

# **The Signs of the Times, Vol. 3 (1877)**

**February 22, 1877**

**"Jefferson, Marion Co., Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 9 , p. 72.**

THIS is a town of about one hundred and fifty inhabitants, situated nineteen miles south of Salem, on the O. & C. R. R. where it crosses the Santione river. I commenced meetings there Dec. 12, 1876, and continued four weeks, giving twenty-one discourses. Then they were discontinued till Jan. 23, during which interval I went to Eola, where Bro. Van Horn organized a church. Then returned to Jefferson and again commenced meetings which continued till Feb. 12. Gave fifty discourses in all. Fifteen signed the covenant, ten subscribed for the SIGNS, and five for the *Instructor*. Sold about \$13.00 worth of books and one \$5.00 Bible. As is the way whenever the truth is presented, a great many more are convinced than have decided to obey. I expect to return there March 22, when we hope for more to go with us.

Feb. 15, I shall begin a course of lectures at the Spring Valley meeting-house, six miles N. W., from Salem, in Polk Col. And I ask every one who reads this, to read also and follow the directions given in the 18th, 19th, and 20th, verses of the 6th chapter of Ephesians, and may the Lord answer, so that his truth may triumph gloriously.

ALONZO T. JONES.

*Salem, Oregon, Feb. 13, 1877.*

**March 8, 1877**

**"Eola, Polk Co., Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 11 , p. 88.**

FEBRUARY 17, I went to Eola, where I held meetings over Sabbath and Sunday, also Tuesday and Thursday evenings. On Friday Bro. Van Horn joined me, and continued meetings till Sunday night, Feb. 25.

The meetings throughout were excellent, and the brethren and friends were greatly encouraged. Sunday, Bro. Van Horn organized S. R. amounting to \$119.

The light of present truth is shining in Eola. May those who have received it keep near to the Lord, that he may bless them richly.

*Feb. 26, 1877.*

ALONZO T. JONES.

**May 24, 1877**

**"Sylvester, Marion County, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 21 , p. 168.**

THIS is a town of about one hundred and fifty inhabitants, situated about sixteen miles north east from Salem. I began meetings here on the evening of March 13, and continued till April 12, giving twenty-six discourses, when the meetings were discontinued, till May 1, when I returned and held meetings till May 5. The interest was good throughout. Five decided to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Sold books amounting to \$7.00, and obtained three subscribers for the SIGNS.

April 27-30, I was with Bro Van Horn at Jefferson, where twelve covenanted to return to the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, to meet together on that day for worship, for the study of the word of God, and to encourage and help one another on in the Christian life, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

The cause of present truth in the North Pacific Coast is bound to succeed.  
ALONZO T. JONES.

## **November 15, 1877**

### **"North Pacific Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 44 , pp. 352.**

THE first annual session of the North Pacific Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was held at Walla Walla, W. T., October 28, 29, 1877,

#### **FIRST SESSION, OCTOBER 25, 8 P.M**

The session was opened by Elder I. D. Van Horn reading from the SIGNS OF THE TIMES the call for the meeting:

*Voted and resolved*, That Elder J. N. Loughborough be assigned as the representative of the General Conference, and that he be elected chairman of all meetings which shall be held in connection with this Conference; carried unanimously. Elder Loughborough took the chair.

*Voted and resolved*, That Alonzo T. Jones be elected secretary *pro tem*; carried unanimously.

Credentials of delegates being called for, the following were presented: Walla Walla, W. T., S. Maxson, J. F. Wood, George Savage, T. Chabot, Milton, Oregon, Wm. Russell, Wm. Goodwin; Dayton, W. T., Albert Woodman, H. Davis; Salem, Oregon, T. H. Starbuck, Wm. L. Raymond; Eola Oregon, A. G. Roberts. For organized bodies of Sabbath keepers in Portland, East Portland and Beaverton, Oregon, Alonzo T. Jones.

Adjourned to 9 A. M., October 26.

#### **SECOND SESSION, OCTOBER, 26, 9 A. M**

The session was opened with prayer by Elder Van Horn.

All members in good standing of the churches within the limits of the Conference were invited to take part in all the deliberations except in voting.

The following constitution was read and adopted as a whole:

## **CONSTITUTION OF THE NORTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS**

### **ARTICLE I**

SECTION I. This Association shall be known as the North Pacific Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and shall be composed of all ministers in good standing, and delegates from organized churches in the State of Oregon and in Washington Territory.

SEC. 2. When Sabbath-keepers, in any place, have enrolled their names under a covenant to keep God's commandments, appointed a leader and organized systematic benevolence, they shall be entitled to delegates to the sessions of this Conference to the same extent as though fully organized.

SEC. 3. It is the privilege of the Conference to invite all members in good standing in our churches who may be present to take part in the deliberations of the meetings, but not in the voting.

### **ARTICLE II**

SECTION I. The officers of this Conference shall be a president, secretary, treasurer, and executive committee of three, of whom the president shall be one, and they shall be elected annually.

SEC. 2. The duties of the president and secretary shall be such as usually pertain to those officers respectively; and it shall further be the duty of the secretary to furnish the General Conference, by delegate or by letter, statistics specifying the number of ministers and licentiates belonging to this Conference, the number of churches and membership, the total amounts of S. B. fund, etc.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to keep an account of the receipts and disbursements of the Conference funds, to pay out the same under the directions of the executive committee, and to make a report thereof annually at the Conference.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the executive committee to appoint, through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, the time and place of the annual meetings, and to call special meetings whenever in their judgment it may be needful so to do; to call on the churches and scattered brethren for means when needed, and to disburse the same; to take the general supervision of all tent operations and property belonging to the Conference; to audit and settle accounts with ministers and others in the employ of the Conference, and to exercise a general watchcare over all matters pertaining to the interests of the cause within the bounds of the Conference.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Conference, at its regular session, to choose an auditing committee, of six laymen to act with the executive committee in the settlement of the accounts with ministers for the preceding years.

### **ARTICLE III**

SECTION I. Conference funds shall be raised from proceeds of systematic benevolence, and by gifts and donations.

SEC. 2. We recommend that all churches belonging to this Conference adopt the plan of systematic benevolence on the tithing principle, as set forth in the tract published by S. D. Adventists on the subject of systematic benevolence.

SEC. 3. The churches and scattered brethren within the bounds of this Conference will be expected to pledge to the executive committee the amount they will give during the Conference year for the support of the ministers and tent operations, and for such other purposes as may be necessary for the advancement of the cause; said sums to be paid to the treasurer at the commencement of each quarter, viz., on the first of January, April, July, and October.

SEC. 4. All moneys drawn from the State treasury shall be by an order signed by the executive committee.

SEC. 5. The churches will be expected to make a report to the secretary at the end of each quarter, of the amount they have paid to the treasurer during said quarter.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty of ministers to report to the secretary, at the end of each quarter, the amount they have received and expended during the quarter; and at the end of each year they shall make a written report to the regular meetings of the entire amount of their receipts and expenditures during such Conference year.

### **ARTICLE IV**

SECTION I. When any church or scattered brethren wish ministerial labor in their vicinity, their call shall be made to the executive committee.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the churches in this Conference to send a written report to the regular meetings of their standing, their losses and additions during the year, also the yearly amount of their S. B. fund.

### **ARTICLE V**

SECTION I. It shall be the duty of the Conference to determine who are the approved ministers within the bounds thereof, to grant suitable credentials to the same at each regular meeting; and during the interval of such meeting the executive committee shall perform such duties.

SEC. 2. Those who feel it their duty to improve their gifts, as messengers or preachers, shall first lay their exercises of mind before the Conference committee, to receive a license from them, if the committee consider them qualified.

### **ARTICLE VI**

SECTION I. It shall be the duty of the ministers of this Conference to make a written report to each annual meeting thereof, of each day's occupation during the conference year.

## ARTICLE VII

SECTION I. The delegates to this Conference shall be elected according to the following ratio: Each church, to the number of twenty members, or under, shall be entitled to one delegate, and one delegate for every additional fifteen members.

SEC. 2. In case all the delegates to which any church is entitled do not attend the Conference the delegates attending may cast the full number of votes to which said church is entitled.

## ARTICLE VIII

SECTION I. This constitution may be amended at any regular meeting by a two third vote of the members present, *provided* such amendment shall not conflict with the constitution of the General Conference.

The Walla Walla church was voted into the Conference. Number of members, 61; S. B. about \$200; Sabbath-school scholars, 18.

The Milton church, with 24 members, \$153 S.

351

B., 15 Sabbath-school scholars was received by vote.

The Dayton church, with 19 members, \$75 S. B., and 7 Sabbath-school scholars was received.

The Salem church, with 35 members, \$235 S. B., and 15 Sabbath-school scholars was received.

The Eola church, with 8 members, and \$118.60 S. B., was received.

*Voted*, That the following unorganized companies of Sabbath-keepers be taken under the watchcare of the Conference:

Jefferson, Marion county, Oregon, 12 Sabbath-keepers, Silverton, Marion county, Oregon, 5 Sabbath-keepers; Beaverton, Washington county, Oregon, 7 Sabbath-keepers; Portland and East Portland, 29 Sabbath-keepers; Oregon city, Clackamas county, Oregon, 4 Sabbath-keepers; Carrolton, Cowlitz county, Washington Territory, 5 Sabbath-keepers; the last of whom represented themselves to the Conference by letter.

*Voted* unanimously, that the chairman be empowered to appoint all committees. The following were announced: Committee on nominations, J. F. Wood, chairman, Wm. L. Raymond, Wm. Russell, committee on credentials and licenses, Geo. Savage, chairman, Aaron Miller, James C. Bunch; committee on resolutions, I. D. Van Horn, chairman, Stephen Maxon, Alonzo T. Jones; committee on auditing, S. Maxson, chairman, Wm. Goodwin, Wm. Russell, Wm. Nichols, T. H. Starbuck, A. G. Roberts.

The president called for written reports of ministers, and reports were presented by Elder I. D. Van Horn and Alonzo T. Jones.

Adjournment till immediately after the 2 P. M. service.

### **THIRD SESSION, OCTOBER 26, 3 P. M**

The reports of committees being in order, the committee on nominations reported as follows: For president, Elder I. D. Van Horn; secretary, Mrs. A. P. Van Horn; treasurer, Alonzo T. Jones; Conference committee, Stephen Maxson, T. H. Starbuck. The report of the committee was adopted, and the nominees declared elected.

The committee on resolutions presented the following, which were unanimously adopted by the Conference, and then by the whole congregation:

*Whereas*, We learn by reports received through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, that the Lord is abundantly blessed the efforts of his servants for the advancement of the truth, therefore

*Resolved*, That our thanksgiving and praise are due to the Author of all good for the great blessings upon us.

*Resolved*, That we hereby express our confidence in those means and agencies, including the gifts of the Spirit which God has connected with this cause; and we see increasing evidences every week that, through these agencies, a people is being brought to the unity of the faith.

*Resolved*, That we hereby express our gratitude to the General Conference for sending Elder I. D. Van Horn, to open a mission in Oregon and Washington Territory, and also for their kindness in furnishing us other laborers.

*Resolved*, That we endorse the Conference address delivered by Elder Van Horn, and request him to furnish the SIGNS OF THE TIMES with a copy for publication.

Adjourned to call of the chair.

### **FOURTH SESSION, OCTOBER 27, 6 P. M.**

The committee on credentials and licenses reported as follows: that credentials be granted to Elder I. D. Van Horn, that Brother Alonzo T. Jones receive ordination and credentials, that licenses be granted to Brethren S. Maxon, Wm. Russel, James C. Bunch and Wm. L. Raymond.

The Conference voted that the credentials of Elder I. D. Van Horn be renewed, that Brother Alonzo T. Jones receive ordination and credentials and that licenses be granted to the four persons above named.

The committee on resolutions reported the following which were adopted unanimously, and the second and third by a vote of the whole congregation:

*Resolved*, That we endorse the plan relative to quarterly meetings recommended by the General Conference and request all our churches and missionary districts to adopt and act upon it, and have a quarterly meeting in each church on the first Sabbath and Sunday of each quarter. A district quarterly meeting in each district, the second Sabbath and Sunday in each quarter and a State quarterly meeting on the third Sabbath and Sunday in each quarter.

*Resolved*, That we will hold a camp-meeting next season near Portland, Oregon, at such time and place as may be appointed by our Conference committee; and we hereby empower said committee to select a camp-meeting committee.

*Resolved*, That we deeply sympathize with Brother White in his affliction, and we will plead with the Lord to speedily restore him to health, and to sustain him and his companion in their arduous labors for the advancement of the cause.

*Resolved*, That we hereby express to Brother and Sister White personally our thanks for the interest and tender care they have manifested for this mission, and we request them, if consistent with their health and other duties, to meet with us in our camp-meeting next spring.

*Resolved*, That we request the General Conference to grant us such help at our coming camp-meeting as may seem best to them for the success of that meeting in this new field.

*Resolved*, That we will now assume the financial responsibility of this Conference, and we will also pay to Brother Van Horn what may be lacking for his past labors, and we feel and realize, that the pecuniary aid which this mission has received from the General Conference, had laid upon us a debt of gratitude to the one great cause they are laboring so assiduously to spread before nations, tongues, and kings, and we will seek to discharge that debt by contributing of our means for those institutions which the General Conference is seeking to establish and encourage especially upon the Pacific coast.

*Resolved*, That we will seek to bring up all our churches and members to the plan of systematic benevolence as recommended by the General Conference of S. D. Adventists.

The committee on auditing reported as follows:

Elder I. D. Van Horn 1st weeks, for

Which we allot him \$12.00 per week, making	\$2,208.00	
Traveling and tent expenses, allowed	196.00	
Total. . . . .		\$2,112.80

Elder Van Horn has received

Systematic Benevolence	\$817.25	
Donations	\$511.00	
General Conference	\$922.00	2,261.00
Balance due for which we are responsible		\$831.00

On the labor of Alonzo T. Jones

Brother Jones has labored 206 days, for which we allow him \$1.00 per day \$206.00

Traveling	expenses	allowed
\$37.55		
Total		\$143.55

Brother Jones has received

By donation \$  
Balance paid \$17.00

The following resolutions were reported by the committee, and unanimously adopted.

*Resolved*, That we will make an effort to raise in our Conference at least \$5,000 in subscriptions to the stock of the Pacific S. D. A. P. Association to be paid on, or before November 1, 1878.

*Resolved*, That we feel the need of a new 50 ft. tent in this Conference, and we empower the Conference committee to order one for use next season, and that the funds for the purchase of said tent be raised by an assessment on each one, according to the ratio of their S. B. pledges.

*Resolved*, That the minutes of this Conference be published in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and that we order 500 extra copies printed for circulation in this Conference.

*Whereas*, In the providence of God not one of all our number has been stricken by the hand of death since the establishment of this mission, three years and six months; Therefore,

*Resolved*, That we feel to express our heartfelt gratitude and praise to the Great Author of life for his abundant mercies toward us, and we feel called upon to consecrate ourselves, our families, and our means anew to God and his cause.

This last resolution was responded to by a rising vote of the whole house.

*Resolved*, That we request the General Conference at its next session to receive the North Pacific Conference.

I. D. VAN HORN, *President*.

ALONZO T. JONES, *Secretary pro tem*.

### **"The North Pacific Meetings" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 44 , p. 352.**

THE meetings held in Walla Walla, are past, but our happy recollections of those meetings can never pass.

There was quite a general attendance of our people from the surrounding country, but the outside attendance was not very great. The Lord gave his servants great liberty and power in his word, and our Sabbath meetings were exceptionally good, especially in the afternoon at 3 o'clock when a call was made for those who wished to make a start in the service of the Lord. There were perhaps no more than a dozen who responded, these from ten to seventy years of age, but the weeping eyes and broken voices told that their hearts were enlisted in the work.

One aged brother of about seventy years stated that his companion had been living the truth for a good many years alone, and that he knew she had been praying for him, and he had now determined, with the help of God to go with her. This gave a thrill of joy to all.

The business sessions were of great interest to all, and all passed with never a dissenting voice.

The evening after the Sabbath, there was a letter received from a little company of Sabbath-keepers in Carrollton, W. T., which was a joyful surprise to us all, and if they could have heard the song of, "We praise thee, Oh God," which went up to Him who is worthy of all praise, they would have known that they were not strangers, though none of us ever saw one of them.

But the climax of the meeting was reached when the committee on resolutions submitted to our consideration the fact that "In the providence of God not one of our number had been stricken by the hand of Death." The whole house arose as one man, and with tearful eyes and thankful hearts sang, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

May God bless the N. P. Conference.

ALONZO T. JONES.

*Walla Walla, W. T., October 29, 1877.*

### **"North Pacific Tract and Missionary Society" *The Signs of the Times* 3, 44 , p. 352.**

THE first session of this society was held at Walla Walla, W. T., at 9 A. M., October 28, 1877.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Brother Jones, Elder Loughborough in the chair. Alonzo T. Jones was elected secretary *pro tem*.

The constitution, published by the General Conference in the supplement to the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, November 1, 1877, was adopted by a unanimous vote.

*Voted*, That the necessary committees be appointed by the chair.

Whereupon the chairman appointed the following committees. Committee on nominations, J. F. Wood, Aaron Miller, T. H. Starbuck; committee on resolutions, S. Maxson, Alonzo T. Jones, Wm Russell; committee on auditing, Wm. Goodwin, W. I. Raymond, W. Nichols.

Adjourned till 2 P. m.

### **SECOND SESSION**

Opened with prayer by Brother Maxson.

Reports of committees were called for, which the committee on districts and nomination of officers reported, recommending to divide the Conference into three missionary districts as follows:

First district—All of Washington Territory east of the Cascade mountains.

Second district—All of Oregon east of the Cascade Mountains.

Third district—All of Washington Territory and Oregon west of the Cascade mountains.

For president, Elder I. D. Van Horn; for vice-president, S. Maxson; for secretary and treasurer, Sister A. P. Van Horn, Directors—first district, Geo. Savage; second district, Wm. Goodwin; third district, Alonzo T. Jones.

