to have put Adam to death that very day, is equivalent to saying that God had no right to provide a plan of salvation for fallen man. All must admit that God does not deny himself by offering salvation to sinners. God is just, at the same time that he is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 344.2}

Although God had announced a specific penalty for transgression, he certainly could with perfect justice remit that penalty in the case of anyone who should accept the offering which he freely provided, and which was outside the demands of the law. Moreover, if God provided such a plan, it must necessarily, in order that strict and equal justice should be done, include all men, not excepting Adam. And, still further, since such a plan was provided, the execution of the penalty must necessarily be stayed, in order to give man an opportunity to accept the offered salvation, if he wished; for it would be but mockery to devise such a plan and still execute the penalty without giving the fallen one any chance to accept it. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 344.3}

Adam had a second probation, and if, as we believe, he repented of his sin and exercised faith in Christ, he will receive eternal life when Christ comes to confer immortality; but since he was only dust, and was removed from the source of life, he necessarily, in the course of time, returned to the dust, just as God said he should. And all of his posterity being likewise of the earth earthy, have also returned to earth. Men die now simply because they are born mortal; Adam died as the direct consequence of his sin. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 344.4}

The penalty, however, whose execution was stayed, still hangs over the fallen race, and when Christ shall cease to interpose in man’s behalf, it will fall upon all who have not hidden in him. Then the folly of those whose hearts are fully set in them to do evil, because sentence is not executed speedily, will be manifested, and it will be seen that every word of God is sure. The Lord “is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” Happy are those who believe that “the long-suffering of our God is salvation,” and who accept that salvation. W. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 344.5}

**“God’s Requirement for Israel” The Signs of the Times, 14, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON 25.—SABBATH, JUNE 23**

1. Who met Moses as he was on his way to Egypt? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.1}

“And the Lord said to Aaron, Go into the wilderness to meet Moses. And he went, and met him in the mount of God, and kissed him.” Exodus 4:27. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.2}

2. What did Moses tell Aaron? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.3}

“And Moses told Aaron all the words of the Lord who had sent him, and all the signs which he had commanded him.” Verse 28. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.4}

3. When they reached Egypt, what did they do? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.5}

“And Moses and Aaron went and gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel; and Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people” Verses 29, 30. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.6}

4. How did the people receive the message, and what did they do? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.7}

“And the people believed; and when they heard that the Lord had visited the children of Israel, and that he had looked upon their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshipped.” Verse 31. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.8}

5. With what words did Moses and Aaron greet Pharaoh? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.9}

“And afterward Moses and Aaron went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.” Exodus 5:1. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.10}

6. What reply did Pharaoh make? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.11}

“And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.” Verse 2. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.12}

7. What further statement did Moses and Aaron make, showing the urgency of the case? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.13}

“And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us; let us go, we pray thee, three days’ journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto the Lord our God; lest he fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword.” Verse 3. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.14}

8. Had God told Moses to make this request? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.15}

“And they shall hearken to thy voice; and thou shalt come, thou and the elders of Israel, unto the king of Egypt, and ye shall say unto him, the Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us; and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days; journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God.” Exodus 3:18. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.16}

9. Do you think that Moses expected Pharaoh to grant this request? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.17}

“And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you go, no, not by a mighty hand.” Verse 19. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.18}

10. Then why was he directed to make it, and why did he ask that the people might be allowed to go and sacrifice, when they wanted complete deliverance? See note. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.19}

11. What did Pharaoh charge Moses and Aaron with doing? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.20}

“And the king of Egypt said unto them, Wherefore do ye, Moses and Aaron, let the people from their works? get you unto your burdens. And Pharaoh said, Behold, the people of the land now are many, and ye make them rest from their burdens.” Exodus 5:4, 5. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.21}

12. What did he say was the reason that the people wanted to go and sacrifice? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.22}

“And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, ye shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish ought thereof; for they be idle; therefore they cry, saying, Let us go and sacrifice to our God.” “But he said, Ye are idle, ye are idle; therefore ye say, Let us go and do sacrifice to the Lord.” Verses 8, 17. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.23}

13. How were their burdens increased in consequence? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.24}

“And Pharaoh commanded the same day the taskmasters of the people, and their officers, saying, Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore; let them go and gather straw for themselves.” “But he said, Ye are idle, ye are idle; therefore ye say, Let us go and do sacrifice to the Lord.” “And the officers of the children of Israel did see that they were in evil case, after it was said, Ye shall not minish ought from your bricks of your daily task.” Verses 6, 7, 17, 19. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.25}

14. After the Israelites had been delivered, what exhortation was given to them, based on their hard usage in Egypt? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.26}

“But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.” Deuteronomy 5:14, 15. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.27}

15. What were they told to remember in order that they might not be led to require their servants to work on the Sabbath? Verse 15. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.28}

16. For what purpose did God deliver them from bondage? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.29}

“And I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy firstborn.” Exodus 4:23. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.30}

“And he brought forth his people with joy, and his chosen with gladness; and gave them the lands of the heathen; and they inherited the labour of the people; that they might observe his statutes, and keep his laws. Praise ye the Lord.” Psalm 105:43-45. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.31}

17. What does this indicate?-*That they could not properly serve him in Egypt*. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.32}

18. What may we conclude from this fact, and Pharaoh’s statement to Moses and Aaron that they made the people “*rest* from their burdens,” and the exhortation in Deuteronomy 5:14, 15? {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.33}

**NOTES**

It is not in accordance with God’s plan to punish any man, no matter how wicked he may be, without warning him, and giving him a chance to repent. Therefore, although he knew that Pharaoh was so churlish and stubborn that he would not listen to reason, he did not begin to send judgments upon him at first, to force him to let Israel go, but sent a simple request instead. Thus his justice was manifested. In the demand, “Let my people go, that they may hold a fast unto me in the wilderness,” an opportunity was offered to Pharaoh to recognize the God of Israel as the true God. It was, in fact, Pharaoh’s chance for repentance. If Pharaoh had granted the simple request which Moses brought to him from the Lord, it would have indicated that he recognized the authority of God; and in that case he would have been willing to grant whatever else the Lord might demand. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 346.34}

From Exodus 4:23 and Psalm 105:43-45 we learn that the children of Israel could not serve the Lord in Egypt. In Deuteronomy 5:14, 15 we find special emphasis given to that portion of the fourth commandment requiring the man-servant and the maid-servant to rest, and the Israelite was told to remember that he had been a servant in the land of Egypt; also in Exodus 5:5 we learn that Moses and Aaron made the people “*rest* from their burdens.” From these facts we may conclude that the Sabbath was one of the things in which they could not serve the Lord in Egypt; and when Moses and Aaron came with the message of God (Exodus 4:29-31) they attempted a reform, which only increased their oppression. The Israelites were delivered that they might observe the statutes of the Lord, including the Sabbath, and this place upon them an additional obligation to keep the Sabbath strictly as well as to keep all the commandments. Compare Deuteronomy 21:17, 18. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 347.1}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 14, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

By a vote of 274 to 153, the Methodist General Conference voted to make the time limit of the pastorate five years instead of three. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.1}

Ninety per cent. of the inhabitants of the Fiji Islands are regular attendants at church. In Chicago the average attendance at church is a little over seven per cent. of the population. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.2}

This may be old, but it is worthy of being repeated several times a year:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.3}

“Is your father a Christian?” asked the new minister. “No;” replied the boy, “he sings in the choir.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.4}

From the actions of a great many people who sing in choirs, one might naturally conclude that singing in the choir and being a Christian are necessarily two different things. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.5}

This is how a lady describes the “sermon” of one who was once a professed minister of the gospel but who is not an “apostle of humanity:”- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.6}

“He preached just as I expected him to. We went asking for bread, and he gave us-not a stone-no, it was not ‘hefty’ enough-but, sawdust. It was about the ‘same philosophy underlying all religions,’ and how we should labor to bring all things into ‘harmony’-that is, idol worship and Buddhism and Christianity. ‘An idol is not a god, it is merely a word to express their idea of God,’ etc. I could hardly sit in my sea. I just ached to get up in the pulpit when he had done, and say the first and second commandments.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.7}

We can heartily second every of the following from the *Advance;* we felt much the same way when we received the circular:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.8}

“We have received an invitation to the ‘Virginia Agricultural, Mechanical, and Tobacco Exposition,’ in Richmond, June 10. On many accounts we would exceedingly like to be present and see what the New Old South is doing; but as for the tobacco exposition, we see every day such an ‘enormous display’ of it, from the poisoned little cigarette between the livid lips of the ragged, unkempt, scrawny, pinch-faced, prematurely old little boy of the street, up to the bigger fellow who has no better manners than to puff is smoke in the most crowded thoroughfares right into the faces of others, that we are not anxious to witness any further ‘tobacco exposition.’” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.9}

The following item is significant. It indicates that when the Sunday-law advocates shall have gathered enough strength to put into execution their pet scheme of a national Sabbath, there will be none to stand in opposition to it except those whose faith in Jesus leads them to yield reverent obedience to all the commandments of God. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.10}

“The leading progressive Hebrews in this country are coming more and more to favor the substituting of Sunday in the place of their Sabbath, which comes on Saturday. Dr. Hirsch, of the Temple Sinai in Chicago, declares that he prefers preaching to men on Sunday, rather than to a handful of women on Saturday. He is said to have discarded his Saturday services altogether. The leading Hebrew congregations of New York have also added a Sunday service to their former Sunday-school.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.11}

“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.” Psalm 33:6. By the word of the Lord the earth which he had created, “being overflowed with water, perished.” 2 Peter 3:6; Genesis 6:5. And by the same word the heavens and the earth which are now, are “reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.” 2 Peter 3:7. As surely as God once destroyed the earth by a flood, so surely will he again destroy it by fire. Yea, just as surely as the earth now exists, will it be destroyed, because the same word which brought it into existence has decreed its destruction. Let no one therefore say that “all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation,” nor imagine that the world will stand forever, simply because *he* doesn’t see any prospects of its destruction. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.12}

Says the beloved disciple, “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” 1 John 2:1, 2. The things which John wrote in order that we should not sin, are that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, if we but confess and forsake our sins. There is not and cannot be any stronger incentive to put away sin, than the knowledge of the infinite love of God in the sacrifice which he has provided for sinners. The knowledge of the free gift of God by grace, instead of leading to looseness, makes sin abhorrent. Yet God does not cast men off even if after coming to the knowledge of the truth, they fall into sin. He is still the propitiation for our sins, as well as for the sins of the whole world. What a wonderful love is the love of God! {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.13}

In their earnest advocacy of the Sunday plank of their platform, some of the California Prohibitionists seem almost to have forgotten what has hitherto been supposed to be the chief aim of their party, namely, prohibition of the liquor traffic. It seems that when a man or a party gets its eye upon Sunday, that “venerable day” eclipses everything else, and the preservation of the “American sabbath” becomes the all-important thing. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.14}

Sabbath observance is a good thing, a very good thing indeed; but enforced rest on Sunday, or for that matter on any other day, is not Sabbath observance; and when it is secured at the expense of the consciences of thousands who devoutly observe another day according to the commandment of God, it is a positive evil. Sabbath-keeping is an act of worship, and as such, to be of any value must be voluntary, and can, of course, be only on the day that God sanctified. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.15}

At the Women’s National Council, recently held in Washington, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton made a speech in which she made known the animus of the so-called woman’s rights movement in the following words:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.16}

“The time is not far distant when, if men do not do justice to women, the women will strike hands with labor, with Socialists, with Anarchists, and you will have the scenes of the revolution of France acted over again in this republic.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.17}

Like most of the Anarchists, Mrs. Stanton is a rampant infidel of the Ingersoll stamp, and it doesn’t augur well for the welfare of the country when the movement which she champions shall succeed, that none of the Christian women who are associated with her, disavow the sentiments which she uttered. We make no further comment than to say that such language from one who was actually suffering a grievous wrong, would show its user to be thoroughly unfit to take any active part in a free Government. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.18}

In an article in *Our Day*, on “Woman as Preacher,” Miss Willard says:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.19}

“We stand once more at the parting of the roads; shall the bold, resolute men among our clergy win the day, and give ordination to women, or shall women take this matter into their own hands? Fondly do women hope, and earnestly do women pray, that the churches they love may not drive them to this extremity.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.20}

Professor Townsend, of New York, a prominent Methodist clergyman, advises women to knock only once more at the doors of the General Conference, and, if their signals are against disregarded, never to knock again, but to take the matter into their own hands. The New York *Christian Advocate* says concerning this thing:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.21}

“Professor Townsend uses bold words. The church will be amazed at them. Our Methodist readers will naturally begin to inquire, ‘Whereunto will the thing grow?’” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.22}

And well they may make such inquiry. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.23}

When the matter of keeping Sunday is under discussion we hear a great deal about apostolic example. Not that the apostles ever kept a Sunday, but it pleases the people to imagine that they did because *if* they did then there is strong presumptive evidence that we ought to keep Sunday too. But the following statements by the *Christ Union*, with which in the main very few people will disagree, shows that apostolic example has actually no weight whatever with the people who say so much about it:- {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.24}

“In the apostolic church baptism was church baptism was almost certainly not administered by sprinkling, probably by immersion, perhaps coupled with pouring, possibly by complete submersion.... Whether infants are proper subjects for baptism is a more serious question. There is no adequate reason to suppose that they were baptized in the primitive church, in that church baptism was a symbol accompanying personal confession of Christ.” {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.25}

And yet they sprinkle instead of baptizing, and sprinkle infants too, which shows that while most follow a wholly imaginary apostolic example in a matter which they are inclined to, they will pay no heed to the most obvious apostolic example in a matter which they have no mind to. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.26}

