**“The Original Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

In view of the agitation of the Sunday question, and the attempt to base Sunday laws upon the Bible, it is well for all to be thoroughly informed as to what the Bible does say about the Sabbath. Nor is this so difficult a matter as many suppose. They listen to some Sunday-law lecturer, who glibly repeats over a series of statements about the Sabbath, which he has culled from some book, and which he has no idea of proving, and they become bewildered, and say, “It is no use for us to try to settle this matter; if teachers of theology are so disagreed, how can we hope to understand it?” Now we do not blame them for becoming discouraged from trying to understand what men say about the Sabbath; but what the Bible says is so simple that a child could not become confused by it. It is true that there are some things in the Bible that are hard to be understood. The doctrines of election, and foreordination, and predestination, may require much hard study in order to be understood; but it is a fact that all those difficult subjects do not involve practical duty. A man may be a good Christian, and still be unable to make any statement in regard to them. But everything which involves a practical duty is very plain. It does not require that a person shall be highly educated to know what murder is, and that it is wrong. A man need not take a college course to understand how to be honest; and a man who does not know the multiplication table may know what would be a violation of the ninth commandment as well as a man who can measure the distances of the stars. So it is with the fourth commandment. It enjoins upon all the observance of the Sabbath, and therefore it is so plain that the most ignorant can understand it. Let us see what the Bible says about it. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 460.16}

Going back to the very beginning, we read the account in Genesis 2:1-3: “Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God had ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 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.” That is the record of the making of the Sabbath. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 460.17}

How was it made? God rested, blessed, and sanctified, or set apart, the day. What day did he rest upon, bless, and set apart?-The seventh day. Which seventh day?-The seventh day of the week, for that is the only period of time consisting of seven days. It is the Sabbath which marks the week. According to the inspired narrative, the first six days of time were spent in the work of creating the heavens and earth and all that they contain; and the creation week was completed by a day of rest. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 460.18}

For whom was the Sabbath made? Jesus said, “The Sabbath was made for man.” Mark 2:27. Of what day of the week was he speaking?-Of the seventh day, the day which the Jews then kept, and which they have always observed. The Pharisees had charged his disciples with violating the Sabbath. Jesus cleared them from that charge, and claimed for himself the high honor of being Lord of the Sabbath,-the very Sabbath which the Jews held as sacred. That showed his ability to decide what was and what was not Sabbath-breaking. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 460.19}

But now the claim comes in that the Sabbath which the Jews kept was another day from the original Sabbath. This is the sum of a book which Dr. Briggs, of California, wrote on the Sabbath. His statement is that in the beginning God sanctified the day which we now call Sunday, but that the people so perverted it and devoted it to the worship of the sun, that he had to give the Jews a fresh day, uncontaminated by heathen worship, when he took them from Egypt. Accordingly he gave them the day before, which was their Sabbath until the crucifixion, when the calendar was slipped forward another notch, and the original Sunday was given to the people. This theory the doctor says he has arrived at by “much study, *self-searching*, and close thinking.” We don’t doubt it; but if he had searched the Bible instead of himself, he would not have broached so baseless a theory. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.1}

Now note how quickly such fog vanishes before the sunlight of truth. We will allow that the Sabbath was given to the Jews at the exodus. This does not indicate that they did not have it before, any more than the fact that God made himself known to them at that time indicates that he was previously unknown. How did he make the Sabbath known to them? Listen to Nehemiah’s inspired prayer: “Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.” Nehemiah 9:13, 14. He made known the Sabbath upon Sinai. Now the only thing spoken on Sinai in regard to the Sabbath was the fourth commandment, which reads thus: {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.2}

“Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, 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 September 1, 1890, p. 466.3}

What day was declared from Sinai to be the Sabbath?-“The seventh day,” the very day that in the beginning was made the Sabbath. God simply declared anew an old truth. He did not say that from that time the seventh day should be the Sabbath, but that “the seventh day *is* the Sabbath.” How did it become such? For answer he repeats just what we have recorded in Genesis 2:1-3, that in six days the Lord made all things, and then rested upon the seventh day, which thus became the Sabbath; and then it was blessed and set apart as the Sabbath for man. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.4}

The original Sabbath, therefore, from creation, was the same day that it was from the exodus to the cross. And the same day that was the Sabbath during Christ’s earthly ministry continued to be the Sabbath for all time afterwards. The Bible knows no other Sabbath. Did the reader ever stop to think that the very day that the Jews kept is throughout the New Testament called the Sabbath? “Oh,” says someone, “the writers of the New Testament were Jews, and would naturally use language that they were accustomed to.” No such thing. The writers of the New Testament were Christians; they wrote for Christians. Not only so, but they did not write their own words. The apostle Paul throws light upon the source of their words and teaching, when he says:- {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.5}

“Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” 1 Corinthians 2:12, 13. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.6}

The Holy Spirit, then, is the source of the words of the Bible. The names which it gives to things are the names which God designs that they shall bear. Now everywhere in the New Testament the seventh day is by the Holy Spirit called the Sabbath; and this was all written years after the crucifixion. The Holy Spirit called it so because it was so. Therefore the conclusion is self-evident, that the same day which was the Sabbath ever since. This is plainly revealed; and “those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.” E. J. W. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.7}

**“No Justification by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

“What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there in none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Romans 3:9-20. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.8}

As we said in our last article, the first part of this passage, down to verse 18, is an answer to the last question raised by the Jewish objector: “What then? Are we better than they?” These verses bring us to the point where the apostle completes the foundation of his argument, and is ready for the climax. We have seen that the first chapter relates to the degradation of the heathen; the second chapter shows the Jews to be in the same condemnation; and in the verses just quoted, the apostle quotes scripture after scripture to corroborate his statements concerning both classes. We need not go into the niceties of the signification of the different terms employed; the charge is plain enough for all to understand. Only two clauses claim special attention. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.9}

“And the way of peace have they not known.” This is in harmony with the previous statement, “They are all gone out of the way.” It is evident that the way from which they have departed is the way of peace. Now what is the way of peace? Let the Bible answer. The Lord says, “O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea.” Isaiah 48:18. Says the psalmist, “Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend them.” Psalm 119:165. Disobedience to the law which governs the universe, is rebellion against God, as he said to Isaiah: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and not it in a book, that it may be for the time to come forever and ever; that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord.” Isaiah 30:8, 9. When men cease their rebellion, and lay down their arms, there is peace; so there can be nothing but peace when men yield to the commandments of God. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.10}

The way of peace, from which men have departed, is God’s way, and he says to sinful men: “My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” Isaiah 55:8, 9. That is, the ordinary plane of men’s thoughts and actions is as much lower than the plane of God’s thoughts and actions, as expressed in his law, as the earth is lower than the highest heaven. This is important to bear in mind while reading verses 19 and 20. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.11}

“Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law,” or within the sphere of the law. We will not take time at this point to explain the phrase “under the law,” because the term is really not found in this place. There is a vast different between the Greek here translated “under the law” and that which is properly so rendered in Romans 6:14, and .... Here the meaning is strictly “in the law” the Greek being the same as in Romans 2:12-15. “As many as have sinned *in the law*.” The meaning of the phrase “in the law,” in Romans 2:12-15 was seen to be, *having the law*, that is, the written law, in distinction from those who have the written revelation. The statement that the law speaks to those who have it, is very plain, but as in Romans 2:12-15 it was shown that none are really without law, but that those who are spoken of as without law are in the law only to a less degree than those that have written revelation, so it is here. For mark:- {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.12}

“What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under in the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.13}

Now it is evident that the law cannot condemn any who are not within its jurisdiction. A law peculiar to England cannot declare a citizen of the United States guilty, even though he does the things which it forbids. But the consequence of what the law of God says, is the world stand guilty before him; therefore the law of God speaks to every man in the world. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.14}

This nineteenth verse of the third chapter of Romans stands as a perptual bar to the limiting of God’s law to the Jewish nation. It proves that that law is world-wide in its requirements. By it both Jew and Gentile are proved to be under sin. It was spoken to the Jews, it is true, but only that they might in turn speak it to the Gentiles; and if they failed in their duty in this respect, then the Gentiles would perish in their iniquity, and their blood would be required at the hands of those to whom the message of truth was given. See Ezekiel 33:2-8; Romans 2:12. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.15}

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 466.16}

This is the grand conclusion of the apostle’s argument, so far as the law alone is concerned in its relation to sinful men. It is so reasonable that anybody can see it, and so just that no one ought to lay anything to the charge of the law, on account of it. It is a fact that every soul, both of Jews and Gentiles, is guilty before God. Now what can the law do? Can it justify them? To justify means to make righteous, or to declare righteous. But they are not righteous, therefore the law cannot say that they are. If it did, it would not be a good law. The fact that it will not justify sinners-will not declare them righteous-is a standing proof that it is good. So, instead of burying the law because it will not justify sin for us, we should applaud it. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.1}

Neither can the law make a sinner righteous. No law can do that, any more than a guideboard can carry a person in the direction which it points. The law says, Do, and thou shalt live. The law speaks; it is the province of the man to do. If he does what the law says, it will witness to his righteousness; if he does not do what the law say, it will declare him guilty. It can do no more nor less. But no man has done the law, therefore none can be justified by it. Thus we see that there is no conflict between Romans 2:13 and Romans 3:20. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.2}

A doer of the law is one who has always done it. If a man has failed in only one particular, he cannot be called a doer of the law, for the simple reason that he hasn’t done it all. Therefore on this account he can never be justified by the law. But what is more, the law of God is so holy, so broad and high in its requirements, that no fallen man can ever attain to its full measure. Remember that we are now speaking of fallen man alone, in his relation to the law. Therefore, while the law is the expression of the righteousness of God, which men are commanded to seek, it is a fact that no man can get any righteousness out of it. His best efforts come short of the high standard which the law sets, and just to the extent that they fall short are they sinful. We may not say that the law condemns a man for his best deeds, but it is true that it condemns him for that which he fails to do even with his best efforts. And so it is a fact that the best efforts that any unaided human being can put forth to attain to the righteousness of the law, will really result in adding to his condemnation, as they add to the sum of his failures. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.3}