J. F. WOOD,

AARON MILLER,} *Committee*

T. H. STARBUCK.

The report of the committee was accepted and the committee discharged. The report of the committee was adopted and the officers declared elected.

The committee on resolutions reported as follows:

*Resolved*, That, in harmony with the suggestion of Brother Van Horn in his Conference address, we will raise by subscription a permanent Conference T. and M. fund of \$300, to be paid on or before January 1, 1878.

*Resolved*, That we endorse fully the recommendation of the General Conference to pay quarterly to the T. and M. fund a sum equal to one-third of our S. R. fund, as a means of constantly replenishing our T. and M. fund.

*Resolved*, That we will circulate in our Conference, through our Missionary workers, 1,000 copies of the *Family Health Annual*.

*Resolved*, That we recommend all our churches in the Conference to take, in addition to the copies for which individuals subscribe, clubs of the SIGNS to be used in missionary work, the same to be paid for from the one-third raised for missionary purposes.

S. MAXON,

WM. RUSSELL, } *Committee*

ALONZO T. JONES.

These Resolutions were adopted unanimously.

Adjourned.

I. D. VAN HORN, *President*,

ALONZO T. JONES, *Secretary pro tem*.

### ***The Signs of the Times, Vol. 4 (1878)***

**April 18, 1878**

**"The Sermon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 15 , pp. 113, 118.**

[ Delivered by Elder A. T. Jones at Jefferson, Oregon, on Wednesday evening, January 16, 1878, and published by special request.]

"THOU shall worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. 4:10.

These words were spoken by our Saviour when under the temptation to worship another than God; when Satan offered Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if He would fall down and worship him, but Jesus repelled his proposition with the words of our text. Certainly it is no more than right that man should worship the Lord his God, and Him only. But there are some even in these days who will stand with ancient Pharaoh, and utter the same sentiments that he uttered as recorded in Ex. 5:2, when Moses told him, "The Lord God of Israel says let my people go," he made answer as follows, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord neither will I let Israel go." So now there are those who when we read the words of our text will say, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice to worship and serve him? I know

not the Lord neither will I worship nor serve him." And not content with making the assertion that *they* do not know him, which might be taken as an admission that there are some things of which they are ignorant, they will go so far as to say, "There is no God."

Now we wish to show that there is no excuse for any man making such an assertion, for God has taken away every excuse. We read Rom. 1:19, 20: Because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them, (margin *to them*) for God hath showed it unto them, for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and God-head, so that they are without excuse. Here we see that they are without excuse because God has shown them the things which reveal him and which make his power known. Certainly, if any one shows me a thing I am without excuse for not seeing it. Paul also says that these things are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Psalms 19:1. Step out of your house in a clear night, and as Isaiah says, "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number, he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth." Yes, go night after night and you will find them all there "not one faileth." Whose all this work? We can only reply in the words already quoted it shows the "handiwork of God."

Again we read Ps. 19:2: "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. Yes, night unto night from the days of Job, the heavens have been showing knowledge; and astronomers who make it the labor of their lives to obtain knowledge of, and from them when their lives close, can only say with Sir Isaac Newton—the prince of Philosophers, if not also the prince of astronomers—when the time came for him to lay down his grand and useful life, "I feel as though I have been but a child gathering shells on the beach of the great ocean." These may not be his exact words, but they give the sentiment, and they are true for he knew that "night unto night showeth knowledge," and that he in his whole life had not been able to gain any more from it, comparatively, than a child gathering shells on the ocean's beach.

But we read on, Ps. 19:3-6: "There is no speech nor language where their voice not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chambers and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof." Think a moment of the system governed by the influence of our sun. It consists of eight planets with their satellites (moons) and one hundred and seventeen asteroids (minor planets) ranging in distance from thirty-five millions to two billions, seven hundred and fifty millions of miles from the sun; the nearest one Mercury, is sometimes hidden from view, being completely enveloped in his glorious rays, and the farthest one Neptune is not "hid from the heat thereof."

Think of it, the sun darting his rays two-billions seven hundred and fifty millions miles, and giving heat and light to the inhabitants of that planet and to

the planet itself. If the heat is so intense as to penetrate to that distance, why are we not consumed for we are only ninety-one and one-half millions of miles from the sun. True, Neptune receives only one-thousandth as much as we do but the wonder is that it receives any at all. Again: these all revolve round the sun, and they not only revolve round it, but the sun with his whole system, revolves round other grand central systems, and systems of systems till we are overwhelmed with the immensity of the firmament, and these planets and systems rolling in their orbits at a rate of speed that is almost incredible. The earth revolves on its axis at the rate of more than one thousand miles an hour it rolls forward in its course round the sun sixty-four thousand, eight hundred miles in an hour, more than one thousand miles a minute, eighteen miles in a second. To convey a faint idea of this speed, we will say that a rifle ball goes at the rate of about one thousand miles in an hour, therefore, we with the earth, go in one direction as fast as a rifle ball and at the same time in another direction sixty times as fast,

*(Concluded on page 118.)*

118

*(Continued from page 113.)*

and in a third, we cannot tell how fast, and with a circuit so vast in extent that it will be millions of years before we shall be again where we now are. The Psalmist says truly: "His circuit is to the ends of heaven." Now we ask again, who does all this? and again we must say, and most reverently too, it shows the handiwork of God. Aye, there is a God, and "The Lord he is God."

We wish to ask those persons some plain questions, we shall read them from Job 38:2-6: "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man, for I will demand of thee and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" Were you there? or can you say that there was no one who did it? "Declare if thou hast understanding." "Who hast laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest," If God did not do it, who did? "If thou knowest," "Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened?" Can you tell? No more than, as all things prove the truth of the words of Job 26:7: "He hangeth the earth upon nothing." "Who laid the corner-stone thereof; when the morning stars, sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy? "Were you there at the creation that you can say there was no song of joy? or more, that God was not there? No, no. Then cease darkening counsel by words without knowledge. "Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days; and caused the day spring to know his place?" Have you done or can you do this? You have not, then do not say, "There is no God," for he might be the one who did it and you not know it. "Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea? or hast thou walked in search of the depth? Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death? Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? declare if then *knowest it all*. Leaving out all the others, we can ask this question, Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? and the answer must be, no. Well, "If thou knowest it all," you ought to be

able to answer that. Therefore as you do not know it all how can you say, "There is no God?"

Again, 19th verse: "Where is the way where light dwelleth? and as for darkness, where is the place thereof that thou shouldest take it to the bound thereof, and that thou shouldest know the paths thereof? Knowest thou it, because thou wast then born?" Were you there when light was formed? Were you then born, that you can say that "God did not do it?" Or "knowest thou it because the number of thy days is great?" Are you so old that you have seen all these things?

Verses 24-27: "By what way is the light parted, which scattereth the east wind upon the earth? Who hath divided a water-course for the overflowing of waters, or a way for the lightning of thunder, to cause it to rain on the earth wherein no man is, on the wilderness where there is no man; to satisfy the desolate and waste ground; and to cause the bud of the tender herb to spring forth?" Who does this if there is no God?

And now after compassing the earth with questions that not one of those can answer, He directs our eyes to the heavens, and how much less can they answer now. Verses 31-35: "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzareth in his season or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons? Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth? Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds, that abundance of waters may covet thee? Canst thou send lightnings that they may go and say unto thee, Here we are?"

And after spanning the heavens with these questions, he comes directly to you with this one, "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? or who hath given understanding to the heart?" On this point we wish to go to chapter 39:13-17. "Gavest thou goodly wings unto the peacocks, or wings and feathers to the ostrich? which leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in the dust, and forgeteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers; her labor is in vain without fear; because God has deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding." Now we ask in the words of Elihu, Job 35:11. "Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven?" How is it that you know more than the ostrich? or how it is that you have more understanding than the beasts? Let the same one answer, Job 32:8: "But there is a spirit in man; and the inspiration the Almighty giveth them understanding." Yes it is God who giveth these very men wisdom and understanding enough to say, "There is no God," and deny him. But surely I have used a misnomer when I said that they had *wisdom* enough to say, There is no God; for I have already read from Ps. 14:1, "The *fool* hath said in his heart, There is no God." It is, it must be true, for surely none but a fool would say it.

Sometimes, however, by the very force of circumstances they are caused to acknowledge that there is a God, and to call upon him. I shall read from Ps. 107, some instances which illustrate this and doubtless there are many of you who are familiar with such instances: "Fools, because of their transgression and because of their iniquities, are afflicted in their soul abhorreth all manner of meat, and they

draw near unto the gates of death. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and he saveth them out of their distresses, he sent his word and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions." Verses 17-20. How often is this the case, men get into a strait, and think their last moments have come. Then they will pray and cry unto the Lord, help comes, they are delivered, and then instead of doing as the next verse calls upon them to do: "Oh that men would *praise* the Lord for his *goodness*, and for his wonderful works to the children of men, and let them sacrifice the sacrifice of thanksgiving and declare his works with rejoicing," instead of this, they forget all that the Lord has done for them, and profane his holy name and never thank him. . . . They go down again to the depths; their soul is melted because of trouble, they reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wit's end, *then they cry unto the Lord* in their trouble, and he bringeth them out of their distresses; he maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still, then they are glad because they be quiet; so he bringeth them unto their desired haven." Then what do they do? render thanksgiving and praise to him, because he has delivered them? often; but instead, they will go off to the theatre, to the ball-room, and all other places of festivity, and never remember the goodness of the Lord. "Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men." Verse 43: "Whoso is wise and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving-kindness of the Lord." For Ps. 92:1, 2 says: "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name O most High; to show forth thy loving-kindness in the morning and thy faithfulness every night." See "His loving-kindness in the morning." Do you do so? do you remember with David, Ps. 4:8, "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep; for thou Lord only makest me dwell in safety." Know you not that it is his loving-kindness that keeps you?

Now we come near to every one, and show that the Lord has not left himself without witness to any one. Acts 14:15. When the Lystrans were about to worship Paul and Barnabas, they said to them, "Sirs why do ye these things ? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities, unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, the sea and all things that are therein; who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." This is also mentioned beautifully in Ps. 65:8, 19. "They also that dwell in the uttermost parts are afraid at thy tokens, thou makest the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice. Thou visitest the earth and waterest it, thou greatly enrichest it with the river of God, which is full of water" &c. See how God sends you rain to nourish the things which you have planted causing them to grow and then blessest the growing thereof that they may bear fruit for the service of man. Oh why will he not observe these things, and give Him "thanks always in all things," who giveth us so richly all things to enjoy? Will he still say "There is no God?" If you can get along so well without God, why do you not do these yourself?

But he does not stop here. We read Acts 17: 24, 25: "God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth

not in temples made with hands, neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed anything seeing he giveth to all life, and breath and all things." He not only gives you fruitful seasons and all those things, but he gives you life and health to enjoy the things that he so richly bestows. And will you not thank Him? When I was here last winter I heard a story related, of an insane man rushing madly along the streets of one of our cities; and as insane men sometimes say the sanest things, so did he. He suddenly and wildly accosted a man with these words, "Did you ever thank God for your reason?" The man answered, "No!" Then said he, "Well, do so quickly, for I have lost mine." It would almost seem that, through the wild delirium of this madman, God was trying to bring sane men to their senses. And now we can repeat his words to you. Did you ever thank God for your reason, life, friends, health, home, happiness? if you have not, do so quickly for many, Oh! how many, have lost theirs, and you know not how soon you may be deprived of yours. Therefore you ought to serve the Lord your God, you must serve him, it is right, it is just. Then worship the Lord thy God, and him only serve. Ps. 100:2-5: "Serve the Lord with gladness, come before his presence with singing, know ye that the Lord he is God, it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves, we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise, be thankful unto him and bless his name, for the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting."

But if we do not worship, nor serve him, then what? We will show by reading Isaiah 5:1-7: "Now will I sing to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well beloved, hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill, and he fenced it and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in midst of it, and also made a winepress therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" Now suppose you should go to a nursery and at great expense, obtain the choice vine, bring it home, set it out, dig round and cultivate, train up and take the best of care of it, finally it bears abundance of fruit, it ripens, you come to gather it, when lo the grapes are both sour and bitter, (for so were the wild grapes of Palestine,) "they cannot be eaten they are so bitter." All your labor and care have been spent in vain. Now what would you do with that vine? You would let it go, let the weeds, thorns, and briars grow up and choke it, or else cut it down. Well, that is just what the Lord did for he says, verse 5: "And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard; I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste; it shall not be pruned, nor digged, but there shall come up briars and thorns; I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it." Now he tells us what this means. "For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel and the men of Judah his pleasant plant, and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression, for righteousness but behold a cry." In Matt. 21:33-43, Jesus explains this parable, he says: "There was a certain householder

which planted a vineyard and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country and when the time of the fruit drew near he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruit of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son, but when the husbandmen saw the son they said among themselves, This is the heir come let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

If these men were miserably destroyed for not rendering the fruits which the Lord had a right to expect in return for the many blessings and great care which he had bestowed upon them, and he has let out his vineyard to us, will he not do the same with us if we do not render him the fruits of righteousness, and righteous judgment between man and man, and not oppression? And if we too, instead of thanks for all his kindness and mercies, return only disrespect, rebellion and profanity shall not we meet the same fate? Most assuredly we shall. Jesus shows this in Luke 13:6-9: "A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard: and he came, and sought fruit thereon and found none; then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree and I find none, cut it down, why cumbereth it ground?"

How long has He waited for fruit from you and waited in vain? all the day long has stretched out His hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people. Would you not have been cut down long ago had not Jesus said as he does, verse 8: "Lord let it alone this year also till I shall dig about it,—and if it bear fruit, well; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down." Ye with all our unthankfulness and evil, Jesus pleads, "Spare them a little longer, O Lord, a little while longer." But oh! "Woe worth the day," when our kind and loving Saviour shall step aside and say, "Thou shalt cut it down." Why will you not bring to the Lord the fruits of the life and loving-kindness, that he so kindly and freely bestows, before he shall pour out his fury upon the heathen that know him not, and upon the families that call not upon his name! Upon how many, many families will his fury be poured out! for how many, many families never call upon his name from the commencement of the year to its close. They lie down at night without remembering his faithfulness during the day. They arise every morning and go about the business of the day without remembering his watchfulness during the night; they come to the table with never a word of gratitude, or thanks to him whose bountiful hand supplies so abundantly their bread. Why is this? With men amongst men, if they at any time receive anything from another, though he be a perfect stranger, without thanking him, they regard it as impolite, if not disrespectful. Then what must God think of

our conduct who day after day receive so many benefits from Him with never a word of thanks? Is it not ungrateful? Is it not disrespectful? My friends these things ought not so to be. Heed the words of Paul in "Giving thanks always in all things unto God, and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. 5:20. And "In everything give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." 1 Thess. 5:18. For it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

**May 9, 1878**

**"Junction, Lane, Co., Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 18 , p. 144.**

THIS is a town of nearly five hundred inhabitants, on the O. & C. R. R., fifty-seven miles south of Salem. On the evening of March 30, I began a course of lectures here, and have given twenty-five discourses. The interest and attendance have been quite good. On April 27, we had our first Sabbath meeting; there were twenty-three present, and we hope by judicious and faithful labor to bring some to obedience of the commandments of God and faith of Jesus. The people of the place generally admit that "these things are so;" it now remains to get them to show by their actions that they believe them.

ALONZO T. JONES.

*April 29, 1878.*

**August 15, 1878**

**"Eugene City, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 31 , p. 238.**

WE have now been here eighteen days, and have given twenty-four discourses. The interest has been good throughout. Some have already decided to obey the truth and others are almost persuaded. Last Sabbath there were twelve at our Sabbath meeting some of whom are keeping the Sabbath, and we know of four or five others who wanted to come, but Satan hindered them.

On Sunday, August 4, two of the ministers of the place, the Disciple and the Presbyterian spoke against us on the Sabbath question. The Disciple minister of course would have the whole law abolished, but our discourse on the two laws set that all straight. The Presbyterian minister just as strenuously upheld the perpetuity of every part of the moral law, only that we should keep the first, instead of the seventh day. We reviewed him Monday evening, may the truth ever prevail, and to the Lord be all praise and glory. We hope for much good fruit here. Pray for us.

A. T. JONES.

*August 6, 1878.*

**August 29, 1878**

**"Eugene City, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 33 , p. 264.**

SINCE my last report a Disciple minister came to this place, heralded as the champion of California. Tuesday evening, August 13, he spoke upon the Sabbath question. I reviewed him with good effect the following evening. The tent was well filled. On Thursday evening, Friday forenoon, and afternoon, we had a debate with him. I learned that "The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was given creation, and is binding on all men." He denied it, but utterly failed to disprove it. When the last session closed, the chairman, who was a leading lawyer of Eugene, asked us if he should submit the question to the audience. Elder McCorkle, said *no*, and I said, *yes*. So the question was submitted, for all who believed that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was given at Creation and is binding on all men to arise. Forty-six arose. Then those who believed that it had been abolished and another day was the one, were called to rise, and thirty-five rose, and there were twenty-three who did not vote either way. So the truth had the victory by the majority of eleven. This has helped us greatly, it has confirmed those who had already decided, it has caused others to decide for the truth who were in doubt, and has exalted the truth, and the cause in this place. It has made us many friends. We have now twenty substantial names to the covenant, and others to come, some of whom are already keeping the Sabbath. We express our gratitude our dear Lord for his abundant grace, and ever present help in time of need. To his great name be all the praise and glory through the precious name and merits of Jesus.

*August 19, 1878.*

A. T. JONES.

**September 12, 1878**

**"Eugene City, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 34 , p. 272.**

THE cause is prospering here. Twenty-two have signed the covenant, and others are keeping the Sabbath, and we hope for more.

A. T. JONES.

**October 17, 1878**

**"Salem, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 39 , p. 312.**

THE quarterly meeting at this place passed off well. On the Sabbath there was quite a good number present. Nearly all of those who were absent were unavoidably so, most of them by sickness. The celebration of the ordinances was a precious season. Evening after the Sabbath we had a tract and missionary meeting, and Sunday evening after the discourse, in a very few minutes \$70 were pledged to the British mission. The dime tabernacle had already been favored with the pledges of many of the friends Salem.