The law of God is the law of love. Said Moses, when rehearsing the law in the hearing of the people: “Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.” Deuteronomy 6:4, 5. And in like manner the great Lawgiver had himself summed up the second table of the law saying: “Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; I am the Lord.” Leviticus 19:18. So, too, when one asked the Saviour: “Which is the great commandment in the law?” Jesus answered him not by giving a new law, not even by presenting the old law in a new form, but by simply quoting these precepts from the Old Testament. And Paul testifies: “He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law;” “for love is the fulfilling of the law.” That is, he who loves is neighbor as he does himself, has fulfilled the law; for before anyone can have such love he must love God with all his heart, and in loving God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself he fears God and keeps his commandments which is the whole duty of man. Ecclesiastes 12:13. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.27}

At a conference of Baptist, Congregational, and Methodist clergymen in South Framingham, Mass., week before last, it was voted to organize an Evangelical Alliance. {SITI June 8, 1888, p. 358.28}

**“Our Position Defined” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

A man in Kankakee, Ill., writes to us that he has read everything in the line of Adventist literature, including the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and says in regard to this paper: “I find three prominent features in your doctrine, but no clear proof to sustain them in the Scriptures. They are, salvation by keeping Saturday, unconscious state of the dead, and future probation.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.29}

We confess to a feeling of discouragement at the thought that there are probably very many people who read with as little thought or attention as this man does. Two of the three “prominent features” which he professes to find in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, are and ever have been most persistently combated in it. We are not at all surprised that a man cannot find any Scripture authority for the unconscious state of the dead, when he reads with so little care as to suppose that we hold to the doctrine of future probation or teach that men are to be saved by keeping Saturday. Perhaps a few plain words as to just what we do and do not believe on the points which our correspondent mentions, may serve to clear up the matter in the minds of others. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.30}

1. We believe that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, is the Sabbath of the Lord. We so believe, because the Lord himself has said so. “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Exodus 20:9, 10. When we have so explicit a declaration as that, our belief amounts to positive knowledge. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.31}

2. We believe that it is the duty of every man, woman, and child to keep this Sabbath of the Lord. Why? Because its observance is enjoined by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, which was spoken by Jehovah from Mount Sinai, in words which shook the earth. Of this law the psalmist says that all of its precepts “stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness.” Psalm 111:8. And Christ himself declared that “it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.32}

3. These statements grow out of the very nature of the law. It is not an arbitrary thing that the commandments of God have been so unalterably fixed; they cannot be otherwise, because they are the expression of the righteous character and will of God. Says God, speaking through his prophet: “Life up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished.” Isaiah 51:6. And then, fixing beyond all possibility of mistake what the Lord means by *his righteousness*, he adds: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is *my law*.” Verse 7. Thus we learn that the law of God is his righteousness; it is a transcript of his character. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.33}

That the law of God is his will is shown by the psalmist, who, speaking prophetically in behalf of Christ, said: “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:8. And Paul said that the Jew knew the will of God, because he was instructed out of the law. Romans 2:18. Now since God is one and unchangeable, it follows that if the Jew could find the will of God in his law, everybody else can, and that that will cannot be found anywhere else. It is from this fact that we know that everybody is in duty bound to keep the law of God, because all are under obligation to do God’s will. And since the fourth commandment is a part of God’s will, it follows that everybody is under obligation to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, which is the seventh day of the week. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.34}

4. But we do not therefore conclude that salvation comes through the keeping of Saturday. The fourth commandment is only one of ten, every one of which is of equal importance. Take the sixth commandment, for instance. None of the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES will object to the statement that it is wrong for a man to take the life of another. Indeed, we apprehend that they will all take as strong ground on that subject as we do. There is not a church in the land whose doors would be open to receive a red-handed, unrepentant murderer. All will agree that such a person could not enter Heaven. But do they therefore believe that if a man does not kill another he is sure of Heaven? that salvation comes through abstaining from murder? Not by any means; and they would be exceedingly indignant if anyone should make such a charge. They teach that a man must abstain from murder, stealing, lying, swearing, etc., but that this alone will not save his soul. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.35}

We believe and teach that the ten commandments, including the Sabbath commandment, are the rule of life. But we also believe and teach that all men are sinners, that no man can do anything to take away his sin, and that this can be done by the blood of Christ alone. We teach also, what we find plainly revealed in the Bible, that “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth” (Romans 10:4); that “the just shall live by faith” (Habakkuk 2:4; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38); and that “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” Romans 14:23. This means that without faith in Christ no one can render acceptable service to God; that without Christ we can do nothing; that our utmost exertions would not of themselves gain salvation for us, but that we must be clothed with the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ. Without faith in Christ, no man can even keep the Sabbath as it must be kept in order to be acceptable to God. Those only will be saved whose faith reaches up to the throne where Christ sits at the right hand of God, and brings his own perfect righteousness down to round out and make perfect their own feeble efforts. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.36}

Therefore we do not teach that a man is to be saved through Sabbath-keeping any more than he can be saved through refraining from swearing. But this does not imply that we are at liberty to break the Sabbath or to swear. There is a vast difference between teaching that a man is to be saved by keeping the commandments, and teaching that he cannot be saved if he breaks the commandments. We are saved by faith in Jesus Christ; but Christ saves us *from* our sins, and not *in* them. He is not the minister of sin. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.37}

5. As to the unconscious state of the dead, we do teach that. We have no space in this article to give extended proof, but will be content for the present with one text: “Put not your trust in princes, not in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish*.” Psalm 146:3, 4. With us, one plain, unequivocal statement from the word of God is as good as a thousand. It ought to be with everybody. More on this point will be given at another time. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.38}

6. As to future probation, probation after death or after the coming of the Lord, we have only this to say, namely, that it is a doctrine devised and promulgated by the devil, for the purpose of drawing souls to perdition. There is no doctrine that is more the doctrine of the devil than this one, and of all the doctrines of devils, we believe it to be the worst. We do not except Spiritualism, because the doctrine of future probation is Spiritualism. If anybody else can find any more emphatic language in which to condemn the doctrine of probation after death, we will heartily indorse it. We trust that no one will misunderstand our position on this subject. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.39}

We might quote Scripture texts by the score in support of all the statements that we have made; but we cannot be expected to give an exhaustive treatise on theology in one short article, and this is amply long enough to let people know what we believe on these points. We shall soon give our readers more in detail the Scripture reasons why we believe concerning them as we do. W. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.40}

**“Thoughts on Psalm 63” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

“O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee; my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” Verses 1, 2. David had correct ideas of his relations to God. He says: “Thou art *my* God.” Too many imagine that God is far off from them, and that they have to make some great exertions to arouse his interest in them. They forget that God is “not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being.” They forget that God has sought us, and is anxiously waiting for us to seek him. They imagine that God is like a man,-holding off those who have done him a wrong, and refusing to be reconciled. They forget that “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8), and that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,” and that to his ministers he has committed the word of reconciliation, who in Christ’s stead beg of sinners, “Be ye reconciled to God.” 2 Corinthians 5:19, 20. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.41}

Many people remain at a distance from God, because they forget, or have never heard, that he has proclaimed himself “the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression and sin.” Exodus 34:6, 7. “The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.” Psalm 103:8. “He is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” 2 Peter 3:9. So willing is he to forgive, that when men seek him, turning from their wicked thoughts and actions, “he will multiply to pardon.” Isaiah 55:7, margin. And so abundant and efficient is his mercy toward them that fear him, that though their sins be as scarlet, “they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” Isaiah 1:18. Why will not men let the goodness of God lead them to repentance. What more could he have done than he has done? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.42}

“Early will I seek thee.” David knew that that was the time to seek the Lord. “Those that seek me early shall find me.” Is not this an indication that, if seeking the Lord is put off, he may not be found? Isaiah says: “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.” Then there will be a time when he may not be found.” “Now is the accepted time.” True, this refers to the gospel age, but it is literally true. We have known men, in this age when the gospel is preached, who could not find the Lord. They had once felt the strivings of the Spirit, but now they could feel no interest in divine things. They would acknowledge the truth of God’s word, but they were indifferent to it. *Now* is the time when the Lord may be found,-just now while you feel that the husks of sin, “the beggarly elements of the world,” are unsatisfying food. Do not stifle the slightest conviction; “quench not the Spirit.” Says Jesus: “Him that cometh to me I will in nowise cast out.” John 6:37. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.43}

But it is not sufficient to simply seek early; some start to seek the Lord, but have not a desire sufficiently to make them persevere. Said David, “My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee.” He felt that he must have God. He could not be satisfied without God. When a man feels that way, he gets what he wants. Says Christ, “Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.” Matthew 5:4. The trouble too often is, that, instead of having an intense desire and longing for righteousness, we are simply passively willing to have righteousness. We ask the Lord to help us overcome some sin, with a mental reservation that we may indulge in it now in a while. We don’t like to say, “I *hate* the sins that made thee mourn.” “Hate” seems to strong a word; we still cherish a secret love for the sin. We want (so we think) to be righteous, and yet we feel loath to part with that darling sin. That is very far from hungering and thirsting after righteousness. Such half-way desire will never result in anything except final defeat. But when the mind is fixed upon Christ; when he is to the soul “the chiefest among ten thousand,” the one “altogether lovely;” when to be like him is the one absorbing desire; when the thought of being like Christ makes “the pleasures of sin” pale into insignificance,-then will he be found. To such the promise is, {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 358.44}

“They shall be filled.” Think of that. How much righteousness does that imply? Here is the definition of “fill;” “To make full; to supply with as much as can be held or contained; to put or pour into till no more can be received; to occupy to the whole capacity of.” Now that doesn’t leave any room for anything else. When a man is “*filled* with the fruits of righteousness,” there isn’t going to be any wickedness cropping out. Such a one “keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.1}

But is such a condition possible? Let us see. Paul told the Ephesians that he prayed to God, “That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be *filled with all the fulness of God*.” Ephesians 3:16-19. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.2}

Do you know anyone who has realized the answer to that prayer? Such a thing must be possible, for Paul prayed for it, and he says that God is “able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, *according to the power that worketh in us*.” Ah! that’s the secret. There is some power working in us that is stronger than we. “That Christ may *dwell* in your hearts.” Well, Christ was unsullied by the strongest of Satan’s temptations, and if he *dwells* in our hearts, why may we not likewise repel all of Satan’s advances? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.3}

Says Paul: “I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; *yet not I*, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Galatians 2:20. No man has strength to resist the devil, but with Christ to strengthen him he can do all things. “This is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith.” 1 John 5:4. Not the victory that makes a feeble effort to overcome, and fails; but the victory that does overcome. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.4}

What has been done may be done. Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth “were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord *blameless*.” Luke 1:6. Enoch “walked with God;” and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Moreover we have the Lord’s own testimony concerning Job that he was “a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil.” It is true that there was “none like him in the earth;” but the fact that there was one such man shows that there might have been more; and if there *might* have been more, there *ought* to have been more. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.5}

Let it be remembered, however, that this is not a gift suddenly bestowed, but is the result of constant, progressive work. Says Daivd: “My soul followeth hard after thee.” Psalm 63:8. It is not enough simply to seek the Lord early, or even to hunger and thirst after him, unless it is kept up. “This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works.” Titus 3:8. Such a state of righteousness is progressive. “And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ.” Philippians 1:9, 10. “The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” Proverbs 4:18. The Christian can never arrive at a place beyond which there is nothing. Stereotyping is a thing that is not done in Christian experience. The Christian must “act in the living present,” and not think to live on past experience. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.6}

As a matter of course, walking with God produces humility. “Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him.” Habakkuk 2:4. When a man becomes satisfied with his condition, he ceases to hunger and thirst after righteousness; he ceases to follow hard after God, and consequently he becomes empty. Notwithstanding Job’s perfectness, when God revealed himself to him in an especial manner, he said: “I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself.” Job 42:5, 6. The nearer one gets to God, the greater will seem the contrast between God and himself. That time can never come. “To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” That is what David longed for. He had been at times wonderfully impressed, during the service in the sanctuary, with the power of the love of God. He had been greatly blessed. Now he wanted to see the Lord just as he had seen him in the sanctuary. He believed that a person might enjoy just as much of the blessing of God while about his daily business, as when in church. How was it with Daniel? He was prime minister of the kingdom of Babylon, with all the burden of the business of that mighty empire upon him, yet while he was in the palace, doing “the king’s business,” he received a vision from God. See Daniel 8:1, 2, 27. He did not allow business cares to separate him from God. “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.” Romans 15:4. For what purpose was it told what Daniel was doing when he had that vision, except that we might learn that it is possible to “walk with God,” and to have close communion with him, even when burdened with business cares. Daniel had learned to cast his care on the Lord. When a man has learned that, he can say, {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.7}

“Because thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee.” He can’t help praising the Lord. “Thus will I bless thee while I live; I will lift up my hands in thy name.” Yes; “they will be still praising thee.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.8}

“My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness; and my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips; when I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches. Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice.” Psalm 63:5-7. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.9}

Continual remembrance of God must result in praise and thanksgiving; and praise to God is a powerful help in overcoming. Says David: “So will I sing praise unto thy name forever, that I may daily perform my vows.” Psalm 61:8. Meditation upon God reveals his goodness, and this calls for praise; praise is but an expression of confidence in God “and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” W. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.10}

**“Significant Resolutions” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

We give the following resolution, comments, and all, just as we find it in the Chicago *Advance* of May 24:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.11}

“The millennium is coming. At a large Catholic mass-meeting held in the Nineteenth Ward of this city last Sunday afternoon the following resolution was enthusiastically adopted by a rising vote:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.12}