Who, then, can be saved? A vast multitude which no man can number. But how will they attain the necessary righteousness, since the law, which is the expression of God’s righteousness, will not impart any to them? The problem is solved in the next few verses of the third chapter of Romans, a consideration of which must be deferred till the next article. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.4}

**“Throughout Their Generations” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are told that God never intended that Gentiles should have anything to do with the Sabbath; that it was made only for the Jews. This text is quoted: “Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.” Exodus 31:16, 17. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.5}

Well, one thing is certainly proved by this text, and that is that it is right for Israelites to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. The words “throughout their generations,” “perptual,” and “forever” show that so long as there are generations of Israelites, they must observe the Sabbath. We pass by for the present the statement that “Gentile Christians” are not under obligation to keep the seventh day. Be that as it may, it is certain that Jews are in duty bound by the unalterable command of God to keep the seventh day. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.6}

But here we are reminded that the promises of God are all to Israel. See Romans 9:4. Those who are “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,” have no hope, and are “without God in the world.” Ephesians 2:12. It is Israel that is to be “saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation.” Isaiah 45:17. And not only a part, but “all Israel shall be saved.” Romans 11:26. True, may who are Gentiles will be saved, but it will not be as Gentiles; they must be grafted into the stock of Israel. To be a Jew indeed is to be one who has praise of God. Romans 2:29. So desirable is the position, that even many who are of this “synagogue of Satan” will falsely claim to be Jews. Revelation 3:9. It is with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that the redeemed from all nations are to sit down in the kingdom of God, and they will do so as children of Abraham. See Matthew 8:11; Galatians 3:20. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.7}

Now since Christians are those who are Christ’s, and all who are Christ’s are Abraham’s seed, it follows that all Christians are Israelites, for the promise to Abraham was through Isaac and Jacob. And since the children of Israel are commanded to keep the Sabbath “throughout their generations,” it follows that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is especially enjoined on Christians. And since Israel is to be saved with an everlasting salvation, it follows that their generations are to continue throughout eternity; and so “it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord.” Isaiah 66:23. {SITI September 1, 1890, p. 467.8}

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

How many Christians think when they engage in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper that it touches both advents of Christ? Paul says: “For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord’s death *till he come*.” 1 Corinthians 11:26. To the man who does not believe in the second coming of Christ, the celebration of the Lord’s Supper cannot mean anything. Do you say that it is even to such a one an emblem of Christ’s death? Of what use is it to celebrate his death, if he be not coming the second time to complete the work of redemption? He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification, and to those who look for him he will appear again, for their salvation. The death and resurrection of Christ are really a pledge that he will come again; for Christ’s resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of all who are his, and the resurrection of the dead cannot take place till he comes. See 1 Corinthians 15:51-54; 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.9}

**“How Righteousness Is Obtained” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justified of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also; seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.” Romans 3:21-31. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.10}

After reading the above, read thoughtfully the preceding verses of the chapter, in order that the connection may be kept. Remember that the main point already made in the chapter is that all men-both Jews and Gentiles-have sinned in the sight of God; all are amenable to the law of God, and all are condemned by it; and therefore it is impossible for any to be justified by it. It cannot declare those righteous who have broken it, and its requirements are so pure and lofty that no fallen man has strength to fulfill them. Therefore no man can obtain any righteousness by the law; and yet without holiness-perfect conformity to the law-no man can see the Lord. Hebrews 12:14. But some will see the Lord (see Revelation 22:3, 4), therefore they must get holiness in some other way than by the law. How this can be is the problem, since the law is the complete and perfect expression of the righteousness of God. The scripture at the head of this article solves the problem. Let us note it carefully. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.11}

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.” Ah! That gives hope. But, hold! Are we not in danger of being led astray? Dare we trust in a righteousness that is obtained apart from the law? Well, since we can’t get anything from the law itself, we shall have to get it apart from the law if we have any at all. But don’t be alarmed, for remember that this righteousness which we are to get without or apart from the law, is “the righteousness of God.” Why, that’s just what the law is! Exactly; there can be no real righteousness that is not the righteousness of God, and all that righteousness is set forth in his law. Where and how we are to get it we shall see presently; but note first that it is “witnessed by the law and the prophets.” It is such righteousness as the law will give its sanction to. Now where is it to be obtained? {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.12}

“Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.” And so we have the strongest evidence that we shall not be put to shame before the law, if we can only obtain this righteousness. For we know that Christ, as part of the Godhead, is equal with the Father. He is the Word, and is God. As the Word, the manifestation of Him whom no man hath seen, he spoke the law with his own voice. He spoke it “as one having authority,” “for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Therefore if we get the righteousness of God through Jesus Christ, it is evident that we shall have the righteousness which the law requires, because we get it from the Fountain-head. Our righteousness comes from the same source that the righteousness of the law does. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.13}

How do we get it?-By faith. How else could we get it? Since it is impossible for any to get righteousness by the deeds of the law, it is evident that it must come by faith, as a gift. And this is in keeping with the statement that “the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Someone says that it doesn’t seem possible that we could get righteousness in this way. But think a moment; “sin” and “righteousness” simply denote our relation to God. Now if there is a way by which he can, consistently with his justice, count us righteous, he has a right to. Who shall say that he may not do what he will with his own? {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 467.14}

“God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.” 2 Corinthians 5:19. In giving his only begotten Son for the world, it was the same as though he gave himself; he did give himself. And since the Just died for the unjust (1 Peter 3:18), God can be just and count as righteous the one who will have faith in Jesus. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.1}

“Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith.” The term “law” as used in this verse has no reference to a code, or to any set rules laid down. It must be considered rather as having the sense of “principle.” We are justified, not on the principle of works, but on the principle of faith. “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” No other conclusion can be arrived at from what has gone before. By the deeds of the law there can no flesh be justified, for all have sinned, and those who obtain righteousness obtain it freely as a gift, through the graciousness of God. This excludes boasting. No one can boast of what he has done, for he has done nothing of which a good man would boast. Only good deeds are worthy to be boasted of; but the goodness that we have is given us by the Lord, and so we cannot boast of that. As Paul says elsewhere: “For who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it? 2 Corinthians 4:7. There is no chance for boasting except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.2}

There are a few expressions in the portion already passed over that must have more attention. One is, “To declare his righteousness for the remission of sin that are past.” This must not be taken as indicating that the grace of God exhausts itself in pardoning sin, and that for our future life we must stand alone. No; if that were true, boasting would not be excluded. We are as dependent on Christ for the continued manifestation of his righteousness in us as for the first exhibition of it. He says: “Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me, ...for without me ye can do nothing.” John 15:4, 5. But God’s grace does not remit any sins except those that are past. Sins that are not past have no existence. To remit or pardon them before they are committed would simply be to grant indulgence or license to sin; only the Pope has presumed to do that, and in so doing he has set himself above God. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.3}

Note also that the righteousness by faith of Jesus Christ is “unto all and upon all them that believe.” On the word rendered “unto,” Prof. James R. Boise has this excellent note: “Not simply *unto*, in the sense to, towards, up to, as the word is commonly understood; but *into* (in the strict and usual sense of *eis*), entering into the heart, into the inner being of *all those who have faith*.” This is exactly in accordance with God’s promise in the covenant: “I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts.” Jeremiah 31:33. The righteousness that comes by faith is not superficial; it is actual; it is made a part of the individual. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.4}

And let no one lose sight of the grand fact that not for a moment can anybody escape from the law. The law is ever present. The gospel does not absolve from obligation to it; on the contrary, the gospel emphasizes our obligation, in that it exists for the sole purpose of bringing us into a state of perfect obedience to the law. The man who imagines that faith leads away from the law, does not know what faith is, nor what it is for. Faith can be exercised only toward Christ, who is its author and finisher. He alone has been set forth as the object of faith. But he has been set forth only “that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. Says Paul again: “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Ephesians 2:10. The antinomian is not the man who has genuine faith in Christ. He cannot be, for if he has Christ, he must have the law; for Christ is the embodiment of the law. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.5}

And now for a very brief summary of the verses that we have commented upon. First, all are guilty, condemned by the law, so that they cannot get from it the righteousness which it requires. They try again and again, but in vain; they cannot turn aside its just condemnation. But now Christ appears on the scene. He is the one whence the law derives all its righteousness, and he promises to give it freely to all who will *accept* it. This he can do, because grace, as well as truth, comes by him. The sinner accepts Christ, tremblingly, yet knowing that it is his only hope. Christ covers him with the robe of righteousness (Isaiah 61:10) and puts his righteousness into his heart. He takes away the filthy garment, and clothes him with change of raiment, saying, “Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee.” Zechariah 3:3-5. And now the law, which before condemned him, witnesses to his righteousness. It engages to go into court and defend anyone upon whom is found that righteousness, for it is its own righteousness. And so the man who was almost in despair because he could not get righteousness of the law, and who turned from it, finds it in its perfection in Christ. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.6}

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” 1 John 3:1-3. This hope and purification work reciprocally. The hope that when Christ comes we shall see him as he is, and be like him, must necessarily tend to purity of life. A man cannot possess that hope without becoming purer. And purity of life makes more certain the hope; for the promise is that the pure in heart shall see God. What makes this hope the more real is that the possessor has a partial fulfillment of it even in this life. Only those will see God as he is who have made his acquaintance here. By faith they see him now, as Moses, who “endured as seeing him who is invisible.” Acquaintance and association with God and the angels must be begun in this life it is to be continued in eternity. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.7}