October 9, 1878.  
ALONZO T. JONES.

### November 7, 1878

**"Eugene City, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 42 , p. 336.**

SUNDAY, October 27, we organized the S. D. A. church of Eugene City, Oregon, with seventeen members. Systematic benevolence, \$60. "Praise ye the Lord."

October 30, 1878.  
ALONZO T. JONES.

### November 28, 1878

**"Eugene City, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 45 , p. 360.**

FROM October 19th to November 18th, I spent in Eugene, doing all I could to strengthen the work. Have held thirty meetings given twenty-eight discourses. Three more substantial persons have taken their stand on the truth of the third angel's message. Let us "Give God the Praise."

ALONZO T. JONES.

November 19, 1878.

### December 12, 1878

**"Historical Notes on the Prophecies" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 47 , pp. 370, 371.**

PROPHECY.—Dan. 2:40. "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise."

HISTORY.—"The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean; and the images of *gold*, or *silver*, or *brass*, that might represent the nations and their kings, were successively *broken* by the *iron* monarchy of Rome. <sup>11</sup>—*Gibbon, Dec. and Fall, Chap. 38, Sec. 43.*

PROPHECY.—Dan. 7:7. "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly: and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." Verse 23. "Thus he said the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces."

HISTORY.—In Mithridates' letter to the king of the Parthians—"Do not deceive yourself; it is with *all the nations, states and kingdoms* of the *earth*, that the

Romans are at war. . . . Do you not know, that the Romans are at war. . . . Do you not know, that the Romans, when they found themselves stopped by the ocean in the west, turned their arms in this way? that to look back to their foundation and origin, whatever they have, they have from violence; home, wives, lands, and dominions? A vile herd of every kind of vagabonds, without country, without forefathers, they established themselves for the misfortune of the human race. Neither divine nor human laws restrain them from betraying and destroying their allies and friends, remote nations or neighbor, the weak or the powerful. They reckon as enemies all that are not their slaves, and especially whatever bears the name of king. . . . It will be for your immortal glory to have supported two great kings, and to have conquered and destroyed these *robbers* of the world." See Dan. 11:14.) *Rollin's Ancient History of Pontus Under the year 69, Hist. J. C.*

"But the empire of the Romans *filled the world*, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. The slave of Imperial despotism, whether he was condemned to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Seriphus, or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and *it was impossible to fly*. On every side he was encompassed with a vast extent of sea and land, which he could never hope to traverse without being discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers, his anxious view could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable deserts, hostile tribes of barbarians, of fierce manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the emperor's protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. 'Wherever you are' said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, 'remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror.'" *Gibbon, Dec. and Fall, Chap. 3, Sec. 34*

Then in his foot-notes he says, note 1: "Seriphus was a small island in the Egean sea, the inhabitants of which were despised for their ignorance and obscurity. The place of Ovid's exile is well known by his humanly [*sic.*] lamentations. It should seem, that he only received an order to leave Rome in so many days and transport *himself* to Tomi. Guards and goalers were unnecessary." Note 2: "Under Tiberius, a Roman knight attempted to fly to the Parthians. He was stopped in the strait of Sicily; but so little danger did there appear in the example that the most jealous of tyrants disdained to punish it."

I know not how words could be gotten together to show more perfectly the fulfillment of that prophecy, and how absolutely the "fourth kingdom upon earth" did "devour the whole earth, and tread it down and break it in pieces," than is shown in these words of Mithridates and Gibbon. And to show the force of Gibbon's mention of the exile of Ovid, we would state that Ovid was the poet of that name, and by some means he incurred the displeasure of Augustus, that "one person" into whose "hands fell the empire of the world," and Augustus banished him to Tomi. Tomi, or Tomos, was a city of Pontus in Europe, on the shores of the Euxine sea near the mouth of the Danube. And to Tomi he went and remained. With neither "guards nor goalers," till the day of his death, a period of nearly ten years. He could not escape from the power of the Romans, so true it was that "the empire of the Romans filled the world; to resist was fatal

and it was *impossible to fly*." Now we come to a prophecy and its fulfillment, which is certainly striking, and also important, as it shows so plainly how this great power and dominion were acquired; we refer to Dan. 8:25, which plainly refers to the same power, the only difference being that this embrace the little horn power of Dan. 7 also.

Dan. 8:24. "His power shall be mighty, *but not by his own power*," "and shall prosper and practice." The 25th verse says, "he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." But how is it that he causes craft to prosper? see verse 25, "Through his policy." Here is the explanation of the whole course of the Roman power, both Pagan, and Papal. And here is the exactness of the Scripture. Notice, it does not say, that *through policy* he shall do this, but "through *his* policy," showing that it is distinctively *his* policy, that he practices. And the history will show that no other nation, kingdom, prince, or people, ever had such a policy. We now turn to history to show that policy. In the year 197-6 B. C., Titus Quintius Flaminius, the Roman proconsul, by the defeat of Philip, (son of Dometrius) the king of Macedonia; in battle, and the conclusion of peace shortly after, put an end to the Macedonian war. It was now the time in which the Isthmian games were to be solemnized, and the expectation of what was to be there transacted had drawn thither an incredible multitude of people, and persons of the highest rank, as the conditions of the treaty of peace were not entirely made public. All Greece was in uncertainty. The multitude being assembled in the stadium to see the games, a herald comes, forward and publishes with a loud voice:—"The senate and people of Rome, and Titus Quintius the general having overcome Philip and the Macedonians, and *set at liberty* from all garrisons, taxes, and imposts, the Corinthians, the Locrians the Phocians, the Eubúans, the Ohtihot Achúans, the Magnesians, the Thessalians, and the Perrhúbians, declare them free, and ordain that they shall be governed by their respective laws and usages."—*Rollin's Ancient History, Book 19, Sec 2.*

In this is shown *his policy*, which was to fight battles, and gain victories for other nations, even though they be entirely strangers, only to set them at liberty as they professed, when in reality it was for the express purpose of getting a firmer hold on them, and on other nations through them;" for here were seven nations, which they had set at liberty, immediately they began to spread abroad to other nations, how magnanimous the Romans were. "They called to mind all the great battles which Greece had fought for the sake of liberty. 'After sustaining so many wars,' said they, 'never was its valor crowned with so blessed a reward, as when strangers came and took up arms in its defense. It was there that almost without shedding a drop of blood, or losing scarce one man, it acquired the greatest and noblest of all prizes for which mankind can contend. Agesilaus, Lysander, Nicias, and Alcibiades, had great abilities for carrying on war, and gaining battles both by sea and land; but then it was for themselves, and their country, not for strangers and foreigners, they fought. That height of glory was reserved for the Romans. A people who at their own expense, and the hazards of their lives, engaged in a war for the liberty of other nations; who crossed seas and sailed to distant climes, to destroy and extirpate unjust power from the earth, and to establish universal law, equity, and justice." *Ibid.* And by sounding this

abroad, other nations heard of the justice of the Romans, and their power was infinitely augmented, by those nations *confiding* in them, and placing the *utmost reliance* in the *faith* of their engagements." "For those nations not only received such generals as the Romans sent them, but earnestly requested that they might be sent; they called them in and *put themselves in their hands* with joy. And not only nations and cities, but princes and kings, who had complaints to offer against the injustice of neighboring powers had recourse to them. So that in a short time the *whole earth submitted to their empire*."—*Ibid*. And it is a fact that no fewer than four kings, namely: Attalus, king of Pergamos, Ptolemy Apion, king of Cyrenaic, Nicomedas, king of Bithynia, and Ptolemy Alexander, king of Egypt, actually left their dominions to the Romans by will.

"The Roman name was revered among the most remote nations of the earth. The fiercest barbarians frequently submitted their differences, to the arbitration of the emperor

371

and we are informed by a contemporary hisitorian, that he had seen ambassadors who were refused the honor which they came to solicit, of being admitted into the rank of subjects."—*Dec. and Fall, Chap. 1, Sec. 11*.

And now Gibbon gives in a few words the end of this policy: "The free states and cities, which had embraced the cause of Rome, were *rewarded* with a *nominal alliance*, and insensibly *sunk* into *real servitude*. The public authority was everywhere exercised by the ministers of the senate and of the emperors, and that authority was absolute and without control."—*Dec. and Fall, Chap. 2, Sec. 10*.

Perhaps we could not sum up this evidence in better words than Rollin has done. And surely he cannot be accused of having written these words as an illustration of the fulfillment of this prophecy, because he applied the prophecy to Antiochus Epiphanes. But at the same time we admit that he could not have shown more plainly the truth of the prophecy if he had written them for that express purpose. We quote:—

"But if we penetrate ever so little beyond this glaring outside, we soon perceive that this specious moderation of the Romans was entirely founded upon a *profound policy*. . . They declared loudly in favor of these republics; made it their glory to take them under their protection, and that with no other design, in outward appearance, than to defend them against their oppressors. And further, to attach them by a still stronger tie, they hung out to them a *specious bait*, I mean *liberty*, of which all the republics in question were inexpressibly jealous. The bait was artfully prepared, and swallowed very greedily by the generality of the Greeks, whose views penetrated no further. But the most judicious and most clear-sighted among them discovered the danger that lay concealed beneath this charming bait and accordingly they exhorted the people from time to time in their public assemblies, to beware of this cloud that was gathering in the West; and which, *changing on a sudden*, into a *dreadful tempest*, would break like thunder over their heads to their *utter destruction*.

"Nothing could be more gentle and equitable than the conduct of the Romans in the beginning. They acted with the utmost moderation towards such states and nations as addressed them for protection. . . . By this means their *authority gained strength daily*, and prepared the nations for *entire subjection*. . . . They used to depute commissioners to them, to inquire into their complaints . . . and to decide their quarrels. . . . Afterwards they used with plenary authority to *summon* those who refused to come to an agreement; obliged them to plead their cause before the senate and even appear in person there. From arbiters and mediators, being become *supreme judges*, they soon assumed a magisterial tone, looked upon their decrees as irrevocable decisions, were greatly offended when the most implicit obedience was not paid to them, and gave the name of rebellion to a second resistance; thus there arose in the Roman senate a tribunal which *judged all nations and kings*, from which there was *no appeal*." *Rollin's Ancient Hist., Book 91, Sec. 7. Reflections, under Ant. J. C. 189.*

Thus is plainly shown "his policy," and how that "through his policy he caused craft to prosper in his hand," and "by *peace* destroyed many," and how his power became "mighty" yet "not by his own power."

And when the papal form received from the pagan "his power, and his seat, and great authority," Rev. 13:2, he received also this crafty, insidious policy, which in a greatly magnified form has ever been peculiarly characteristic of that power. Witness the inquisition, the very name of which is suggestive of all that is implied in the prophecy. It is hardly a matter of wonder that the emperors of Rome should claim absolute authority over nations and kingdoms. But when a man, the head of a church, claims and is allowed to exercise, absolute authority over nations, kings, and emperors, we cannot but wonder. And to show that this authority was also "absolute and without control," we wish to present a few passages. First the famous contest between Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) and the Emperor Henry IV of Germany. (These extracts will be taken from "Historical Studies," by Eugene Lawrence, published by Harpers & Bros., New York, a work that any man who can raise three dollars and a half ought not to be without.) He says:—

"The representative pope of this new era was the illustrious, or the infamous, Hildebrand, the Cesar of the papacy. Hildebrand was the sea of a carpenter, but he was destined to rule over kings and nobles. His youth was marked by intense austerity, and he was a monk from his boyhood. He early entered upon the monastic life, but his leisure hours were passed in acquiring knowledge, and his bold and vigorous intellect was soon filled with schemes for advancing the power and grandeur of the church. Small, delicate, and unimposing in appearance, his wonderful eyes often terrified the beholder. He came up to Rome, became the real master of the church, and was long content to rule in a subordinate position. Pope after pope died, but Hildebrand still remained immovable, the guide and oracle of Rome. He revolved in secret his favorite principles, the celibacy of the clergy, the supremacy of the popes, the purification of the church. At length in

1073, on the death of Alexander II, the clergy with one voice elected Hildebrand pope. He was at once arrayed in the scarlet robe, the tiara placed upon his head and Gregory VII was enthroned, weeping and reluctant, in the papal chair.

"His elevation was the signal, for the most wonderful change in the character and purposes of the church. The pope aspired to rule mankind. He claimed *absolute power* over the conduct of kings, priests, and *nations*, and he enforced his decrees by the terrible weapons of anathema and excommunication. He denounced the marriages of the clergy as impious, and at once there arose all over Europe a fearful struggle between the ties of natural affection, and the iron will of Gregory. Heretofore the secular priests and bishops had married, raised families, and lived blamelessly as husbands or fathers, in the enjoyment of marital and filial love. But suddenly all this was changed. The married priests were declared polluted and degraded, and were branded with ignominy and shame. Wives were torn from their devoted husbands, children were declared bastards, and the ruthless monk, in the face of the fiercest opposition, made celibacy the rule of the church. The most painful consequences followed. The wretched women, thus degraded and accursed, were often driven to suicide in their despair. Some threw themselves into the flames; others were found dead in their beds, the victims of grief or of their own resolution not to survive their shame, while the monkish chroniclers exult over their misfortunes, and triumphantly consign them to eternal woe.

"He next forbade all lay institutions or appointments to bishops or other clerical offices, and declared himself the supreme ruler of the ecclesiastical affairs of nations. . . . It was against this claim that the Emperor of Germany, Henry IV, rebelled. The great bishoprics of his empire, Cologne, Bremen, Trier, and many others, were his most important feudatories; and should he suffer the imperious pope to govern them at will, his own dominion would be reduced to a shadow. And now began the famous contest between Hildebrand and Henry—between the carpenter's son, and the successor of Charlemagne; between the Emperor of Germany and the head of the Church." This was in the winter of 1075-6.

"It was plain to all that no physical danger could shake the iron resolution of Gregory; he next determined to humble the self-willed emperor. Henry flushed with victory, surrounded, by faithful bishops and nobles, attended by mighty armies, had refused, with petulant contempt, to obey the decrees of Rome. Hildebrand summoned him to appear before his tribunal, and, if he should refuse to come, appointed the day on which sentence of excommunication should be pronounced against him. The emperor replied by assembling a council of his German nobles and priests, who proclaimed the deposition of the pope. All Christendom seemed united to crush the bishop of Rome; the married clergy, the Simonists, and all who had received their investiture from temporal sovereigns joined in a fierce denunciation of his usurpation. But Gregory called together a third council in the Lateran, and a miracle or an omen inspired the superstitious assembly. An egg was produced with much awe and solemnity, on which a serpent was traced in bold relief, recoiling in mortal agony from a shield against which it had vainly struck its fangs. The bishops gazed upon the prodigy with

consternation, but Gregory interpreted it with the skill of a Roman augur. The serpent was the dragon of the Apocalypse; its mortal agonies foretold the triumphs of the church. A wild enthusiasm filled the assembly, the anathema of Rome was hurled against Henry, his subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and the king was declared excommunicated. The effect of this spiritual weapon was wonderful; the power of the great emperor melted away like mist before the wind. His priests shrunk from him as a lost soul, his nobles abandoned him, his people looked upon him with abhorrence, and Henry was left with a few armed followers and a few faithful bishops in a lonely castle on the Rhine."

A. T. JONES.

*(To be Continued.)*

**December 19, 1878**

**"Historical Notes on the Prophecies. (Concluded)" *The Signs of the Times* 4, 48 , pp. 378, 379.**

HENRY, with abject submission, now resolved to seek the forgiveness of the pope in Rome. In midwinter, accompanied by his wife, his infant son, and one faithful attendant; having scarcely sufficient money to pay the expenses of his travel, he set out to cross the Alps and throw himself at Gregory's feet. Never was there a more miserable journey. The winter was unusually severe, and great quantities of snow filled up the Alpine passes. The slippery surface was not hard enough to bear the weight of the travelers, and even the most experienced mountaineers trembled at the dangers of the passage. Yet the imperial party pressed on; the king must reach Italy, or his crown was lost forever. When, after much toil and suffering, they reached the summit of the pass, the danger was increased. A vast precipice of ice spread before them so slippery and smooth that he who entered upon it could scarcely avoid being hurled into the depths below. Yet there was no leisure for hesitation. The queen and her infant son wrapped in the skins of oxen and drawn down as if in a sled; the king, creeping on his hands and knees, clung to the shoulders of the guides, and thus, half sliding, and sometimes rolling down the steeper declivities, they reached the plain unharmed.

"Gregory, meanwhile, doubtful at first of Henry's real design, had taken refuge in the Castle of Canossa, the mountain stronghold of his unchanging friend and ally, the great Countess Matilda. \* \* \* \* \*

"To Canossa came Henry, the fallen emperor, seeking permission to cast himself at his enemy's feet. On a bitter winter morning, when the ground was covered deep with snow, he approached the castle gate, and was admitted within the first of the three wails that sheltered Gregory and Matilda. Clothed in a thin white linen dress, the garb of a penitent, his feet bare, his beard uncovered, the king awaited all day, in the outer court the opening of the gate which should admit him to the presence of Gregory. But

the relentless pope let him shiver in the cold. A second and a third day Henry stood as a suppliant before the castle gate, and, hungry, chilled, disheartened, besought admission, but in vain. The spectators who witnessed his humiliation were touched with compassion, and every heart but that of Gregory softened toward the penitent king. At length Henry was admitted to the presence of the compassionate Matilda, fell on his knees before her, and besought her merciful interference. Gregory yielded to her prayers, and the pope and his rightful lord, whom he had subjugated, met at a remarkable interview. Tall, majestic in figure, his feet bare, and still clad in penitential garb, the haughty Henry bowed in terror and contrition before the small and feeble gray-haired old man who had made *kings* the *servants* of the church.

