**“The Spirit as Guide” The Signs of the Times, 15, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ told his disciples that he was about to go away, and that they could not follow him, their hearts were filled with sorrow and anxiety. They dreaded to face an unfriendly world alone. He had been their guide and instructor, and they had learned much from his teachings. They knew of no one who could fill his place. Peter had echoed the sentiments of all the disciples when, in answer to Christ’s inquiry if they also would go away, he said, “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.” They knew that no one else could do for them what Jesus had done; and the thought of being separated from him was a sad one. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.61}

To comfort them, Christ gave them the assurance that he would come again and receive them unto himself, and that by this means they could again be with him. But even this promise was not sufficient, for there would still intervene a long period during which they would be left alone. How could they do without the presence and counsel of their Lord? {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.62}

Again Jesus meets the difficulty by promising that whatsoever they should ask in his name should be done for them; and he added, “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth.” John 14:16, 17. This Spirit was to be sent in his name, and was to take his place until his return. Said Christ, “I will not leave you comfortless [orphans]; I will come to you.” This coming does not refer to his personal, visible coming, when he will receive his people to himself, but to the Spirit who should come in his name. The Spirit was to be their guide, to prepare them for his coming at the last day. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.63}

The offices of the Spirit are many; but there is a special one pointed out in this discourse of our Lord. Said he: “These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” John 14:25, 26. It is as a teacher that the Spirit is here brought to view. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.64}

Many persons entertain very erroneous views as to the manner in which the Spirit operates. They imagine that it will teach them something which the Bible does not contain. When certain Bible truths are presented to them for their observance, they excuse themselves from all responsibility in the matter by saying that they are led by the Spirit of God, and do not feel it their duty to do that particular thing. They say the Spirit was given to guide into all truth; and, consequently, if it was necessary to obey that portion of the Scripture, it would have been brought to their notice. The fact that they do not feel impressed to obey is proof to their minds that there is no necessity for obedience. To such persons the Bible is of no account; they make its truth depend entirely upon their own feelings. And they actually charge God with the inconsistency of authorizing his Spirit to speak in contradiction of his revealed word. The fact that God cannot lie should convince anyone that his Spirit and his word must always be in harmony. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.65}

Christ prayed for his disciples, “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” The psalmist David said, “Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth.” From these passages we learn that when Christ said, “When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth,” he meant that the Spirit would lead them into a proper understanding of that which had already been revealed. He plainly stated this when he said, “He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” Many things that Christ said were not understood at the time; but they were made plain by the Spirit, after Christ had ascended to heaven. And it is thus that the Spirit teaches us now; it leads those who are humble and teachable into a proper understanding of the written word of God. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.66}

Paul gives testimony on this point which is not uncertain. In Ephesians 6:13-17, he describes the Christian’s armor. The following is the concluding portion: “Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, *which is the word of God.*” Christ said that when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, should come, he would “reprove [convince] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.” Paul says that “by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Both these passages are harmonized by the one quoted from Paul to the Ephesians. The Spirit does indeed convince of sin, but it is by impressing on the minds and hearts of men the claims of God’s word. The Bible is the sword, the instrument by which the Spirit pierces the heart and lays bare its wickedness. The Spirit is the active agent, but the word of God is that through which it works. The two always act in harmony. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.67}

We should look with suspicion upon any spirit that counsels opposition to the word of God. John tells us that there are many spirits, and that we are to try them. In Isaiah we are told by what we are to try them: “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20. It is the spirit of darkness that leads men to act contrary to the word of God. E. J. W. {SITI December 2, 1889, p. 632.68}

**“Who Is to Blame?” The Signs of the Times, 15, 47.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are very many people who want peace, but they want it after their own ideas. It is quite common for people who have taken a wrong course to lay the blame of the trouble that inevitably follows upon someone who, so far from following in the wrong, has endeavored to set things right. They say, “If you will let us alone, there will be no trouble.” Many children are very patterns of propriety so long as everything goes to suit them, but when their tracks are crossed, there is trouble. Then the trouble is charged, not to their own perverseness, but to their parents, or those who try to check their wrong-doing. It is a painful fact that these children do not always lose this trait when they grow up. It is not easy to live under condemnation, and, therefore, the natural mind seeks an excuse for sin, and an *excuse* is not very hard to find. {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.69}