**“Hope” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” 1 John 3:1-3. This hope and purification work reciprocally. The hope that when Christ comes we shall see him as he is, and be like him, must necessarily tend to purity of life. A man cannot possess that hope without becoming purer. And purity of life makes more certain the hope; for the promise is that the pure in heart shall see God. What makes this hope the more real is that the possessor has a partial fulfillment of it even in this life. Only those will see God as he is who have made his acquaintance here. By faith they see him now, as Moses, who “endured as seeing him who is invisible.” Acquaintance and association with God and the angels must be begun in this life if it is to be continued in eternity. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.8}

**“A Good Utterance” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the evening of August 26, a banquet was given in the First Congregational Church, Oakland, Cal., by the Congregational Club, in honor of Rev. Dr. R. R. Meredith, of Brooklyn, N.Y., who was its guest. Many pastors of Congregational Churches in San Francisco and the surrounding towns, were present. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.9}

In response to several addresses, in which warm fraternal sentiments were expressed toward himself, Dr. Meredith said that two thoughts had been uppermost in his mind during his journey across the continent, and his thirty days’ visit on the coast. These thoughts were Christianity and the country. Of the former, he said: Strictly defined, its essential spirit is a missionary spirit. From its institution down to this day, its true work has been missionary work. The church, which is the embodiment of Christianity, is necessarily a missionary society; that and nothing else. Jesus Christ, the author of Christianity, and the founder of the church, was himself strictly a missionary; for he came to *seek* and to save them that were lost. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.10}

As to the country, he firmly believed that God had, for centuries before it was settled, kept his hand upon this land for a peculiar purpose, keeping out the old nations until an appointed time. And this peculiar purpose, he believed, was to establish on this continent a nation in which the political and religious institutions should be kept utterly separate; in short, a nation in which there should be not the shadow of a union of Church and State, and no State support for church schools. And he thanked God for that purpose; for Christianity needs no aid, no support, from the State. Christianity has power within itself to stand alone; to accomplish its own mission; and should the day ever come in this country, when the church, as in an hour of great temptation in the third century join hands with the State to accomplish her aims, that will be her day of peril, and will seal the fate of the country. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.11}

So far as Dr. Meredith’s utterance is concerned, it is all right, but the trouble is, he does not realize what may constitute a union of Church and State. The fact that he says, “Should the day ever come in this country when the Church...joins hands with the State to accomplish her aims,” etc., shows that he does not realize that the church is quite generally doing that very thing now, in asking the State to teach religion in the public schools, and to maintain Sunday observance. And so, in spite of his opposition to Church and State union, he may be expected to lend a hand to help it on. Yet we are glad of such utterances, for they call people’s attention to the danger attending a union of Church and State, and so prepare them to oppose it when we show them that the principle of such union is embodied in Sunday legislation. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 474.12}

**“‘An Unanswerable Argument’” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is positively the very latest thing in the line of arguments against the Sabbath of the Lord. It is from an article in the *World’s Crisis* of August 20. We are thus particular in giving the credit, lest it should be doubted that anybody is capable of evolving such an argument:- {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.1}

“Why do people want to keep the seventh day? No one will ever get any credit from God for so doing. Let me hear call your attention to a point that I have never read in print, and maybe somewhat new. When Paul was telling Timothy what should transpire in the last days, making them perilous, he mentions a score or more features, but says nothing about Sabbath-breaking. To my mind this is an unanswerable argument against the seventh day been binding.” {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.2}

We think that this is not only “somewhat new,” but altogether new. We freely allow to the writer all honors of its discovery. Paul didn’t mention Sabbath-breaking in his list of last-day horrors, therefore the seventh day cannot be binding! Very well, let us go on. Paul said not a word in that list about stealing, therefore the eighth commandment cannot be binding, and must be right to steal. He didn’t mention drunkenness, therefore the temperance societies are all anti-scriptural. He said nothing about the worship of graven images, therefore, to the mind of the discoverer of the new anti-Sabbath argument, this is doubtless an unanswerable argument against there being anything wrong in idol-worship. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.3}

We confess that we are disgusted with such folly. We were going to call it childish reasoning, but we have too high an opinion of children’s logic. No child would argue in such a way. We have this apology to make for taking the space to notice it: We know that it is not worth answering, but it is an excellent specimen of the extremities to which men are driven in their fight against the Sabbath. The fact that men with presumably fair sense can call such an assemblage of words an unanswerable argument against the seventh day being binding, is a strong argument in its favor. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.4}

As to the idea of keeping the Sabbath in order to get credit, we have only to say that we don’t expect any. After we have done all, we shall be obliged to confess that we are “unprofitable servants;” we shall have done only our duty. Eternal life will come as a gift. But if we get no credit for doing what we are plainly commanded to do, what will be the case if we fall short of that? Here is something that our friend will do well to consider. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.5}

**“Millennial Conversion” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Evangelist* (Presbyterian) says:- {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.6}

“Is it a pleasing fact to look in the face, that our church through the past seven years has added to its ranks from the world not quite *four* each year for every hundred of its members? At this rate, it will need centuries to complete its conquests, for its numbers would be doubled only after eighteen and a half years.” {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.7}

It certainly is not a pleasing fact, from whatever standpoint it is looked at. And it would seem to be quite a discouraging factor for those to look at who think that the world is to be converted before the coming of the Lord. The number of heathen born every year is greater than the number of converts to Christianity in the whole world. Will the result be to open men’s eyes to the truth that the coming of the Lord to judgment will alone put an end to wickedness?-No; finding that the millennium will not come through preaching, but, on the contrary, wickedness increases, they will foolishly think to make people Christian by legal enactment. When they induce all nations to pass “Christian laws,” then, in the midst of still existing wickedness, they will cry, “Peace and safety,” when sudden destruction will come. 1 Thessalonians 5:2, 3. The doctrine of the temporal millennium will be responsible for the lack of preparation on the part of thousands. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.8}

**“Protestantism and Persecution” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

In his speech before the National Convention of Teachers, at St. Paul, Archbishop Ireland said:- {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.9}

“I would permeate the regular State school with the religion of the majority of the children of the land, be it as Protestant as Protestantism can be, and I would, as they do in England, pay for the secular instruction given in denominational schools according to results.” {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.10}

We have argued many times that such a course would be a complete union of Church and State, although it is just what thousands of professed “reformers” in United States are clamoring for. But the views which we have often stated are put so well by the *Independent* that we gladly give place to them. Speaking of the archbishop’s plan, it says:- {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.11}

“We Protestants cannot accept it. We do not want the State to make our public schools ‘as Protestant as Protestantism can be.’ We do not trust the State enough for that. We do not want the State to interfere with our religious matters. We cannot depend on the State to provide the sort of teachers always to whose religious instruction we are willing to commit our children. We know too well what that means. If the State can see to it that in its schools the children are taught its own Protestant religion, then it can say that this is a Protestant country, and that we do not want any but Protestants to come here; that other religions are foreign and un-American, unpatriotic and seditious; that Catholic parochial schools are a menace to our Protestant institutions, and if Catholic schools, then Catholic Churches; and the step is not a long one, and is a most logical one, to persecution. A State Church means persecution. There is always a quarrel until you have either an absolute, persecuting State Church, or an absolutely free church. The Protestant State Churches of Europe are rapidly becoming free churches. So far as they are not free, the religion of the minority is practiced under a disadvantage. Catholics and Dissenters even in England now suffer under serious disadvantages, which are not persecution simply because England is moving perceptibly toward complete establishment.” {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 475.12}

Perhaps such words as these, coming from so influential a journal as the New York *Independent*, will be given some attention. If any advocate of State religion is able to show that the position is not a just one, we should be glad to know it. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.1}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is expected that the missionary ship, *Pitcairn*, will be dedicated on Thursday, September 25, during the camp-meeting at Oakland. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.2}

Isn’t its strange that the laboring men, who are represented by the Sunday-law lecturers as consumed with desire for a Sunday law, are in mortal dread of saying anything about it, lest they should lose their places, and yet they will strike for an advance of twenty-five cents a day in wages, or even when they have no personal grievance, if a fellow-workman is discharged? {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.3}

Through the courtesy of Hon. George Hearst we have received two interesting volumes of Reports from the Department of Agriculture for 1888 and 1889. From a hasty examination of the volumes, we are convinced that our National Department of Agriculture is doing better and more thorough work than in times past. Thanks, Senator, for these and all other documents. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.4}

The Maryland State Prohibition Platform has the following as one of its planks:- {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.5}

“We approve our Sabbath laws and their enforcement, which secures to the people one day’s rest in seven.” {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.6}

This, the New York *Voice* calls an almost model platform. But that political platform which approves of Maryland Sabbath laws is as far from model as the darkest laws of the Dark Ages is from the Constitution of the United States. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.7}

Dr. W. W. Atterbury, of New York, is quoted by the *Alta California* of August 18 as saying in a recent sermon, on this coast: “The great principle of our Sunday law is not coercion, but protection.” Dr. Atterbury may believe this, but there is no statement farther from the truth. Every believer in Sunday sacredness in this broad land, can observe the day as religiously as he desires, without a Sunday law. Seventh-day people have no difficulty in observing the Sabbath, with the busy world against them. Cannot Sunday-keepers do equally well with so many on their side? Those who do not believe in Sunday are not asking for protection, unless it be some who do it on the principle of reducing time and maintaining or increasing wages. Sunday laws are asked for by those who believe in the day, in order to *coerce*, or *compel*, those who do *not* believe in it to keep it as though they did. The principle underlying Sunday laws is *coercion*, and *only coercion*. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.8}

The only true union among Christians is union with Christ. Men may try to patch up union between themselves, but it lasts only so long as will subserve their selfish purposes. Man cannot be grafted upon man for the reason that no man has life in himself to impart to others. Such a union is like the union of two separate branches; there is no vitality to it. But if the Christian is united as a branch to the Living Vine, Christ Jesus, the One who has life in himself, that branch becomes transfused with the life of the Vine, a part of the very stock itself. Two Christians thus united are united to each other by a bond which no power on earth can break. That bond is the Lord Jesus Christ. In this way is our Lord’s prayer answered: “That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.” John 17:21. This is the union which God desires; this is the only true union possible! {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.9}

