**“Good Words in a Sunday Convention” The Signs of the Times, 16, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

In previous numbers of the SIGNS we have shown the fallacy of the idea the civil government may enforce any portion of the moral law, and we have also shown the evil consequences which would necessarily result from an attempt to put such a fallacious idea into practice. We are glad to present in this number a corroboration of our views by a minister of the gospel. And we are the more glad because the argument which we shall quote was made in a Sunday convention, in the second annual meeting of the Sabbath Association of Iowa, which was held in Des Moines, November 12, and 13, 1889. Rev. J. K. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, gave an address on “The Basis of the Civil Sabbath,” which was printed in full in the *Iowa State Register* of November 13, from which we quote. Speaking of the laws already existing, and of the Sunday laws which the association is seeking to make, he said:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.94}

“If these laws are right, why are they right? There needs to be a clearing up at this point. The ideas of many are vague and faulty as to the genius and intent of these Sunday regulations. Many in the church and out imagine that they prescribe a precept of the Christian religion; that they are simply a transcript of the fourth commandment to our statue-books. More than that, many ardent defenders of the Sabbath justify them on that ground. They say, God has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, and the State should do the same. But God has demanded that we be good stewards of his bounty, and give liberally to him. Is the State therefore to command this? God has commanded that we be given to hospitality. Is the State to see to it that this be accomplished? God has commanded that we honor one another and in honor prefer one another. Shall the State undertake the enforcement of these divine laws? It is time we had done with arguing for Sabbath legislation before Congress or other legislative bodies on plea of its divine institution and scriptural authority. It is utterly untenable according to the spirit of our charters of government.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.95}

In this paragraph the question is fairly stated, and the statement in the closing sentence is correct. After referring to certain judicial decisions on certain laws against crime, the speaker continued as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.96}

“The civil law forbids these, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relations of men to God. To base these Sunday laws thus upon a divine command, as the civil ground, is to that extent to join Church and State, and to violate the fundamental principles of the State and federal governments.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.97}

In the above paragraph we have a just distinction made between sin and crime. Sin is the violation of the moral law. Crime is a violation of human law. We wish the reader to notice the latter part of the paragraph just quoted. In agreement with arguments we have before presented, he shows that for the State to base its law upon divine command, or to attempt to enforce any one of the divine commands, is the union of Church and State. This was wholesome truth to present before a Sunday convention. We wish every Sunday convention could listen to similar talk. Mr. Fowler continued as follows, concerning the idea that the State could enact a Sunday law on the basis of the divine commandment:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.98}

“But such a basis of the Sunday law is not only illegal, but it may be even unscriptural. The Bible itself does not warrant us in inscribing upon the civil statute-books whatever we find to be the mind of the Lord. The Bible does not give us a divine standard of moral duty, by which we may discriminate between right and wrong. But it also gives a divine model of wise legislation. It shows there are some things reasonable and some unreasonable to undertake by the civil statute, that statutory law is not to be framed always into exact correspondence with the criterion of individual duty. And this scriptural lesson is one of the very first importance for a Christian citizen of a republic like ours to learn.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.99}

We wish every citizen of this republic might learn this scriptural lesson. The fact that the great body of the National Reformers desire to have the State attempt to re-enact and enforce the law of God, shows, according to Rev. Mr. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, that they are very deficient in scriptural knowledge; and in this we agree with him. Again Mr. Fowler said:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.100}

“If our zealous, well-meaning, but deluded friends of the Sabbath, desire to defeat the very ends they aim at, they want to push to the front, and press upon the law-makers this scriptural command for the basis of Sunday laws, until a furor of public feeling like that of 1826 again sweeps the country and takes with it every vestige of Sabbath legislation. Many good people, even of these boasted days of religious liberty, fail to understand that the State is not competent to enjoin divine precepts because they are divine. The law against murder is not on the civil statute-books because it is in the decalogue, but because society could not exist without such a law. The law against stealing is not in the civil code because it was found essential to maintain the rights of property. Government exists to secure to men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to maintain a peaceful and orderly, a mutual, helpful condition of society. Hence its laws simply aim at these ends. They are passed because of some supposed public need, because it is believed the general good requires them. We are bound thus in the matter of the Sunday laws to stand outside the Bible and argue for them on the same line as all the other laws, because the public need and advantage require them. If we cannot indicate them on these grounds they can claim and deserve no place on the statute-books.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.101}