An instance in point is seen in the case of Ahab. His course is briefly stated in the following scripture: “And Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him.... And he reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made a grove; and Ahab did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him.” 1 Kings 16:30-33. Elijah was a man of God, who dared to stand boldly for the worship of the true God, even though he were the only one in the nation who was not an idolater. His life alone was a constant rebuke to the wicked king, and his testimony was plain. Through him the Lord spoke, and said that on account of the wickedness of Israel there should be no rain throughout the land. This came to pass, and great suffering necessarily followed. But did Ahab acknowledge that he himself was the cause of all this? Hear him: “And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel?” 1 Kings 18:17. Like a petulant child, he blamed the one who was trying to save him. But Elijah stated the case in its true light when he answered: “I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father’s house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim.” Verse 18. {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.70}

But human nature is the same now as in the days of Ahab. The following paragraph is from a report of labor, which a first-day preacher sent to the organ of his denomination, and which will serve to illustrate this fact:- {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.71}

“Our next was at Battle Creek. This is the headquarters of the Seventh-day Adventists. As Saturday is one of the busiest days of a city, and Sabbath [Sunday] the great working-day of the Adventists, and as the ungodly are embolden to respect neither, it is hard to tell in Battle Creek whether it is Saturday, Sunday, or Monday. Thus the seventh-day system spreads infidelity.” {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.72}

Note the parallel. Ahab led Israel into idolatry; Elijah fearlessly preached and practiced the religion of the true God. The result of this was that many of the people halted “between two opinions.” 1 Kings 18:21. They did not believe anything. In the modern instance, the Seventh-day Adventists teach, and try to conscientiously live out, the commandments of God. This includes the observance of God’s Sabbath, the day which he rested upon, blessed, sanctified, called his own, and commanded all men to observe. See Genesis 2:2, 3; Exodus 20:8-11; Isaiah 58:13, and many other texts. The great mass of mankind, following in the wake of papal lawlessness and assumption, trample upon God’s holy day, and exalt a rival in its place. In consequence of this, some people accept neither. They do not take the trouble to examine for themselves to see which is right, and reject both as of no consequence. {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.73}

Now who is to blame for their infidelity? Is it those who are walking according to God’s rule, or those who walk in a way of their own devising? In the case of Ahab and Elijah all will agree Elijah did right. He is looked upon by all Bible readers as a model of integrity; and such he was. All the trouble and unbelief that existed is chargeable solely to Ahab’s wicked course, and to those who followed him. Would it not, then, be more in accordance with the facts to say that first-day-keeping, or at least Sabbath-breaking, leads to infidelity? If God’s word remains the same now that it was four thousand years ago, it would. He gave the Sabbath as a sign, that men might know that he was the true God. Exodus 31:13; Ezekiel 20:20. If men had always kept the Sabbath of the Lord, remembering that it is the memorial of his creative power, there would never have been any idolatry or infidelity. {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.74}

The question to be decided is simply this: Does it make a wrong thing right for a majority to practice it? Is it better to disobey God with the many, or to obey him with the few? Will God alter his laws, and make wrong right, because the majority do wrong? His word says, “Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil” (Exodus 22:2); and, “Thou hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished.” Proverbs 11:21. It is safe to believe these statements, in spite of the assertions of men to the contrary. Although the gospel of Christ is a gospel of peace, it does not contemplate a peace purchased by a sacrifice of right-doing. Christ foresaw that men would be shaken when they saw divisions on account of his doctrine, and he forewarned his disciples in Luke 12:51-53. Let men deplore divisions, and let them endeavor to promote harmony; but let them labor only for Bible union, and not fear to say, with Joshua, “Choose you this day whom ye will serve; ...but as for me, and my house, we will serve the Lord.” E. J. W. {SITI December 9, 1889, p. 632.75}