The additions to the Northern Presbyterian Church last year amounted to about 49,000. This was an increase of one member to every fifteen church-members. The New York *Observer* finds in these figures no cause for congratulations, as the net gain in the church is less than three per cent. There were six thousand accessions less than in 1889. It says truly that these things ought to bestir the people and pastors. If our Presbyterian brethren (and the lesson is as good for all) had placed as much thought on the word of God and its teaching as upon the revision of the Westminster Confession, it would doubtless have gained spiritually as well as numerically. {SITI September 8, 1890, p. 476.10}

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

In an article in the *Independent*, concerning the railroads and the labor troubles, the Hon. Cassius M. Clay says:- {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.11}

“There is anarchy and civil war lowering along the whole horizon. There comes anarchy, and then, like as in the French Revolution in 1787, despotism.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.12}

The Universal Congress of Catholics is to be held at Liege, Belgium, this month. Delegates are expected to be present from every Catholic country in the world. Among the subjects to be discussed are: The Temporal Power of the Pope, and Papal Arbitration. The Congress is said to be the outcome of a circular letter which was sent to all Catholic bishops two years ago, asking if they thought it advisable for the Pope to leave Rome. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.13}

Here is an example of the illogical manner in which men too often handle Bible doctrines:- {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.14}

“On the morning of his resurrection, Jesus said, ‘I have not yet ascended to my Father.’ We have his word, therefore, that he did not enter Paradise on the day of his death.”-*Rev. C. C. Foote, Detroit*. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.15}

“We must remember Christ ubiquity. As he could enter that ‘upper room’ to the disciples without opening the door, so he was in paradise without ‘ascending’ there.”-*Christian Cynosure*. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.16}

Which is the plainest kind of a *non sequitur*. Jesus didn’t enter that upper room without going to it. He was actually in the room; but he plainly declared to Mary that he had not ascended to the Father. “Ubiquity” doesn’t cause one to be in a place to which he hasn’t gone. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.17}

The New York *Observer*, in an editorial on “Filling the Treasury,” takes a position against grab-bag, fairs, festivals, and other ungodly means of raising money for the church, and says:— {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.18}

“Such means more money-raising for the purposes of God’s kingdom can scarcely be too strongly and sieraly denounced. It is a question whether the church will ever be the successful opponent of evils in the world that she could be, if she leans for her financial support upon worldly men or worldly measures. What concord has Christ with Belial? Did all the faithful, godly pastors of our land speak their minds on this subject they would present an awful array of testimony concerning the ill effects of worldly-wise methods for filling church coffers.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.19}

But what are faithful and godly pastors for if it is not to speak their minds on such subjects as this? And if pastors do not speak their minds when such a canker is eating the heart out of the church, can they be called faithful and godly? The command is, “Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.” Isaiah 58:1. And there is no question at all whether the church can ever be the successful opponent of evils in the world, when she cherishes the evils of the world in her own bosom. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.20}

**“Is the Seventh-day Sabbath Binding Upon Christians?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading the *Leader* of August 14 contained twelve propositions answering the question in the negative. We have heard the article spoken of several times as being something that Sabbatarians couldn’t answer; and as the *Leader* is the principal organ of the Baptist denomination on the Pacific Coast, it has doubtless had much influence with those who are not conversant with the Sabbath question. For this reason we take space to show the weakness of the answers. In the various paragraphs below will be found the entire article:- {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.21}

“Recently I was asked to answer this question publicly, My reply was No! and for the following reasons:- {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.22}

“*First*-For 2,000 years, no command was given for anyone to keep the Sabbath. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.23}

The same thing may be said of the prohibition against idol-worship and blasphemy. Shall we therefore conclude that Christians are at liberty to do those things? If not, how does silence about the Sabbath indicate that we are not to keep it? For a period of six hundred years after the law was given upon Mount Sinai nothing was said, so far as we have any record, about the Sabbath. Shall we conclude that God did not care to have even the Jews keep it-No; we are glad to know that the God whom we worship does not have to repeat his commandments every year or every century, in order to have them valid. But, as a matter of fact, we have the most explicit reference to the seventh-day Sabbath twenty-five hundred years before the exodus. After creation was completed, God rested on the seventh day, and the record says: “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. To sanctify means to set apart, to appoint, to command. See Joshua 20:7, margin; Joel 2:15. Therefore the inspired record is that as soon as the first week of time was ended, God commanded the observance of the seventh day. Even if it were true that twenty-five hundred years passed before the command was given to keep the Sabbath, that would determine nothing as to our duty now. Men do not argue so in regard to human laws. The fact that a law was enacted only last year is not considered as a reason why it should not be obeyed. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.24}

“*Second*-When the command was first given, it was given to the Israelites. Exodus 16:23. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.25}

“*Third*-It seems plain from Exodus 16:27-30, that they did not keep the Sabbath previous to this time.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.26}

This is not true, as has been shown in the preceding paragraph. The command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath was given in Eden at the close of the creation. It was given to Adam, the father, not of the Jews, but of the whole human family, thus indicating that it is for the race, in harmony with the declaration of Jesus, “The Sabbath was made for man.” Mark 2:27. The only day that was known as the Sabbath when Jesus said this, and the day which was the special subject of remark on that occasion, was the seventh day of the week. The reading of Exodus 16:23 is sufficient to prove that it is not the first command to keep the Sabbath, nor indeed is it a command at all. It is simply a reference to a commandment already given. The entire transaction recorded in the sixteenth of Exodus shows that the Sabbath was well known. As to the statement in “reason” *third*, that “it seems plan from Exodus 16:27-30 that they did not keep the Sabbath previous to this time,” we have only to say, Read it, and see for yourselves. Some of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and the Lord said, “*How long* refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?” Exodus 16:28. This is sufficient proof that the Sabbath was not a new thing. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.27}

“*Fourth*-This is further corroborated by the fact that on the three preceding seventh days, the whole camp to Israel was on the march.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.28}

It is of no use to take time on this, for it is an assertion unbacked by any proof, and which is incapable of proof. It is a lamentable fact that many opposers of the Sabbath of the Lord do not hesitate to resort to fiction, in the absence of argument. This should open the eyes of the candid. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 476.29}

“*Fifth*-The Sabbath, and the laws pertaining thereto, was given to the Israelites alone, and was to be a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and a sign of the covenant between them and the Lord. Exodus 31:13-17; Deuteronomy 5:12, 15.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.1}

This is true of all the commandments to the same extent that it is true of the fourth. Paul says that the chief advantage of the Jews lay in the fact that to them were committed the oracles of God. Romans 3:1, 2. It was committed to them to make known to others. They were to be the light of the world, as Jesus himself declared to a congregation of Jews. Matthew 5:14. The Sabbath was given them as a sign, that they might know God; but God never designed to shut himself up to the Jewish nation. He wants all men to know him; he is known by his works; and the Sabbath is the memorial of creation. This also is additional proof that the Sabbath was made for all men. Moreover, God has no covenant except with Israel (see Hebrews 8:8-10; Romans 9:3, 4; Ephesians 2:11, 12), and only the seed of Abraham are Christ’s and heirs of the kingdom (Galatians 3:29). If any Gentiles are saved, they must be grafted into the stock of Israel. See Romans 11:13-26. So the fact that a thing was given to Israel is nothing against it, but rather in its favor; “for salvation is of the Jews.” John 4:22. And the fact that Israel is to be the nation that will endure throughout eternity and that the Sabbath was given them to be observed throughout their generations, shows that it is binding on Christians both now and forever. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.2}

“*Sixth*-If the law of the Seventh-day Sabbath is binding upon all, then the penalties are also binding. No work was to be done, no fire was to be kindled by anyone, under penalty of death. Exodus 31:14, 15; 35:2, 3; Numbers 15:32-36; Ezekiel 20:10; Deuteronomy 5:14.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.3}

Very true, the penalty is as sure as the law. The penalty for Sabbath-breaking was death, and is still the same. The same is true of any of the commandments. The penalty for idolatry, blasphemy, and persistent disobedience to parents, was death, and is still; for “the wages of sin is death.” But God has not committed to men in this age the execution of the penalty. The Jewish government was a theocracy; God himself was their ruler. It is not so now, for his people, the true Israel, are in all nations; but when they are gathered out at the coming of the Lord, then it will be seen that the penalty for violation of God’s law is death; and unto his people will it be given to share with him in executing the judgment which is written. See. Psalm 119:9. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.4}

“*Seventh*-Nowhere in the Old nor New Testaments are the Gentiles commanded to keep the Seventh-day Sabbath, but Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, are in Colossians 2:13-17 forbidden to insist on keeping the Jewish Sabbath-days.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.5}

The first part of this has been answered in number 5, above. The latter part is sufficiently answered by saying that the seventh day is not, and never was, a Jewish Sabbath. The Lord says, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Exodus 20:10. He also styles it, “my holy day.” Isaiah 58:13. This day the true Israel-Christians-are commanded to keep throughout their generations, and they will do so as long as the new heavens and the new earth endure. Isaiah 66:22, 23. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.6}

“*Eighth*-Christ, in his teaching, calls attention to, and enforces, all of the commandments, except the fourth. Why this exception, if that was still in force?” This is simply not true. Nowhere in the teaching of Christ is there the slightest reference to the second commandment. This does not prove that the second commandment is not binding on Christians, and that they are free to worship idols. As we said before, we worship a God who does not have to repeat his commandments often, in order to given them force. When he speaks once, that is sufficient. Is not this a more loyal way of looking at the matter? Christ has nowhere in his teachings repealed the fourth commandment, therefore it must still be binding. But the fact is the Lord made no exception in the commandments, but declared them all to be binding. Said he, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. This should stop the mouth of every man who professes to love the Lord. By the way, isn’t it strange that Christ’s utter silence in regard to the first day of the week is not considered by first-day advocates as anything against the claim that it is a sacred rest day? {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.7}