“‘*Resolved*, That the Catholic people of this parish and the Catholics of the entire city are of one heart and mind, and in full accord with their brethren of every religious denomination-with all decent, self-respecting, order-loving citizens-in denouncing and insisting that the whisky-shop and saloon shall not be permitted to offend public decency in front of the churches dedicated to the worship of God, nor alongside our schools to contaminate and imperil the innocence of our children. And we, moreover, believe that we have the right to claim protection from the same unwelcome intrusion in residence neighborhoods from the pest which threatens and menaces our home, peace, and property interests.’ {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.13}

“The meeting then demanded that the saloons should be closed at least during the hours of worship on Sunday, and also that the alderman of the ward should either vote to keep the saloon away from the church and school or resign. This pronounced action is largely due to the good work done by the *Tribune* in calling attention to the fact that the nineteen Catholic aldermen always vote on the side of the saloons.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.14}

Now we know just what is necessary to the ushering in of the millennium, according to the *Advance*. It is to have Catholics, unite with Protestants in “*demanding*” that the saloons shall be closed “at least during the hours of worship on Sunday.” Truly that will be a glorious millennium! It will be akin to the time in the Dark Ages when the Catholic Church had supreme control, when, as Lea in his “History of the Inquisition” so tersely puts it, “society, as long as it was orthodox and docile, was allowed to wallow in all the wickedness which depravity might suggest. The supreme object of uniformity in faith was practically attained, and the moral condition of mankind was dismissed from consideration as of no importance.” It was so in the days when the Jews made void the commandment of God by their traditions. They tithed mint, and anise, and cumin, but neglected the weightier matters of the law. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.15}

Yet in the face of such declarations as the above, people ask us to believe that the effort to enforce Sunday liquor laws is solely a temperance movement. We trust that the unprejudiced, thinking persons will not think us very obtuse if we say that we can see in it nothing whatever but a scheme to compel people to attend church for want of any other place to go. The saloon is becoming too formidable a rival of the church, and therefore it must be suppressed. It seems almost uncharitable to intimate such a thing, but they leave us no alternative; church zeal and determination to have Sunday observed at all hazards form ninety-nine one-hundredths of the so-called temperance enthusiasm to-day. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 359.16}

**“An Important Question” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

On one occasion Jesus said to the Jews, “What think ye of Christ?” This is a question that may well be addressed to every person. A great deal depends upon the answer that is given to it. The one who thinks of Christ as a mere man, has not the slightest knowledge of him. He might as well deny that there is or ever was such a person as Christ. The one who regards Christ as more than man, as one of the angels, does not know him either, since Christ has “by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they,” Hebrews 1:4. The one who regards him as one of God’s creatures to whom power was delegated as representative of God, has not yet such a knowledge of him as will make him partaker of the divine nature. But he who can say with all his heart, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” who regards him in his earthly ministry as God manifest in the flesh, has such a knowledge as will enable him with all confidence to lay hold on the hope set before him. Whoever has not this knowledge, should obtain it; and he who has it should not rest content, but should “grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 360.1}

**“The Commentary. Review and Temperance” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(June 24.-1 Corinthians 8:1-13.)**

In this lesson there are several points noted for review, only one of which we wish to notice. It is called “The Atonement on the Cross.” When we say that this is a mistaken idea, and that the atonement was not made upon the cross, some may think that the statement is almost equivalent to a denial of the Bible; but we beg then to hold their decision in reserve until they read farther. The Bible nowhere states that the atonement was made on the cross, and we think that we can very readily demonstrate that it was not then made. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.1}

In the first place we wish it to be remembered that the Jewish tabernacle and temple service was a type of Christ’s service in the real work of taking away sin. The victims that were brought to the altar and slain, could not take away sin, but were simply types of the Lamb of God, who alone can take away the sin of the world. This needs no argument, as it will be conceded by everybody. Now we ask, Was an atonement made for the sins of any man, at the time when he brought his offering to the priest, confessing his sins upon it? The answer must be, No, since the tenth day of the seventh month was the day of atonement for the whole congregation. If an atonement had been made in the case of each individual, when he confessed his sins, then there would have been no necessity for a general day of atonement. Whenever a man brought an offering, and confessed his sins, he was forgiven, but the atonement was not then made, even in figure. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.2}

We come then to the day of atonement. The sixteenth chapter of Leviticus contains a description of this event. After the high priest had made an atonement for himself, he was to take one of the two goats that had previously been selected, and proceed as follows:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.3}

“Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat; and he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.” Leviticus 16:15-17. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.4}

From these verses we learn that the atonement for the people was made *in the sanctuary* with the blood of the goat that had been slain outside the sanctuary. The atonement was not made when the victim was slain, but was made afterwards with its blood, which was taken into the sanctuary for that purpose. Now those priests served “unto the example and shadow of heavenly things” (Hebrews 8:5), and, therefore, from the figurative atonement we must be able to trace the real. In the one sacrifice of Christ, all the daily sacrifices, and the sacrifices of all the yearly atonement days, found their complete fulfillment. Christ was offered “once for all.” But since in the figure the atonement was not made when the offering was slain, but was made with his blood afterwards, so it must be in the reality. The death of the offered victim was only the preparation for the atonement; it furnished the means by which the atonement could be made; and as in the figure the blood was taken into the sanctuary, in order to make the atonement, so Christ has entered into the holy places in Heaven, with his own blood to make an atonement for his people. We cannot here go into the particulars of the atonement, but can merely show that the atonement was only begun and was not completed on the cross. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.5}

If it were true that the atonement was completed on the cross, then the doctrine of election and foreordination as taught by the ultra-Calvinists, or else universal salvation, would necessarily be true. There would be no escape from one or the other. For if the atonement were made and completed on the cross, then nothing that anybody can do can change his condition as there fixed. It must necessarily follow that those for whom the atonement was made cannot fail of salvation, and that those for whom it was not made cannot obtain salvation, no matter what course they pursue. But nobody can really believe this doctrine, no matter what his printed creed may say; and so many have gone over to the other logical extreme, namely, that everybody will be saved. We say that this is a logical conclusion from the premise that the atonement was made on the cross; for since Christ died for all, it necessarily follows that if the atonement was made when he died, all must be saved. But we need not adopt either of these conclusions. Christ died in order that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Whosoever will may come and find pardon for his sins, and have them finally blotted out. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 362.6}

The remaining portion of the lesson, which headed “Temperance,” is the eighth chapter of First Corinthians. It is rather farfetched for a temperance lesson, and in fact cannot justly be made to serve in any way as a temperance lesson; for in this chapter Paul shows the necessity of abstaining from a thing that is in itself perfectly harmless, in order to avoid injuring the conscience of some weak brother, while intoxicants should be let alone, not because some weak brother may take license from our example, but because they are in themselves injurious. They can produce nothing but harm, no matter what may be the conscience of the man who indulges in them. Since this is not primarily a temperance chapter, we shall simply make a few comments upon it of a general nature. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.1}

“Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.” To edify means to build up. So the text really means: “Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up.” There is a vast difference between being puffed up and being built up. We must not understand that the apostle means a depreciate knowledge, but that he wishes to show that knowledge alone will not amount to anything. Read what he says in 1 Corinthians 13:1, 2: “Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.” Such a person would be puffed up, and might, like a drum, make a great noise, and many people might therefore think him to be of great importance, but he would lack solidity, and be in reality nothing. From the apostle’s statements we must conclude that knowledge which does not have true charity as a basis, is a worthless thing. It serves simply to puff up, to glorify the possessor, but not to build up anything. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.2}

But charity builds up. Why? Because charity is “the bond of perfectness;” it is “the fulfilling of the law.” Our minds naturally revert to the words of Christ at the close of the sermon on the mount: “Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.” Matthew 7:24. The sermon on the mount was simply an expansion of “the law and the prophets.” Those who heed Christ’s words will keep the law, and will consequently build up a perfect character. They will have rock foundation, and the pillars of their super-structure will be the pillars of truth. It has been said that “a little learning is a dangerous thing;” as a matter of fact, any learning, little or great, is a dangerous thing, unless it is the wisdom that cometh from above which is “first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.” James 3:17. See also 1 Corinthians 13:4-6. And this is the wisdom which comes from obedience to the commandments. W. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.3}

**“Suggestions for Quarterly Review” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON 26.—SABBATH, JUNE 30**

1. Give a brief Bible description of the character of Abraham. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.4}

2. What was the foundation of Abraham’s righteousness? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.5}

3. Tell how Abraham’s faith was tested. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.6}

4. What made this such a test of his faith? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.7}

5. How did Jacob come to leave his father’s house? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.8}

6. Relate the dream which he had while on his journey. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.9}

7. What vow did he make? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.10}

8. Give proof that it is right for us to make such vows. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.11}

9. Where is this narrative recorded? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.12}

10. Relate the circumstances of Jacob’s wrestling with the angel. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.13}

11. Who was the angel? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.14}

12. What was the cause of Jacob’s importunity, and what did he receive? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.15}

13. For what purpose was this narrative recorded? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.16}

14. What led to Joseph’s being sold into Egypt? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.17}

15. How did he suffer there, and what for? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.18}

16. What subsequent position did he occupy? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.19}

17. What was the real cause of Joseph’s prosperity? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.20}

18. Show how God overruled the purposes of wicked men for good. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.21}

19. How did the Israelites come to settle in the land of Eygpt? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.22}

20. After they became very numerous, what was done to them? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.23}

21. Tell how Moses was fitted for the work of delivering the people. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.24}

22. Relate the circumstances of his call to return to Egypt to deliver Israel. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.25}

23. What was God’s special object in delivering his people? {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.26}

**NOTES**

Character is what a man is; reputation is what others say that he is. What Abraham’s reputation was among the heathen with whom he dwelt we are not informed; but we are told in so many words (Genesis 15:6) that the Lord counted him righteous; not because Abraham had never sinned, and was perfect in himself, but because of his faith. All have sinned (Romans 5:12), and Abraham was no exception to the rule, but he “believed in the Lord,” and his faith was counted “unto him for righteousness;” that is, his sins were forgiven and the righteousness of Christ was imputed to him. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.27}

Faith was the foundation of Abraham’s righteousness, as indeed it is of all righteousness. The apostle tells us (Hebrews 11:6) that without faith it is impossible to please God; but we know that God is pleased with righteousness, and with those who are righteous; therefore, without faith it is impossible to be righteous. And this is just what the Saviour meant when he said: “He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing.” John 15:5. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.28}

But these words of our Saviour suggest another thought, namely, that being merely justified for past transgressions is not enough; the man who is justified must, if he would retain his justification, abide in Christ by a living faith. This is aptly stated elsewhere by the same apostle who recorded the words of our Saviour just quoted. He says: “He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.” 1 John 2:6. There must be a growth, a development; the Christian must bring forth fruit. Paul tells us (Galatians 5:22, 23) what some of these fruits are, and in 2 Peter 1:9 we are assured that “he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.” The professed Christian who is not giving all diligence to add to his faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, may well doubt the genuineness of his faith. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.29}

Bible faith is not simply a passive belief of the declarations and promises of God, but it is an active, living principle which permeates the whole being, rules the life, and incites its possessor to action. We know that Abraham’s faith was of this character, for the Lord himself said to Isaac: “Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.” Genesis 26:5. And the apostle James says, “Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.” James 2:17. In proof of this proposition the apostle cites the case of Abraham, thus: “Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.30}

The apostle does not teach that works can by any means take the place of faith, but that real faith will work. Abraham obeyed God because he had faith; and in the very act of obedience his faith was strengthened. This is well explained by these words of the apostle John: “Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight.” 1 John 3:21, 22. It is thus that “by works was faith made perfect” in the case of “the father of the faithful.” And it is thus that faith must be perfected in each one of our cases. Faith is implicit trust in, or confidence towards, God; but if our hearts condemn us, as they certainly will if we are living in sin, we cannot have this confidence, and consequently no true faith, but, like the devils, we also will believe only to tremble. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 363.31}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is an item clipped from *America*, which ought to stop some of the glorification of high license by professed temperance reformers:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.1}

“A prominent liquor dealer of Chicago complained the other day that the license was not high enough. ‘If it were only $5,000,’ he said, ‘all the cheap shops would be closed, and the higher-class places would be benefited.’” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.2}

Strangely enough, the paragraph from which this was taken contained a plea for high license! {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.3}

Two National Political Conventions have already met, done their work, and adjourned. The Prohibitionists assembled at Indianapolis declared in favor of women’s suffrage and a Sunday law, and nominated Gen. Clinton B. Fisk, of New Jersey, for President, and John A. Brooks for Vice-President. The Democratic Convention at St. Louis nominated Grover Cleveland for President, and Judge Thurman, of Ohio, for Vice-President. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.4}

It seems that the Anti-Poverty Society is becoming an Anti-Pope Society. A few days ago Dr. McGlynn spoke to more than 1,500 people, most of whom were Catholics, on the “Pope in Irish Politics.” His denunciations of the Pope received with cheers. Not content with repeating the common saying, “All the religion you please from Rome, but no politics,” he went farther, and said that “what is true in religion comes from God, and not from Rome.” Although this is Protestant doctrine, Dr. McGlynn and his followers are a long way from being Protestants. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.5}

We are glad to see a protest in the New York *Observer* against applying the title “his Holiness” to the Pope. Is quite common to see him referred to in that manner, not only in secular journals, but also in Protestant papers. The title sometimes appears in these columns, and quotations from other journals, but we never use it. Even when we see it in our columns and quotations from others, it makes us feel as though we were guilty of sacrilege in so degrading the word “holiness.” As a representative of the power designated in the Scriptures as “that Wicked,” and “the man of sin,” “his wickedness” would be a much more appropriate title to give the Pope. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.6}

In his address to the National Reform Convention in Philadelphia, Rev. J. A. Wylie said that Sunday laws cannot be oppressive, since they bind all alike, and make no discrimination in favor of any. This he illustrated by saying:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.7}