**“Why It Is” The Signs of the Times, 15, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

A man who has been out in a very dark night finds it impossible to see objects distinctly if he suddenly enters a well-lighted room. It would be just as well, yes, even better, for him if the room were at first only partially lighted, for then his eyes would the sooner accommodate themselves to the changed conditions. So also a man who has been in a very deep well, or a cave, cannot see when he suddenly finds himself in the blazing sunlight. Everything at first appears in a haze, then the outlines of form begin to be seen, and finally everything stands out in full relief. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.76}

The same principle holds good in other things. If you should place a work on geometry in the hands of an Indian just from the plains, you could not expect him to understand it. Its figures would convey no meaning whatever to him. Or if you should place a Greek Testament in the hands of a bright Sabbath-school scholar, it would be unintelligible to him, although he might be able to read the English language with ease. But give him a few years’ time, and he would be able to read the Greek. Yet he would not read it readily at first. He would learn the letters, then certain forms and rules, and then he would stumblingly pick out the meaning of a simple sentence. Even if a book were in a child’s own language, and he were unable to read, he would have to acquire a knowledge of it gradually. And so in everything; all knowledge is gradually acquired. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.77}

Now let us apply this principle to another case. We claim that the Bible very plainly teaches that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that no other day is or can be the Sabbath of the Lord. But the question comes up, Why did not all the good of past ages believe and teach thus, if it is Bible doctrine? Why did not the reformers keep the Sabbath? The question is already answered. For centuries the Catholic Church had had supreme sway. Its policy was to keep men in ignorance, especially of the Bible; that was a proscribed book. Wherever one was found, it was burned by the priest, and the possessor treated as a heretic. The priests themselves knew nothing of the Bible. Even the cardinals and archbishops, the men in highest position in the church, were ignorant of its teachings. They were taught to look upon it as a vile book, and to look to the church for their spiritual knowledge. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.78}

Among the common people, the ignorance was of course still greater. There were very few who had ever seen a Bible. If they had seen one, the most of them would have spurned it as a loathsome thing whose very touch would contaminate. Had they ventured to open its pages, it would have conveyed no more to them than if it were blank, for the Bible had not been translated into the language of the common people. The small portions of the Bible that the church allowed the priests to have were written in Latin. And even if the Bible had been translated, to thousands it would still have been a blank, for where there is ignorance of the Bible there is ignorance of the deepest kind. Very few of the people could read; many even of the nobles and princes could not; there was no incentive for them to do so. This was the night, the darkest part of the night, and the darkness, like that of Egypt, could indeed be felt. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.79}

But night does not always last. God’s Spirit was at work in the hearts of men, and that always brings light. There were men who had all the wisdom that the schools could bestow. They had been moved to acquire this knowledge by a desire to benefit their fellow-men. And yet in regard to the Bible they were as ignorant as the poorest peasant. But they were anxious to serve God, and Christ says that “if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine.” And so these men found the Bible, and, unmoved by the threats of bishops and popes, they translated it and studied it. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.80}

The Reformation gave the Bible to the people, but they could not grasp all its truth at once. It simplest doctrines were so directly opposed to the teachings of the church that it took a long time for their minds to comprehend them. The one great point then needed was to make men understand that the pope had no power to forgive sin, or to give men license to sin, or to remit the punishment due to sin; works of penance would not suffice to gain the favor of God. “The just shall live by faith,” was the watchword of the Reformation. People must first learn to believe that the Bible, not the pope, could alone point out the way of life. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.81}

Some of the reformers had glimpses of still further truth, but not all. The Reformation had only just begun when Luther and his fellow-laborers died. Many grievous papal errors still existed. Other men followed them, who were moved by the same spirit, and now the light began to dawn more brightly, and more and more of the Bible was made clear to men. They had become somewhat accustomed to its rays of light. Some rested content with the little light they had received, and refused to receive any more. But others looked still farther, and were rewarded by finding new treasures. And now a great flood of light shines forth form the sacred page, and men are beginning to endure the sight. But this could not have been done at once any more than men who have been long confined in a dark dungeon could look at once upon the sun at noonday. And this answers the question, “Why were these things not found out before?” E. J. W. {SITI December 16, 1889, p. 632.82}