“*Ninth*-After Christ’s resurrection, the disciples met for worship on the first day of the week. Matthew 25:21; Mark 16:2-9; John 20:1, 19-26; Acts 20:27; 1 Corinthians 16:2; Revelation 1:10.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.8}

This proves nothing. They also met on the Sabbath. See Acts 13:14, 42, 44; 17:21; 18:4. They also met every day. Acts 2:46. It is amazing that men will offer to prove that the seventh-day Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not binding, and then will gravely say, “The disciples met on the first day of the week,” as though that simple fact was sufficient to overthrow the commandment, or had any relation whatever to it. But let us look a moment at the texts referred to prove that the disciples met for worship on the first day. Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2; John 20:1 all refer to a single first day, the day of the resurrection; and not one of them says anything about any meeting. They simply state the fact of Christ’s resurrection. Mark 16:9 says not a word about any meeting of the disciples, but simply says that Christ “appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.” Nothing about Sunday worship in that. John 20:19 does speak of a meeting of Christ and his disciples on that same first day of the week, and Mark 16:14 informs us that this meeting of the disciples was at their own home, for the purpose of eating supper. Acts 20:27 makes no reference to any day of the week; but Acts 20:7-11, which the writer evidently meant, does speak of a meeting on the dark part of the first day of the week, namely, Saturday night, and of a long journey which Paul and his companions took the next day, Sunday. 1 Corinthians 16:2 makes no reference to any meeting on the first day of the week, but on the contrary, directs each one to “lay *by him in store*,” as God had prospered him. And, lastly, Revelation 1:10 says nothing of the first day of the week in anywise, but mentions “the Lord’s day,” which the Lord himself declares to be the seventh day. See Exodus 20:10; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.9}

“*Tenth*-The spirit of the fourth commandment is: Work six days and rest one. This can be done by resting on the first day, and working the other six.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.10}

The spirit of the fourth commandment cannot be kept by breaking it. It commands the observance of “the seventh day.” The commandment not only says that we are to work six days and rest one, but it tells us particularly upon which one we are to rest. Who but one whose heart was fully set in him to disobey, could argue that a direct command to rest on “the seventh day” can be complied with by resting on the first day? {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.11}

“*Eleventh*-In regard to rest, morality, piety, or true religion, the keeping of the seventh day has not a whit the advantage over the first.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.12}

We submit that God is the best judge of what constitutes “rest, morality, piety, or true religion.” The keeping of the seventh day has just this advantage over the first, that God has commanded it, and he has said nothing about the first except to include it in the six days in which work may be done. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.13}

“*Twelfth*-Ninety-nine per cent of those who keep any Sabbath keep the first day of the week. If God does not require it, why should one percent insist that the other ninety-nine should change their Sabbath?” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.14}

Where in the Bible is it stated that truth and duty are to be determined by the practice of ninety-nine per cent, of the people? He says, “Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.” Ninety-nine per cent of the people in the days of Noah thought he was a fool, but the result showed that he was right and that they were wrong. Ninety-nine percent of the Jews, and more, rejected Christ when he was on earth; yet this did not prove that he was not the Messiah. The majority of the people on earth to-day do not worship the one God, Jehovah. The great majority of those who profess to believe in baptism, call sprinkling baptism, and sneer at the Baptists for insisting on immersion; yet this does not prove that the Baptists are wrong in obeying literally. The majority say that the spirit of the commandment is met by pronouncing the formula and applying a little water; the Baptists insist on actual baptism, immersion in water, according to the command. If the practice of the majority is to determine what is right, why do not the Baptists give up immersion? A Baptist should be the last one in the world to argue against obedience to the letter of any precept, or to urge numbers as proof that a practice is right. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.15}

We have denoted this space to the consideration of these “reasons” against Sabbath-keeping, because they are the *reasons* that are kept in stock, and are used all over the country. Wherever the Sabbath truth is taught, these objections are urged. Let the friends of the Sabbath lose no opportunity to enlighten those who have not examined both sides, by showing to them the utter absence of reason in the “reasons” against the Sabbath. E. J. W. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.16}

**“No California Sunday-law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is something for our ardent Sunday-law friends to explain. A prominent citizen of Melbourne, Australia, who is visiting in San Francisco, said: “In Australia, Sunday is a holy day, observed by all; in San Francisco it is a gala days; yet I saw fewer people drunk here on Sunday than on the same day in Sydney or Melbourne.” Our Eastern friends are apt to imagine that California is a terribly lawless place because it has no Sunday law; but as a matter of fact, there is not a State in the Union were life and property are more safe than here, and Sunday is as quiet a day in San Francisco as in Chicago, New York, or even Philadelphia, the home of Sunday legislation. Religious legislation is far from being synonymous with moral development. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 482.17}

**“Destroying the Foundations” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is doubtless well known to the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that there is quite a body of people professing to look for the coming of the Lord, who do not keep the seventh day, and who are probably the most bitter of all people in their opposition to the Sabbath of the Lord. The name which they take to themselves if “Advent Christians,” the idea being that Adventists who keep the Sabbath are not Christians. This explanation is made simply that the readers may understand who the people are that made the following remarkable resolution, which we find in the *World’s Crisis* of August 6:- {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.1}

“WHEREAS, There are many people among the Advent Christians who believe that the decalogue of ten commandments is in full force in the Christian dispensation; and, {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.2}

“WHEREAS, By the Advent Christian Conference of Oregon and Washington, that the ministers of our denomination, especially our evangelists, have not done their whole duty if they terminate a series of meetings in a new field without teaching that the five books of Moses, including the decalogue, are one law, and as each are abrogated.” {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.3}

We pass by the fact that this resolution carries by the board all the commandments, and obliges the ministers to teach that the commands not to steal, kill, commit adultery, or bear false witness owed their existence to the prejudices of an unenlightened age, and are obsolete. That they might be able to do; but we should think that they would often get into difficulty in carrying out the resolution. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.4}

For instance: The book of Genesis tells about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It relates the wonderful history of Joseph. In Exodus we are told of Moses and the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Now some on of those preachers will almost involuntarily begin to talk about Abraham and his faith, or the integrity and purity of Joseph, before he remembers that it has been officially declared by his denomination that those records are abrogated, and of no account. A thing is placed upon record because it is supposed to be true, therefore the abrogation of it is evidence that it has been discovered that it is not true. Now let us see how much of the Bible those preachers are permitted to teach. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.5}

They cannot teach that if we are Christ’s we are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise, for, according to the resolution, there never was any such man as Abraham. They cannot draw any lessons form the first half of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, for that is all based upon an abrogated record. They must teach that there was never any such man as Moses, and that the Israelites were never delivered from Egypt. The story of the flood must be classed with fables, and the story of creation likewise. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.6}

Possibly they may begin to tell their people that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,” before they remember that this is founded upon an outgrown tradition. The story of the fall of Adam has been abrogated. Then forgetting that the abrogation of the story of the fall makes unnecessary the story of redemption, they may begin to tell about the glory of our Advocate, who is “made an high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,” when their better-instructed audience would interrupt them with the query, which would now be pertinent, “Who was Melchizedek?” Sure enough; that story about Melchizedek has been abrogated, together with the statement which the Lord made to Moses: “I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.” Deuteronomy 18:18, 19. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.7}

And so the evidence of the Lord as “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) is abrogated. But if it is abrogated there, it must be everywhere, and so the whole gospel of Christ must be overturned in order to get rid of the Sabbath. This is even so, for Christ said, “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” John 5:46, 47. Belief on Christ depends on belief of Moses; therefore if the five books of Moses be abrogated, Christ himself is taken from us. Well did the psalmist ask, “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” Psalm 11:3. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.8}

Dear Christian reader, do you think it is worth while to overturn the whole plan of redemption, in order to get rid of the duty to keep the Sabbath? You say it is not necessary to do that in order to show that we need not keep the seventh day. But think a minute. Here are people who have been forty years fighting the seventh-day Sabbath, and is it not to be presumed that in that time they have found the best argument that can be devised? They have tried everything, and find this the most effective. They have found that the only consistent way to oppose the Sabbath is to abolish the entire revelation of God to man, for it all goes with the five books of Moses. Doesn’t it seem to you that a cause that requires such desperate measures must be dangerous? Is not the fact that opposers of the Sabbath can take such a position sufficient evidence that they are wrong in their opposition? Think of this carefully, and decide to “remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.” E. J. W. {SITI September 15, 1890, p. 483.9}

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

“The ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth aong the wise,” but “he that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.10}

When the fearful storms, tempests, and cyclones have been pointed to as fulfilling prophecy, thereby indicating that we are in the last days, people have been wont to say, “Cyclones are peculiar to America and its prairies, and have always been prevalent through the centuries past.” But will these same wise heads tell us the same of the European cyclones? Two severe ones of late have made havoc in Switzerland and Styria. These electric storms are certainly a latter-day innovation there. The fact is, as the Bible declare, the earth is waxed old as doth a garment. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.11}

The Lord said to Israel, “When ye make many prayers, I will not hear,” and the same may be said of the present day. Max O’Rell, the French humorist, says: “The other day I was introduced to an audience with prayer, and in that prayer the Lord was asked to allow my audience to see through my jokes.” Such is not prayer; it is flat blasphemy. Well does the *Lutheran Witness* says: “Such flippant abuse of prayer-so many sectarian reverends being ready to open any sort of meeting with prayer, and another ‘brother’ closing it with the benediction-and oh, what flippant praying!-is only too common.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.12}

It is cheering whenever we find a voice raised against the tendency which so many churches manifest, to attempt to do gospel work according to worldly methods. The New York *Witness* having been appealed to to decide as to the propriety of using a church edifice for popular amusements and games, and thus perhaps get them into the habit of attending religious services, decides that it is proper. From this decision the *Christian Advocate* strongly dissents, and says, among other things: {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.13}