“Like the pressure of the atmosphere of the human body, no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike. In regard to those who observe some other than the first day of the week as a day of sacred rest, the law should not prohibit this, and if their consciences require that they should observe a different day, they may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath every week.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.8}

But what becomes of his figure concerning equal pressure of the air? He must have forgotten that. So long as the air presses equally on every portion of the body, there is perfect ease; but just let one portion of the body be subjected to double pressure, and there will be a continual sense of discomfort. To one who should complain because he was subjected to double pressure, the National Reformers would say, “You ought rather to thank the man who has secured to you twice as much air as other people have.” He would doubtless fail to appreciate the kindness, and would prefer to take his air just as the Lord provided it for him, without having it tampered with by man. So long as men have Sabbath laws as God fixed them, there is no an equal pressure; but when they attempt to improve upon his plans they make trouble. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.9}

A private letter received a few days since at this office brings the welcome intelligence that Brother A. LaRue has reached Hongkong, China, in safety after a pleasant voyage of forty-two days from Honolulu, H.I. At the date of writing, May 6, Brother LaRue had not yet commenced work, having but just secured suitable room; but being well supplied with publications, and, above all, being fully imbued with the spirit of the message, he has doubtless entered upon his work long ere this. Indeed, he began his work long before he reached land, and so faithfully did he perform it that the mate of the vessel accepted the truths of the Third Angel’s Message, and is now keeping the Sabbath. May the blessings of the Lord of the harvest attend Brother LaRue in his foreign field. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.10}

At a meeting held by the common council of the city of Kankakee, Ill., May 14, the following ordinance was passed, which was approved by the mayor, May 21:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.11}

“Whoever shall, on Sunday, keep open, or permit to be kept open, his or her place of business, or shall do any work, or pursue any occupation, within said city (except as otherwise provided), shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not less than two dollars nor more than twenty-five dollars for each offense; *Provided*, that this section shall not be applicable to cases of necessity or charity, nor to hotels, eating-houses, livery stables, common carriers of passengers, or drug stores; nor to butcher shops being kept open to the hour of nine o’clock A.M. of said day.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.12}

The effort to pass a State Sunday law in Illinois failed, and whether the city ordinance would amount to anything in the face of that failure, we do not know; but it serves to show the tendency to enact iron-clad Sunday laws. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.13}

We would again call attention to the pamphlet containing the Sabbath-school lessons for the last half of this year. It is now printed, and orders can be filled to any extent as fast as received. The pamphlet contains three-fifths more matter than the one containing the lessons for the first six numbers of the year. This increase is due to the notes that have been prepared for the lessons, which the student will find a great help to him in learning the lesson. When we say that this pamphlet will be much more helpful than the other, we are sure that none who use it will fail to secure this. At least every officer and teacher ought to have one. To those who are traveling constantly, it is a necessity, for without it they could not keep track of the lesson so as to join in the recitation wherever they may be. Send in your orders to Pacific Press. Price per copy, fifteen cents. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.14}

In the *Christian Union* of May 31 there is a short editorial concerning the case of Dr. Woodrow, who has been under trial for teaching that evolution is not inconsistent with the teaching of Scripture. In that editorial occurs the following passage, which, to say the least, is peculiar, as coming from a professedly religious journal:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.15}

“One thing seems to us very clear. When we reflect that the traditional doctrine of the fall of man is directly inculcated only in two passages of Scripture, if there-the fifth chapter of Romans and the third chapter of Genesis-that the first passage is a parenthesis which is of doubtful interpretation and might be omitted entirely without interfering with the apostle’s argument, while the second is regarded by many of the ablest Hebrew scholars as a poem or allegory, is quite evident that the prosecutors of Dr. Woodrow are lifting up the doctrine of the fall into a position, which it does not occupy in Scripture, and are giving it a prominence and importance for which they can find no warrant in revelation, however they may be supported by traditional theology or ecclesiastical authority.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.16}

We can’t imagine what kind of gospel Dr. Abbott preaches; for if man never fell, he certainly doesn’t need salvation. Aside from the tendency to minimize the authority of Scripture statements, which appears in the extract, the thoughtful reader will see in it doctrine very closely allied to Spiritualism. Christianity without the doctrine of the fall, is Christianity without Christ, and that is paganism. It is the indorsement of the line by which Satan induced Eve to disobey God, telling her that instead of falling she would rise to a more exalted position. It is just such teaching as that of the *Christian Union* that is preparing the way for the almost universal adoption of Spiritualism. {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.17}

**“Good News for Pitcairn” The Signs of the Times, 14, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following is from the Philadelphia *Record* of May 23. We know that many of our readers will be interested to learn that there is so good a prospect of direct communication with the good people of Pitcairn:- {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.18}

“The clipper ship, *Josephus*, now lying at the old navy yard wharves, is bound to Pitcairn Island, the home of the descendants of the mutineers of the English ship *Bounty*. She will first proceed to San Francisco, where she will discharge the cargo now on board and take a lot of dry goods and cattle, the gifts of Captain Knowles, a retired whaler, who, while master of the ship *Wildwave*, was wrecked on one of the outlying reefs near Pitcairn, and with difficulty reach the latter Island with $26,000 in gold. This he eventually saved with the assistance of the islanders, and delivered to the owners of the ship. Recently, while on the passage to the city from California, he stopped off the island, where he was visited by twenty-five men and women, who reported that there are one hundred and fifteen souls at Pitcairn. The *Josephus* will take from this city many valuable presents, which have been donated by prominent citizens from the different parts of the United States, to be delivered by Captain Rogers to the islanders. When the *Josephus* was thirty days out from San Francisco bound toward Philadelphia the island was first seen. In a short time the vessel was boarded by the islanders. As the natives were religiously inclined, and worship on the seventh day of the week, no business was done until after six o’clock, when their Sunday ended, after which they brought on board oranges, bananas, pine-apples, and water-melons, with sufficient eggs and fowls to last the vessel to her port of destination. About one year ago the islanders adopted the doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventists, which form of worship now prevails there exclusively.” {SITI June 15, 1888, p. 368.19}

**“Spiritualism and Romanism” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

Though not generally recognized, it is nevertheless a fact that Spiritualism and Romanism are but different phases of one gigantic system of error. Both are paganism, the former pure and simple, while the latter has a slight admixture of formal Christianity. They are, however, equally antichristian, for the one absolutely denies Christ, while the other gives to the Virgin and to the “saints” the honor which belongs alone to Christ. Both are alike dependent, also, for their very existence upon the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul; and as is shown by the following quotations from the New York *Observer*, of May 10, the conscious state of the dead is alike their sole stock and trade:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 371.1}

“Spiritualism enthralls many by its claim to have communication and association with the departed loved ones. Romanism claims to relieve the sufferings of departed loved ones by masses and labors. This degradation of Christianity is not at all realized by those brought up in Protestant communions. The *Catholic Mirror*, one of the most intelligent Romanist publications in this country, has an editorial urging attention to the Pope’s encyclical which calls for a special mass for the dead on the grandest scale possible in honor of the Jubilee. It says that after death ‘we lose power to contribute to our own salvation’ and are ‘thrown upon the charity of those who are left behind;’ and this religious newspaper thus concludes: ‘It is for this reason that the church never ceases to offer a share of the merits due to every voluntary good work and prayer for the suffering souls of her children in purgatory; and it is for this reason that our Holy Father bids the faithful to unite in a special service offered up for the satisfaction of God’s justice in behalf of the departed, that they may enjoy a share of the blessings and graces so abundantly showered upon the church and the faithful at this time.’ {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 371.2}

“No Scripture-taught Christian believes that those who die in the Lord are ‘thrown upon the charity of those who are left behind.’ What a caricature of the church is that organization which teaches that good works, prayers, and money of the living, can be used as ‘the satisfaction of God’s justice’ in behalf of the dead. But this superstitious idea of helping out of suffering deceased loved ones and others, and ourselves when death has taken us away, serves to comfort many a deluded heart. Like Spiritualism, it takes advantage of strong natural instincts to secure faith in preposterous claims. It is both dangerous and degrading. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 371.3}

“For one dollar the Bishop of Montreal offers a share in the spiritual advantages of more than ten thousand masses, nearly a half million communions and ways of the cross, more than a half million rosaries. This is doubtless a very small share, but it is promised to do something at least, however small, to lessen the torments of posthumous suffering on account of sin. This gives but a faint idea of the boldness in which this matter is dealt with by the priests.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 371.4}

**“The Law of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Nation* of June 6 contains an extract from a characteristic address on National Reform, by the Rev. M. A. Gault. In that speech he professed to show that the Bible contains all the laws necessary for the government of any nation. Taking the “United States of Israel” as the “model republic,” he pointed out the making and ratification of the Constitution, the formation of “Congress,” etc. But the thing which specially interested us was this:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.1}

“The law for the keeping of the Sabbath is defined in Exodus 20:8-11.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.2}

Now since Mr. Gault was describing the model of the National Reform Government, and since he and his followers are just now actively engaged in trying to secure a “Sabbath” law as the basis of that Government, we may profitably examine the “law for the keeping of the Sabbath,” to see if they are now acting in harmony with it. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.3}

The bill which they are trying to get through Congress is designed to promote the observance of the first day of the week as a day of religious worship and rest. The day which they expect to have kept by everybody, when they establish their reformed government, which is to be a republic ruled by a king-a monster-is Sunday. But the law by which they will try all violaters of the national rest day, will be, according to Mr. Gault, the fourth commandment. That commandment reads thus:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.4}

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Exodus 20:8-11. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.5}

From the commandment itself we learn that it was not the Sabbath institution that was blessed, but *the Sabbath day*, literally, the day of the Sabbath. The commandment also declares that Sabbath is the name of the seventh day. The seventh day is the Sabbath, because that in it the Lord rested. Turning to the record of creation, to which the commandment refers, we find again that it was not merely the Sabbath as an institution, that was blessed, neither was it an indefinite Sabbath day, but *the seventh day*. “And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Genesis 2:3. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.6}

So the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the seventh day. The seventh day of what? The seventh day of the week, as a matter of course. There is no other period of time the days of which can be designated by number without naming the period. Try it, and see. Suppose you design to go to start on a journey on the seventh of August. A friend asks you when you are going, and you tell him that you will start on the seventh day. He will at once conclude that you are going to start on Saturday. If you tell him no, he will not know what you mean. The week is composed of seven days. Each of these days is designated by a certain number. In the Bible they are always named by number. To the seventh day is given the name Sabbath. Indeed, it is utterly impossible for an unprejudiced person to read the fourth commandment without saying at once that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath. The idea that “the seventh day” of the commandment refers to the seventh day from any point at which a person may choose to begin to count, is of modern date, invented as an excuse for keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.7}

If, however, more is required on this point, we have an inspired comment. Luke tells us that the day on which Christ was crucified was the preparation, the day before the Sabbath; that the women who followed to see where Jesus was buried, “returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*.” And then, very early in the morning of the first day of the week, they hastened to the sepulcher, bearing the spices which they had prepared to anoint Jesus. See Luke 23:54-57; 24:1. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.8}

Now there are but seven days in the week, so that the day before the first day of the week must be the seventh day of the week. Therefore the women rested on the *seventh day of the week*, and this was the Sabbath day “according to the commandment.” So we are sure that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. There can be no avoiding this conclusion. Any judge would decide that one who keeps the seventh day of the week has fully complied with the requirements of the law of the Sabbath, because it is a legal axiom that the words of a law must be taken in their usual and ordinary acceptation. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.9}

Therefore if the National Reformers shall take the fourth commandment as the Sabbath law for their reformed government, the only law-abiding citizens of that government will be the ones who keep the seventh day of the week. We shall carefully treasure this saying of Mr. Gault’s for future reference. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.10}

It is possible, however, that Mr. Gault and his associates will utterly ignore the plain intent of the commandment as given by the Lord, and will claim to be divinely commissioned to interpret the law, and will fall back on the seventh-part-of-time theory. If they will only be consistent in that interpretation, it is most certain that the observers of the seventh day of the week will never come in conflict with their government, for to keep the seventh day is to keep a seventh part of time. On this point there can be no question. The seventh day of the week is a seventh part of time just as much as is the first day. So, allowing that the commandment enjoins the observance of one-seventh part of time, merely, seventh-day people are still the strictest commandment-keepers, for as a general thing they keep the seventh day more strictly than others do the first day. Let this thought be fixed in mind. If the fourth commandment is taken as the law of the Sabbath in the National Reform mongrel government, and if it be held that that commandment enjoins the observance of simply one-seventh part of time, without specifying which seventh, then each man will be at liberty to decide for himself which day he will keep; and all that the officers of that government can do will be to require that everybody shall keep some day. This will be a hardship to some, but it will not affect those who observe the seventh day. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.11}

But it is possible, and most probable, that the National Reformers will want uniformity. They will not be satisfied to leave people free to do as they please in matters purely religious, for the foundation-stone of the National Reform movement is selfishness,-the idea that because the National Reform leaders believe a certain thing, everybody else must be compelled at least to act as though they believed it too. So they will decide, in accordance with the law which they are now trying to have enacted, that everybody must keep Sunday, the first day of the week. Still they will adhere to their statement that they are acting in harmony with the fourth commandment, which they have taken as their only Sabbath law. In that case seventh-day people will have a very simple line of defense. When arraigned for violating the human enactment requiring the observance of the first day of the week, they will reply that, according to their most honorable judges, the National Reformers, they have strictly complied with the law requiring them to observe Sunday. And when asked how they can make that appear, they will reply something as follows:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.12}