With this also we heartily agree; only one statement might have been made a little stronger, and that is, that laws passed to secure men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are passed on account of some supposed public need. There can be no supposition about it. If there is to be any public at all, it is an actual necessity that life and liberty be preserved. But in all these paragraphs which we have quoted the speaker has shown a clear perception of the limitations of human government, and we would that all could read his argument and see the force of it, and agree with him that, if Sunday laws are made to stand, it must be because the public good requires them. The next and closing paragraph of this speech shows how impossible it is to make it appear that the public good requires a Sunday law, and that the Sunday should be enforced for the same reason that laws are enacted against stealing. Said he:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.102}

“That a law-guarded rest-day is one of these agencies will hardly be questioned by any reasonable man. On that day peace of God settles down over Sabbath-keeping land. The din of labor ceases, and the din of strife and merry-making, and a few quiet hours are given in which the most engrossed and toil-burdened soul may at least have the opportunity, if it will, to worship God and learn of truths that bear upon a right life. Remember that the law makes no attempt to enforce religion, or even religious observance, on Sunday. It simply institutes a weekly civil holiday, and surrounds it with safeguards such as subserve the interests of morality and makes as favorable as possible.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.103}

In this paragraph the speaker went against all he had so clearly stated before. His attempt to show that society requires such a law, by stating that on Sunday, if enforced by law, peace settles down over the land, and a few quiet hours are given in which all may have the opportunity to learn of God and truths that bear upon a right life, shows that such laws are at least an attempt to enforce morality. There is not the slightest ground on which a so-called civil Sunday law can be based consistently with justice. If it is said that man needs one day in seven for rest, then we will point to the thousands who are observing the seventh day of the week, and to the scores of thousands who are observing the first day of the week, without any law compelling rest. That is sufficient evidence that no such law is needed. If the law is asked only in order that man may have one day in the week to rest, why is it that many who have strictly and quietly rested on the seventh day have been persecuted for not resting on the first day? They have surely rested one-seventh of the time, and nobody can claim that resting upon the first day of the week will do a man more good than resting upon the seventh. Of course it will be said that the seventh day is not the day that the law recognizes; that the great body of Christians recognize the first day, and therefore the law should demand rest on that day. So then the whole question of the civil Sunday law is given up, and it is admitted that the basis of the law is some supposed superiority of Sunday over other days. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.104}

It needs no argument to show that all the physical good that may be gained by resting on Sunday is gained to an equal extent by resting on Saturday, and as to the good of society we challenge anyone to demonstrate that a society observing the seventh day is not outwardly, to say the least, as good as one which observes the first. But in spite of Mr. Fowler’s little defection at the close of his speech, we think it is a good one, and commend it to the careful perusal of our readers. E. J. W. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.105}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:1-9” The Signs of the Times, 16, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 24, March 15, 1890.)**

1. What was the nature of the law of sacrifices? Hebrews 10:1. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.106}

2. Was it exactly like the things of which it was the shadow?-*Ib*. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.107}

3. What differences were there between the priesthood of Aaron and that of Christ? {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.108}

4. Could the sacrifices of that law make anyone perfect?-*Ib*. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.109}

5. If they could, what would have been the result? Verse 2. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.110}

6. Why would they have ceased to be offered? Ans.-They would have had the same power as the offering of Christ, and would not have needed to be repeated. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.111}

7. What is meant by their being remembrances of sin? Ans.-Their continued sacrifices were continual acknowledgments of sin. Verse 3. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.112}

8. Why were their sins kept in continual remembrance? Verse 4. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.113}

9. What is Christ represented as saying when he came into the world? Verse 5. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.114}