“The hope of the young men that a gymnasium in the church will attract other young men to the place of worship is vain. The belief which they express, that the church cannot reach the masses without these accessories, is not sustained by past experience. These things have been tried and have failed. There is nothing so attractive to young men as young men. There is no instrument with which the church can work so effectively as the gospel. Amusements have no place in the church.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.14}

If we are in doubt as regards the right or wrong of a certain course, it is always safe not to pursue it. Give right and God the benefit of every doubt. To do this may seem at the time to be loss in some way, but it only *seems* so. The better way is always the right. Fools look only to the present. The butterfly lives only for the present; but the child of God ought to measure circumstances and decisions by their eternal results, not by their present appearance. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.15}

**“Not a Debt, But a Gift. Romans 4:1-8” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

If we are in doubt as regards the right or wrong of a certain course, it is always safe not to pursue it. Give right and God the benefit of every doubt. To do this may seem at the time to be loss in some way, but it only *seems* so. The better way is always the right. Fools look only to the present. The butterfly lives only for the present; but the child of God ought to measure circumstances and decisions by their eternal results, not by their present appearance. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.16}

Let us take a very brief review of the first three chapters of Romans, that we may the better understand the force of the fourth, as we begin it. The first chapter, after the introduction, treats of the terrible depravity and blindness of the heathen, and how they lost the knowledge of God which they once had. It closes with the statement that they themselves know that for their deeds they deserve this condemnation to death, which God has pronounced upon them. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.17}

In the second chapter we have all men brought into the same condemnation with the heathen. There is no room in the writings of Paul for any of the modern speculation about future probation for the heathen. They are all shown to be justly condemned to death. To this sentence the Jews would give a cordial assent; but now he declares that all who know enough to judge the heathen, thereby condemn themselves, for they show that they know better, yet they do the same things. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.18}

Passing on through the second chapter, we find the truth stated that to every man God will render according to his deeds, whether good or evil, because he is no respecter of persons. Thus we learn that it is *doing*, and nothing less, that finds favor with God, and that the Gentiles, who are without the written law, really have the law, and will be judged by it at the last day. Next, the matter is brought home directly to the Jews, and they are shown to be guilty of transgressing the law, while making their boast in it; and thus he shows that in reality they are not Jews at all, for only those are Jews who keep the law. The man who has not received the outward sign of circumcision, but who keeps the righteousness of the law, is an Israelite indeed; while the man who has been circumcised, and who ma be able to trace his genealogy to Abraham, is not a Jew at all, if he does not keep the law. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.19}

In the first nineteen verses of the third chapter the fact is emphasized that both Jews and Gentiles are in the same condemnation; all are within the sphere of the law; it speaks to all; and as a consequence, all are declared guilty before God. The conclusion from all this is that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified in the sight of God. The law is the perfect pattern of truth, therefore it must declare all men guilty and not righteous; and no one can hope to atone for his guilt by deeds of righteousness, because his best efforts come far short of the required standard, and so really add to the measure of is guilt. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.20}

In this extremity the righteousness of God without the law, in the person of Jesus Christ, is manifested. This righteousness is just that which the law demands, and it is put upon all who believe in Christ. Without money and without price, this righteousness is freely given to all who exercise faith in his blood. This righteousness put upon the sinner, takes the place of his sins, which are removed as far as the east is from the west, and he who before was a sinner now stands justified before God, his righteousness attested to by the law, although he has not done the law. He has been justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. This removes all ground for boasting, for no man has anything by his own merits. There is one God, both of Jews and Gentiles, and he justifies both Jew and Gentile in the same way, namely, by faith, for his own sake, through the merits of Christ. Thus it is by faith, and not by works, that the law is established in the hearts and lives of men. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.21}

And now the Jewish objector returns to the attack with a question very similar to that with which the fourth chapter opens: “What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?” Romans 4:1. He has nothing to say to the charge that the Jews as a class are guilty, and cannot be saved without the aid of a power outside of and greater than themselves; but certainly Abraham, the good old father of the nation, must have gained something by his good works. Well, says the apostle, if Abraham was justified by works, he has something whereof to glory. He can boast that his own hand has wrought righteousness and salvation. But we read, “but not before God.” That is equivalent to saying, “But Abraham was not justified by works, and has nothing whereof to glory before God;” and the proof is given in verse three: “For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 483.22}

The scripture to which the apostle refers is Genesis 15:6. God took Abraham out and told him to look at the stars and see if he could number them, and said that his seed should be as numerous. And the record is, “And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.” Paul quotes this in the passive form, but without changing the sense. This scripture proves conclusively that Abraham was not justified by works, and therefore has nothing to boast of, as to the flesh, any more than any other man. His righteousness was not something of his own working out, but was freely given him by the Lord, because he simply believed what the Lord said. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.1}

“Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.” Romans 4:4. Righteousness is the thing under consideration, and so the expression, “to him that worketh,” means, to him that works to secure righteousness. It is very evident that if a man works out his own righteousness, the reward which he gets is not a gift, but the payment of a debt. If he does it all himself, he puts God under obligation to him, to give him the reward of righteousness. He can then come to the Lord and demand his dues. But no man can put God under any obligation to him. The apostle writes: “Who hath first given to him again?” Romans 11:35. The Lord himself said to Job: “Who hath prevented me, that I should repay him? Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine.” Job 41:11. Whatever the Lord does for man, he does for his own sake. See Psalm 23:3; Isaiah 43:25. Therefore the statement in Romans 3:24-27 stands unshaken. Even Abraham is no exception to the truth that righteousness-conformity to the law-comes alone through faith in Christ. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.2}

“But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.” Romans 4:5. “There,” says the antinomian, “I knew there was nothing at all required of us.” Not quite so fast. Remember that we have already learned from the same epistle that God “will render to every man according to his deeds.” Romans 2:6. When the Lord Jesus comes, bringing his reward with him, it will be “to give every man according as his work shall be.” Revelation 22:12. Works can by no means be left out of the account. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.3}

But works are of no account in securing righteousness for the remission of sins, and that is what is under consideration in this chapter, as we learn very clearly from the next three verses:- {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.4}

“Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.5}

Here we learn that when the apostle speaks of one that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, having his faith counted to him for righteousness, he means the forgiveness of sins, which is accomplished, not through any good works of the sinner, but by the imparting of Christ’s righteousness to take the place of the sin. The simple process of bestowing righteousness for the remission of sins is set forth in Zechariah 3:1-5; Isaiah 61:10; Romans 3:22-25; Titus 3:3-7. E. J. W. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.6}

**“Is It Personal Rights or Selfishness?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Young Men’s Era*, of Chicago, in an article relative to the opening of the World’s Fair on Sunday, says:- {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.7}

“Much of the outcry against the enforcement of laws pertaining to Sabbath observance, the Bible in the public schools, etc., is based on the claim of interference with personal rights and religious convictions. Is it not about time the rights and religious convictions of the other side shall be taken into consideration? Shall there not be some assertion that the rights of the Christian people in this country, rights and privileges which we have inherited from our forefathers, and that are vouchsafed to us by the laws of the land, shall be respected?” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.8}

This is another instance of the prevailing ignorance of what constitutes personal rights. The idea seems to obtain quite generally that the rights of different people almost always clash, and that for one class of people to have their rights, another class must yield theirs. This is a great mistake. Human rights are equal. If no man grasps more than he has a right to, every man will have all that he has a right to. Take the case of Sunday rest. It is stated that every man has a right to it. That is true, if he wants it; and it is just as true that every man has a right not to rest if he doesn’t want to. The right of choice implies the right of refusal. If a man has not the right to refuse to do a certain thing, then he has no right to choose to do it; it is then no longer a matter of right, but of compulsion, and in that case the rights of some are certain to be trampled upon. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.9}

Moreover, the right of one man to refuse to do a certain thing does not interfere with the right of another to do it. The fact that one man doesn’t observe Sunday doesn’t interfere in the least with the right of another man to keep it. The fact that one man objects to hearing the Bible read, or to having his children hear it read, does not in the least interfere with the right of another man to read it for himself, and to his children. So the opening of the fair on Sunday will not in the least degree interfere with the personal rights and religious convictions of those who regard Sunday as the Sabbath, since none will be compelled to visit it on that day. On the other hand, to refuse to have it opened on that day would seriously interfere with the right of thousands who have no conscientious scruples in regard to the day, and who cannot see the exhibition on any other day, yet who have as much right to see it as others have; and while these are being deprived of a right, those who regard Sunday religiously will not be having anything added to their rights and privileges, since the closing of the fair will not enable them to rest or go to church any better than if it were open. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.10}

In these days professed Christians have need to beware lest they confuse personal rights and selfishness, and while they deprive others of what is their right, add nothing to themselves. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.11}

**“Reading the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is related of Thomas Carlyle that a gentleman at whose house he was stopping asked him to read for morning worship, when he began at the first chapter of Job and continued reading until he had completed the book, saying as he finished, “That is a wonderful poem, and to be understood needs to be read through at one sitting.” The host, as might naturally be expected, never again asked Carlyle to read the Scriptures at morning worship. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.12}

But Carlyle had the correct idea of Scripture reading-the idea that should be applied not only to the book of Job but to many other books of the Bible, although we would by no means recommend such lengthy reading at family prayers. There, a few verses are often better than even an entire chapter. But it is a great mistake, especially in reading the minor prophets and the epistles, to take them in fragments. One who, in his rigid adherence to the rule of just so many chapters a day, reads the first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, for instance, as the last of his chapters for one day, the second, third, and fourth the next day, and the fifth and sixth the third day, loses more of the force and beauty of the epistle than can be expressed. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.13}

We do not say that one should never read in one of the epistles without reading all, but we do say that everybody ought to make it a frequent practice to read an entire book at one sitting. Never mind if it does break into your course; better break that than lose the benefit of the connection. It won’t hurt to read a little more. It is not a great thing to do. People will sit down and read in a newspaper more matter than is contained in any one of the epistles, and not think they have performed a great feat. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.14}