**“Sunday Laws and Church and State” The Signs of the Times, 15, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Iowa Falls, Iowa, sends us the following kind and candid letter, to which we take pleasure in replying. The question upon which it touches is a live one at the present time, and the SIGNS OF THE TIMES designs to give the different phases of it quite full discussion in future numbers:- {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.83}

“EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES-*Dear Sir and Brother:* Some kind friend has mailed to me several copies of your excellent paper, and I have carefully perused every number. I am much pleased with its vigorous and brainy articles, which flash at me from its columns, and, being an old editor, I admire the make-up and press-work of the paper. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.84}

“I notice that you are especially antagonistic to the proposed ‘Sunday laws,’ and that you fear a union of Church and State is foreshadowed by the passage of such laws. I had not thought much about this feature of the matter, and while I am in the ‘formative’ state of mind regarding it, I wish to be enlightened on a few points, if you deem them to be of sufficient force to need replies. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.85}

“In the first place, are not all human laws based on the divine law? Second, does not every law passed by men seek to enforce a law that has been proclaimed by God to man; for instance- {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.86}

“We have on our statute-book a law against larceny, being a reflection of the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not steal.’ We have a law against perjury, which is a reflection of the law, ‘Thou shalt not bear false witness,’ etc. We have a law against the violation of marriage vows, being a reflection of the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery.’ We have laws compelling children to obey and to provide for if necessary; their parents, being a reflection of the commandment, “Honor thy father and thy mother,’ etc. We might go on and illustrate further, showing that God’s laws as given to us in the Book are but the patterns from which we copy our human laws for the government of man. Now is there any commandment that is above this. ‘Thou shalt keep the Sabbath-day holy,’ so far as its effect on man’s physical, mental, and moral being is concerned? Is it not absolutely certain that Sabbath desecration means decay of men, families, communities, and nations? Is not the observance of the Sabbath a necessity, vitally so, of man’s moral life? {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.87}

“If this is true, then would it be any more a step towards the union of Church and State to copy this commandment of God into our human statutes and enforce it, than it is to copy other commandments and enforce them? {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.88}

“Here is where I want light. I am with you entirely on the question of a union of Church and State in America, but I am intensely in favor of a union of God and State. I am not for creeds, but I am for the Bible, and I hold that this government owes all its grandeur to the God of the Bible, and that our human laws should aim to produce in the citizens of this country obedience to the laws of God.” {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.89}

Inasmuch as we can scarcely make a beginning to canvass the whole field in this article, we will confine our reply solely to the points noted in the letter. Fortunately, these touch the very heart of the matter. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.90}

In the first place, to the question, “Are not all human laws based on the divine law?” we must answer, No. And why not?-Because the divine law is entirely beyond the scope of human laws. The idea that human laws are based upon, and are an enforcement of, the divine law, is an outgrowth of a misconception of the true nature of the moral law. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.91}

We take it for granted that our brother accepts the statement that the moral law is summarily contained in the ten commandments. The Decalogue comprehends all human duty, being an expression of the will of God, a transcript of his character. These propositions may be clearly proved by Scripture, but it is probably not necessary to take the space to do it here. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.92}

Now the inspired apostle, speaking of this same Decalogue, says, “The law is spiritual.” Romans 7:14. Comparatively few give enough thought to the law of God to consider the full force of this. It means that nothing that is not spiritual is obedience to the divine law. it means that mere outward physical conformity to the precepts of the Decalogue, has really nothing to do with the law. This is shown by our Saviour in his sermon on the mount. In that he said: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” Matthew 5:21, 22. Through the apostle John he also said, “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” 1 John 3:15. What do we learn from this? Is it that Christ has given us rules of life that are higher than the ten commandments?-Not at all. We learn that the sixth commandment means more than that a man should not take his neighbor’s life with knife or pistol. We learn that when from the fire and smoke of Sinai God thundered the words, “Thou shalt not kill,” he meant that we should not indulge a thought that if allowed to fully develop would result in murder. The sixth commandment reaches to the thoughts and emotions of the soul. That which does not go as deep as this is not obedience. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.93}