10. Did this mean that the Lord would not have any sacrifice? {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.115}

11. From what scripture is this quoted? Psalm 40:6-8. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.116}

12. For what can we say a body was prepared him? Ans.-For a sacrifice in contrast with those undesirable ones that could not take away sin. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.117}

13. Where was it written that he should thus come? Hebrews 10:7. The volume of the book doubtless refers to the Pentateuch; for the Saviour said that Moses wrote of him, and that all things written in the law of Moses concerning him must be fulfilled. John 5:46; Luke 24:44. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.118}

14. For what did he say he came? Hebrews 10:7. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.119}

15. What two things are spoken of in verses 6 and 7? Ans.-Burnt-offerings and the will of God? {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.120}

16. What do we learn concerning the will of God in the verse from which this is quoted? Psalm 40:8. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.121}

17. Is the law the will of God? Ans.-There is no difference between the will of God and the law of God. The law of any ruler is his will. See Romans 2:17, 18, etc. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.122}

18. Where did Christ say the law was? Psalm 40:8. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.123}

19. Where did God promise to put his law, in the new covenant? Hebrews 8:10. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.124}

20. Who is the mediator for the fulfillment of this promise? {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.125}

21. Would he make the sacrifice that he did, to accomplish this, if the law were not in his own heart? {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.126}

22. What is meant by his taking away the first? Hebrews 10:9. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.127}

23. What is the second, that he came to establish? See note. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.128}

**NOTE**

Verse 9 has also been obscured by the unwarranted additions of theologians, who have put their theories into their translations. In a certain translation of the New Testament, of high pretentions, it is made to read, “He taketh away the first will that he may establish the second.” But there are no two wills spoken of in the text. The rendering is intended to be equivalent to this: He taketh away the first covenant, that he may establish the second. No one is warranted in putting an idea into a text which is not written in the text, merely because the idea may be true. That construction is altogether foreign to the apostle’s train of reasoning. There is a contrast presented throughout in verses 5-9, as follows:- {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.129}

1. “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire.” “I come to do thy will.” {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.130}

He takes away the first, that he may establish the second. In this is found the only contrast in the argument, and it is made very prominent. The sacrifices and offerings of the Mosaic law could not perfect the conscience, could not reform the life, could not write the law of God in the heart. These are taken away, that he may come in whose heart is the law, and who alone can fulfill the promise of the new covenant. {SITI March 3, 1890, p. 91.131}

**“Religion and the Church” The Signs of the Times, 16, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

When so much is said *pro* and *con*, about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by “the church.” Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If in squeaking of the church “we should refer to some special denomination, we would thereby imply that no other denomination could be a part of “the church.” With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term “the church” with reference to any particular sect. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.132}

In the Bible “the church” is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that “he is the head of the body, the church” (Colossians 1:18); and again he says that God “hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.” Ephesians 1:22, 23. Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the church, as Paul says, “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” and that this body is Christ is shown by the words, “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.133}

“The church,” then, in the strict sense of the word, is composed of those who are “in Christ,” who have been converted, “born again,” and are consequently “new creatures.” From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them together, can be called “the church.” Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of “the church,” because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.134}

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the church is known only to Him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of his church. Thus we *assume*, since we cannot *decide*, that such individual’s profession is an honest one. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.135}

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church. It is that which makes the church, and without that there is no church. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.136}

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment party is in favor of a union of Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the New York Convention of the National Reform Association held in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards of Peoria, Ill., said:- {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.137}

“It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen, of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all other sects, or that all these sects would combine to effect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate upon principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions.” {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.138}

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining “the church,” taken in connection with Dr. Edward’s positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 91.139}

“But,” says one, “do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?” We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any men religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.1}

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian-a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so, likewise, the profession of religion by the State constitutes a State church. This is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment party is pledged to bring about. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.2}

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding? E. J. W. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.3}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:10-20” The Signs of the Times, 16, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 25, March 22, 1890.)**