"Henry subscribed to every condition the pope interposed; obedience to ecclesiastical law, perfect submission to the pope, even the abandonment of his kingdom should such be Gregory's will. On these terms he was absolved, and with downcast eyes and broken spirit returned to meet the almost contemptuous glances of his German or Lombard chiefs. \* \* \* \* \*

"No sooner had Henry left Canossa than [sic.] he seemed suddenly to recover from that strange moral and mental prostration into which his adversary's spiritual arts had thrown him. He was once more a king, He inveighed in bitter terms against the harshness and pride of Gregory; his Lombard chiefs gathered around him and stimulated him to vengeance, while Matilda hurried the pope back again, fearful for his life, to the impregnable walls of Canossa."

Hildebrand, just, before his death, "gave a general absolution to the human race, excepting only Henry and his rival pope. He died May 25, 1085, having bequeathed to his successors the principle that the Bishop of Rome was the supreme power of the earth."

"The idea was never lost to his successors, . . . but its full development is chiefly to be traced in the character of Innocent III. of all the bishops of Rome, Innocent approached nearest to the completion of Gregory's grand idea. He was .the true universal bishop, deposing kings, trampling upon nations, crushing out heresy with fire and sword, relentless to his enemies, terrible to his friends—the incarnation of spiritual despotism and pride. In the year 1198, at the age of thirty-seven, in the full strength of manhood, Innocent ascended the papal throne. . . . Yet his ruthless *policy* filled Europe with bloodshed and woe. He interfered in the affairs of Germany, and for ten years, with but short intervals of truce,

happy land was rent with civil discord. He deposed his enemy the Emperor Otho, and placed Frederic II., half infidel, half Saracen, the last of the Hahenstaufens, on the German throne, he ruled over

Rome and Italy with an iron hand. But it was in France and England that the despotic power of the church was felt in its utmost rigor, and both these mighty kingdoms were reduced to abject submission to the will of the astute Italian."

And now we may turn our attention with curious interest to a contest between Innocent III. and Philip Augustus of France, no less remarkable than that between Hildebrand and Henry. He continues:—

"France, in the year 1200, was ruled by the firm hand of the licentious, self-willed, but vigorous Philip Augustus. Philip, after the death of his first wife, Isabella of Hainault, had resolved upon a second marriage. He had heard of the rare beauty, the long bright hair, the gentle manners of Ingelburga, sister of the king of Denmark, and he sent to demand her hand. The Dane consented, the fair princess set sail for France, unconscious of the long succession of sorrows that awaited her in that southern land. The nuptials were celebrated, the queen was crowned; but from that moment Philip shrunk from his bride with shuddering horror. No one could tell the cause, nor did the king ever reveal it. Some said that he was under the influence of a demon, some, that he was bewitched. Yet certain it is that he turned pale and shuddered at the very sight of the gentle and beautiful Ingelburga, that he berated her with intense vigor, and that he sacrificed the peace of his kingdom, the welcome of his people, and very nearly his crown itself, rather than acknowledge as his wife one who was to him all gentleness and love. At all hazards he resolved to obtain a divorce, and the obsequious clergy of France soon satisfied his wishes in this respect, upon the pretense that the ill-assorted pair were within the degree of consanguinity limited by the church. The marriage was declared dissolved. When the news of her humiliation was brought to the unhappy stranger-queen, she cried out, in her broken language, 'Wicked, wicked nuisance! Rome, Rome!' Philip, having thus relieved himself forever, as he no doubt disposed, of his Danish wife, began to look around for her successor. Three noble ladies of France, however, refused his offers, distrustful of his fickle affections; a fourth, countess daughter of the Duke of Meran, was more courageous, and was rewarded by a not unusual constancy. To the fair Agnes, Philip gave his heart, his hand, his kingdom. His love for her rose almost to madness. Further he bore the anathemas of the church, the hatred of his people, the murmurs of his vassals, the triumph of his foes. . . . Miserable, however, was the fate of the rival queen. Ingelburga, in her distress, had appealed to Rome; her brother, the king of Denmark, pressed her claim upon the pope; hence Philip, enraged at her obstinacy, treated her with singular cruelty. She was caged from convent to convent, from castle to castle, to induce her to abandon her appeal; her prayers and her entreaties were . . . ved with cold neglect, and she who was supposed to be queen of France was the most despised woman in the land.

She was now at last to find a champion in a protector. Innocent, soon after his . . . ion, resolved to interfere in the affair, to build up the grandeur of his see upon misfortunes of two unhappy wives and insolent king. . . . The pope sent a legate to France with a command to Philip to put the beautiful Agnes, and receive back . . . ted Dane. If he did not comply with the orders of his spiritual father

within thirty days, France was to be laid under an interdict and the sin of the sovereign was to be laid upon his unoffending people. Philip, . . .d rather than intimidated, treated Innocent's message with contempt; the thirty days expired, and the fatal sentence was pronounced. For the first time in the annals of France it ventured to inflict a spiritual censure upon a whole nation; for the effect of interdict was to *close the gates of heaven to mankind*. All over gay and prosperous France rested a sudden gloom. The churches were closed, and the worshipers driven from their doors; the rites of religion ceased; no marriages were celebrated in the church- . . . the bodies of the dead were refused . . .n consecrated ground, and flung out . . .h in the corrupted air; baptism and holy unction were the only services allowed, and the voice of prayer and praise ceased throughout the land; and the French with the government found themselves condemned by venal woe for the sin of Philip and fair . . .f Meran.

This punishment seemed no doubt irrational and extravagant even to the clouded intellect of that half-savage age; but it was no less effectual. Philip sought to prevent the enforcement of the interdict by punishing the clergy who obeyed it; and he swore he would lose half his kingdom rather than part with Agnes. But Innocent enforced the obedience of the priests. France grew mutinous under its spiritual sufferings, and the king was forced to submit. '*I will turn Mohammedan,*' he cried, in his rage. '*Happy Saladin, who has no pope above him.*' Agnes, too, wrote a touching letter to the pope, in which she said she cared not for the crown it was on the husband that she had set her love. 'Part me not from him.' But Innocent never relented. Agnes was torn from her husband and her love, and was confined in a lonely castle in Normandy, where she was seen at times wandering upon the battlements with wild gesture and disheveled hair, her face wan and pale, her eyes streaming with tears; and then was seen no more. Nor was Ingelburga more happy. She was conducted, indeed, by a train of Italian priests to the arms of her loathing husband, and, whether witch or woman, Philip was forced to receive her publicly as his wife. France rejoiced, for the interdict was removed; a clang of bells announced the return of spiritual peace; the curtains were withdrawn from crucifixes and images; the church doors flew open; and a glad throng of worshipers poured into the holy buildings, from which for *seven months* they had been rigidly excluded. Yet the change brought little joy to the queen of France."

"The pope now turned his spiritual arms against England, and soon reduced that powerful and independent *kingdom*, the condition of *a vassal of the Roman see*. John, the wickedest and the basest of English kings, now sat on the throne. His life had been stained by almost every form of licentiousness and crime; he had murdered his nephew, Arthur, and usurped his crown; he had shrunk from no enormity, and his subjects looked upon him with horror and disgust; Philip had torn from him all his continental possessions, and his cowardice had been as conspicuous, as his vices. Yet John had ever remained the *favorite son the church*, and Innocent would still have continued his ally and his friend had not a sudden quarrel made them, for the moment, the bitterest of foes. It

would be impossible for us to review the full particulars of this memorable affair. It is sufficient to say that Innocent claimed the right of controlling the election of the archbishops of Canterbury, and that John resisted his pretension. The pope employed the instrument which had been so effectual against France; in 1208 England was laid under an interdict, and for *four years* beheld its churches closed, its dead cast out into unconsecrated ground, and its whole religious life crushed beneath a fatal malediction. Yet John resisted the clerical assailant with more pertinacity than Philip, and even endured the final penalty of excommunication, and it was not until Innocent had bestowed England upon Philip, and that king had prepared a considerable army to invade his new dominions, that John's courage shrunk. Full of hatred for the pope and for religion, it, is said that he had resolved to become a *Mohammedan*, and sent ambassadors to the caliph of Spain and Africa *offering to embrace* the faith of the Koran in return for material aid; and it is further related that the cultivated Mohammedans rejected with contempt the advances of the Christian renegade. So low, indeed, was sunk the moral dignity of Christianity under the papal rule, so *oppressive was that power*, that of the three great potentates of Christendom at this period, Frederic II. was suspected of preferring the *Koran* to the Bible, and both Philip Augustus and John are believed to have entertained the desire of adopting the tenets of the Arabian impostor; and all three were no doubt objects of polished scorn to the cultivated Arabs of Bagdad and Cordova." *Historical Studies, article, Bishops of Rome.*

We could give more of these sketches but they are too long to quote, and it is impossible to abridge them. However these, will serve to show how perfectly the prophecy is fulfilled in that power. And he never could have succeeded in exalting himself to that place where he ruled with such absolute sway, and sunk all Europe to such a fearful depth of superstitious dread, had it not been that "be cast down the truth [the word of God, the Bible] to the ground." Dan. 8:12; John 17:17. For as "the entrance of God's word giveth light," Psalms 119:130, so the taking of it away caused this horror of great darkness that enveloped Europe for ages. It was during these long weary years that, as we learn from the same work, "no layman was permitted to possess a Bible." "He who read his Bible was to be burned. To read or study the Scriptures was the deadliest of crimes." *Id. Art. Loyola and the Jesuits.* "For many centuries the Scriptures had been hidden in a dead language, guarded by the anathemas of the priests from the public eye, and so costly in manuscript form as to be accessible only to the wealthy. A Bible cost as much as a landed estate; the greatest universities, the richest monasteries, could scarcely purchase a single copy." *Id. Art. The Huguenots.*

At last Luther arose, seized a Bible, and through the powerful aid of the printing press he flooded Europe with its glorious rays. The entrance of thy words, O Lord, did give light, and by this light the kings, the nations, saw the horrible monster, the well-favored harlot, that had "deluged Europe and Asia with blood," and turned with fury against her "to make her desolate and naked, to eat her flesh and burn her with fire." Rev. 17:16, 17. The judgment sat, they took away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end, Dan. 7:26, and here we give his and her lament through one of his cardinals (Manning): "What do you see at present? The vicar of Christ has gloriously ruled the church for thirty years, during which time he has been the prey of all the anti-Christian and anti-social revolutions of the period, and even now is morally a prisoner in his palace. He has been *despoiled of all his temporalities*. He has *no army*, no lands, no *lands*, no *territory*." These words I clipped from the *Catholic Sentinel* of Portland, Oregon, in the month of October or November, 1877.

The following is from the *Christian Union*: "Hardly had the Ecumenical Council [of 1870] separated when the whole structure of his [Pius IX.] temporal power crumbled into dust beneath his feet. Other losses followed fast. In France his most catholic majesty, Louis Napoleon, was overthrown by heretics. In Italy the church property was sold by the crown. The monasteries were closed by law. The brotherhoods were dispersed. In Austria, that faithful son of the church, Francis Joseph, formed an alliance with the excommunicated Victor Emanuel and the heretic Wilhelm against the Ultramontanes, with the pope at their head. In Germany not only is the crown arrayed against the crozier, but the holy church itself is rent in twain." Rev. 17:6: "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."

"The Roman bishops have deluged Europe and Asia with blood." *Dec. and Fall, Chap. 45, Sec. 22.*

Dan. 7:21, and Rev. 13:6: "I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them." "And he shall wear out the saints of the Most High." Dan. 7:25.

"The popes had succeeded in subjecting kings and emperors; they now employed them, in crushing the people. Innocent III. excited Philip of France to a fierce crusade against the Albigenses of the south; amidst a general massacre of men, women, and children, the gentle sect *sunk, never to appear again*. Dominic invented, or enlarged, the Inquisition; and soon in every land the spectacle of blazing heretics and tortured saints delighted the eyes of the Romish clergy. Over the rebellious kings the popes had held the menace of interdict, excommunication, or deposition; to the people they offered only submission or death. The Inquisition was their remedy for the apostatic heresies of Germany, England, Spain—a simple cure for dissent or reform. It seemed effectual. The Albigenses were extirpated. In the cities of Italy the Waldenses ceased to be known. Lollardism concealed itself in England; the Scriptural Christians of every land who refused to worship images

or adore the virgin disappeared from sight; the supremacy of Rome was assured over all Western Europe

"Yet one blot remained on the fair fame of the seemingly united christendom. Within the limits of Italy itself a people existed to whom the mass was still a vain idolatry, the real presence a papal fable; who had resisted with vigor every innovation, and whose simple rites and ancient faith were older than the papacy itself . . . But in the fifteenth century the popes and the inquisitors turned their malignant eyes upon the simple Piedmontese, and prepared to exterminate with fire and sword the Alpine church.

"And now began a war of four centuries, the most remarkable in the annals of Europe. On the one side stood the people of the valleys—poor, humble, few. Driven to resistance by their pitiless foes, they took up arms with reluctance; they fought only for safety; they wept over the fallen. For four centuries a crusade almost incessant went on against the secluded valleys. Often the papal legions, led by the inquisitors, swept over the gentle landscape of Lucerna, and drove the people from the blazing villages to hide in caves on the mountains, and almost browse with the chamois on the wild herbage of the wintry rocks. Yet the unflinching people still refused to give up their faith. . . . The Psalms of David, chanted in the plaintive melodies of the Vaudois (Waldenses), echoed far above the scenes of rapine and carnage of the desolate valleys; the apostolic church lived indestructible, the coronal of some heaven-piercing Alp.

"They clung to their mountains, their moral purity, and their faith. Generation after generation, fiercely tried, hardly tempted, never wavered in their resolve. The war of four centuries for liberty of conscience, for freedom to worship God, was accepted by the youthful Vaudois as their noblest inheritance.

"Pope Innocent VIII., a man of rare benevolence, according to the Romish writers, and a devoted lover of Christian union, resolved (1487) to adorn his reign by a complete extinction of the Vaudois heresy. He issued a call summoning all faithful kings, princes, rulers, to a crusade against the children of the valleys. . . . Still the perpetual persecution went on."

In September, 1560, Pope Plus IV. sat on the papal throne and, "Innumerable martyrdoms now filled the valleys with perpetual horror. It is impossible to describe, it is almost inhuman to remember, the atrocities of the papal persecutors. Neither sex nor age, innocence, beauty nor youth, softened their impassive hearts. . . . The papal troops entered the valleys, roused by the priests and Jesuits to an unparalleled madness. Such cruelties, such crime, have never before or since been perpetrated upon the earth; the French revolution offers but a faint comparison; the tortures of Diocletian or Decius may approach their reality. The gentle, intelligent, and cultivated Vaudois fell into the power of a band of demons. Their chief rage was directed against women and children. The babe

was torn from the mother's breast and cast into the blazing fires; the mother was impaled, and left to die in unpitied agony. Often husband, and wife were bound together and burned in the same pyre; often accomplished matrons, educated in refinement and ease, were hacked to pieces by papal soldiers, and their headless trunks left unburied in the snow. A general search was made for Vaudois. Every cave was entered, every crag visited, where there was no danger of resistance; every forest was carefully explored. When any were found, whether young or old, they were chased from their hiding-places over the snowy hills, and thrown from steep crags into the deep ravines below. No cliff but had its martyr; no hill on which had not blazed the persecutor's fire. In Leger's history, printed in 1669, are preserved rude but vigorous engravings of the malignant tortures inflicted by the papal soldiers upon his countrymen. There, in the Alpine solitudes, amidst the snow-clad summits of the wintry hills, are seen the dying matron; the tortured child; the persecutor chasing his victims over the icy fields; the virgin snows covered with the blood of fated innocence; the terrified people climbing higher and higher up the tallest Alps, glad to dwell with the eagle and the chamois, above the rage of persecuting man. "The pope applauded; the Duke of Savoy rejoiced in the massacres of the valleys. The Jesuits chanted their thanksgiving in the ruined villages. The Capuchins restored their convent. The church of Rome ruled over the blood-stained waste. \* \* \* \* \*

"There was now no more hope for the Vaudois. From 1655 to 1685, they suffered all the ignominies and all the cruelties that could be inflicted by the malevolent priests.

"At last in 1685 came that fatal period so long anticipated with triumph by the Jesuits of Turin, when the voice of Christian prayer and praise was no longer heard in the valleys. The wonderful people had survived for six centuries the enmity of the papacy; but now the Alpine church seemed blotted from existence. . . . A dreadful punishment now fell upon them. The papal soldiers swept through the valleys, made prisoners of nearly the whole population, and carried them away to the dungeons of Turin. Fourteen thousand persons were shut up in close confinement. The consequences were such as might have touched the hearts of Diocletian and Decius, but to the Jesuits and to Rome they were only a source of insane joy. . . . Diseases raged among them; a pestilence came and of the *fourteen* thousand saints, the followers of Christ, only *three* thousand came, emaciated and pale, from their noisome dungeons. Eleven thousand had died to satisfy the malice of Rome.

"In the fearful winter of 1686-87, when the Rhone was frozen to its bed and the Alps

(Concluded on page 382.)

(Continued from page 379.)

were encrusted with ice, the papists drove the surviving remnant of the prisoners over the precipitous passes of Mount Cenis. The aged, the sick, women, children, the wounded and the faint, climbed with unsteady steps the chili waste of snows, and toiled onward toward Protestant Genoa. Many had scarcely clothes to cover them; all were feeble with starvation. The road was marked by the bodies of those that died by the way. The survivors staggered down the Swiss side of the mountains, palid with hunger and cold; some perished as they approached the border of the friendly territory, others lingered awhile and expired in the homes of the Swiss. But the people of Genoa, as they beheld the melancholy procession approaching their city, rushed out in generous enthusiasm to receive the exiles in their arms. As the exiles entered the town they sung the Psalm of persecuted Israel 'O God, why hast thou cast us off?' in a grave sad voice, and breathed out a melancholy wail over ruin of their apostatic church.