Read the Bible through by course as much as you please, but do not neglect reading by books, and studying by books, and you will find that you are beginning to know the Bible as never before. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.15}

**“Righteousness Is Life” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

“The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord,” Paul declares in Romans 6:23. But God does not give this irrespective of character. In fact, he can give eternal life only in one way, and that is the way of righteousness. He gives life by giving righteousness. They that “receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.” Romans 5:17. Man is a sinner. Being a sinner, he is subject to death, is condemned to death. If he had never sinned, he never would have died, for death is only the result, or wages, of sin. James 1:15. Therefore when man becomes clothed, through faith in Christ, with the perfect righteousness of God, life comes with it as a consequence. “In the way of righteousness is life.” Proverbs 12:28. Christ could not be holden of death because he was righteous (Acts 2:24), and therefore those upon whom he has placed that righteousness are in possession of that life. Death cannot hold them. The gift of righteousness through grace is also the gift of life. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.16}

**“Progress of Arbitration” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

The London *Daily News*, commenting on the “Universal Peace Congress” that was recently held in London, says:- {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.17}

“The agreement [for arbitration] between the States of the two Americas marks a stage in the history of civilization, from which there will be no retrogression. The inhabitants of barrak-ridden Europe may well derive some inspiration from the lesson of the New World. Arbitration has won the day among the States of the two Americas, because sixty millions of people in the great republic have been educated up to the idea.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.18}

This is news to us on this side of the water. The bloody revolutions now going on in the Central American States do not have much of the flavor of peace; and the men-of-war and the big guns which the United States is building do not look as though this country intended to put its trust in soft words. Never before in the history of the United States, except in time of actual war, has there been so much activity in the way of preparing ships and implements of war. The idea of arbitration has taken hold of but a very few of the sixty-four million people of this country, and with them it is only a dream that shows no signs of materializing. But the *News* continues:- {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.19}

“The substitution of arbitration for the stupid crime (as it ordinarily is) of war will take place in Europe with the idea of it takes hold of the European mind.” {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.20}

A very just and wise remark,-one which shows more wisdom than is generally exhibited in connection with peace congresses, where the idea seems to obtain that good resolutions will bring about the result. Nations are composed of individuals, and before peace can reign when great provocation is given, the hearts of the people must be changed, and that is a work that is not done in mass. When men are “shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace,” they will be peace-makers; but the word of God gives no warrant for hoping that any such universal change will be wrought. On the contrary, it says that in the last days perilous times will come, because men will be lovers of their own selves, without natural affection, truce-breakers, fierce, despisers of those that are good, and traitors. See 2 Timothy 3:1-4. Surely there is no hope for arbitration among people of that description. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.21}

There will come a time, however, when peace will reign over all the earth, and there will be no need of arbitration, because there will be nothing to arbitrate. And that time is not far distant. But it will be brought about by such a war as the earth has never yet seen, even the battle of the great day of the Lord (see Revelation 16:14; 19:11-21; Jeremiah 25:31-33); and when evil-doers shall have been cut off, and sin and sinners destroyed from the face of the earth, then “the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” Psalm 37:11. {SITI September 22, 1890, p. 490.22}

**“The Blessing of Abraham” The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered a particular case of justification-that of Abraham-illustrative of the general truth set forth in the third chapter of Romans. In verses 1-8 we found that Abraham was not made righteous by works, but by faith. Righteousness was a gift by the grace of God to Abraham, the same as to all others, so that even he had nothing whereof to boast. We found also what the imputation of righteousness is, namely, the forgiveness of sins. The righteousness which is counted to a man in response to his faith-the righteousness which is put into and upon all them that believe-is the remission of sins. See Romans 4:5-8. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 490.23}

It ought to be apparent from what we have already learned in the book of Romans, that forgiveness of sins is not a mere book transaction,-the simple entry of the word “pardoned” on the books of record,-but that it is an actual fact; something that personally affects the individual. It is righteousness put *into* and *upon* the man; it is *blessedness* that comes to him. It is a change. It does not consist simply in the Lord’s saying to the sinner, “I will not hold the past against you,” but it consists in taking his sin away from him,-removing it as far as the east is from the west,-so that he now stands in the sight of God as though he had never sinned. This is blessedness indeed. Surely, this is more than a change in theory. It is taking a man who is morally bankrupt, and setting him on his feet, so that he can now do good works; for it is only the good man that can do good works. See Luke 6:45. And that the righteousness which is imputed for the remission of sin does effect a change in the man is evident from Romans 3:22. It is righteousness put *into* and *upon* the sinner. That is, he is made righteous both inside and outside. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 490.24}

The question that the apostle now asks is if this blessed gift comes upon the circumcision only or upon the uncircumcision also; that is, if it is only to Jews or to Gentiles as well. Romans 4:9. This is answered by finding out Abraham’s condition when it came to him. “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.” Romans 4:10, 11. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 490.25}

It will be seen at a glance that this settles the matter as to who are children of Abraham. A man cannot claim to be a child of Abraham simply because he has been circumcised. And this means not now only, but at any time in the past. Righteousness was imputed to Abraham before he was circumcised. Therefore since he is the father of all them that believe, it follows that it makes no difference whether they are circumcised or not. Circumcision was only a sign of the righteousness which he already had by faith. Therefore those who had not righteousness had no right to the sign; and if they had the sign and were not righteous, they were children of Abraham only in appearance, and not in fact. See John the Baptist’s burning words to the Pharisees. Matthew 3:7-9. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 490.26}

Moreover, it is evident that the sign of circumcision was not given to Abraham and his seed for the purpose of keeping them separate from other nations. God never builds up a wall of partition to keep his people from those who do not believe. Christ said, “Ye are the light of the world,” and reproved the Jews for hiding the light which God had intrusted to them. This they did by clannishly separating themselves from others, considering themselves too good to associate with them. Christ himself set the example, mingling freely with all classes, and bringing from the self-righteous Pharisees the intended reproach, “This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.” Luke 15:2. He prayed for his disciples, not that they should be taken out of the world, but that they should be kept from the evil. John 17:15. The man who is righteous, and who maintains his integrity at all times, and in all places and society, is as separate from the world as God ever designed any man to be. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 490.27}

Compare for a moment Romans 4:11 and Genesis 17:11. In the latter text we learn that circumcision was a token or seal of the covenant which God made with Abraham. In the former we learn that it was a sign or seal of righteousness. Therefore we are forced to conclude that the covenant with Abraham was a covenant of righteousness. This is confirmed by Romans 4:13: “For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.” Now note: (1) The possession which was promised to Abraham was not confined to the small territory of Canaan, which the Jews afterwards occupied. Canaan was designed only as the beginning of that possession. The promise can never be considered as completely fulfilled until the seed of Abraham, together with Abraham himself, occupy the whole earth. This is in harmony with the words of the apostle, that Joshua did not give the Jews the promised rest or inheritance, and that therefore there remains a rest to the people of God. Hebrews 4:8, 9. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.1}

2. The covenant with Abraham involved this possession. The covenant assured to Abraham the inheritance of this earth for an everlasting possession. Compare Genesis 17:7-11 and Romans 4:11-13. But the covenant was a covenant of righteousness. Therefore the promise made to Abraham comprehended nothing less than the new heavens and the new earth, for which we also, in accordance with that promise, look. 2 Peter 3:13. So the covenant with Abraham included righteousness and eternal redemption, and the everlasting possession of the earth. This is for all who have the same faith that Abraham had. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.2}

“For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise of no effect.” Romans 4:14. This does not mean that faith is made void and the promise of no effect if those who keep the law are heirs; for none others are heirs. The inheritance is to those who are righteous, who have the righteousness of faith. Faith establishes the law and its righteousness. But it means that the mere possession of the law and the trusting in it for justification cannot constitute one an heir. If it could, then there would be no such things as heirship by faith. And it is easy to see how in that case the promise would be of no effect. Thus: If God has promised an inheritance on the sole ground of faith (a working faith, of course), and then requires us to work and earn that inheritance, the promise amounts to nothing. But all the promises of God are in Christ Jesus yea and amen; therefore the inheritance comes through the righteousness of faith. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.3}

“Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression.” Romans 4:15. This is positive proof that the inheritance cannot come through the law, but must be by faith. The law gives the knowledge of sin; we have already learned that all have sinned; but the law works wrath to the transgressor; therefore all are condemned. Now here is the broad earth, which is the promised inheritance. Here is a man who ignores the promise of God, and proceeds to work out his title to a portion of the land. The time of judgment comes, and he thinks that he has worked enough to enable him to “prove up” on his claim, and he goes to the court to have the inheritance forever confirmed to him. But now he finds his mistake, for the law in which he had trusted declares that his life is forfeited as a rebel, and, instead of getting an inheritance, he loses his life. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.4}

“Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations), before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.” Romans 4:16, 17. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.5}

This is the great ground of confidence. The inheritance is of faith, that it might be by grace; therefore anybody can have a share in it. What if the law has declared our lives forfeited? “Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us (for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree); that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” Galatians 3:13, 14. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.6}

What a blessing! And what assurance we may have that we shall share in it! The blessing is an inheritance in the new earth, which will never be defiled with unrighteousness. God’s holy will-his law-will be done in it even as it is now done in heaven. But we have all sinned, and are under the curse of the law-doomed to eternal death. How then can we hope for a share in the everlasting inheritance?-Through the unbounded mercy of God in Christ. Christ has taken upon himself the curse of the law for those who believe,-he bore our sins in his own body on the tree,-and so the promise to Abraham may be as sure to us as though we had never violated the law. “Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift!” {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.7}