When the apostle says that “the law is spiritual,” he cannot mean anything less. The statement is true of the whole law. It is spiritual, and only spiritual. It is not worth while to spend time showing that this does not mean that outward conformity is non-essential if the spirit of the law is kept; for as the greater includes the less, it is manifest that spiritual obedience-the obedience of the heart-involves conformity to the letter of the law. A man who never harbors an evil thought will not lay violent hands on his neighbor. But let it be understood that if a man does cherish anger, hatred, and envy in the heart, he does not keep the sixth commandment in any sense whatever. So the man whose mind indulges in lustful thoughts does not in any sense keep the seventh commandment, although so far as any human being knows, he may be a very respectable man. A man may dishonor his parents while supporting them in the finest style. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 632.94}

The idea seems to obtain quite generally that there are two parts to each commandment-an outer and an inner-and that if a man “keeps the commandment outwardly,” he does very well; that such “obedience” will be set down to is credit in the books on high. This comes from confounding respectability with morality. It is assumed that that which gives a man favor with man will likewise give him favor with God. But we think that what we have already written is sufficient to enable the reader to understand that “the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.” 1 Samuel 16:7. *Seeing* is not *being*. The shadow is not the substance. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.1}

We might dwell at great length on the nature of the moral law; but what has been said is sufficient to show that “the commandment is exceeding broad.” And so it will be seen that the law on our statute-books against larceny is in no respect a repetition of the divine commandment. “Thou shalt not steal.” The law against violation of the marriage vows is in no sense a repetition of the precept, “Thou shalt not commit adultery.” The civil law against murder is not an enforcement of any part of the divine precept which says, “Thou shalt not kill.” The reason is, as already shown, that those commandments are spiritual, and nothing but spiritual life meets in any degree their requirements, while civil government is not spiritual, and is satisfied if men refrain from overt trespass against their fellows. It can require nothing more, and the basis of their requirement is not the moral law, but the natural desire of men for protection. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.2}

The State is not charged with the duty of making Christians. It was not to civil magistrates that our Saviour gave the commission to preach the gospel to every creature. The apostles went out taking nothing and asking nothing from the Gentiles. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.3}

Having shown that the laws which are already enacted against murder, theft, etc., are not reflections of the divine law, but are simply the expression of the natural desire of man for self-preservation, and that because the commandment is spiritual the State *cannot* deal with it, the fourth commandment may quickly be disposed of. That commandment is spiritual, as are the others. It is not mere physical rest that the divine law requires. The Sabbath must be kept *holy*. He who does not keep the day holy, does not keep the Sabbath, no matter how much he abstains from labor. In fact, the keeping of the Sabbath according to God’s appointment is the mark of the highest spiritual attainment. Hear what the Lord says: “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” Isaiah 58:13, 14. This is true Sabbath-keeping. It is divine worship and spiritual attainment so high that the majority have no conception of it. Much less can the State enforce it. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.4}

The matter seems to us so plain that we cannot but think that our brother now sees it as we do; yet we know that there are many phases that we have not touched, and we shall be most happy to consider any further questions that may be asked. We can in this article no more than call attention to the fact that for the State to attempt to enforce the moral law would be a union of Church and State. As a matter of fact, no civil government has ever yet made laws requiring obedience to anything which God has commanded. When the State has legislated concerning something different from the Scripture precept. But the union of Church and State consists in the State enforcing what it or its advisers conceive to be the divine requirements. This is all that was done during the ages of papal supremacy, which furnishes the most perfect example of Church and State union. A State law designed to enforce the fourth commandment, or anybody’s conception of the fourth commandment, is to that extent a union of Church and State. Dr. Schaff (“Progress of Religious Freedom,” p. 82) says, “Some features of a union of Church and State remain in some States even to this day.” If the law is a dead letter, the union is only nominal, but the fact remains the same. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.5}

This is a subject of vast and growing importance, and we hope to hear from our brother again. E. J. W. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.6}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:6-13” The Signs of the Times, 15, 50.**

E. J. Waggoner

1. In the Mosaic dispensation, did God have a dwelling place among his people? {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.7}

2. Where was it made? and by whom? {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.8}

3. What were its two rooms called? {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.9}

4. Who were permitted to go into the sanctuary? Numbers 18:1-7. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.10}

5. How often did the priests go into the holy place? Hebrews 9:6. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.11}