"There was now peace in the silent valleys; villages without inhabitants, homes without a family, churches no longer filled with the eloquence of supplication. And thus in 1689, seemed forever dissipated that hallowed race, that assembly of the faithful, over whose career in history had ever hung spotless halo of ideal purity.—

*Historical Studies, Art. "The Vaudiois."*

The story of the Albigenses and the Huguenots would be but a repetition of the horrors of this. The same writer says in a note: "The narrative of the persecution is too dreadful to be repeated, too horrible to be remembered. And when Sir Samuel Morland was sent by Cromwell to the court of Turin to remonstrate against these enormities, he told them that "The angels were horrified, that men were amazed, and the earth blushed at the fearful spectacle." Surely he has "worn out the saints of the Most High."

Ezekiel 30:12. Of Egypt it is said, "And I will make the river dry and sell the land into the hand of the wicked; I will make the land waste and all that is therein, by the *hand of strangers*; I the Lord have spoken it."

Gibbon: "A more unjust and absurd constitution cannot be devised, than that which condemns the natives of a country to perpetual servitude, under the arbitrary dominion of strangers and slaves. Yet such has been the state of Egypt above *five hundred years*." *Dic. And Fall, Chap. 59, Sec. 20*, and note 5, he says from Volney, "And Egypt groans under the avarice and insolence of the strangers."

Ezekiel 30:13: "Thus saith the Lord God I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause their images to cease out of Noph." To see the force of this prophecy it must be remembered that, "in Egypt, it was less difficult to find a god than a man." *Dec. and Fall, Chap. 37, Sec. 3*. And they have ceased.

Ezekiel 30:13 "And there shall be no more a prince *in the land of Egypt*." In the year 350 B. C. Nectaeus, a native Egyptian ruled Egypt on the Egyptian

throne. Ochus, king of Persia, in this same year made war against him, and he being unable to keep his forces about him, fled into Ethiopia, and from that day to this there has not been a native of Egypt upon the throne.

Gibbon.—"Egypt is accessible only on the side of Asia, whose revolutions in almost every period of history it has humbly obeyed." *Dec. and Fall, Chap. 1, Sec. 36*. Witness the following synopsis. Here fell into the hands of the Persians. Alexander conquered Persia, the Egyptians welcomed him as their ruler, and voluntarily submitted themselves to him. Upon the death of Alexander and the division of his dominions, Ptolemy, one of his generals, received Egypt as a part of his share; and it remained with his descendants 294 years, until it fell into the hands of the Romans, B. C. 30, by whom it was held 700 years to A. D. 670. Then it was taken, and held by the Saracens to 1250; then by the Mamelukes to 1517 and by the Turks from that year to this. And by this "perpetual servitude," when much of the time the rulers were "succeeded not by their sons but their servants." *Dec. and Fall, Chap. 59, Sec 20*. Egypt has been driven to the perfect fulfillment of Ezekiel 29:15. It is "the basest of the kingdoms."

A. T. JONES.

### ***The Signs of the Times, Vol. 8 (1882)***

**January 5, 1882**

#### **"That Sunday Yacht" *The Signs of the Times* 8, 1 , p. 7.**

ON the subject of that wonderful(?) testimony to Sunday sacredness, the fate of the yacht Sabbath-breaker, as published in the SIGNS of Dec. 1, 1881, I would offer the following:—

"Nearly three years ago I heard that identical story told (with the exception of any locality) by a man in Oregon, as a powerful argument in favor of Sunday-keeping. But it was wholly traditional with him; he did not even pretend to tell where it happened. And I am perfectly satisfied that no one will ever find a place in California, or anywhere else, where it occurred.

I should have no hesitation whatever in saying that it is altogether an invention of some over-zealous advocate of the Sunday institution, and they find it so well adapted to their purpose that it is passed on from one to another, and no questions asked lest it should prove false. Doubtless the person who put the story in that paper originally, thought that by placing the scene in California, he would fit it so far away that no one would discover the fraud.

However I apprehend that this is only the beginning of what will become quite general ere long, and I do not know whether from the nature of things we should expect anything else. For when the people of this enlightened age wilfully shut their eyes, and turn their backs to the evidence of all history, and deliberately go back to the darkest period of the Dark Ages, for an issue (Church and State), it is only to be expected that the methods of the Dark Ages will be employed for the success, and the defense of that issue.

And again the world is to behold the spectacle of the Church defending by violence, the power that she has obtained by fraud.

ALONZO T. JONES.

Spangle, W. T.

### **March 2, 1882**

**"Farmington, Whitman County, W. T." *The Signs of the Times*, 8, 8 , p. 104.**

COMMENCED meetings here January 17. On Sabbath, February 4, seventy-six were at the morning meeting, and thirty-four signed the covenant to keep the Sabbath. Several are keeping it who have not signed the covenant, and I have hopes that more will keep it, who are favorable. Attendance has ranged from fifty to three hundred. Variolod appeared in town to-day, and school and all meetings are discontinued for three weeks.

ALONZO T. JONES.

February 7, 1882.

### **March 30, 1882**

**"Farmington, W. T." *The Signs of the Times*, 8, 13 , p. 152.**

HAVING to discontinue meetings in Farmington on account of small-pox, I went six miles out to Dutch Flat school-house and held a short series of meetings. As a result eight are keeping the Lord's Sabbath. These are near enough to Farmington to belong to that church. There are now forty-two names on the covenant, and some are observing the Lord's day who have not signed the covenant. The Methodist minister gave two opposition discourses on March 5th which helped us much. The no-law pamphlet of S. C. Adams, of Historical Chart fame, has been distributed lately, which has also helped us. I had reviewed its positions before it was circulated. May the word of the Lord mightily grow and prevail.

A. T. JONES.

### **June 22, 1882**

**"Upper Columbia Conference" *The Signs of the Times*, 8, 24 , pp. 284, 285.**

THE second annual session of the Upper Columbia Conference of S. D. Adventists convened at the camp-ground in Dayton, W. T., June 1, 1882, at 9 o'clock A. M. President Eld. G. W. Colcord in the chair. Prayer by Eld. J. H. Waggoner. Credentials of delegates being called for, the following were

presented: Walla Walla two, Dayton one, Patahah one, Meadows one, Farmington one. Alpawai one, Medical Lake one. Spokane Co. one.

Voted that Eld. J. H. Waggoner be accepted as representative of the General Conference. Minutes of last session read and approved. Instructive remarks were made by Eld. Waggoner on the idea of attendance at camp-meeting, and representation in Conference.

Voted that all committees be appointed by the Chair.

Committees were named as follows: Nominations, M. O. Beck, W. A. Gibson, E. E. Vinson. Resolutions, J. H. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, Wm. I. Goodwin; Credentials and Licenses, B. F. Winkler, T. A. McCoy, I. M. Johns; Auditing, I. M. Johns, T. Chabor, B. F. Winkler, E. E. Vinson, L. W. Butler, T. S. Bagsdale.

Adjourned to call of Chair.

### **SECOND MEETING, JUNE 4, 8 A. M.**

President in the chair. Prayer by Eld. Colcord. Credentials of other delegates presented as follows: Milton two, Snipe Valley one. Minutes of last meeting read and approved.

The Committee on Nominations reported as follows: For President, Eld. G. W. Colcord; Secretary Eld. A. T. Jones; Treasurer, Wm. Nichols, Ex. Committee Ambrose Johnson, T. I. Bagsdale. The nominees were elected. The Committee on Credentials and Licenses recommended, that credentials be renewed to Elders G. W. Colcord and A. T. Jones, and that licenses be renewed to Brethren Wm. Russell and W. A. Gibson. The report was accepted, and the Committee retained for further inquiry. Credentials and licenses were renewed according to report.

285

Voted that the Camp-meeting Committee be secured by the Executive Committee, who were empowered to pay for the services of such Committee if necessary.

The question, Shall we accept the proposition of the citizens of Farmington for the establishment of an Academy in that Town? was discussed by Elders Jones, Colcord, Waggoner, Brethren Ambrose Johnson, Wm. Goodwin and I. M. Johns, with the question pending Conference.

Adjourned to call of Chair.

### **THIRD MEETING, JUNE 5, 2 P. M.**

Prayer by Eld. Waggoner. Minutes of last meeting read and approved. Consideration of pending question was resumed, and voted that a committee of five be appointed by the Conference to further consider the matter. Carried. The committee was named as follows: Elders Colcord, Jones, Brethren Goodwin, Johns, and Ragsdale.

The Committee on Resolutions, reported as follows:—

*Resolved.* 1. That we have unabated faith in the Testimonies which are given to the church, and we express our regret that Sister White was not able to meet

with us this year. And we hereby extend to her our earnest invitation to meet with us in our camp-meeting in 1883.

2. That we extend the thanks of this Conference to the O. R. and N. C. Railroads for the favor granted in returning to their homes at reduced fare all who came over their lines to this meeting.

The Auditing Committee reported all business settled.

Moved that Bro. Wm. Russell be requested to report labor to the Conference Committee.

Adjourned to call of Chair.

#### **FOURTH MEETING, JUNE 6, 6 A. M.**

President in the chair. Prayer by Eld. Waggoner. Minutes of last meeting waived.

The Committee on Credentials and Licenses finding nothing further to report, requested to be discharged. Discharged accordingly.

Remarks by the President upon plainness of dress. Unanimously voted that the church is better off without tobacco and jewelry.

Committee on School reported that after mature deliberation on all points, we are compelled to decline the offer. Report adopted.

Moved, that agents be requested to give receipts for all money received. Carried.

A vote of thanks was tendered to the General Conference for the efficient help rendered by the labors of Eld. J. H. Waggoner.

Adjourned *sine die*.

G. W. COLCORD, *President*.

ALONZO F. [sic.] JONES, *Secretary*.

#### **November 2, 1882**

#### **"Goodchild" *The Signs of the Times*, 8, 41 , p. 491.**

GOODCHILD.—Died at her home in Eugene City, Oregon, Sept. 24, 1882, Joannah Goodchild, aged 69 years and 9 months. Sister Goodchild embraced the truth under the labors of the writer, during tent labor in Eugene, the summer of 1878. She was formerly a member of the M. E. Church. She was an earnest, humble, devoted Christian, and we feel that she rests in hope. The little flock at Eugene will miss her much. But the Saviour has said, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

ALONZO T. JONES.

#### ***The Signs of the Times, Vol. 9 (1883)***

#### **March 1, 1883**

**"Value of Marginal References" *The Signs of the Times* 9, 9 , p. 98.**

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

AS a kind of religious "last ditch," the marginal references of Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2 and Rev. 1:10 are adopted as proof that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and therefore holy.

I would not utter a word against the use of the marginal references of the Scriptures as *helps to the study* of the sacred word; but there are inseparable objections to there being adopted as the *basis of doctrine*, or their use as *authority* in connection with the word itself.

The marginal references, the punctuation, the divisions into verses and chapters, are all the work of men. Not of men met together for that purpose as in the translation of the Scriptures; but by several men at different times, and each independent of all the others.

First was the division into chapters. This was made by Hugo de Sancto Caro who was born at St. Cher, Dauphine, France, about A.D. 1200, was created a cardinal by Pope Innocent IV., in 1245, and died in 1263. In preparing to make a concordance to the Latin Vulgate version of the Scriptures, he divided both the Old Testament and the New into chapters, and that division still remains as he made it, in all our Bibles.

Next was the division into verses. The first direct step toward this was taken by Rabbi Mordecai Nathan, a celebrated Jewish teacher, in a "Concordance to the Hebrew Scriptures," composed A.D. 1438 to 1445. In this concordance, he made the division into verses, and marked every fifth verse with a Hebrew numeral letter. Then in 1661, Athias, a Jew of Amsterdam, printed an addition of the Hebrew Bible, in which he adopted the verses of Rabbi Nathan, and marked every verse with the figures in common use 1, 2, 3, 4, &c., &c., except the verses previously marked with the Hebrew numerals by Rabbi Nathan. With the rejection of these Hebrew numerals, and placing instead the corresponding figures, the verses and numbers of Nathan and Athias are still retained and all the copies of the Bible and other languages. But observe, this refers only to the Hebrew Bible *i. e.* the Old Testament. The verses of the New Testament as now used are the invention of a printer, Robert Stephens by name, in imitation of those made for the Old Testament by Rabbi Nathan. They were first introduced in 1551, in an addition of the New Testament printed by Stephens.

As for punctuation points, with the exception of the period, no such things were known when the New Testament was written, nor for a long time afterward, for the writing in the oldest manuscripts is all in Without accent or mark of any kind, not even spaces, between the words. Here is a copy of the first few lines of the gospel of John as it was written:--

"INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHEWORDANDTHEWORDWASWITH  
GOD.ANDGODWASTHEWORD.HEWASINTHEBEGINNINGWITH  
GODALLWEREMADEBYHIMANDWITHOUTHIMWASMADENOTO  
NETHINGTHATWASMADENHIMLIFEWAS.

About 400 A. D. Jerome, and others from him, used points that correspond with our comma and colon, but they did not go into general use at all. Again in the eighth century the stroke now called comma was received, and Jerome's points were again used at the command of Charlemagne, and in the ninth century the Greek note of interrogation, which is now our semicolon, was first use. But it was not till the invention of printing that any of these points came into general use. Thus the colon and the period began to be used about 1485, the comma was next given a better shape, and the semicolon added about 1521, and in surface Philip Sidney's "Arcadia" 1587 they all appear, as also the note of interrogation, the asterisk, and the parenthesis.

Then again, there were no of knowledge rules to guide the editors and printers and the use of the points, consequently they were placed just as each one please, and very often arbitrarily. And yet again the same editors and printers would change the punctuation in the different editions of the same work as they were successively printed; especially did Stephens vary his points in every addition of the Bible that he printed. And more than that, this variance in the punctuation of the Bible is not yet ended, as any one may prove by comparing copies of the Bible printed only as far back as 1830 or 1840 with the later editions, and looking at Matt. 19:28 and Heb. 10:12. In the earlier copies, at Matt. 19:28 you will see the comma placed after "regeneration" in the passage reading thus:—"Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c, whereas in the later copies the comma is placed after "me," thus: "ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c. See what a difference it makes. The first would imply that Christ had been in Heb. 10:12 is still more apparent, for in the older editions the comma is after "sins," thus; "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God," where in the newer editions the comma is placed after 'ever,' thus: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." While the first would make Christ *sat down at the right hand of God forever*, the last only makes *one sacrifice for sins for ever*, and then sat down at the right hand of God only "till his enemies be made his footstool."

To anyone who will compare the Revised New Testament with the old version of common use, it will be apparent that the Revision Committee did not hold themselves subject to the punctuation of the common version, but changed it wherever they chose; and it would seem that these changes are not always for the better, for instance, Matt. 27:52, 53. From this it would appear that at *the death of the Saviour*, "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised;" and yet did not come out of the tombs *till after his resurrection*, which was the third day after his death. Such a thing is hardly to be supposed, but rather, as our old version gives it, that, at the death of Christ "*the graves were opened*; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection," that is, the *graves were opened* at his death, when the earth quaked, and the rocks were rent; but the saints did not arise till after his resurrection. This looks more reasonable, and is less ambiguous. Yet there are

places in our old standard version where the punctuation needs to be changed before the Scripture will be in harmony with itself. One notable instance is Luke 23:43; by placing the comma after "to-day," instead of after "thee." Then it will harmonize perfectly with Zech. 9:12 and John 20:17, and with the whole course of Scripture on that subject.

Now we come to the *marginal references*. The first introduction of these was in Coverdale's Bible, the first English translation of the entire Bible, which was printed in 1535. The marginal references were few however, but they served as an introduction, and as an inducement to others to follow his lead. The next was King James' translation of 1611, now our Authorized Version. This had in the first edition, 6,588 references in the Old Testament and 1,527 in the New. In an addition printed by J. Harris, in 1677, there were 14,699 references in the Old Testament and 9,857 in the New. In Dr. Scattergood's edition 1678, there were 20,300 to 27 references in the Old Testament, and 11,717 in the New. In Dr. Blayney's, 1769, there were 43,318 in the Old Testament, and 19,898 in the New. In Bishop Wilson's, 1785, there were 45,190 in the Old Testament, and 19,993 in the New, making total in Old and New of 65,183. These were perhaps a few additions are the ones we now use, and thus we have Acts 20:7, and 1 Cor. 16:2 referring to Rev. 1:10. No doubt these Bishops believed, as many will claim now, that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, but the Scripture does not say so, and there running the references from one to the other does not make it so, any more than the references from Lev. 16:10, 21, 22 to Isaiah 53:6, 11, 12, and 1 John 2:2, &c., make Christ, the Holy Saviour, the *scapegoat*. Neither of these is any nearer to the truth than is the explanation in the margin of Daniel 9:24, in saying that the seventy weeks begin from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. And not one of all three is any nearer to the truth than is the margin of 2 Chron. 21:12, in explaining the writing which came to Jehoram from Elijah the prophet, when it says, "Which was written before his [Elijah's] death.' Everybody knows that there is no truth in that, for all know that Elijah *never died*, but was caught up *alive*, by a whirlwind, *into heaven*.

All this goes to show that the references are not to be followed implicitly as are the Scriptures, but simply and alone, as *helps* to the study of the Scripture. As such they are a very great help. But always bear in mind that the *plain reading of the word of God* is to be taken *above any, or all*, references, punctuation, or division of verses or chapters.

**June 28, 1883**

**"Upper Columbia Conference" *The Signs of the Times* 9, 25 , p. 297.**

THE third annual session of the Upper Columbia Conference convened at the Milton camp-ground, June 6-12, 1883. First meeting June 7, 5 P. M. President in the chair. Prayer by Eld. Haskell. Credentials of delegates called for and presented as follows: Milton, 3; Walla Walla 3; Pataha, 1; Farmington, 1; Echo, 1; Dayton, 1; Alba, 1.

The church of Farmington, W. T., 15 members, was admitted into the Conference, also the church of Echo, Oregon, 11 members. Voted that Bro. Wm. Russell be invited to act as representative of the brethren in the Spokane Country. Voted that Eld. Haskell, of General Conference, Eld Boyd, of N. P. Conference, and Bro. W. C. White, of P. S. D. A. Pub. Association, be invited to participate in the deliberations of the conference. Minutes of last session read and approved. Voted that all committees be appointed by the chair.