“You, honorable sirs, have taken the fourth commandment as the Sabbath law for this nation; you claim to be yielding strict obedience to its requirements, and we are bound to believe your statement. Yet that commandment emphatically and unequivocally designates the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, while you keep the first day of the week. We do not know by what hocus-pocus you accomplish this wonderful feat, but simply accept the fact; and we respectfully submit that if you who observe the first day of the week are keeping God’s commandment which requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, we, by the same token, have, by keeping the seventh day of the week, conformed to *your* commandment as loosely as you interpret God’s commandment, unless you set yourselves and your commandment above God and his commandment.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.13}

If there is any fault in any of this reasoning, we shall esteem it a great favor if some of our National Reform friends will point it out to us. We want them to be very explicit, and not indulge in generalities, or we may miss the point. We cannot see how they can even by any possibility convict seventh-day people of wrong-doing, if they take Exodus 20:8-11 as their national law for Sabbath observance. But we know one thing that they can do, and which they will in all probability do. They will determine that they are going to have *their* Sabbath, the first day of the week, observed any way, no matter what the fourth commandment may be thought to enjoin. And among men might is always stronger than right or reason. W. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.14}

**“An Unrighteous Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following request comes to us from an investigator in Washington Territory:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.15}

“For the benefit of one who is seeking light on the whole advent doctrine please explain through the SIGNS 1 Timothy 4:3-5. This passage seems to teach that in this dispensation all things of the animal creation-swine not excepted-are pure and good for food, if received with thanksgiving. Does not verse 5 teach that they are now sanctified by God, and that we may receive them with prayer? May not this be one of the ordinances which passed away at the cross, and since that time may not swine’s flesh be pure and good for food?” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.16}

The whole question, in the mind of our questioner, seems to turn on the matter of swine’s flesh. It is assumed that, in what is called the Christian dispensation, “all things of the animal creation are pure and good for food,”-why not say that therefore the flesh of caterpillars, lizards, snails, snakes, dogs, cats, moles, rats, crows, buzzards, vultures, etc., is good for food? If the gospel has cleansed all animals that were previously unclean, then these creatures must be just as good for food as is the swine. This statement of the case should of itself be sufficient to show the fallacy of such an exposition of the text. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.17}

The distinction between clean and unclean beasts had no connection whatever with those ceremonial ordinances which passed away at the cross. At the time of the flood, hundreds of years before there was a Jewish ordinance, or even a Jew, we read of clean and unclean beasts and birds. The clean animals were such as could be sacrificed to God (see Genesis 8:20), and therefore the distinction must have existed from the very beginning, and must have been made known to man at least as soon as the fall, when sacrifices were first offered. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.18}

The gospel deals with men, and not with the brute creation. The brutes have no promise of eternal life; they are incapable of believing and consequently the gospel makes no more change in them than it does with inanimate creation. When God shall make all things new-when upon the new earth new vegetation shall be made to grow as in the beginning-then he will send forth his Spirit and create beasts to roam upon it, subject to the dominion of man. (See Psalm 104:29, 30; Isaiah 11:6-9). Beasts will have a place upon the new earth by a new creation, and not by a resurrection of those beasts which once lived upon it; therefore the nature of beasts on this earth does not need to be changed. But all the human beings who shall dwell upon the new earth will be those who have lived upon this earth; therefore the nature of men must be changed through the gospel. An animal which was unclean in the days of Noah or Moses or David, is unclean to-day. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 374.19}

Now for a brief exposition of the text. In the first place let it be understood that no man or class of men has a right to *command* people to indulge in, or to abstain from, anything. The Catholic Church arrogates to itself the right to command people to abstain from certain things at certain times, but in so doing it assumes power that belongs only to God. No man has a right to command another to abstain even from unclean things which God has forbidden, any more than he has a right to command him to abstain from violating the Sabbath. God makes commandments, and people who do not choose to obey them are amenable to God alone. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.1}

But notice that the text speaks of those who command “to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving,” etc. This says nothing about commanding to abstain from meats originally unclean, but which the gospel has purified, for there are no such meats. The meat to which it refers are those which God created for food; it has nothing whatever to do with things which God has declared to be unfit for food. Now what did God create for food for man? Read the account. When God made man, he said: “Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.” Genesis 1:29. The word “meat” does not necessarily mean flesh, but refers to anything that is used for food; and since the *meat* which God created for man’s use was fruits and grains alone, it is highly probable that the apostle refers to some who should forbid the use of some of the most wholesome articles. The reference may, however, include also the flesh meats which man was afterward permitted to use. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.2}

The next point to be considered is when this thing shall take place. The apostle says: “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that *in the latter times* some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils,” etc. The expression, “in the latter times,” may include a very much longer time than the few years immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. “The last days” must include the very last day, but may include the greater part of the last half of the world’s history. In the Bible it is often used of the entire period between the first and the second advent. Thus we read that “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath *in these last days* spoken unto us by his Son.” Hebrews 1:1, 2. And Peter made the last days include the notable pentecost. See Acts 2:14-18. So for a fulfillment of 1 Timothy 4:1-5 we may look to any time since the days of Paul. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.3}

That there were those in the church in the days of the apostles who gave heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, is shown by the following: “Little children, it is the last time [“the latter times,” “the last days”]; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.” 1 John 2:18, 19. Paul also, after speaking of “that man of sin” who should oppose God, and exalt himself above God, claiming to be God, said, “For the mystery of iniquity doth already work.” 2 Thessalonians 2:7. Then, since the spirit of antichrist was manifested, and doctrines of devils were taught and believed, very early in the Christian era, we should expect that the forbidding to marry, and the commanding to abstain from certain proper food, would also have found at least fulfillment then. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.4}

The growth of asceticism in the church forms a most interesting study, but we can do no more here than to refer to it. Perhaps the following quotation from Mosheim will set the subject before the reader in the most comprehensive manner possible in short space:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.5}

“The cause of morality, and indeed of Christianity in general, suffered deeply by a capital error which was received in this century [the second]; an error admitted without any sinister views, but yet with great imprudence, and which, through every period of the church, even until the present time, has produced other errors without number, and multiplied the evils under which the gospel has so often groaned. Jesus Christ prescribed to all his disciples one and the same rule of life and manners. But certain Christian doctors, either through a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in consequence of a natural propensity to a life of austerity (which is a disease not uncommon in Syria, Egypt, and other Eastern provinces), were induced to maintain that Christ had established a double rule of sanctity and virtue, for two different orders of Christians. Of these rules one was ordinary, the other extraordinary; one of a lower dignity, the other more sublime; one for persons in the active scenes of life, the other for those who, in a sacred retreat, aspired to the glory of a celestial state.... They looked upon themselves as prohibited from the use of things which it was lawful for other Christians to enjoy, such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and trade. They thought it their indispensable duty to extenuate the body by watchings, abstinence, labor, and hunger. They looked for felicity in solitary retreats, in desert places, where, by severe and assiduous efforts of sublime meditation, they raised the soul above all external objects and all sensual pleasures. Both men and women imposed upon themselves the most severe tasks, the most austere discipline; all of which however the fruit of pious intention, was, in the issue, extremely detrimental to Christianity. These persons were called Ascetics.”-*Eccl. Hist., book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 11, 12* (Maclaine’s translation). {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.6}

The reader will see in this the beginning of the monk’s orders, whose threefold vow was poverty, chastity, and obedience. Some may wonder how anything harmful could come from efforts to become more spiritual; but we have only to remember that they borrowed their system from the heathen philosophers, and not from the Bible, and the query will be settled. A false idea soon attached to the word “chastity,” so that a priest might indulge in all manner of lewdness provided he abstained from marriage. Nicholas de Clemangis, a Catholic writer of the fourteenth century, and secretary to Pope Benedict XIII., gives the following picture of the monks:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.7}

“As for monks, they specially avoid all to which their vows oblige them-chastity, poverty, and obedience-and are licentious and undisciplined vagabonds. The mendicants, who pretended to make amends for the neglect of duty by the secular clergy, are Pharisees and wolves in sheep’s clothing. With incredible eagerness and infinite deceit they seek everywhere for temporal gain; they abandon themselves beyond all other men to the pleasures of the flesh, feasting and drinking, and polluting all things with their burning lusts. As for the nuns, modesty forbids a description of the nunneries, which are mere brothels; so that to take the veil is equivalent to becoming a public prostitute.”-*Lea’s History of the Inquisition, Vol. 3, chap. 9, par. 11.* {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.8}

In chapter 5, paragraph 17, of the same volume, Mr. Lea, speaking of the Order of Knights Templars, says:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.9}

“That unnatural lusts should be attributed to the Order is easily understood, for it was a prevalent vice of the middle ages, and one to which monastic communities were especially subject.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.10}

We think that sufficient has been given to show the nature of that against which the apostle gave warning. It is the same thing against which he warned the Colossians. “Which things,” he says, “have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” Colossians 2:23. As he said to Timothy, in connection with the passage which we are studying (1 Timothy 4:8), “bodily exercise profiteth little.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.11}

That the same vices that characterized the monks of the middle ages, will be common in the very last days, and to a much greater extent than ever before, we have not the slightest doubt. And they will be the outcome of what will at first seem the most innocent, nay, the most necessary, teaching. Just how this will come about we cannot now tell; but we know that Spiritualism is to get a firm hold on all who receive not the love of the truth, and, under the guise of religion, is to sink the world in the most abominable wickedness. And the very people who will commit those abominations, will say, “Is not the Lord among us?” W. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 375.12}

**“Papal Assumption” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the 11th inst. the “Most Rev.” Dr. Dwyer, bishop of Limerick, delivered an address to the clergy of his diocese, in which he said some things that are quite interesting, as showing how the Catholics look to the Pope instead of to God. The report says:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.1}

“He urged that by the Papal decree the practices of boycotting and plan of campaign as they exist in Ireland stand condemned as a violation of the moral law of charity and justice. ‘This,’ he added, ‘is no longer a matter of opinion. It is now the settled and certain law of the Catholic Church, which all the faithful of this diocese are bound to take from me as their bishop, that these practices are sinful, and it is even more sinful as being against faith to defy or impugn, under any pretext, the right of the Pope to condemn them.’” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.2}

There can be no question but that boycotting is a violation of the moral law, but it is no more so now than it was before the Pope issued his decree. None of these priests had a word to say against it before, however; they did not know that it was immoral until the Pope said so. This is not a very flattering testimony to their moral sense, for any child who ever read the Sermon on the Mount could have told them that boycotting is a sin. But what is the use of one’s having moral sense, when he can go to the Pope to find out what is right? {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.3}

But worse than the fact of ignoring a wrong condemned by the law of God until the Pope declares it to be wrong, is the statement that to disobey the Pope is “even more sinful” than to violate the moral law. That is to say, although boycotting is a sin against the moral law, those who engage in it now are guilty of the greater sin of disobeying the Pope. Thus the Pope is exalted “above all that is called God or that is worshiped.” Could blasphemy go any further? {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.4}

After the commands of the Pope have thus been declared to be more saved than those of God, we are not surprised at the following statement made by the bishop:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.5}

“This decree of the Pope’s is final and unalterable, and you might as well expect to put back the sun in its course as to undo it.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.6}

The Lord’s decree may be set aside by the Pope, but the Pope’s decree is unalterable. Such is the decision of “good” Catholics. Yet there are many professed Protestants who feel aggrieved if it is intimated that the Papacy is not a part of Christianity. The closing words of the bishop are in keeping with the rest of the address. Still speaking of boycotting he said:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.7}

“If it is condemned by the church I will not have it, but accept the decision of our own father, Christ’s vicar, who is placed by his exalted office above the passions and self-interest that often blind us, and who has no motive in all he does but God’s honor and our salvation.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.8}

It is a mystery how a man of intelligence could have his mind and conscience so enslaved, but in this we have an evidence that education is not of itself any bar to superstition. It is a proof also of the truth of the Scripture statement. “Souls of men” form part of the merchandise of Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. See Revelation 17:18. W. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.9}

**“Charity Extraordinary” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Oregonian* tells of a certain Catholic archbishop recently visited Summerville, Oregon, to lecture-“although,” as the account runs, “there are only half a dozen Catholics there”-and who are called upon by the pastor of the Methodist Church, who tendered him the use of the Methodist house to lecture in. The offer was accepted, and that evening the archbishop addressed a large audience upon “The Value of the Human Soul.” At the close of the exercises the archbishop, “at the request of the pastor, blessed the congregation;” which to judge from the tone of the published account, was looked upon as a great condescension on the part of the archbishop. We are further told that the priest “who accompanied the archbishop, was tendered the use of the church for lectures or masses, at his pleasue.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.10}

This we regard as charity extraordinary-*not* Bible charity, for that does not require any man to countenance that which he believes to be error, but that pernicious liberality which is miscalled charity. “Charity,” says the apostle, “rejoices in the truth;” but certainly the sickly sentimentalism that would open a Christian house of worship for the senseless pagan mummery of the mass, does not rejoice in the truth, but in error. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.11}

All true Protestants hold Rome to be antichrist, and as such no Christian can bid it Godspeed without denying his Saviour. The Protestant minister who does not know that the celebration of the mass is idolatry, has much to learn before he is qualified to instruct others in the service of God; and the minister who, knowing its true nature, would deliberately throw open his church for its celebration, shows by that act that he cares very much more for the applause of men than for the honor of the truth. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 376.12}

**“The Commentary. God’s Covenant With Israel” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(July 1-Exodus 24:1-12.)**

There are many covenants mentioned in the Bible, but there are two which stand out prominent, and sustain such a relation to each other that they are called the old covenant and the new. Our lesson has to do with the old covenant, but we shall refer to the new, since both concern the same people and the same thing. The covenant is first introduced in the nineteenth chapter of Exodus, and we must study that in order properly to understand the passage covered by the lesson. The children of Israel had come into the wilderness of Sinai, and the Lord called to Moses from the mountain, saying:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 377.1}

“Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord.” Exodus 19:4-8. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 377.2}

This was really the first or old covenant. It was simply a mutual agreement between God and the people, which is all that is usually understood by a covenant. So far as the covenant itself was concerned, the people entered into it here; Exodus 24:1-8 simply records the ratification of the covenant. The reader will notice, however, in the above quotation, that although the people said, “All that the Lord hath spoken we will do,” the Lord had not yet told them anything to do, except to keep his covenant. Now ordinarily a covenant implies mutual obligation, but here we have a covenant mentioned which was the Lord’s special property, and which the children of Israel were to keep; and their promise to keep this covenant was their part of the covenant which God made with them. Thus we see that the first covenant with Israel was made concerning something else that is also called a covenant. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 377.3}

The student needs to watch closely here, lest he become confused. The simple facts are these: The “covenant” which the people were to “keep” was the ten commandments, which had not yet been given. It was not a covenant made with them, but God’s own covenant given to them. Moses refers to it as follows: “And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.” Deuteronomy 4:12, 13. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 377.4}

Let the student bear in mind these points, and he will have no difficulty: 1. The ten commandments are God’s covenant. 2. God did not make this covenant with the children of Israel, but he commanded them to do it; they were to keep it. 3. This covenant is entirely different from a covenant in the ordinary sense of the term; for there was no agreement about it; it was God’s will which he commanded the people to do. 4. Notwithstanding the fact that it was the duty of the people to keep God’s law,-his covenant which he commanded them to perform,-God made a covenant with them concerning it. Although he could rightly have required unconditional obedience of them, he condescended to enter into covenant relation with them; if they would promise on their part to keep his covenant,-the ten commandments,-as was their duty, he on his part agreed to grant them peculiar blessings. This mutual promise, this contract, was the covenant which God made with Israel. 5. Observe then that God’s covenant lay behind the covenant which he made with Israel; it was the basis of that covenant, the thing concerning which that covenant was made, but was entirely distinct from that covenant. 6. And, lastly, remember that when they entered into the covenant with God, promising to do all that the Lord commanded, they had not heard God’s covenant which he commanded them to perform. In short, they made a covenant, without knowing what it was which they were promising to do. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.1}

Three days after this the Lord spoke his law from Sinai “out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice,” which caused the earth to tremble. This was the covenant which he commanded the people to perform, and which they had already promised to keep as their part of the contract. And now that they had heard the words which they had before promised to do, it remained to be seen if they would stand by their agreement. This ratification is a part of the subject of this present lesson, and was on this wise: First, Moses repeated God’s words to the people, and all the people answered with one voice, and said, “All the words which the Lord hath said will we do.” Exodus 24:3. Then Moses wrote all the words of the Lord in a book, and built an altar, and offered sacrifices. Verses 4, 5. Next he took the book and read all the words in the hearing of the people, and again they said, “All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.” Verse 7. Finally he took the blood of the sacrifice and sprinkled both the book and the people, saying, “Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.” Verse 8; Hebrews 9:19, 20. Thus was the covenant ratified; the people had emphatically and repeatedly promised to keep God’s commandments, and he had promised to make of them a peculiar treasure to himself, above all people. This was the first covenant. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.2}

But this covenant was not kept by the people, and so one of two things was necessary: either God must cast off the people, which would have been their eternal ruin, or else a new covenant must be made. Accordingly we read:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.3}

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” Jeremiah 31:31-34. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.4}

Notice that this covenant was made with the same people that the first one was,-“with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah.” Let this fact be firmly fixed in the mind. Many people imagine that the first covenant was made with the Jews and the second with the Gentiles. But this is a great error. God never made any covenant with the Gentiles, and never gave the Gentiles any promises. Paul says that to the Israelites pertain “the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.” Romans 9:4. The Jews have everything. Then what is left for the Gentiles? Nothing whatever. Says the same apostle: “Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Ephesians 2:11, 12. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.5}

But are the Gentiles shut out from salvation. Yes, as Gentiles. So long as they remain Gentiles, which is but another term for heathen, they have no part in the things of God. Thus being reconciled to God, they are “no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God” (Ephesians 2:19), and their citizenship is in Heaven, from whence they look for the Saviour. Philippians 3:20. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.6}

Note further that the new covenant is made concerning the law of God. This time, says the Lord, “I will put my law in their hearts.” Then since the new covenant was made with the same people that the first was, and concerning the same thing, why was there any necessity for making it? Why could not they go along under the old one? Simply because the people had broken the first covenant, and there was in it no provision for any such thing. The first covenant was unconditional. The people promised to keep the commandments, and God promised to make them a peculiar treasure unto himself. This was all. It will be readily seen that when the people violated their agreement, as they did almost immediately when they worshiped the golden calf, they had no more claim on the Lord, according to the covenant which they had entered into with him. They couldn’t go on under that covenant any more, for no matter how perfectly they might abide by its terms in the future, the fact would remain that they had once broken it, and that was sufficient to forfeit all the blessings which God had promised. So, since the Lord did not wish to cast off his people, it became necessary to make “a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.” Hebrews 8:6. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.7}

What were these better promises of the new covenant? Chief among them was the forgiveness of sins. It was in the people that the first covenant was faulty for if the first covenant had not been faulty in this respect, there would have been no place for the second. There was in the first covenant no provision for forgiveness of sins. It was ratified by the blood of beasts, which could never take away sin. But the second covenant was ratified by the blood of Christ which “taketh away the sins of the world.” This covenant is made concerning the same law, but if people break it, they may by repentance obtain pardon, and so still remain in covenant relation with God. This is a wonderful exhibition of the mercy and love of God. First he consents to make a contract with the people, concerning that which it is their duty to do; and then he provides pardon for them when they have not only failed to do their duty, but have also violated their agreement to do their duty. Surely love could go no further. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.8}

One thought more. Someone may wonder if God didn’t know that the people would break that first covenant. We reply, Yes; he not only knew that they would not keep it, but he knew that they could not keep it. In fact, they had broken the commandments, concerning which the covenant was made, before the covenant was made. It was utterly impossible for the people to keep the commandments by their own unaided efforts, yet that is what they promised to do. Then why did the Lord lead them to make such a promise? For the purpose of showing them their own weakness, and of directing their minds to the second covenant, which already existed, in effect, in the covenant made with Abraham. That covenant “was confirmed before of God in Christ” (Galatians 3:17), and the giving of the law, and the unconditional promise made by the people to keep that law, could not disannul it, that it should make of none effect the promises which it contained. It provided forgiveness for transgression of the law concerning which the covenant was made, and also help to keep the law. And so when the Lord made a new covenant with Israel, he was simply directing their attention to the covenant made long before with Abraham. And the proof of this is found in the fact that all who are heirs of the promises, are children of Abraham. W. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 378.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

The statements expressed by Ingersoll in his Decoration-day address so deeply moved the Rev. Robert Collyer, of New York, that he declared in a recent sermon before the faculty of Cornell University that he would be willing to receive Ingersoll as a member of his church. We cannot see any objection to Mr. Collyer’ receiving him if he wishes, for we are not unmindful of the fact that between Robert Collyer’s church and the Church of Christ there is a wide difference. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.1}

We were very much interested in reading the *Union Signal’s* report of the Prohibition Convention, the chief interest of which centered around the woman suffrage plank in the platform. It is worthy of note that those who oppose the plank were all unparliamentary, and their speeches destitute of force, while those who championed it were courteous, and very considerate of the weakness of their opponents, and their speeches were “packed full of argument.” Queer, isn’t it. From the report one would naturally conclude that the convention itself was “packed.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.2}

Great excitement has been occasioned among the Catholics, especially in Europe, but a change in the criminal code of Italy, which will, if rigidly enforced, be likely to lead to the arrest and imprisonment or exile of the Pope. This code is very explicit in its requirement that all ecclesiastics shall in no way interfere with politics nor oppose or criticize in any way the official acts of the Government. Violations of this act are to be punished by imprisonment from three months to a year. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.3}

The law makes no exception in favor even of the Pope, and as Leo XIII. is an inveterate meddler in political matters, and has for years been engaged in a direct contest with the king of Italy, it is thought to be more than probable that this law may be invoked to silence his “holiness,” in which case a sensation may be expected in Europe. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.4}

The great error of most Prohibitionists is that they oppose the liquor traffic from the wrong standpoint. They say that liquor-selling is an immoral act, and that it must therefore be suppressed; whereas the State is not the conservator of morals, and has nothing to do with the morality or immorality of an act. There are hundreds of things that are just as immoral in their nature as is liquor-selling, but no one thinks of trying to prohibit them. To think vile thoughts is immoral, but the State cannot prohibit such thoughts. But when those vile thoughts culminate in open assault upon some person, then the State steps in and punishes the offender for the crime to which his immortality led him. The State punishes for the crime only; God punishes for the immortality, the sin. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.5}

And so while we believe most heartily that the liquor traffic ought to be abolished, we do not think so because it is immoral, but because it is a crime. The liquor-seller ought to be punished for the same reason that the murderer should,-because he commits an outrage upon society. This is reason enough for suppressing his business. If a man should erect a stand upon some street corner and should either sell or give away little packages of poison to whomsoever he could induced to take one, it would not be long before he would be behind prison bars. And people would not talk much about the morality of his deed, although it would be immoral, but they would cry out against the fiendishness of it. They would not wait to see whether or not anybody had taken the poison and died, before they arrested him, but would stop him because his business was endangering the lives of the people. On this ground, and this alone, can prohibition rightly stand. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.6}

Commenting editorially on the fact that the Mormons have purchased 400,000 acres of land in Chihuahua, Mexico, the *Chronicle* says that it indicates that the Mormons propose to emigrate to Mexico, and adds that with the Republican party in power in the United States, “Utah can never become a State, save by loss of all that the Mormons hold as vital to the power of their church. In Mexico they would not be troubled by the Government, if they paid their taxes and kept out of politics.” But that is just what they will not do. We say nothing of the payment of taxes, we know that with out political intrigue, the Mormon church would cease to exist. It is a political church, and but for that fact it would never have reached its present proportions. It may be set down as certain that wherever the Mormon Church is, it will, *as a church*, have a hand in politics. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.7}

In his report of the Presbyterian General Assembly, at which he delivered the historical address commemoratives of the centennial of Presbyterianism in America, Dr. Cuyler says: “Four-fifths of the members seem to carry grey heads; the leaders of our church were there in full force. The custom of audible applause, which was borrowed from foreign religious bodies, has become confirmed, and the late meeting was often as demonstrative as a political gathering.” It was Chrysostom who first introduced the custom of applauding discourses. That was shortly before religion became part of the politics of the nation. Are not religious assemblies preparing for a repetition of the same thing? When religion and politics become united, we must expect to see religion conducted according to political methods. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.8}

Twice this year has the German nation been called upon to mourn the death of their emperor. Frederick III. was always a favorite with his people while he was Crown Prince, and in the short time that he was emperor he gave every indication that he would make a wise and faithful ruler. It was well known that although he was a soldier, and was brought up under the military *regime* that characterized his father’s rule, he was a lover of peace, and was in favor of relieving the people as far as possible from the burdens that had been imposed upon them. In other words, he proposed to make Germany something besides a military camp. His bravery and unselfish patriotism are shown in that through all his illness, to the very last, his thoughts and plans were all for the welfare of the country, and not for himself. It is not expected that his son, who takes the throne as William II., will adopt Frederick’s pacific policy. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.9}

A London dispatch to the *Chronicle* says:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.10}

“The papers here devote much space to experiments in America with the dynamite gun, and quote its tremendously destructive qualities as being in the interest of universal peace and arbitration. The influence of this gun already will give great weight to America in future diplomatic dealings. No European nation would dream of sending a navy against the United States with these guns threatening its approach.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.11}

According to that philosophy, the surest way to keep peace in the community is to have everybody become a pugilist. The only trouble with the theory is, that it doesn’t correspond to the facts. Fighters usually fight. As to no European nation during to attack the United States in the face of these dynamite guns, it is simply nonsense. They would have some of the same kind of guns or some they would think as good or better, and so the balance would be maintained. Since the world began, preparation for war has never been a preventive of war. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.12}

In an article entitled “Saloons on Sunday,” the New York *Observer* says:- {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.13}

“The saloons do so much damage six days of the week that we may fairly claim their suppression on Sunday.” {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.14}

It is beyond comprehension how religious bigotry will blind the minds of men. The *Observer* is a clean, straightforward, high-class religious journal, and yet it deliberately proposes a bargain by which the saloon may pursue its nefarious course six days in the week, if Sunday be left free. It doesn’t say so in so many words, but that is what it means. So intent are the Prohibitionists on preserving the “American Sabbath,” that they are virtually making a bargain with the rum power, by which it can do its work unmolested six days in the week if it will give them Sunday. Thus they cease to be prohibitionists. If that is what is meant by a prohibition, then it may well be said that prohibition doesn’t prohibit. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.15}

**“An Abomination” The Signs of the Times, 14, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

In this year of our Lord 1888, we shudder at the iniquity of the antediluvians, and think it a shame, even to speak of those things which were done in Sodom; and yet, as a people, a commonwealth, we are fostering among us an evil which will go very far toward so corrupting the minds of the rising generation as to make true honesty a rarity, and impure thought the rule. We refer to the abominable practice of advertising by means of lewd pictures. In the past, liquor-dealers, tobacconists, and dive-keepers have pretty nearly had a monopoly of this disreputable business of corrupting the morals of our youth by means of indecent pictures for the sake of gain, but recently some unscrupulous manufacturer of chewing-gum has attempted the same method, and seeks to make his wares attractive by facing each five-cent package of his gum with pictures not fit to be described. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.16}