6. Who was permitted to go into the most holy? Verse 7. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.12}

7. In what does our priest minister? Hebrews 8:2. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.13}

8. Where is the sanctuary in which he ministers? Verses 1, 2. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.14}

9. Who made that sanctuary? Verse 2. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.15}

10. Where was the blood of the sin-offerings presented before the Lord? Leviticus 4:7; 16:14, 15. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.16}

11. Could Christ have any priesthood on earth? Nehemiah 8:4. See note. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.17}

12. Who were the priests that served according to the law?-*Ib*. Exodus 28:1. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.18}

13. What was the nature of their service? Hebrews 8:5. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.19}

14. What is meant by the example and shadow? *Ans*.-They were typical. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.20}

15. How was the pattern or example obtained? Same verse, last part. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.21}

16. Of what is Christ the mediator? Verse 6. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.22}

17. How does this compare with the old covenant?-*Ib*. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.23}

18. What was the old covenant? See Exodus 19:5-8; 24:3-8. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.24}

19. What is a covenant? See note. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.25}

20. Upon what was the better covenant established? Hebrews 8:6. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.26}

21. What was the condition of the covenant in Exodus 19:5-8?-It was that which the Lord called *his covenant*. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.27}

22. What was his covenant which he required them to keep? Deuteronomy 4:12, 13. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.28}

**NOTES**

At first glance it might seem that the reasoning is not good, which decides that Christ could have no priesthood on earth; for, if the law which confined the priesthood to the family of Aaron were abolished, what would hinder one serving though he were of another tribe? But it must be remembered that the priesthood and the law ordaining the priesthood stood and fell together. The only law for an earthly priesthood was that law which gave the office exclusively to the family of Aaron, and if any would act as priest on earth he must conform to the law of the earthly priesthood. It was impossible for one of another tribe to act as priest on earth. Further, it must be borne in mind that the service in the temple was still kept up by the Jews at the time when this letter was written, so that the words in this verse were conformable to the facts as they existed, as well as to the facts concerning the change of dispensations. For no one could possibly have then officiated as priest unless he were of the family of Aaron. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.29}

Webster gives two principal definitions to the word “covenant.” The first is, “A mutual agreement of two or more persons or parties, in writing and under seal, to do or to refrain from some act or thing.” The second is, “A writing containing the terms of agreement between parties. But neither of these definitions is extensive enough to cover all the uses of the word in the Bible. For instance, in Genesis 9:9-16 the word “covenant” is used with reference to a promise of God, given without any condition expressed or implies. The common idea of a covenant more nearly fits the transaction recorded in Exodus 19:5-8; yet even here we shall find that the thing called a covenant, which God made with the people, does not in every particular correspond to a contract made between two men. It is only another instance of the impossibility of a perfect comparison between divine and human things. In other places in the Bible the word “testament” or “will” is used with reference to the same transaction, although a *contract* and a *will* are greatly different. The transaction between God and Israel partakes of the nature of both. But it is of little consequence that a human covenant does not perfectly represent the affair, or that the Bible uses the word “covenant” in so widely varying senses. The main point is to understand just what is meant in each instance, and this the Scriptures themselves enable us readily to do. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 791.30}

Still another sense in which the word “covenant” is used in the Bible, is found in the text under consideration. Exodus 19:5-8. The condition of the covenant which the Lord made with Israel, was that they should keep his covenant. Here was something already existing, which God calls “my covenant,” concerning which he was about to make a covenant with the people. What God’s covenant is, may be found from Deuteronomy 4:12, 13. It is the ten commandments. God’s law-called his covenant-was the basis of the covenant between him and Israel. The matter is so plain that there is no necessity for confusion. It makes no difference that the same term is applied to both; it is sufficient to know that God’s covenant-the ten commandments-antedated and is entirely distinct from the transaction at Horeb-also called a covenant. That to which the apostle refers as the first covenant, was, therefore, simply this: A promise on the part of the people to keep his holy law, and a statement on the part of God, of the result to them if they should obey him. {SITI December 30, 1889, p. 9.1}