Remarks were made by Elds. Haskell and Boyd on the point of turning the "moving" spirit to good account, by all who move into new places making of themselves active missionaries in the places where they go.

Committees were named as follows: on Resolutions, Elds. Haskell, A. T. Jones, and Bro. W. J. Goodwin; on Nominations, W. A. Gibson, G. W. Rees, C. W. Hick; on Credentials, I. M. Johns, G. S. Rogers, T. Chabot; on Auditing, Wm. Russell, C. W. Hicks, N. W. Miller, C. I. Ford, W. A. Gibson, Wm. J. Goodwin. Adjourned to call of chair.

## **SECOND MEETING, JUNE 11, 5:30 P. M**

Prayer by Bro. Goodwin. Voted that Bro. H. A. Wilder act as representative of the Basket Mountain company. The reading of minutes was waived, and reports of committees called for.

Committee on Nominations reported as follows: President, Eld. G. W. Colcord; Secretary, Eld. A. T. Jones; Treasurer, Wm. Nichols; Ex. Committee, T. I. Ragsdale, Wm. J. Goodwin. These were all elected.

Committee on Credentials and Licenses reported as follows: That the credentials of Elds. G. W. Colcord and Alonzo T. Jones, and the licenses of W. A. Gilson and Wm. Russell, be renewed, and that colporteur's licenses be granted to C. L. Ford and H. A. Wilder. After remarks by Elds. Haskell and Colcord and the candidates, the report was adopted.

Committee on Resolutions reported as follows:

WHEREAS, The evidences of the near coming of the Lord are daily increasing, and the time for laboring for the salvation of souls is short, therefore

*Resolved*, That it be the view of this Conference that our brethren should not retain the labors of the ministers, but that they be free to labor in such fields as may present a prospect of raising up new churches.

*Resolved*, That we heartily recommend to our brethren and sisters the plan adopted by other Conferences in obtaining subscribers for the SIGNS OF THE TIMES for a short period, and visiting, and their laboring to awaken an interest in new fields.

*Resolved*, That it is the view of this Conference that Bro. Wm. Russell be employed in labor in the missionary work, and to visit the brethren at their homes and churches, and encourage the study of the Bible and mission work.

*Resolved*, That Bro. Wm. Nichols be requested to assist Bro. Russell, as far as he can, consistently with his other duties.

*Resolved*, That we recommend that Bro. Goodwin devote his time to the missionary and canvassing work; especially the "Home Hand Book." And that he shape his financial affairs so that he can work where he can do the most good.

WHEREAS, There is a feeling among many of our brethren and sisters that a school is needed in this Conference, where the young can be brought under proper influences, as well as shielded from the corruptions which are common to many of the schools of the present day, and

WHEREAS, When such school shall be established, there should be connected therewith teachers who can also give instruction to young men and women, by which they may be fitted for positions of usefulness in the cause of God. And as at present we have not teachers of such experience, nor a suitable place selected for the establishment of such a school, therefore

*Resolved*, That we recommend that those of our brethren and sisters who have in view the work of teaching, attend the school at Healdsburg, Cal., that thus they may obtain the instruction and experience which will enable them to efficiently connect themselves with such school whenever in the providence of God it may be founded.

*Resolved*, That we recommend also that those young men and women who design giving themselves to labor in the cause of God, either in the work of the ministry or otherwise, and are not prepared, through lack of instruction, to enter the field, attend the school at Healdsburg, and thus obtain such information and experience as will enable them to labor more successfully in the work of the Third Angel's Message.

After the reading and full discussion of each of the resolutions, they were adopted unanimously.

Voted, That we extend the thanks of this Conference to the General Conference for the labors of Eld. Haskell, to the N. P. Conference for the help of Eld. C. L. Boyd, to the P. S. D. A. P. A. for the assistance of Bro. W. C. White.

Voted, That the thanks of the Conference be extended to the O. R. & N. Co., and the Northern Pacific R. R. for the favor granted, in returning to their homes at reduced rates all who have come to this meeting over their lines.

Voted, That we heartily thank Bro. Nichols for the free use of the camp-ground.

Voted, That Wm. Nichols, W. J. Goodwin, Ambrose Johnson, Wm. McCoy, and T. L. Ragsdale, comprise the camp-meeting committee for the ensuing year. Following is the Treasurer's Report:

**FROM JUNE 1, 1882, TO JUNE 1, 1883.**

Amount received. . . . .	\$1516.25
Amount paid to Gen'l. Conf. and Ministers . . . .	953.20
Balance on hand . . . . .	\$503.05

WM. NICHOLS, *Treasurer*,

Adjourned without day.

G. W. COLCORD, *President*.

ALONZO T. JONES, *Secretary*.

***The Signs of the Times, Vol. 10 (1884)***

**January 3, 1884**

**"Price" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 1 , p. 14.**

PRICE.—Died, near Farmington, W. T., Nov. 24, 1883, of scarlet fever. Lester W., son of Bro. W. C. T. and Harriet Price, aged 2 years and 6 months.  
A. T. JONES.

**June 5, 1884**

**"How Is the Amendment to Be Carried Out Practically?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 22 , p. 339.**

THIS question is asked by the Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, and the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884, and is answered by him as follows: "In brief, at its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State Constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will become unconstitutional. But the changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole framework of Bible Legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

Then what will that be but to re-open the whole course of religious controversy from the Council of Nice to this day? And when the whole nation is thus plunged into religious controversy, who shall decide whether Congress or the State Legislature is correct? Who shall decide between lawyers and citizens generally, or between lawyers themselves, or citizens, or congressmen themselves?

Dr. M'Allister's answer is, "The conflict of individual opinion will inevitably lead to anarchical conflict of legislative action, unless there is an acknowledged standard to which appeal can and must be made. The Law of the Bible, by the proposed amendment, is made the supreme standard in deciding all moral questions in the administration of the government." (See his Cleveland Convention speech, *Statesman*, Dec. 27, 1883.)

But it is not a sufficient answer to say that "the Bible is the standard and source of appeal;" because the Bible is just what all the controversy and "conflict of opinion" is about. And to say that there the Bible is to be the source of appeal, is only to say that the very subject of controversy is to be the standard by which to decide the controversy. It is plain, therefore, that there must be something to which appeal may be made, and which can interpret the Scriptures, and decide between the disputants, as to what the truth of the question is; and this decision must, in the very nature of the case, be final. It cannot be the courts, because

they are parties to the controversy, and again, because there are certain principles of law which courts recognize in their decisions; such as this: "When words are put in a written law, there is an end to all construction. *They must be followed.*" (See Hon. John A. Bingham, in "Impeachment of Johnson," p. 23.) And this: "The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import."—*Kent's Commentaries, section 462.* These principles will not be accepted by the Amendment party.

To illustrate: Suppose the Amendment is secured, and, therefore, ten commandments are the supreme law of this nation. I, to be loyal to my Government, as well as loyal to my God, take the Bible, find the ten commandments, and begin to study diligently to learn what is my duty under this Government. I am taught by these fundamental principles in the interpretation of law, that "when words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction; they must be followed." And having this plain rule, from the Hon. John A. Bingham, for my guide, and believing that the Congress of the United States made no mistake when it chose Mr. Bingham as the Special Judge Advocate to conduct the trial of the assassins of President Lincoln, and again when it chose him to conduct its impeachment of President Johnson; therefore be leading him to be a safe guide in the interpretation of law, and having also the plain directions of Chancellor Kent, I proceed to the inquiry, as to what is required of me by the ten commandments. I come to the fourth commandment. I read, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work." I applied my rule, thus: (1) This is a written law; (2) the words are plain,—"The seventh day is the Sabbath." Now if I find what day is the seventh day, my duty is plain. I turn to that subject, and I find that all the sources of inquiry to which I reply, answer with one voice, "The day commonly called Saturday *is the seventh day.*" Having found the seventh day, and the words been "plain," (3) "there is an end to all construction," "they must be followed." Now I apply Chancellor Kent's rule, that by the testimony of two witnesses I may be right. First, are the words of the statute to such as are of "common use it"? I read the statute over carefully, and I find not a single word that is not of common use, and not one which I do not understand. Then I must take them "in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import." Therefore, by these plain principles of the highest authority, I am compelled to admit that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and also to keep it as such.

Having now learned my duty in relation to the Sabbath, and having kept it, I proceed to learn and obey the rest of the commandment. I read just as plainly as the other, "Six days shalt thou labor." When the Sabbath is passed, I go to work on the first day of the week, that I may work the six "working days." But my neighbor sees me at work, and calls out to me, "Halloa! Why are you working on the Sabbath?" I reply, This day is not Sabbath, and therefore I am not working on the Sabbath. I kept Sabbath yesterday. He answers, "Oh! that was the Jewish Sabbath that you kept. This day is the Christian Sabbath; this now a Christian Government, and the Christian Sabbath must and shall be kept." I refuse to yield to that argument, and here is a "conflict of the individual opinion." He has me arrested, and brought to trial. Suppose I providentially obtain the services of Hon.

John A. Bingham to defend my cause, and he, by his consummate ability, convinces courts and juries that from the plainest reading of the statute I have to obey the supreme law of the land, and therefore innocent. And now suppose that just here the prosecution enters a plea that that is not the *correct interpretation* of the commandment; that, correctly interpreted, it means, not the definite seventh day, but "one day in seven." Mr. Bingham insists that, by the fundamental rules of law, it must mean the seventh day. They reply, "Are we to apply the rules of civil law in the interpretation of a religious question? This is a religious subject, and it must be decided, and the commandment interpreted, in accordance with the Christian sentiment of this Christian Government. We are the majority, and the majority must decide."

Now in such a case is this, is it not plain that the Bible will not be the source of appeal, but that it will be the Church as the interpreter of the Bible, which must render the final decision? Plainly, Yes. Is this an unjust illustration, or an unfair conclusion? Let us have their own words for answer. Please read again the question that the head of this article, and to the last word of that quotation connect the following and read it right onward; for it belongs there: "The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on *all* moral questions, and with *interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil* . . . points and it is probable that in the almost *universal* gathering of our citizens about these the . . . *final decision* of most points will be developed there. . . . There is certainly no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy than the leaders and teachers in our churches." (?)

So, then, the church is to be the grand interpreter, and is to render the "final decisions" in this universal controversy. And again we are brought face to face with the *image* to the papal church. It was in this way that Rome placed herself as the one single interpreter of the Scriptures. Whenever a conflict of opinion occurred, it was brought immediately to the notice of the church, and she must decide as to what was the Scripture in the case, and which one of the disputants was in the right; consequently, no opinion could be held, and no duty practice, which he chose to declare unscriptural. Therefore, if the Scriptures were to be interpreted alone by her, and conduct was to be regulated alone by her decisions, it is manifest that the more the people read the Scriptures, the more we she annoyed by new controversies and by the necessity of rendering new decisions; and then why *should she not prohibit* the laity from reading the Scriptures? Besides, where was the use of the laity reading the Scriptures anyhow, when none but the clergy could interpret?

Will the national reformers prohibit our reading and interpreting the Scriptures? If not, why not? Would it not be vastly better to do so at once then [*sic.*] to be kept in a constant whirl of "interpretations," and decisions? Then they could regulate the faith and practice of their so-called Christian government bulls issued, as occasion required, "*in Domino salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*" This would save them a fast deal of labor, and doubtless would work just as well.

Seriously, now, from reading the *Christian Statesman*, and studying this movement, how is it possible for any one to doubt that the "*image to the beast*" is

to be formed in this United States Government, and that it is that the very doors? And we fully agree with them that their movement does decidedly "contemplate sufficiently practical ends."—Alonzo T. Jones, in *Review and Herald*.

**July 3, 1884**

**"Upper Columbia Conference" <sup>21</sup> *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 26 , p. 410.**

THE fourth annual session of the Upper Columbia Conference of S. D. Adventists was held at Walla Walla, W. T., June 6-16, 1884.

### **FIRST MEETING, JUNE 6, 9 A.M**

Eld. G. W. Colcord in the chair. Prayer by Eld. J. H. Waggoner. Credentials of delegates called for and presented as follows: Walla Walla church, three; Milton, three; Dayton, two; Pataha, one; Farmington, one; Echo, one; church of Lostine, Oregon, eleven members, one delegate, admitted into Conference. Unorganized companies admitted to representation as follows: Alba, one; Alpawai, one; Idaho, one.

All visiting brethren from General Conference and California, were invited to participate in the deliberations of the Conference. Minutes of last session read and approved. Remarks of great encouragement and devotion to the cause were made by Elders J. N. Loughborough and J. H. Waggoner.

Committees were named by the president as follows: On Resolutions—Elders J. H. Waggoner and A. T. Jones, and Prof. S. Brownsberger. Nominations—I. M. Johns, N. L. McCormick, J. Bartlett. Auditing—Wm. Russell, Anderson Johnson, W. R. Jones, T. Chabit, J. Cochran, and Aaron Miller. Credentials—Ambrose Johnson, J. Hammer, and Wm. Semple.

### **SECOND MEETING, JUNE 8, 9 A. M**

Brother Womach, of Basket Mountain, and Bro. Geo. Rogers, of Butter Creek, Oregon, were admitted as representatives of their respective fields. Church at Goldendale, nine members, one delegate, admitted into Conference.

Reports of laborers were called for, and reports made by Elders A. T. Jones, J. O. Corliss, G. W. Colcord, and by Licentiate W. A. Gibson and C. L. Ford.

### **THIRD MEETING, JUNE 10, 6:15 P.M**

Reports of committees were called for: Committee on Nominations reported: For President, Eld. J. N. Loughborough. Discussed by Elders Loughborough, Colcord, and Jones, and referred back to the committee.

It was moved by Elder Jones that Elder J. M. Loughborough be cordially invited to labor in the Upper Columbia Conference. Discussion by Elders

Loughborough, W. C. White, and J. H. Waggoner, and carried unanimously by a rising vote.

Committee on Resolutions reported: the resolutions were read, and consideration postponed till next meeting.

#### **FOURTH MEETING, JUNE 11, 11:30 A.M**

Consideration of resolutions was taken up, which we re-read as follows:—

*Resolved*, That our earnest gratitude is due to God for his tender mercy toward us, and for the good counsel he has given us by his servants at this meeting, and especially through the labors of Sister White.

*Resolved*, That it is our duty, and we hereby pledge ourselves to more earnestly endeavor to keep the "unity of the Spirit" and of work in the Third Angel's Message.

WHEREAS, There are few laborers in this Conference, and because "the time is short" the needs of the cause are urgent, therefore,

*Resolved*, That we hereby request, and encourage all who can possibly give themselves to the work of God, to use every means in their power to place themselves in the ranks of the active workers.

*Resolved*, That we recommend that all who can do so, avail themselves of a course of Bible instruction in Healdsburg College, in order to become better prepared to perform efficient service in the cause.

Adopted unanimously up to the fourth, which was read, and the Conference adjourned.

#### **FIFTH MEETING, JUNE 11, 6 P.M**

Resolution No. 4 was taken up and discussed at length by Prof. S. Brownsberger, Eld. W. C. White, Eld. J. H. Waggoner, and Bro. Wm. Nichols and carried unanimously.

#### **SIXTH MEETING, JUNE 12, 9:30 A. M**

Committee on Nominations reported: For President, Eld. J. N. Loughborough; Secretary, Eld. G. W. Colcord; Treasurer, I. M. Johns; Executive Committee; W. J. Goodwin and T. L. Ragsdale.

Moved that the report be adopted as a whole. After remarks by Elder Loughborough, it was carried unanimously.

#### **SEVENTH MEETING, JUNE 12, 5:15 P. M**

Calls for labor were heard. Strong calls were made for Colfax and Moscow, and for Weston and Centerville.

## EIGHTH MEETING, JUNE 13, 11 A.M

Wm. Nichols, Treasurer, presented an itemized report showing amount received, \$1,407.20; paid, \$1,407.20; with a balance due on labor, of \$435. The report was accepted.

The Committee on Credentials and Licenses reported: For credentials, Elds. G. W. Colcord and A. T. Jones; for colporter, W. R. Jones.

A motion to accept the report was discussed by Elders Loughborough and Waggoner, and adopted. Other names were referred to the Conference Committee.

It was voted that a tent and camp-meeting fund of \$500 be raised.

Moved that Brn. W. J. Goodwin and Wm. Nichols be chosen as delegates to the Pacific Coast Council, at East Portland. Carried unanimously.

It was voted the appointment of Camp-meeting Committee be left to the Executive Committee. A vote of thanks was tendered to the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, and the Northern Pacific Railway Company, for reduced rates of travel over their lines.

## NINTH MEETING, JUNE 16, 5:30 A.M

The Auditing Committee reported all business settled satisfactorily. Calls for labor were made in favor of Alpowai, Wallowa, Grande Ronde, and Goldendale.

Adjourned *sine die*.

G. W. COLCORD, *President*.

ALONZO T. JONES, *Secretary*.

A. T. Jones, "Charity the Object of the Law," <sup>32</sup> *The Signs of the Times* 10, 29 (July 31, 1884), pp. 450, 451.

TEXT.—"Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; from which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling." 1 Tim. 1:4, 5.

The word "end" is it used here as in other places in the Scriptures, as meaning *purpose*, as in the Jas. 5:11. In exhorting to patience under the coming of the Lord, he says, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the *end* of the Lord." That is, we see the *purpose* of the Lord in allowing Job to suffer affliction. Again the word is used in Rom. 10:4, "For Christ is the *end* the law, for righteousness, to every one that believeth." That is, Christ is the purpose of the law for righteousness. Righteousness is in the law of God. Ps. 118:172. To maintain righteous character is one of its purposes. But that purpose has been frustrated by man in his transgression, and he has forfeited all opportunity of obtaining righteousness from the law. Now Christ steps in; through him we obtain righteousness, and he thus becomes the purpose of the law for righteousness. This is the point of Paul's argument in Rom. 8:3, "For what the law *could not do*, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the *righteousness of the*

*law might be fulfilled in us," &c.* So then we may read the text, "The *purpose* of the commandment is charity," &c.