Here in the city of Oakland, famed for its schools and churches, and for the morality of its inhabitants, first-class candy stores exhibit in their show windows, and offer for sale, the gum, and of course the abominable pictures with which it is adorned. This is far worse than selling the pictures with cigarettes, since gum-chewing is practiced by little girls and boys who do not smoke. The creatures who prepare these things seem determined that no means be left untried to corrupt every child that is out of its mother’s arms. Do the parents of this city know, or do they care, that their children are being lured to their moral ruin by the shameful pictures, *photographs* of nearly nude forms of lewd women? {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.17}

This is a matter that comes properly within the scope of civil legislation. To stamp out this abomination is ten times as practicable as to close of liquor saloons; and would be done if parents were only awake to their children’s interests. We cannot think that the majority of parents would quietly endure the evil if they fully realized it; but in such a case as this, the fact that they do not realize it argues criminal negligence. {SITI June 22, 1888, p. 384.18}

**“The Lord’s Day” The Signs of the Times, 14, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

An exchange having been asked to give its authority for calling Sunday the Lord’s day, and for the statement that in the Bible the first day of the week is so named, replies, in part, as follows:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.1}

“In response to this, we say that (Revelation 1:10) we find that John was ‘in the Spirit on the Lord’s day.’ To find out what that day was, we do just as we do on the question of baptism, we go to the New Testament Greek lexicon and those times to find out what it means. We find that the term Lord, in this passage, comes from the Greek *kuriakos*. We find that in the New Testament the word is used in one other place only (1 Corinthians 11:20), when it speaks of ‘the Lord’s Supper.’ Now the question is, Can we settle clearly what supper that was? It appears that Paul tells us it was the supper instituted by the Lord, the night in which he was betrayed. Then we are clear and know surely that the term Lord’s Supper means, a supper that Jesus began or brought into existence. So when we find ‘the Lord’s day,’ we know just as certainly it was a day that began with Jesus, and that he brought into notice. We find that Jesus rose on the first day of the week, that he met with his disciples on that day after his resurrection, that he sent down the Holy Spirit on that day, that the disciples came together on that day to break bread, and thus we are as sure that the first day of the week is the Lord’s day as we are that immersion is baptism.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.2}

Our neighbor is very easily satisfied in regard to some things. It is indeed amazing to see how much evidence may be brought forward in vain to convince a man of a thing which he is determined not to believe, and what an infinitesimal amount will speedily convince him on some other point when he has already made up his mind to believe it anyway. The *Oracle*, for that is the name of the paper from which we quote, would carry the idea that there is just as much reason for believing that Sunday is the Lord’s day, as for believing that baptism is immersion. Now note the difference: Baptism is defined to be immersion, and was never used in any other sense, either in Scripture or out. There is nothing to which the word can be applied, except to immersion. But the word Lord’s, or, to give an air of learning to the discussion, *kuriakos*, may be applied to anything which belongs to the Lord. The term “Lord’s day” does not of itself give any idea of the day referred to. The word “baptism” is in itself a description of a certain act; but in order to know what day the Lord’s day is, we must learn from some source other than the term itself. Now not only does the term Lord’s day fail to tell us what day is the Lord’s day, but there is no declaration in the Bible, nor even an intimation, that Sunday is that day. So there is by no means as much reason for believing that Sunday is the Lord’s day as there is for believing that baptism is immersion. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.3}

The *Oracle* seeks to make a comparison between the alleged Sunday Lord’s day and the Lord’s Supper. It says: “We are clear and know surely that the term ‘Lord’s Supper’ means a supper that Jesus began or brought into existence. So when we find ‘the Lord’s day,’ we know just as certainly that it was a day that began with Jesus, and that he brought it into notice.” Very good, barring a little looseness in statement. Now let us see if Sunday will stand the comparison. In four several places by four several inspired writers, we have a minute account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, accompanied with the words of the Lord, “This do in remembrance of me,” or equivalent expressions. Is there anything of the kind in connection with Sunday? Nothing. Did the Lord ever command his followers to observe it in remembrance of him, or of anything in his life or death? Never. Then on what ground is it called the Lord’s day? On none at all. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.4}

But it is a fact that the Lord’s day must be a day intimately connected with the Lord Jesus Christ,-one which he specially set apart as his own, and commanded to be kept holy to him. These specifications are all met in the seventh day of the week, commonly call Saturday. Note carefully the following points:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.5}

In the fourth commandment it is explicitly stated by the Lord himself: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” The reason why the Lord chose that day for his own is thus stated in the latter part of the same commandment: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” That the Lord did not bless merely the Sabbath institution, which may be expanded to cover any day, is clearly evident from the following: “And God blessed *the seventh* day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Genesis 2:3. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.6}

Now when six days are given to man, and it is plainly declared that “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,” there can be no question but that the seventh day, and that alone, is the Lord’s day. And none can deny that it is the seventh day, and that alone, to which the Lord refers, when he calls the Sabbath “my holy day.” Isaiah 58:13. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.7}

But the *Oracle* will ask, “What had Jesus to do with that day?” That is, it must ask such a question, if it is consistent; for if it denies that the seventh day is the Lord’s day, then it must deny that Jesus had anything to do with that day. And to deny that is, as we shall show, equal to denying that divinity of Christ. For, according to the New Testament record, Jesus himself created the heavens and the earth. The writer to the Hebrews says that by him the worlds were made. Hebrews 1:2. John says that he is the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which *was God*, and that “all things were made by Him; and without him was not anything made that was made.” John 1:1, 3, 14. And Paul says to the Colossians, that “by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things.” Colossians 1:16, 17. This statement, that “by him all things consist,” is the same as the statement to the Hebrews, that he is “upholding all things by the word of his power.” Hebrews 1:3. That is, the same word by which he brought the worlds into existence, maintains them in their places. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.8}

To deny that Jesus created all things, is to deny his divinity, for creative power is an attribute of Deity alone; and since it is true that the Word was, and is, God, then the Word-Christ-must have created, for there cannot be divinity without creation. But it is useless to argue a point that is plainly declared in Scripture. Jesus is “the mighty God,” one with the Father, and he did create all things. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.9}

But the one who created the heavens and the earth must also have rested from that creation. The same one who in six days made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, also rested the seventh day, and afterward blessed and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. And since Jesus created all things, the heavens and the earth included, it must have been he who rested on the seventh day, and blessed and hallowed it. Of course the Father and the Son were one in this, as in all things else; but we make mention of Jesus exclusively, because his agency in the matter is virtually denied. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.10}

Now who can deny that the seventh day is “a day that began with Jesus, and that he brought it into notice”? As the *Oracle* feebly puts it. Who, we ask more emphatically, can deny that the seventh day is the day which Jesus himself sanctified, and declared to be his day? In reply we say that nobody can deny it, except those who deny that “men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father,”-honor Him as God and Creator. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.11}

In the light of the facts above briefly noted, we now better understand the words of Christ, when speaking of the day which the Jews regarded as sacred, the seventh day of the week, he said: “For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day.” (Matthew 12:8), thus claiming the seventh day as his own day. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.12}

We should like to have someone show us how it can be denied that the seventh day is the Lord’s day, without denying that Jesus created the heaven and the earth, which is equivalent to denying that he is divine. It cannot be done. So we say that no matter how much people may *claim* to love Christ, it is a fact that when they refuse to recognize the Sabbath of the fourth commandment as his day, they in their own hearts degrade him from the high office as Creator. Such may well fear that he will say to them, as to some of old, “And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” W. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.13}

**“Conciliation and Controversy” The Signs of the Times, 14, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

God is love. It is not simply that he has love in large measure for his creatures, but he is love. He is the embodiment of love. To love is a part of his nature, and this love manifests itself in devising plans for the perfect happiness of all created beings, both in Heaven and on earth. It was shown in the garden of delights, paradise, which he planted upon the earth that was already exceedingly good, for the pleasure of the man whom he had made. And in infinite measure was his love manifested when he gave all that Heaven had to bestow for the reclaiming of fallen man. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.14}

But while God is love, it is a fact that between man and God there is not perfect harmony. Indeed, in man’s natural state there is not the least harmony between him and God. The apostle Paul puts this very emphatically when he says: “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Romans 8:7. It will be noticed from this that the enmity is all on the side of man; the carnal mind is enmity against God. And the cause of this enmity lies in the fact that the law of God, which is the law of love, is regarded by man as a yoke of bondage. God’s law is the verbal picture of his pure and holy character, it is an expression of the love that springs naturally from his heart. But “out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness.” Mark 7:21, 22. Hence the enmity against God. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.15}

The prophet Isaiah says, in language that will apply to all men as well as to ancient Israel: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever; that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord.” Isaiah 30:8, 9. This is man’s position. “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” Romans 5:8-10. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.16}

Throughout the Bible it will be found that the testimony is the same: the enmity is all on the side of man. This is shown by these words of the apostle: “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” 2 Corinthians 5:19, 20. This is very emphatic. Man is the enemy of God; God is the friend of mankind, entreating them to become reconciled to him. And the depths of God’s love for the sinful, rebellious world is shown in the next verse: “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Although the offense was all on the part of man, God has made all the effort possible even to infinite power to have him become reconciled. On the part of man there is enmity; on the part of God there is an infinite tenderness, and a longing to have the rebellious children become reconciled to him. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 390.17}

The same truth concerning the enmity of man and the love of God, is brought out in Colossians 1:19-22. Speaking of Christ, the apostle says: “For it pleased [the Father] that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight.” Colossians 1:19-22. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.1}

After Christ had suffered for our sins which alienated us from God, he ascended into the Heavens, “there to appear in the presence of God for us,” and is now sitting upon his Father’s throne. Revelation 3:21. Of his work there, the prophet Zechariah thus speaks: “Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” Zechariah 6:12, 13. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.2}

This presents a wonderful scene,-the Father and the Son counseling together for the peace of mankind, the great mass of whom choose rebellion rather than peace. Instead of loving peace and happiness, they, after their hardness and impenitent hearts, not knowing that the goodness of God leads them to repentance, treasure up unto themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.3}

For a day of wrath will surely come. God is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, but he will not force men to repent and become reconciled. His love draws men to him; but there are many who resist the movings of the Spirit, and will not be drawn. As the same sun that melts the wax also hardens the clay, so the same love that destroys the enmity in some hearts, only increase it in others. The simile is of course not perfect, for while it is natural for the clay to become hardened by the sun, it is unnatural for human hearts to be hardened by God’s grace. Hearts could not fail to be melted into tenderness by the tender, unfathomable love of God, if they did not steel themselves against it. And so when even infinite love fails to reconcile the rebellious subjects, there is nothing left but to cut them off as useless cumberers of the ground. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.4}

In the two passages of Scripture the long-suffering of God is represented by the figure of a husbandman trying to develop good fruit from his garden. Says Isaiah: “Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill; and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes.” Isaiah 5:1, 2. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.5}

Christ speaks of a barren fig tree in the vineyard, and represents the owner as saying, “Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none; cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?” And the reply is, “Let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it; and if it bear fruit, well; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.” Luke 13:7-9. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.6}

Thus is shown God’s unwillingness to cut off even the most unfruitful plant, so that he can say: “Judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it?” Isaiah 5:3, 4. The gnarled, crooked natures of some will resist all the efforts of the faithful husbandman to induce them to bear good fruit, or any fruit at all, and since they bear only thorns and briers, there is nothing to do with them but to burn them. So the Lord says of his unfruitful vineyard:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.7}

“And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard; I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste; it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns; I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it.” Isaiah 5:5, 6. And of the unfruitful plants he says: “Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust; because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” Verse 24. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.8}

At that time the counsel of peace between the Father and the Son will have ceased. The word of reconciliation will no longer be preached, because all will have become reconciled to God, who could by any possibility be reconciled. Reconciliation will then give place to controversy, for that time of burning will be “the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.9}

The controversy is now between the Lord and Satan for the possession of the souls of men. In proportion as men resist the strivings of God’s Spirit they place themselves on the side of Satan, and become actuated by his spirit. And when by continued sin, and repeated resistance of the Spirit of God, they have finally driven it from them, have blotted out every thought of good, upon which the Holy Spirit could work, then they are wholly Satan’s, actuated solely by his wicked spirit. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.10}

Then when men shall have fully identified themselves with Satan, the Lord will have a controversy with them also. Says the prophet, speaking of that time: “A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth.” Jeremiah 25:31-33. “For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” Malachi 4:1. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.11}

Thus will the great controversy end. In that day those who have allied themselves fully with Satan, will find out what a hopeless thing it is to fight against God. They will realize that while God is love, his is not the love that is imbecile, but the love that protects. In love to his loyal subjects, who have placed confidence in the integrity of his Government, he must blot out the incorrigibly rebellious ones. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.12}

Says God: “I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing.” “A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, ... and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God.” “Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” Deuteronomy 30:19; 11:27, 28. Who will make the wise choice, and, through Christ, become reconciled to God and his law? “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” W. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 391.13}

**“The Commentary. The Golden Calf” The Signs of the Times, 14, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(July 8.-Exodus 32:15-30.)**

The making and worshiping of the golden calf by the Israelites forms a basis for a most interesting study of the form of heathen worship which has drawn the greatest number of the human race from the worship of the true God. There was a peculiar significance in the making of the calf at that special time, which will appear as we proceed with the study. The calf was a representation of the sacred bull called Apis, which the Egyptians worshiped, and with which the Jews had necessarily become very familiar in their long sojourn in Egypt. Concerning this god Apis, and what it signified, we find the following:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.1}