1. For what did Christ take away the sacrifices of the law of Moses? {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.4}

2. What do we learn in the Scriptures is the will of God? {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.5}

3. What is done for us by this will? Hebrews 10:10. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.6}

4. What is the law called in Psalm 119:142? {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.7}

5. What did the Lord Jesus say in his prayer for our sanctification? John 17:17. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.8}

6. Is the truth necessary for our sanctification? Ans.-It is; error, however fine in appearance, however firmly believed, has no sanctifying influence. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.9}

7. Are we sanctified by hearing the truth? Compare John 3:19; 15:22; Matthew 7:26, 27. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.10}

8. Are we sanctified by believing the truth? James 2:14, 17, 20, 26. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.11}

9. What is necessary in order to be sanctified through the truth? 1 Peter 1:22. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.12}

10. Can all truth be obeyed? Ans.-It cannot. To be obeyed it must be in the form of law. There can be no obedience where there is nothing commanded. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.13}

11. Is that truth sanctifying which does not call for obedience? James 2:19. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.14}

12. Is it therefore of no profit because it will not sanctify? See note. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.15}

13. What did God say the children of Israel should be if they would keep his commandments? Exodus 19:6. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.16}

14. Can we, then, be sanctified by our obedience to the law? Ans.-We cannot. See note. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.17}

15. How does Paul say that we are sanctified by the will of God? Hebrews 10:10. Compare 2 Timothy 3:15. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.18}

16. After our High Priest offered his sacrifice, where did he go? Hebrews 10:12. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.19}

17. What is he expecting-waiting for? Verse 13. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.20}

18. Who puts his enemies under his feet? Psalm 110:1. Compare 1 Corinthians 15:27, 28. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.21}

19. Where have we liberty to enter? Hebrews 10:19. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.22}

20. What is meant by the holiest? Ans.-It is, literally, the holies, that is, the heavenly sanctuary. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.23}

21. By what means do we enter there?-*Ib*. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.24}

22. Do we enter there actually, or in person? Ans.-No; we enter in the person of our Priest as a man is said to appear in court when his advocate is there for him. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.25}

23. By what manner of way do we enter there? Verse 20. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.26}

24. With what is the new and living way in contrast? Ans.-With the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, which were dead when their blood was offered in the sanctuary. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.27}

25. What is that way?-*Ib*. See note. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.28}

**NOTES**

By 2 Timothy 3:16, 17 we learn that all truth is profitable, but truths are not all of the same nature, and are not all equally profitable. Some truths are primary, some are secondary. In James 2:19 we are told that we do well if we believe that there is one God; that is a very important truth, which, unfortunately, some nations of the earth have entirely forgotten. But it does not call for obedience-nobody can obey an abstract statement of that kind. It only calls for belief. And the demons believe it, and they remain demons still, even though they tremble before that truth. They are not sanctified by their belief, because it works no change of character; it is dead. But he who does the will of that one God is sanctified thereby, because he thereby forms a character in harmony with that will. While the law of God is that primary truth, which directly sanctifies, other truth is secondary; it can only work indirectly in our sanctification. But it leads toward sanctification, even indirectly, only when it leads us toward the law-to the way of obedience. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.29}

We could be sanctified by obedience to the law if we had never forfeited our justification and destroyed our ability by disobedience. Instead of now being justified by the law, we already stand condemned, for we have all disobeyed it. Romans 3:9, 19, 23. Sin has perverted our natures, so that alone we can do nothing. John 15:5. But that does not destroy the fact that the law is perfect, and is justifying in its virtue. That the law cannot justify us is not the fault of the law-it is our own fault. The law did not fall in the fall of man; the law does not become sin because we sin. Romans 7:7-14. The law is the measure and rule of the righteousness of God; it witnesses to that righteousness. Romans 3:21. By our fall we are far below the righteousness of the law, and we are now dependent upon another to raise us up to where its righteousness may be fulfilled in us. Romans 8:4. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.30}