From the context, it appears that the word "commandment" also is used in an accommodated sense, as being synonymous with the word "law." It is used the same way by Paul in Rom. 7:8, "Sin taking occasion by the *commandment* . . . For without the *law* and was dead." Verse 9: "I was alive without the law. . . . but when the commandment came." Now putting these definitions in the place of these two words, we get the real meaning of the text by reading it: "Now the purpose of the law is charity." And as charity means *love*, Prov. 10:12; 1 Pet. 4:8, we have this still further reading: "The purpose of the law is love;" and by it we discover that the purpose that God had in giving the ten commandments was love. This is further proven by Deut. 33:2, 3: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea *he loved the people.*" And as God is love, 1 John 4:8, and as it was love which led him to give his law to the people, and as the very purpose of the law is love, it could be nothing but a law of love. And so we find it. Rom. 13:8, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Verse 10, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." 2 John 6, "This is love, that we walk after his commandments." 1 John 5:3, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," and Matt. 23:37-40. So then we see that the degree of love which is demanded by the law of God is measured only by the demands which are made upon us by the Lord himself, for the law is simply and only an exposition of the perfections of God. But this purpose of the law cannot be met by the natural man. Rom. 8:7. Therefore the apostle adds a phrase, "The purpose of the law is charity, *out of a pure heart.*" "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." Jer. 17:9; and the Saviour gives us a picture of the natural heart in Mark 7:21, 22, "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness." And this is what God finds in men, instead of the purpose of his law. Well indeed it is that Paul says that the purpose of the law can come only out of a pure heart. And blessed be God who has not only in love given us a lot of love, but has given the Son of his love to redeem us from this iniquity, and to teach us the way of love. By faith in him the heart is purified. Acts 15:9. And by his Holy Spirit dwelling in the heart, making it spiritual and thus in harmony with the law, the purpose of the law can be met,—love out of a pure heart, for the fruit of the Spirit is love. Gal. 5:22.

There is another phrase added in the text. "The purpose of the law is charity out of a pure heart, and of a *good conscience.*" It is a point that has been much debated whether conscience be a sufficient guide; and it may always be answered in the negative, because the conscience itself must be guided. The phrase now under consideration shows that, because it says a *good* conscience, implying that there are consciences that are not good. And this is made sure by 1 Tim. 4:2, where we read of the "conscience seared with a hot iron." Surely such a conscience as that needs to be guided; for a bad conscience could be nothing

but a bad guide, and needs itself to be guided to that which is good; in short, needs to be made good.

This "seared with a hot iron," of course is a figure, applied to the conscience, but if we understand the real searing with a hot iron, we may understand what the figure really means, applied to the conscience. If by accident your hand were struck upon a red-hot iron and held there a moment, it would be burned so much that the pain would be very severe. If the same hand were put a second time upon the same piece of hot iron, the pain would not be so great. And if it were put there the third time, there would be no pain at all. The tissue of the flesh would be so deadened that all sense of pain would be gone. Now carry the illustration to the conscience. Take, for instance, a young man, the son of pious parents, and who has been brought up in the fear of God. He leaves home and goes out into the world and falls in with evil associates, say with a class of persons who will steal, and to think that the one who can steal most expertly should be held in esteem among them. The young man is influenced finally to steal, for the first time; it is conscience will sting him to the quick. I once saw a young man steal a fine scarf, and go and put it away where it was perfectly safe; no one saw him but myself, and he did not know even that, but he was as restless as a person could be; and when he had stood it perhaps half an hour, I saw him go and get the scarf, and put it right back where he stole it from. Then he was easy.

Suppose now this young man resist the pleadings of his conscience, and keeps what he has stolen; when he steals the second time, his conscience will not affect him nearly so much; and when he has stolen the third or fourth time, he will have no conscience on that point of all. He has utterly deadened his conscience, "seared it with a hot iron." And so can he do under any commandment of the decalogue; and finally bring himself to that place where he will have no conscience at all on any of these points. Now suppose he by some means is induced to enter a church, where he, perhaps, hears read from the Bible the words his mother taught him, or hears the words of a hymn which she sang to him, when a child, and he becomes a child again and listens to it all, until he falls on his knees before God, and cries for forgiveness; it is granted, and, like a child, again he starts into the world; he meets his old associates; they invite him to go with them in the old way, and he abhors it. Why, what is the matter? Ah! he is converted. The law of God is written anew upon his heart by the Holy

451

Spirit, 2 Cor. 3:3, and now he has a *good* conscience, one which recognizes the claims of the command, "Thou shalt not steal."

Now I say that the *law of God is the great regulator of the conscience*; and so much of the law of God as is in the heart, just that much contents a man has, and no more. Webster remarks on the word conscience that—"The English word implies a *moral standard of action* in the mind." What moral standard of action is there for the human mind? None other than the ten commandments, which show the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13. And Paul expresses it clearly in Rom. 7:25: "So then *with the mind* as serve the law of God." This is further confirmed by Rom. 2:14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, *do* by nature the *things contained in the law*, these having not the law are a law unto themselves;

which show the work of the *law written in* their hearts, *their conscience* also *bearing witness*," &c. So we see that when they show (by doing the law) the work of the law written in the hearts, their conscience bears witness. And it is only to the *work of the law*, that their conscience does bear witness. Therefore it is plain that where there is no work of the law, the conscience cannot bear witness, and consequently, virtually, *there is no conscience*. On the strength of these "proofs of the Holy Writ," let me repeat, Just as much of the law of God as is in the heart, just so much conscience a man has.

However from the quotation before made from Mark 7:21, 22, it appears that there is hardly any of the law of God recognized in the natural heart. But God in his great love, "wherewith he hath loved us," has made abundant provision for this lack. If we will repent, he will convert us, Acts: 3:19; and write his law new in our hearts, 2 Cor. 3:3; Heb. 10:15, 16; Ps. 19:7; and thus, in writing his *good* law in our hearts, he gives us a *good* conscience, and the purpose of the law can be met.

There is yet another phrase that Paul has given us: "The purpose of the law is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of *faith unfeigned*." James (chap. 2:14-26) sets before us fully the nature of a feigned faith, a faith that depends all upon believing without any *doing*—all faith and no works. But Paul in Gal. 5:6, shows us what he means by the phrase "faith unfeigned." "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which *worketh* by *love*." There is; it is not alone a faith which *works*, but a faith which *works by love*. And thus in this, the "purpose of the law" is met. What a wondrous view of the law of God is here set before us! The purpose of the law is love. Love out of a heart from which love alone can flow. Love out of a conscience which witnesses to nothing but love. Love by a faith which works with nothing in view but love.

And this brings us to notice, for just a moment, the last part of our text, with the marginal reading. "From which some *not aiming at*, have turned aside to vain jangling." This shows that the purpose of the law, which is charity (love) must be our aim in the Christian life. What more painful thing to we see than a person who has no aim in life, having no controlling influence, no guiding star, but holy and entirely the creature of circumstances, now here, now there, and finally nowhere. But the person who has an aim, it matters not what it may be, everything must be turned to helping him reach it. Circumstances may seemingly turn him from it, but in the outcome they have only helped him onward. Warren Hastings, one of the men to whom England owes the greatness of her dominion, when he was but a child playing in the fields, saw the castles and estates that had once belonged to the name of Hastings. And child though he was, he determined *then* that he would bring them back once more to the name. And though it was nearly at the end of a long life before he reached it, he did reach it. Through many vicissitudes, adversity and prosperity, his one aim in life was that, and he accomplished it. In the Christian life God has set before us this aim, charity. And we are to aim at nothing else; for he who aims at anything else, even though he should reach his aim, really aims at nothing and reaches nothing. For though I aim at the eloquence of the tongues of men and of angels, and reach it,

I reach only the lifeless, sounding brass. Though I aimed at the gift of prophecy and reach it, or the understanding of all mysteries and reach it; though I aim at all knowledge and reach it; though I aim at martyrdom and reach it; though I aim at any or all of these, and reached them, I have aimed at nothing and reached nothing. But if I aim at charity, I aim at that which God has set for my aim; and he will help me to reach it. And in reaching that, the highest, in the very nature of the case I reach all below it.

Here, then, is our aim. Let it be indeed our aim. Let nothing swerve us from charity. For as surely as we lose our aim, of vain jangling is the inevitable consequence. The apostle Peter, after showing us how to reach charity says: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." So means *in this way*, which shows that without charity we cannot obtain that entrance. Oh! we must aim at charity; we must reach it. And may the Lord help this people, who are set for the defense of the law of God in the earth, to aim at charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned, and so fulfill the purpose of that law.

**July 31, 1884**

**"Dragons" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 29 , p. 461.**

DRAGONS are often mentioned in the Scriptures, especially in connection with the ruins of cities, as in Isa. 13:22; but the imagination has always supplied any description of them that there might be. Now, however, through the researches of geologists, the veritable dragon itself has been brought to light. From a recent article on the subject, by C. F. Halder, in the *Youth's Companion*, we extract the following:—

"They ranged in size from that of a snipe up to nearly thirty feet in width, and when flying must have presented an astonishing spectacle. Those discovered in the chalk beds of the State of Kansas had no teeth, the jaws being covered by a horny case, as in the birds; in fact, when they were first taken from the ground, the discoverers did not hesitate to pronounce them a new and strange bird.

"There was a long, bird-like, toothless head; the sternum had a keel like that of birds, and the limb bones were also hollow, and contained air cells. But here a curious fact presented itself, the limbs themselves were those of a lizard, and the strange creatures were found to be reptile-like bats, being a combination of reptiles and flying birds; in fact, forming a link between them. In Europe most of these creatures found have ferocious teeth, and in all but the fiery breath and double heads are perfect dragons. In one specimen the membrane that formed the wing is perfectly preserved.

"The animal was found in the lithographic slates near Eichstadt, Bavaria. It had fallen upon its back and had been buried up in that position, and preserved for untold ages. The membrane forming the wing is held in place by what corresponds to our little or fifth finger, which, curiously enough, like some of the Japanese finger nails, has grown out so that it is almost as long as the animal's entire body, thus forming a boom for the sail-like wing. If the reader can imagine his or her little finger ten feet long, and from its tip a wing or membrane extending to the ankle, an idea may be obtained of this curious contrivance.

"The hind limbs were also connected by a web that presented a surface like a kite, while the tail had grown out to a prodigious length, almost twice that of the body, and ending not in a point, but in a broad, leaf-like, vertical paddle or rudder that our dragon used to guide himself in the air.

"This membrane was rhomboid in shape, was probably of the same thickness as the wing, and held in position above and below by a series of cartilaginous spines that were flexible enough to allow a movement to and fro. The jaws of this monster were armed with teeth that protruded forward in a singular manner, seemingly utterly useless in either tearing or holding prey.

"The strange sight presented by these bat-like forms can only be imagined. From the cliffs along the shore, they perhaps hung like the bats of to-day, soaring away through the air with clumsy, labored flight. When crawling upon the ground the long finger was probably extended backward at an angle, and their motions could only be compared to the awkward shuffle of the bats.

"The living dracos or flying dragons of the East India Archipelago are also remarkable creatures. Between the limbs they have a membrane that is supported by the much prolonged five or six hind ribs. Their colors defy all description, and, flashing and glistening in the sun, their snake-like tails winding in and out, their curious ruffs trembling, they are dragons indeed."

A. T. JONES.

**August 28, 1884**

**"Civil or Religious, Which?" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 33 , pp. 514, 515.**

REV. W. F. CRAFTS has been preaching lately, in the First Congregational Church, Chicago, a series of sermons in favor of Sunday laws; and the fact that the daily *Inter-Ocean* reports these verbatim, sometimes occupying more than five columns, is an indication of the prominence that this subject is assuming in

public affairs. The report of the sermon of Sunday evening, August 3, it is before us, some points of which we propose to notice.

As is usual in the discussion of this question nowadays, he tries to make it appear that Sunday laws and their enforcement have nothing to do with religion, but have "relation to health, education, home virtue, and patriotism," and his attempt is crowned with the usual success of such efforts, that is, to prove emphatically the contrary. He says: "Such a day [as is secured by *well-enforced* Sabbath laws] causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of"—What suppose you, my reader? On the platform of "health" interests? of "educational" interests? of the blessings of the home virtue? on the platform of "patriotism"? Not at all. But "causes rich and poor to meet on the platform of *religious* equality." Yet Sunday laws *well-enforced* have no relation to religion!

Again; "Liberty allows the majority no right. . . to enforce its religion upon others. But inasmuch as more than three-fourths of the population are members or adherents of Christian churches, and so accustomed to set apart the first day of each week for rest and religion; and inasmuch as it is the conviction of this majority that the nation cannot be preserved without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without lost, therefore Sabbath laws are enacted," &c. Let us analyze this. (a) The nation cannot be preserved without *religion*. (b) But religion cannot be preserved without the *Sabbath*. (c) But the Sabbath cannot be preserved without *laws*. Now if these laws are to preserve the Sabbath *that* the Sabbath a preserve *religion*, it inevitably follows that all such laws are enacted in the interests of religion solely.

Again; "Sabbath laws for protecting the worshiping day of the prevailing *religion*,. . . are vindicated." And so he goes on through his whole sermon, insisting all the time that Sunday laws must have "no relation to religion," yet proving by every line of argument, in spite of his propositions, and in spite of logic, that such laws are wholly in the interests of religion. So it is, and always will be, with every one who attempts the task. All this goes to show that the animus of the whole discussion is the Sunday as a *religious* institution, and the enforcement of its observance as such. A further illustration of this is seen in the above quotation. Notice, he says the "majority has no right to enforce its religion upon others." Then without the slightest break, or hesitation, he goes right forward and declares that a majority "are members or adherents of the Christian churches, and have set apart the first day of each week," &c., &c., and winds up with the demand for laws for the enforcement of Sunday *for the preservation of religion*, an obedience to the will that majority. The gentleman's logic is about as badly mixed as are his metaphors in that place where he sees the "infidel iconoclast," that is one *breaking an image*, and cries out, not in tones of a entreaty, but of command, '*Woodman, spare that tree.*'"

After all this we are not surprised to find him sanctioning an exposition (?) of the first amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." He calls it "that much misunderstood article of the National Constitution" and says: "President Charles E. Knox, D.D., of the German Seminary at Bloomfield, N.J., in a *very able paper* on the 'Attitude of Our Foreign Popula-

tion toward the Sabbath,' urges that this amendment needs to be expounded everywhere to our foreign population. It should be shown to them that while Congress possesses no law-making power in respect to an establishment of religion, it *may*, and *does*, and *always has*, passed laws which have respect to religion." Then our foreign population are to be informed, are they, that Congress "may, and does, and always has," violated the Constitution? That would be an exposition of this article indeed. This will be news to the National Reform Association, too, as well as to the rest of us. We feel almost sure that if Dr. Crafts can convince that association of the truth of this exposition, he will be promoted to great honor. However, we doubt his ability to do it. First, because this statement of Mr. Knox is notoriously false; and secondly, because the idea advanced by Mr. Crafts himself that the enactment of Sabbath laws is "not in violation of this article," stands contradicted by the United States Senate, in that, when in 1830 it was positioned to legislate on this very subject of Sunday, it declared that such action would be unconstitutional.

Nor is the gentleman any more successful in his exposition of Constantine's edict. After referring to the words of Moses in connection with the Sabbath, "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou," he says: "Constantine gave substantially the same reasons for the first Sabbath law enacted in Europe. It was a law to protect slaves and peasants in their right to Sabbath rest." From this we can only wonder whether Mr. Crafts ever read Constantine's law to which he refers. So far from its being the "first Sabbath law enacted in Europe," it was not a *Sabbath* law at all. It commanded rest on the "*venerable day of the sun*." It was the *sun* that was to be honored. If he had said this was the first *Sunday* law enacted in Europe he would not have been far wrong. But to make it a Sabbath law, is as utterly at variance with the truth as is the statement that "it was a law to protect slaves and *peasants* in their right to Sabbath rest." A peasant is one who lives in the country, one who lives by rural labor. Now read Constantine's law and see how much protection it gave the peasant, and the slave. Here it is—"Let all the *judges* and *town people*, and the occupation of all *trades* rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are *situated in the country freely* and at *full liberty* attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn or planting vines; last, the critical moment been let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven. Given the seventh day of March; Crispus and Constantine being consuls, each of them for the second time." It is exceedingly difficult to conceive how any honest man who ever read that edict at all, could state that it was to "protect slaves and peasants," when they were the very ones to whom it gave no protection whatever; the very ones who, by the terms of the edict itself, were excluded from its protection.

And it is by such methods as these that the national Sunday laws to be brought about, methods that have been them every element of dishonesty. But the methods are worthy of the cause in which they are enlisted, and the institution which by them is sought to be upheld. "Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh

himself a prey; *and the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment.*" Isa. 59:14, 15.

Other points we reserve till another occasion.

ALONZO T. JONES.

## September 4, 1884

### "The Law of Rest—What Is It?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 34 , p. 530.

IN further notice of Dr. Crafts on Sunday laws, we quote: "The liberty of rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all. " This is in *fact* the truth, but in the way in which it is expounded by those in favor of Sunday laws, it is false.

"The liberty of rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all." Is there then a lot of rest for all? We say there is. Where? In the fourth commandment of the decalogue. We read: "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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

There is the original and only rightful lot of weekly rest there is in the world. It is obligatory upon all men, but for all time and everywhere. It is explicit as regards the *rest*; it is definite as regards the *time* of the rest, and it is complete in that it not only enjoins the rest and tells the time of it, but gives the reason for it, and the reason for the law which enjoins it, and also reveals the Author of the law. See: (a) Remember the *rest day*. (b) The *seventh day* is the *rest day*. (c) In it thou *shalt not do any work*. (d) For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and *rested the seventh day*. (e) For *this reason* the Lord blessed the *rest day* and *set it apart*. Again we say this is the law of rest for all. And *it is the right of rest for each*. And more; outside of this command as God wrote it, and as it reads, *there is no right* of weekly rest for any man on the earth. To deny this is to a search that it is right to ignore the authority of God, and to disobey God; which is only to say that it is right to do wrong. For, God in his supremacy has commanded to man a day of rest. He likewise has fixed the day upon which man shall rest. He has set that day apart from the other days of the week, and the Lord's order of things concerning it, and to select another day of the week, and obtain the enactment, by earthly governments, of laws enforcing its observance, is a *will-worship* in its inception, *usurpation* in its fruition, and *rebellion* in its completion. Col. 2:18, 22, 23; Jer. 28:15, 16.