“Apis, the bull worshiped by the ancient Egyptians, who regarded it as a symbol of Osiris, the god of the Nile, the husband of Isis, and the great divinity of Egypt.”-*Chamber’s Encyclopedia*. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.2}

The “Encyclopedia Britannica” (art. Apis), says:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.3}

“According to the Greek writers Apis was the image of Osiris, and worshiped because Osiris was supposed to have passed into a bull, and to have been soon after manifested by a succession of these animals. The hierogryphic inscriptions identify the Apis with Osiris, adorned with horns or the head of a bull, and unite the two names as Hapi-Osor, or Apis Osiris. According to this view the Apis was the incarnation of Isiris manifested in the shape of a bull.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.4}

Since Apis was considered as the visible manifestation of Osiris, we must learn what Osiris stood for, in order to understand the calf-worship of the Israelites. Again we quote from the “Encyclopedia Britannica,” art. “Egypt:”- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.5}

“Abydos was the great seat of the worship of Osiris, which spread all over Egypt, establishing itself in a remarkable manner at Memphis. All the mysteries of the Egyptians, and their whole doctrine of the future state, attach themselves to this worship. Osiris was identified with the sun.... Sun-worship was the primitive form of Egyptian religion, perhaps even pre-Egyptian.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.6}

Rawlinson says:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.7}

“Ra was the Egyptian sun-god, and was especially worshiped at Heliopolis. Obelisks, according to some, represented his rays, and were always, or usually, erected in his honor.... The kings for the most part considered Ra their special patron and protector; nay, they went so far as to identify themselves with him, to use his titles as their own, and to adopt his name as the ordinary prefix to their own names and titles. This is believed by many to have been the origin of the word Pharaoh, which was, it is thought, the Hebrew rendering of Ph’ Ra-‘the sun-god,’ ... Osiris was properly a form of Ra. He was the light of the lower world, the sun from the time that he sinks below the horizon in the west to the hour when he reappears above the eastern horizon in the morning. This physical idea was, however, at a later date modified, and Osiris was generally recognized as the perpetually presiding lord of the lower world, the king and the judge of Hades or Amenti. His worship was universal throughout Egypt, but his chief temples were at Abydos and Philae.”-*American History*. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 393.8}

Again we quote from the “Encyclopedia Briticannica:”- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.1}

“It was to Osiris that the prayers and offerings for the dead were made, and all sepulchral inscriptions, except those of the oldest period, are directly addressed to him. As Isis is a form of the female principle, Osiris, the sun and the Nile, was considered in one phase to be the made principle.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.2}

“The three most famous of those more sacred animals which were worshiped as individuals, not as a class, were the bulls Apis and Mnevis, and the Mendesian goat. Of these, Apis and the Mendesian goat were connected with the worship of Osiris.... It is very characteristic of the Egyptian religion that the reverence for Osiris should have taken this grossly material form. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.3}

“The bull Apis, who bears in Egyptian the same name as the Nile, Hapi, was worshiped at Memphis.... Apis was considered to be the living emblem of Osiris, and was thus connected with the sun and the Nile, and the chronological aspect of both explains his being also connected with the moon.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.4}

From these extracts it appears that the worship which the Israelites paid to the golden calf was really the Egyptian form of sun-worship-that form of idolatry which has always stood foremost as the antagonist of the true worship of God. It is indeed significant that just at the time when God manifested himself to the Israelites in a peculiar manner, and made known to them his Sabbath, they should have fallen back into the old sun-worship, whose chief festival day-the first day of the week-has always contended for supremacy with the day specially distinctive of the worship of the true God. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.5}

Note also that the sun-god Ra, Osiris, or Apis, was the patron god of the Egyptian kings, and stood for Egypt and its customs. So the worship of the calf signified that the Israelites, forgetful of the covenant that they had made with God, were sinking back to the level of Egyptian life. It was the very worst manifestation of the spirit which led them so often to long for the flesh-pots of Egypt. It is significant of the sensuality to which people naturally sink when they turn aside from the worship of the true God, who can be worshiped only in the beauty of holiness. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.6}

But we have not yet learned the full extent of the sin of the Israelites in the worship of the calf. The worship of Apis was accompanied with the grossest licentiousness, as is indicated by the ceremonies attendant upon the inauguration of a new Apis. There were certain definite marks which must always be present in an animal that was to occupy that position. As soon as a suitable animal was found, “he was led in triumphal procession to Nilopolis, at the time of the new moon, where he remained forty days, waited upon by nude women.” The “Encyclopedia Britannica” says: “When he had grown up he was conducted, at the time of the new moon, to a ship by the sacred scribes and prophets, and conducted to the Apeum at Memphis, where there were courts, places for him to walk in, and a drinking fountain. According to Diodorus, he was first led to Nilopolis, and kept there forty days, then shipped in a boat with a gilded cabin to Memphis, and he was there allowed to be seen for forty days only by women, who exposed themselves to him.” As to the significance of this, see the prohibitions recorded in Exodus 22:19; Leviticus 18:23; 20:16. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.7}

The Scripture record indicates that the calf worship by the Israelites on this occasion was accompanied with all the license usual in heathen worship. We read: “And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.” Exodus 32:6. The Hebrew word rendered “to play,” signifies playing with leaping, singing, and dancing. This dancing, especially among the Egyptians, was sensual and indecent. The word rendered “corrupted,” in the next verse, where it is said, “Thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves,” is the same that is used in Genesis 6:11, 12, where we read that the earth was corrupt, “for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” This explains the terrible anger of the Lord, and why he desired to consume the people at once. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.8}

We have occupied all our space in simply intimating the signification of the worship of the golden calf. It is a line of study that may be followed to a great length, and to great profit. In closing, we merely note that the grinding of the calf to powder was a fitting emblem of the weakness of all that are called gods, when brought before the God of Heaven and earth. W. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 394.9}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 14, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

Says President Seelye, of Amherst College: “I am often in *doubt* as to which is the more startling, the timidity which causes a preacher to suppose that the gospel needs to be defended, or the self-conceit which leads him to think he can defend it.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.1}

In the SIGNS of June 1 it was stated that the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church had sustained Dr. Woodrow’s evolution teaching by a vote of 34 to 19, thus giving a practical indorsement of evolution. An error in the figures of the report misled us. There were 34 votes to sustain his teaching, and 109 against. This is very much better. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.2}

Men may theorize as they will about universal salvation, or, what is the same thing, the final restoration of all men, but their theories can avail nothing; for the unequivocal testimony of the word of God is ever the same: “For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” Malachi 4:1. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.3}

When the apostle says (Romans 3:28) that “a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law,” he does not imply that any are therefore free from obligation to obey the law; but his statement is made in the light of verse 20, in which he says: “By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Which is only saying that which, were it not for the blindness of mind engendered by sin, would not need to be said at all, namely, that the law which shows one to be a sinner cannot at the same time show him to be just: in other words, the law is consistent and does not stultify itself. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.4}

Elder S. N. Haskell writes encouragingly of the work in London. The work already done is of course insignificant as compared with the great amount to be done; but it is no small thing to get the work established in so large a city, on a basis where it can be carried forward with prospects of continued and increasing success. On the 9th inst., baptism was administered to fifteen candidates. About twenty from the Established Church have already begun to keep the Sabbath. Several canvassers for the *Present Truth* and for books are now at work in the city, and next winter a training school for canvassers will be held, which it is hoped will greatly add to the number and efficiency of the workers. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.5}

It is too bad that men like Dr. Field and Mr. Gladstone will gratify Ingersoll’s vanity by condescending to argue with him on the subject of Christianity. As a consequence of their entering the lists with him, he has become so insufferably puffed up that he imagines that he is a great reasoner. He is never at a loss for an argument, for he has a stock of witticisms on hand which he uses for everything. Let someone answer him, and he replies by repeating the same things over again, in a little different form. Moreover, like all professional debaters, he is not animated by a desire to ascertain the truth, but to win applause for his own sharp sayings. The *Independent* thus sets forth the reason why he receives so much applause from a certain class of people:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.6}

“He argues for a laugh, not for conviction. He plays for points, not victory. It is all very brilliant, but is not war. Those who enter the lists with him can hardly expect to get the better of him, for what chance has the soldier with the circus acrobat? The crowd in the amphitheater will cheer the dexterity of the leaping, dodging clown, and will see nothing very amusing in the serious soldier’s attempt to fight.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.7}

The *Union Signal* says that Rev. W. F. Crafts is working in Chicago in the interest of what is known as the Blair Sunday Bill. It says:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.8}

“He met representatives of the labor organizations, and secured their co-operation in the effort to secure national laws against Sunday mails and Sunday trains. Thus these great organizations in New York City and Chicago are now working unitedly with the W.C.T.W. and the churches to secure a Christian Sabbath.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.9}

But we thought it was only a chance for the workingman to rest, that they want. That’s what they say sometimes; but what they want is the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship. Mr. Crafts secured many hundred signatures to the petitions to Congress. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.10}

The Chicago *Advance* says that churches and labor organizations East and West are adopting the following resolution:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.11}

“*Resolved*, That we indorse the petition to Congress, asking it to stop Sunday work in its mail and military service, and in interstate commerce.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.12}

The *Advance* says that the latest indorsements to this resolution are those of “the Central Labor Union and the Carriers’ Association of New York City, the Knights of Labor Council of Chicago and vicinity, the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the State Sunday-school Associations of Missouri and Kansas.” “The Congregational ministers’ meeting of Chicago has recommended that all Congregational Churches take action in this matter either by resolution or petition.” What are the friends of freedom of conscience doing to offset this pressure that is being brought to bear upon Congress? {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.13}

That the Christian Sabbath so called was unknown in the days of the apostles is evident from the statement of the apostle James, recorded in Acts 15:21: “For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues *every Sabbath day*.” This was true only of the seventh day, the day enjoined in the commandment, and the only day recognized at that time by either Jews or Christians as the Sabbath. If at that time any had regarded the first day as a Sabbath, the apostle would have been under the necessity of saying, “every seventh-day Sabbath,” or, as some delight to stigmatize it now, “every ‘Jewish’ Sabbath,” but he said, “every Sabbath,” showing to all who should come after that he knew but one Sabbath, namely, “the Sabbath of the Lord.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.14}

When the Rev. W. F. Crafts was before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, making a plea in behalf of the Sunday Rest Bill, senator Payne said to him: “I wish to know whether your reform contemplates the entire suspension of the transportation, distribution, and delivery of the mails on Sunday.” Mr. Crafts replied as follows: “We will take a quarter of a loaf, a half a loaf, or a whole loaf. If the Government should do nothing more than forbid the opening of the post-offices at church hours, it would be a national tribute to the value of religion that would lead to something more satisfactory.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.15}

Yet in the face of such declarations as this; in the face of the fact that the Sunday Rest Bill does provide that whatever post-office work shall be necessary on Sunday shall be done at such time as will not interfere with public worship, the National Reformers tell us that the proposed Sunday law is to be merely a civil and not a religious enactment. If they expect to be believed, they must count very much on the blindness or ignorance of the people. Our readers can imagine what would be the “something more satisfactory” than a law forbidding work to be done during the hours of church service. What would be the use of compelling people to stop work during church service unless they went to church? As a general thing those who work on Sunday wouldn’t go to church if they had a chance; and so when the law should be found to effect the perceptible increase in church attendance, a law to compel people to attend church on Sunday would now follow. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.16}

The apostle Paul says that Christ “gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world.” Galatians 1:4. The sacrifice that was made for sin shows its heinousness. It should also show us the futility of attempting to absolve sins by any works of our own. For any man who may think that by doing penance, afflicting his soul by doing any number of “good works,” he can make propitiation for his sins, is to imply that his life is as great as that of Christ. This is just the thing that constitutes the Roman Catholic Church penance-it turns men’s minds away from Christ from the only sacrifice for sin. But if anything besides the blood of Christ could cleanse a man from sin, then Christ would not have suffered. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.17}

*“Not all our groans and tears,  
Not works that we have done  
Not vows, nor promises, nor prayers  
Can e’er for sin atone. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.18}*

*“Relief alone is found  
in Jesus’ precious blood;  
‘Tis this that breaks the mortal wound  
And reconciles to God.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.19}*

Christ gave himself “that he might deliver us from *this present evil world*.” That is the primary thing-it is all we have to look out for. We need not worry about being saved from eternal death, if we are but freed from this present evil world. That will follow in due time. This present evil work is “the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.” To be delivered from this means to be saved from the love of sin, as well as from the guilt of it. It is to be redeemed “from all iniquity,” and purified and made “zealous of good works.” Titus 2:14. When one is delivered from the love of sin, zeal for good works manifests itself; the two things are identical. {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.20}

**“What Is this but Spiritualism?” The Signs of the Times, 14, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the Presbyterian General assembly, recently held in Philadelphia, Dr. T. L. Cuyler delivered the historical address commemorative of the Centennial of American Presbyterianism, in the presentation of which he said:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.21}

“The spirits of the mighty dead, whose achievements we have rehearsed, seem to hover around us, and to join in our songs of thanksgiving. For amidst the entrancing splendors of Paradise, they cannot have lost the memories of the church to which they consecrated their earthly lives, or have lost their interest in its welfare.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.22}

On Sunday, June 10, Rev. F. F. Jewell, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church at San Jose, Cal., delivered a sermon on the subject of “Our Neighbors, the Spiritualists,” in which he said:- {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.23}

“On approaching this subject I am struck with the large quantity of truth there is in it. it largely rests on the principles on which our faith rests. With us, they believe in the existence of spiritual beings.... In agreement with us, they believe that the disembodied spirits of persons who have lived in this world, on passing into the other, retain an interest in things earthly, and continue to watch our lives.” {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.24}

If this is not Spiritualism, what is it? {SITI June 29, 1888, p. 400.25}