There is a fund of instruction in this expression in Hebrews 10:20. It is not a “way of life,” as some have construed it, but a way ever new, ever living. Our Sacrifice is alive forever, and his blood is ever fresh, precious, incorruptible. 1 Peter 1:18, 19. This great truth is denied by the Catholics by their doctrine of transubstantiation. They affirm that there is no sacrifice now available for man, except upon their altars, where the water and wine are turned into the actual body and blood of Christ. In that doctrine the sacrifice of Christ is not even new, but needs ever to be renewed; the body and blood need a constant re-creating. By it the contrast between the daily offerings of the old law, and the one offering of Christ, is utterly destroyed. {SITI March 10, 1890, p. 151.31}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:21-25” The Signs of the Times, 16, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 26, March 29, 1890.)**

1. Where is our High Priest? See Hebrews 8:1, 2. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.1}

2. To what purpose did he go to heaven as a priest? Hebrews 9:26. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.2}

3. Are we said to go into the sanctuary, or holies? Hebrews 10:19. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.3}

4. How may we approach the throne? Verse 22, first part. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.4}

5. How does faith come? Romans 10:17. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.5}

6. What is necessary to full assurance of faith? See note. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.6}

7. What is a true heart? Ans.-A heart that clings to the ground of faith, the word of God. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.7}

8. What is said to be done to the heart? Hebrews 10:22. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.8}

9. What is said to be sprinkled upon the heart to purify it? See 1 Peter 1:2; Hebrews 12:24. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.9}

10. Is the heart literally sprinkled with blood? {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.10}

11. How is the blood of Christ applied to our hearts? Ans.-By our faith and the work of the Holy Spirit. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.11}

12. What is said to be done to the body? Hebrews 10:22, last part. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.12}

13. Is the body literally washed with water? {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.13}

14. Is either of these words ever used for baptism? Ans.-They are not. Washing is used for the object or end of baptism in Acts 22:16. Baptism describes the action, by which the washing was accomplished. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.14}

15. How should we hold our profession of faith? Hebrews 10:23. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.15}

16. What is said of him that wavereth? James 1:6. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.16}

17. Why are we encouraged to hold fast without wavering? Hebrews 10:23, last part. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.17}

18. What is meant by considering one another? Ans.-Having regard for; watching over for good. Verse 24. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.18}

19. What is meant by provoke? Ans.-To incite; to stimulate. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.19}

20. Unto what should we incite one another?-*Ib*. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.20}

21. What should we not forsake? Verse 25. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.21}

22. What should we do in our assemblies?-*Ib*. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.22}

23. Is the duty to exhort one another confined to meetings? {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.23}

24. Does the apostle specify any particular time for assembling? {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.24}

25. What special reason is given why we should exhort one another? {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.25}

26. To what day does the apostle here refer? Ans.-The day of which he has spoken, when our Redeemer will come again. He has introduced no other. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.26}

27. Is it, then, true that we can see the day approaching? Matthew 24:3, 32, 33, etc. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.27}

**NOTE**

Many people mistake strong feeling for an assurance of faith, though they are essentially different. Strong feeling may be an accompaniment of faith, though it is not faith itself. And many suppose that there can be no faith without a happy state of feeling, which is a great mistake. Paul had great faith, though circumstances caused him to have great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart. Romans 9:2. Compare Isaiah 50:10; Matthew 5:4. Faith rests entirely upon the word of God, but feeling is often the outgrowth of impressions, produced in various ways. Self-complacency, deep satisfaction over one’s own experience, is very often mistaken for assurance of faith, while, oftentimes, the individual has no faith at all-no clear conception of the teachings of God’s word. Full assurance of genuine faith is unwavering confidence in God, with knowledge of his word and implicit belief of the word. The clearer the word is to our understanding, the better is the chance for full assurance of faith; for how can we have faith in that of which we are ignorant? The mystical system of interpreting the Scriptures, by which they are made to mean anything that can be imagined, precludes faith. Under that system the mind is filled only with fancies, while faith is something substantial. This subject is fully considered in the next chapter. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.28}