A law is in force until it is repealed. The repeal, in justice, should be given as wide a publicity as the enactment of the law. These are simple principles recognized in all the governmental affairs of man. Apply the same principles to the decalogue, the law of God. It existed from the beginning. It was solemnly spoken by the Majesty of Heaven in a voice which shook the earth; it was written by his own finger on tables of enduring stone; it was complete in itself. It is repeatedly declared to be perfect, sure, good, true, righteous, everlasting, throughout the Old Testament. Jesus, in the New Testament, declares that he came not to destroy it, and that is is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail. Matthew 5:17-20; Luke 16:17. The psalmist declares (Psalm 119:172) that it is God’s righteousness, and the Lord says through his prophet that his “righteousness shall not be abolished.” Isaiah 51:6, 7. In the light of these simple principles and plain declarations of Scripture, how can man say that the Sabbath has been changed or abolished? Why is it not better to believe God? {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.8}

**“Law in Force” The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

A law is in force until it is repealed. The repeal, in justice, should be given as wide a publicity as the enactment of the law. These are simple principles recognized in all the governmental affairs of man. Apply the same principles to the decalogue, the law of God. It existed from the beginning. It was solemnly spoken by the Majesty of Heaven in a voice which shook the earth; it was written by his own finger on tables of enduring stone; it was complete in itself. It is repeatedly declared to be perfect, sure, good, true, righteous, everlasting, throughout the Old Testament. Jesus, in the New Testament, declares that he came not to destroy it, and that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail. Matthew 5:17-20; Luke 16:17. The psalmist declares (Psalm 119:172) that it is God’s righteousness, and the Lord says through his prophets that his “righteousness shall not be abolished.” Isaiah 51:6, 7. In the light of these simple principles and plain declarations of Scripture, how can man say that the Sabbath has been changed or abolished? Why is it not better to believe God? {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.9}

**“The Parable of the Vineyard. International Lesson Notes. Luke 20:9-19” The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**
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**INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.  
(Luke 20:9-19; October 5, 1890.)**

THE CONNECTION.-The speaking of this parable (see also Matthew 21:3-46; Mark 12:1-12) came the next day after the events recorded in the last regular lesson. It was the last great day of our Saviour’s teaching in the temple. On Sunday he had ridden into Jerusalem as a conqueror. On Monday he had driven out of the temple the extortionate and covetous who were defiling with their unholy traffic the temple of God. Other events, such as the cursing of the fig-tree, the lesson of the prayer of faith, the crafty scheme of the scribes and Pharisees to entrap Jesus with artful questions, and the parable of the two sons, preceded the parable of the vineyard, and can be studied with profit. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.10}

This one fact is nearly always prominent in the Lord’s parables, he uses as his illustrations things with which the people were familiar. In this parable, our Lord simply uses that which his Spirit had inspired some hundred years before. See Isaiah 5:1-7. The vineyard represents Israel; the tower, the temple at Jerusalem; the place of resort, the strength and center of their worship, the place from which the whole vineyard could be overseen. The wine-press evidently includes all those means which God gave Israel by which the riches of their vineyard could be developed and used to God’s glory. This vineyard was “hedged about,” separated from other fields. Israel was a separated people. That which separated them was God’s truth-his law, his statutes, his promises to the fathers: “Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them; that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spew you not out. And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nations, which I cast out before you; for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them. But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey; I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people.” Leviticus 20:22-24. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.11}

The one who planted the vineyard is the Lord; the husbandmen were those in responsible places in the Jewish nation. And truly what great things God had done for his people! From the time of his first call to them in Egypt till they were cast off forever, the way was strewn with the mercies of God. Truly the Lord could say: “What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?” Isaiah 5:4. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.12}

The householder sent his servants to the husbandmen; the Lord sent his prophets to Israel. It was Samuel, and Elijah, and Isaiah, and Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and many others. But as the husbandmen beat the servants of the owner of the vineyard, so Israel abused the prophets of God. The record is very explicit on this point: “And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy.” 2 Chronicles 36:15, 16. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.13}

God left them without excuse. He sent “betimes” to them, or, as the margin reads, “rising up continually and carefully and sending.” He could not let them go. The language of God’s heart was: “How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together.” Hosea 11:8. These are the pleadings of Infinite Love to rebellious and fallen man. He will not yet reject Israel. He has one more evidence of his love; he will bestow that; surely they will yield him his due then. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.14}

Then the Lord of the vineyard sends his only begotten Son for the love which he bore to the world. John 3:16. Christ “gave himself.” Titus 2:14. Heaven or the universe could bestow no more; it bestowed its Maker. He who with the Father created all things, laid aside his glory and came to earth, and endured what man must endure, was tempted, tried, and suffered for man’s sake. “He came unto his own,” but, sad to say, “his own received him not.” The Jewish nation had closed their hearts against him. They continually read the prophecies which foretold his coming; they continually offered those sacrifices which typified his death, but the antitype they knew not. Their heart was not in harmony with the message of meekness and humility and heart righteousness; therefore they could not receive him. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.15}

But they said, “This is the heir; come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours.” And this is just what the Jews did. Strange madness, that such should be the case, and yet it was, after three and one-half years of teaching such as the world never heard. No charge could be brought against it, neither could they bring aught against his life. He could say without boasting, “Which of you convinceth me of sin?” He met in himself all the specifications of the prophecy. He went beyond this. The mighty power of God was manifested by him wherever he went. The crowning miracle of raising to life him who had been dead four days had but recently been wrought. Lazarus was known to the priests and many about Jerusalem. This miracle, in connection with all the evidences of Christ’s divinity which preceded, had led a multitude to believe in him. In fact, no evidences were wanting. The priests had confessed that the “world” had “gone after him.” {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.16}

But notwithstanding all this, the Jews cast him out and crucified him, after a heathen governor had repeatedly declared, “I find no fault in him.” In rejecting Christ, the Jews filled up the cup of their iniquity. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.17}

This is the lesson of the parable, from which, according to the account by Matthew, the Jews themselves drew the lesson: “He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.” Then our Lord forced home the lesson of the parable by a reference to a well-known scripture: “The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner.” {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.18}

When the temple of Solomon was built, the stones were all prepared in the quarry, so that no sound of tool was heard in the building. It is said that one stone was for a long time rejected by the builders as of no use; but it was finally ascertained that it was the chief corner-stone. This stone typified Christ. Rejected of men, but chosen of God and precious, he was the tried upon whom if anyone believed he would not be ashamed or confounded. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.19}

“Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken.” Whosoever comes before God with a “broken and contrite spirit” (Psalm 51:17), falling unreservedly upon his mercy, will be received. The brokenness is the brokenness of heart so pleasing to God. He dwells with the humble (Isaiah 57:15); God looks with favor upon the contrite of heart (Isaiah 66:2). But whosoever rejects the mercies of God, will, like the Jews, be rejected of God. If they will not receive Christ as a Redeemer, they must meet him as Judge, when he dispenses judgment without mercy. The lesson for the Jews is a lesson for us all. Let us heed the lesson. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 498.20}

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**
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It is often said that the ten divisions into which Rome was divided in the third and fourth centuries is denoted by the toes on the great metallic image of the second chapter of Daniel. But this is not the case. The prophecy expressly shows that the division of the Roman Empire is not denoted by the toes, but by the intermingling of the iron and the clay. “And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter’s clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided.” Daniel 2:41. Iron and clay will not mix and become homogeneous. They will not unite. There is division wherever the two materials exist. Even so the divisions of the Roman Empire will “not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.” Verse 43. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.1}

It is a precious thought that God not only helps a man after he becomes a Christian, but he helps him to begin the work. No man can lift up himself. The hymn is true; Jesus must take us just as we are. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.2}

*“Just as I am, poor, wretched, blind,-  
Sight, healing, riches of the mind.-  
Yea,*all I love in thee to find*,  
O Lamb of God, I come, I come.” {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.3}*

Christ says, “Without me, ye can do nothing.” We are literally “without strength.” Furthermore, Jesus says, “No man can come unto me except my Father draw him.” But, praise God, he draws all men. He desires all men to be saved. He calls to all the ends of the earth, “Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.” God invites by his Spirit, by his word, by his servants. He draws us by the manifest exhibitions of his love; he gives us strength to accept the invitation and come; he freely accepts us when we come. The strength, the power, the glory, are all God’s. Man has naught of which to boast. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.4}

In Europe we hear of the “English Sabbath,” and the “Continental Sabbat;” in America, the “Puritan Sabbath” and the “American Sabbath;” and now the *Australian Christian World* is calling for an “Australian Sabbath.” If all these dear people would believe God and accept of his word, they would get along with one Sabbath-the Sabbath of the Lord our God. God is a God of Gentiles as well as Jews. Romans 3:29. His Sabbath is not local; it “was made for man,” for the race. Mark 2:27. But it belongs not to man or country, it is God’s “holy day.” Isaiah 58:13. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.5}

The *Presbyterian* mourns the growing disposition in the country to exclude the Bible from the public schools, and says: “The conscience must be trained as well as the intellect.” “In Australia, men of observation, influence, and position...are calling for suitable religious instruction in their public schools.” This is strange talk for a religious journal. What are churches and Sunday-schools for? For what are fathers and mothers? But if the church and home cannot give sufficient moral instruction, how will the public schools, which are furnished and fed from the home, be able to do this? They will never be higher morally than the elements they may be made. The public schools are not founded for moral and religious training. It is utterly impossible for them to fulfill the requirement. It is one of the follies of National Reform that such a thing could be thought feasible. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.6}

The *Union Signal* of August 28 has the following item: “Mrs. J. C. Bateham has returned to San Francisco from her very successful work for Sabbath observance in the Sandwich Islands.” Of which we have to say: (1) Mrs. Bateham not only does not “work for Sabbath observance,” but she is doing all she can against all true Sabbath observance; and (2) unless her work in the Sandwich Islands was vastly different fro her work in the city of Oakland, she counts her success wholly by faith. But perhaps the islanders were more profoundly impressed by her profound ignorance of the question with which she presumes to deal. {SITI September 29, 1890, p. 500.7}