**ADDITIONAL NOTES**

“Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together.” God has made man a social being. Intercourse with his fellows is a law of his nature, and man cannot reach his full development as a man without this. This is especially true as regards Christian character. God has set in his church different gifts, which are likened to different members, or parts of the human body. (See 1 Corinthians 12.) As each part of the body is mutually dependent to a greater or less extent on every other part in order to full and perfect development, so the various members and gifts in the church need the aid and instruction to be received from all. They are to “edity [or build up] one another” (1 Thessalonians 5:11); to “comfort one another” (chap. 4:18); and, if connected with Christ, the head, they will in this way be “fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love” (Ephesians 4:16). {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.29}

He who thinks to live a Christian life, separate from his kind, will find himself dwarfed in the end. That hill of corn, or maize, best filled and more nearly perfect is not found alone, or on the outskirts of the cornfield, but in the middle of the field. The pollen of its neighbors fertilizes then every kernel represented by the “silks.” One hill standing alone will be wanting. It needs the aid and abundance of the many to supply its wants; as it also may unite with the many in supplying others needs. Stones become polished by contact; characters are somewhat similar. Therefore the people of God should meet together to warn, exhort, instruct, and comfort, and so build one another up in the most holy faith. He who can meet with others of like precious faith and fails to do so, will bring only barrenness to his soul. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.30}

But someone will say: “I am all alone. I live near no one who believes as I do. Those truths so dear to me I cannot talk with others. What shall I do? Am I to grow spiritually poor because of that which is not my fault?” Not at all. God asks no more of us than what it is possible for us to perform through grace. If we can meet with the living members of Christ’s body, that is our duty; if we cannot, there are other means which God will provide. There are his holy word, the writings of his faithful servants in good books and papers; there is the soul communion with him. God “giveth more grace” to the lonely ones who trust him and improve their opportunities. Neither are those who do meet with each other, to neglect the aids of the word of God, prayer, and instructive reading. Greater privileges bring greater responsibilities. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.31}

“And so much the more as ye see the day approaching.” This does not mean that we should meet more and more frequently, continually increasing the times of assembling; for this would after awhile lead to continuous meeting; and continuous meeting alone will not develop Christian character. The character must be settled, hardened, established, by meeting in the grace and strength of Christ the trials and conflicts of life. It means that we should so much the more not forsake the assembling of ourselves together and exhorting one another. As the day of God draws near, perils thicken around the little flock; the enemy brings upon them sorer temptations. So much the more ought they not to neglect every means of grace. Courage and faith in God should be their watch word. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.32}

Yet as the day draws near there will be strong temptations not to do this; there will be apparent duties to plead, physical disability or physical disinclination will be presented as an excuse. The “enchanted ground” lies just before the land of Beulah. And as Christian and Hopeful could only resist its influence by talking over the things of God, so will the people of God in the last days have to use every means of grace or be overcome by its baneful, deadly opiate. Prudence and safety demand a fulfillment of duty in meeting together whenever possible. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.33}

There is another side. God makes precious promises to those who will do this. When only two or three meet in his name there will the Lord be. Matthew 18:20. And in speaking of the time when “that day” is near, the Lord thus speaks through the prophet: “Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that servth him.” Malachi 3:16, 17. {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.34}

We can see, or perceive, that the day of the Lord is approaching by the signs which God has given in his prophetic word, compared with the condition of things in the last days. The multiplying events in the physical world, in Church and in State, will show the fulfillment of God’s word, and will thereby strengthen faith and assure us that the day is nigh. It will, however, be ushered in by no great physical portent or omen. God will decide the time in heaven, Christ will leave his priestly throne; and the eternal fiat will go forth (Revelation 22:11, 12). That day will come upon the earth as a thief (2 Peter 3:10), but it will not overtake the faithful, watchful brethren in Christ (1 Thessalonians 5:3). The thief spoils the house of him who sleeps and watches not; but to the faithful watcher every sign and omen is noted. “Let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober.” {SITI March 17, 1890, p. 155.35}

**“Another Sunday Prosecution in Tennessee” The Signs of the Times, 16, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Troy, Obion County, Tennessee, Mr. R. M. King has just been tried for working upon Sunday, and upon conviction has been fined seventy-five dollars and costs. The circumstances of the case are somewhat peculiar, and are very significant. The indictment read as follows:- {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.36}

“The Grand Jurors of the State of Tennessee, elected, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire in and for the body of the county of Obion, in the State aforesaid, upon their oath present, that R. M. King, late of said county, laborer, heretofore, to wit: on the 23rd day of June, A.D. 1889, and on divers other Sundays before and after that date, and up to the taking of this requisition in the county of Obion aforesaid, then and there did unlawfully and unnecessarily engage in his secular business and performed his common avocation of life, to wit: plowing on Sunday, and did various other kinds of labor on that day, and on Sundays before that day, without regard to said Sabbath-days. Said work was not necessary, nor done as a matter of charity; and the doing of said work on said day was and is a disturbance to the community in which done, was offensive to the morals of the public, and is a common nuisance. So the Grand Jurors aforesaid present and say that said R. M. King was in manner and form aforesaid guilty of a public nuisance by such work on Sunday, in a public place, prejudicial to public morals, contrary to the statute, and against the peace and dignity of the State.” {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.37}

The first and chief witness for the prosecution did not see the defendant at his work for more than five minutes, as he was not in sight of any place of public worship. On cross-examination he said that the work was very annoying to his feelings, on the ground that it was a violation of sacred and civil law. He admitted that Mr. King was in other respects a quiet, peaceable, law-abiding citizen, and a pious, Christian gentleman, but that he did not favor Mr. King’s religious views. It should be stated that Mr. King is a Seventh-day Adventist. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.38}

The judge ruled that the questions as to the defendant’s religious character were not in order. The lawyer for the defense drew from two of the witnesses that they and certain others had bound themselves by a written pledge to prosecute every violation of the Sunday law. The defendant offered to prove that others who made no pretense of observing any other day than Sunday, did at the same time engage in reaping wheat with a machine, rating logs, etc., on Sunday, but this evidence the court would not allow. Of course this evidence would not make the defendant’s guilt any less, if there were any guilt attaching to Sunday labor, but it would show the animus of the prosecution. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.39}

The cross-examination showed that the third, fourth, and fifth witnesses for the prosecution were themselves engaged in secular labor when they saw Mr. King at work. But they had not rested on the seventh day. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.40}

The defendant also offered to prove, which was a fact, that he had been tried before a justice of the peace, and had been fined for the identical work which was cited as the principal offense in the indictment, namely, plowing on the 23rd of June last, but this evidence the judge would not allow. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.41}

The speed of the prosecuting attorney was a tirade against Seventh-day Adventists, and was full of indecency, which was calculated to please the vulgar. Said he:- {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.42}

“I wish to God we had more Methodist Churches, and more Baptist Churches, and more Presbyterian Churches, and more Episcopal Churches, and more Catholic Churches, until every man was brought under the benign influence of these churches; but, in the name of God, I do not want any of these Adventist Churches, or Mormon Churches. Gitteau, when he had a revelation from God (and I expect he had a Seventh-day Adventist lawyer to defend him), took a pistol and shot down the ruler of the nation, and they hung him; and that is what they ought to do with all these fellows.” {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.43}

Much more of the same sort, and much worse, was given, all of which showed that the spirit of the prosecution was not zeal for Sunday as the Sabbath, nor for good morals, but hatred for the Sabbath, and for those who observe it. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, where it will soon be heard. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.44}

Thus we have another instance of the working of religious legislation. From the days of Constantine down, evil and nothing but evil has come from State laws in favor of any religious practice. Would that men would learn that “God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth,” and not by civil enactments. E. J. W. {SITI March 31, 1890, p. 155.45}