From the force of this arrangement, they attempt to shield themselves by the claim that the fourth commandment "is indefinite as regards the day." As we have shown, and as every unprejudiced reader of the commandment knows, that is false. But for the sake of the argument let us admit that it is true. Then we have the following: (a) God wrote it himself on the table of stone. Ex. 31:18. (b) He

added no more (Deut. 5:22), which shows (c) Whatever the command is, definite or in definite, it is *intentionally* so by the Lord himself. (d) They claim that it is indefinite, therefore it follows from these promises that the Lord *intentionally made it so*. Then we say to them: If God has made that commandment indefinite, by what authority do *you* make it *definite*? If he in his own law has *not* fixed the date to be observed in obedience to that law, what right have *you* to *fix* it? And in thus presuming to do what God has purposely *not done*, you turn that usurpation into open rebellion by exacting of all, under pains and penalties, obedience to law as *you* have fixed it, in defiance of the law as God has made it, and as you yourselves affirm that he made it. Then we say to all: In this where do the Sunday-law movers differ from the papacy in its dealings with the law of God? Dan. 7:25; 2 Thess. 2:4. In other words, will not this movement in its completion be that to which the scripture points, "an image to the beast"? So then their claim, of the indefiniteness of the law, instead of shielding them, only serves the more plainly to expose their willfulness, usurpation, and rebellion.

After this exploit of usurping the authority to fix the day, it is but an easy step to the reading in its reverse the quotation at the beginning of this article, thus: "The *right* of rest for each is the *law* of rest for all." This is the reading most commonly found among the Sunday-law advocates, and indeed, for them it is the appropriate reading. For claiming, as we have seen, the *right* to fix the day of rest, and having the *power* to enact a law enforcing its observance, their *right* then becomes the *law* for all. It is plain, however, from any analysis of their movement that may be made, that all the right there is in it is that where in *might* makes right. It is not that right which is the illegitimate offspring of a conscientious regard for righteous law; but that right (?) which is begotten of the adulterous connection of church and State; that right (?) which says, "I have the power, and I will be obeyed. If you do not acknowledge my right you *shall* acknowledge my might." And this is the nature of the Sunday-law observance, from the first Sunday law that ever was enacted to the one which they now seek to have enacted.

In consonance with this, Mr. Crafts pays his respects to the opposition to such laws in the following illustrative style. He calls it, "The brazen despotism of a loud and low minority over a two compromising majority who in danger liberty by concessions, for fear of being misunderstood in their methods of protecting it. In California this oligarchy of foreign liquor-sellers was actually allowed to repeal the Sabbath law as a 'league of freedom.' "This *oppression* of masses by margins *must be stopped*."

Seventh-day keepers also come into the gentleman's notice. He asks a very important question, to which we should be very much pleased to have some Sunday-law advocates give a consistent answer. Here is his question: "But how is it consistent with liberty that those whose religion requires them to rest on the seventh day are compelled to give the public business and public amusements on the first day?" In his answer he separates the Jews from other Sabbath-keepers, and says: "In the case of the Jews the case is not as difficult as many have thought." Oh, yes, it is very easy for him to dispense with their case. Hear him: "If he cannot do more business in five days in Great Britain and the United

States than in six days elsewhere, *he is free to remain elsewhere*. If when he comes into Great Britain or the United States he finds by experiment that a 'conscientious Jew cannot make a living,' *the world is all before him* to choose where he will dwell." And so it appears that whether a man can be an inhabitant of the United States, is to depend altogether upon whether he will keep Sunday. Yet Sunday laws have nothing to do with religion! Compel a man to stultify his conscience or leave the country; and yet the cause of all this has nothing to do with religion!

Rabbi Winter, of Brooklyn, applied a touchstone to this thing which in an instant proves its "true inwardness." In reply to questions and proposals of Dr. Crafts, looking to the adoption by the Jews, of Sunday instead of Sabbath, the Rabbi proposed "a compromise between Christians and Jews, by agreeing on 'a neutral day in the middle of the week' as a sabbath for all—showing that he is willing to give up Saturday and take some other common day, his national prejudiced against the Christian first-day Sabbath been his only reason for preferring the third or fourth day to the first, a prejudiced which *of course the law cannot recognize*." Certainly "of course" not. But why "of course"? If Sunday laws have relation simply to "health, education," etc., cannot these be promoted just as well on Wednesday as on Sunday? If not, why not? Cannot the laboring man rest just as well on Thursday as on Sunday? And if the rest is to have no reference at all to religion, nor to the "religious aspect of the day," then why is not the proposition of the Rabbi eminently proper? You ask the Jew to give up the day which he observes; he only ask that you do likewise. He proposes to meet you halfway; certainly nothing could be fairer, but "of course" it cannot be recognized. Oh no, "of course" everything must be given up for Sunday, and every man's conscientious convictions must be crushed doubt that Sunday laws may have free course to run and be glorified. And all this without any reference to the religious aspect of the day? Nay, barely! For the "opinion" of these people, "is very decided for freedom [on Sunday] from anything that could shock a *thoroughly Christian community*."

His opinions of Seventh-day Baptist, and in that, of seventh-day Adventists, will be noticed next week.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**September 11, 1884**

**"Sunday Laws and Liberty" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 35 , pp. 546, 547.**

LAST week, in answer to Dr. Crafts' question, "How is it consistent with liberty that those whose religion requires them to rest on the seventh day are compelled to give up public business and public amusements on the first day?" He gave an answer, so far as the Jews are concerned, to the effect that as Sunday-keepers are the majority, and therefore have the power, they are "*decided*" that nothing shall be done by anyone "that could shock or disturb a *thoroughly Christian*

community." In short, that the institutions of their religion shall be observed at the expense of the conscientious convictions of every one else in the country. And this is "consistent with liberty"! It is, with that species of liberty which is created by relentlessly crushing out the exercise of every dissentient opinion. And with *that* kind of Liberty, no act of the papal church has ever been inconsistent.

Of other seventh-day keepers, illustrated by his citation of the Seventh-day Baptists, he says: "So, the Seventh-day Baptists, being only one five-thousandth of the population, can hardly ask to have the laws change for them." Why not, pray? Is it not just as proper for the Sabbath-keepers to ask that the laws be *changed* in their behalf, as it is for the Sunday-keepers to have those laws enacted in their behalf? Or is it true that all rights, civil and religious, human and divine, are summed up in Sunday-keepers?

Again: "It would not be responsible for the Legislatures to compel the other ninety-nine-hundredths of the population who do not regard *Saturday* as a sacred day, to stop business, for the few who do." True enough. But suppose that those who "regard *Saturday* as a sacred day," were the *majority*, then, according to the premises of Dr. Crafts, and the Sunday-law people generally, it *would be* reasonable for the Legislatures to *compel* all who did not so regard it, to *stop business* on Saturday. But will they admit the reasonableness of this logical conclusion from their own premises? Not for a minute. Suppose, for instance, that in the State of Ohio the Seventh-day Adventist were the majority. Then suppose that they, being the majority in the Legislature, pass a law compelling all the people of the State to rest on the seventh day (Saturday), what a roar of indignant protest would immediately arise from united Christendom! Exclamations of "religious bigotry!" "Destruction of religious liberty!" "Violation of the rights of conscience!" etc., etc., to the end of the catalogue, would fill the air. And justly so, say we. But if the claims of the Sunday-law advocates be just, where would there be any wrong, where any injustice, in such an action? If it would be wrong for Sabbath-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Sunday-keepers to rest on Saturday, where in then is it right for Sunday-keepers, when in the majority, to pass laws compelling Sabbath-keepers to rest on Sunday?

And, too, in answer to all their protestations, we could say, Why, dear sirs, you need not make so much ado. This is no restriction of your rights, this is no invasion of your liberties. You are right to rest on Sunday still remains to do. You are at perfect liberty to refuse to work on Sunday. Our action is entirely "consistent with liberty." We do not by this law compel you to keep Saturday *religiously*; this statute has "nothing to do with religion." This does not compel you to go to church; you are at "liberty," to stay at home. This law has nothing to do with "the religious aspects of the day," it only has relation to your "health," to your "education," to your "home virtue," and to your "patriotism"! Now, reader, we ask you to candidly, is there in all the United States, one person who regard Sunday as a sacred day, who would accept any such reasoning as that? And yet those who do so regard Sunday, are the very ones who offer this reasoning (?) to us, and expect us to accept it as conclusive, *for the reason* that they are the majority, and for that reason alone.

But if it be thus, as Mr. Crafts says, that "laws for protecting the worshipping day of the prevailing religion from disturbance, are then vindicated," who does not see that loss for the protection of the institutions of the *prevailing religion* are vindicated in the same way, whatever and wherever that religion may be? And then is not the Mohammedan, in his own country, fully justified in enacting laws compelling Christians to shut up their places of business, and rest on Friday, his Assembly day, and saying to them, in the words of Dr. Crafts, "If you cannot do more business in five days in Turkey or Arabia, then in six days elsewhere, you are free to go elsewhere. If you find that in Turkey or Arabia and a conscientious Christian cannot make a living, the world is all before you to choose where you will dwell." Every man who has the least conception of liberty will say that that would be oppression. Yet the same Sunday-keeping Christians, who would unanimously pronounced that oppression in Turkey, will do the same thing in America in behalf of Sunday, and call it liberty. And wherever a voice is raised against their action, it is immediately branded as the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," even though the opposition be made by a majority of the inhabitants of a whole State, as in California in 1882. And for this these free citizens of the sovereign State of California are called by this Sunday-law champion, "this oligarchy of *foreign liquor-sellers*." Hear him: "In California this oligarchy of foreign liquor-sellers was *actually allowed* to repeal the Sabbath law, as a 'league of freedom.'"

His application here to the "League of Freedom," is as false as any of the other of his claims. The *Rescue*, the organ of the Good Templars, said of the Sunday plank in the Republican platform, that it was an "entire blank, *acceptable to the League of Freedom, and entirely in their interests*." And Dr. McDonald, president of the Home Protection Association, said that he was "disgusted with the Sunday-law plank in the platform." That it was "too treacherous and unsafe," etc. and the Home Protection Association was the most active opponent of the League of Freedom. It "is a consummation devoutly to be wished," that, while the spokesman strive so strenuously for their *Christian Sabbath*, they would show some respect for the Christian duty to "speak the truth," and to "not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

They were "actually allowed," he says, to "repeal the Sabbath law." "Allowed!" By whom? That Sunday law was repealed by virtue of an issue that was carried by a majority of 17,517 votes, in the State election. And the Governor and other State officers who were "actually allowed" to be elected in that campaign, are still "actually allowed" to conduct the affairs of the State. And by the same token, and on the same day, Secretary Folger was "actually allowed" to be beaten for the Governorship of New York. We should not wonder if Dr. Crafts would one of these days volunteer the information that the people of the United States were "actually allowed" to abolish slavery! After this display of erudition, we are not at all surprised to find him, in the very next sentence, calling the repeal of the law, an act of *oppression*. See, "This *oppression* of masses by margins *must be stopped*." So, then, a condition of affairs under which Sunday-keepers and all others are at liberty to keep the day as they may choose, without the *slightest interference*, is *oppression*. But if only a law could be enacted *compelling all* to

keep the Sunday, under penalty of fine, or imprisonment, or confiscation of goods, or banishment, *that* would be LIBERTY. To quote his own words, it "leaves a man's religious beliefs and practices as free as *the air he*

547

*breathes.*" Yes, it does. As free as the air that was breathed in the Black Hole of Calcutta.

And in leaving "a man's religious beliefs and practices" so free, "it only forbids the carrying on of certain kinds of business on a certain day of the week, . . . in deference to the feelings and wishes" of a certain class. It therefore was no restriction whatever, of the "religious beliefs and practices" of the apostles when the priests and Sadducees laid hands on them and put them in the common prison, and commanded them not to speak at all nor to teach in the name of Jesus. That was perfect religious liberty. And for the apostles to oppose the will of the majority as they did, was the "brazen despotism of a loud and low minority," we suppose. Acts 4 and 5. The priests and Sadducees and the Council, did not command them to not *believe* in Jesus, and his resurrection. They did not command that they should not worship him. They only commanded that they "should not *speak* at all nor *teach* in the name of Jesus." The Sadducees were the "majority," and as the preaching of the apostles disturb their "thoroughly" Sadducean religion, "this oppression of masses by margins "had to be "stopped." And thus might Dr. Crafts and the National Reform party justify every act of repression, and condemn every work of reform that has ever been in the world.

One other point we will notice at another time.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**September 18, 1884**

**"Civil Government and the First Table of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 36 , pp. 562, 563.**

ROGER WILLIAMS enunciated the doctrine that "the civil magistrate has no authority over offenses against the first table" of the law of God. On this Dr. Crafts remarks that it "is worthy of all acceptance; but it must be interpreted and applied with common sense." Then he proceeds to give us an "interpretation," which presumably he considers to be "common sense." And now—

"Turn hear your steps, and your eyes employ,

Ye hapless daughters, and ye sons of Troy."

And see how he does it. He says: "The Mormon is not to claim under it a right to bigamy and polygamy."

What shadow of connection is there between "*bigamy and polygamy*," and the *first table of the law*? Or has he become so accustomed to looking at everything in the reverse that the law of God to is turned backward, and so to his vision the second table of the law is the first, and duty toward men takes precedence of that toward God? The Mormon in his "bigamy and polygamy," commits *adultery*, which is transgression of the seventh commandment, the third statute of the *second table*; and the second table regulates our duties toward our

fellow-men, and civil government has a right to, yea, it *must*, exercise its authority there, because that is one of the main purposes of civil government. And when Congress legislates on the Mormon adultery, what kind of "common sense" is that which interpret such action as legislation upon offenses against the first table? So far is it from being *common* sense, that it is the oldest kind of nonsense—in short there is *no sense at all* in it. But utterly destitute of sense as it is, it shows plainly that there is no sophistry, no subterfuge, and that will not be employed to blind the minds of the masses to the unrighteousness of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws.

This statement by Roger Williams is sound doctrine and eminently common sense as it stands. It is truth that civil government has no right to legislate in matters pertaining to the first table of the law. The first table has to do it alone with man's duty to God; and what ever conception of what God is or what God requires, is distinctively his own conception, and applies exclusively between that man and his God. And when the State attempts by law to regulate such conception, it enters the domain where it does not belong, and where it can have no shadow of a right.

The State has no right to say whether a man shall have one God or fifty, or whether he shall have any God at all. It has no right to say whether its subject shall worship Jehovah, Jupiter, Josh, Buddha, Thor, Odin, Isis, or Isiris. So far as the State is concerned, the Chinaman has a right to bring his graven images of his gods with him, and worship them. The Hindoo has a right to bring his Buddha with him and worship if there. The Sabian has the right to bring his sacred fire, and worship it.

But, on the other hand, the worshiper, of what kind soever he may be, must keep his worship between himself and his god, must keep it within the limits of the first table. He, on his part, must not invade the domain of the State. The fire-worshiper may carry on his worship unmolested so long as he keeps it between himself and his fire-god; but the moment that he sees is one of his fellow-men and attempts to kill him and burn him in the fire as a sacrifice to his god, that moment the State stretches forth its powerful hand and stops him. Because, in the exercise of one of its chief offices, the State must protect the life of this one of its subjects. Therefore when any one in his worship of his god attempts the life of another, even though it be his own child, the State must interfere and protect the life of its subject, and *prosecute the offender*. Prosecute him, *not* for any offense against any part of the first table, but for his offense against that statute of the *second* table, which says, "Thou shalt not kill." And the State has the right to so prosecute, even to the annihilation of such worship, if it proved to be necessary to the protection of the lives of its subjects.

So likewise the Mormons have the right to separate themselves, and go away into the wilderness, and there establish a hierarchy if they choose, and the Government can say nothing against their proposal to worship their god in that way. But when they make adultery the chief corner-stone of their hierarchy, and when every act of worship toward their god must be sanctified by adultery, then the Government *must* interfere; because the State has the right to, yea, it *must protect* its subjects from the adulterer as well as from the murderer. And in this,

as in the above case, such interference is *not* because of any infringement of the first table of the law, but solely because, and in correction of, there infringement of that statute of the *second* table which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" and the State has the right to carry such interference to the extent of annihilating that hierarchy, if it be found necessary to the abolition of their adulterous practices.

Again, suppose a class of religionists should arise, holding, upon Acts 4:32, that no worship was acceptable to God except that based upon the principles of community of property. So long as such religionists, believing it their duty, maintain such views and worship between *themselves* and God, the Government has nothing to say against what they do. But if they, in carrying out their principle of "all things common," begin to appropriate the property of their neighbors, then the State asserts its right to protect the property of its citizens. And such action in no wise touches relations nor duties of the first table, but does solely with that part of the second table which says, "Thou shalt not steal." The same principle would hold in regard to any infraction of the ninth commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Therefore it is plain that the civil Government has no right to interfere with the religious practices of any people so long as such practices are confined within the limits of the first table of the law.

Now the question arises, Has the State any right to compel the observance of the Sabbath? From the principles pointed out in the foregoing, the question must be answered in the negative; because the Sabbath is an institution belonging exclusively to the first table of the law, and is regulated wholly by a statute of the first table. The non-observance of the Sabbath interferes with no person's life, nor chastity, nor property, nor character. Consequently the non-observance of the Sabbath on the part of any person can by no possibility come within the limits of the jurisdiction of the State. This of the Sabbath. We do not hear refer to Sunday, because Sunday-keeping has no connection whatever with anything in either first or the second table, unless it be in the form of a *transgression* of the *first commandment*. And as we have seen that, though it were part of the first table, the State can have nothing to do with it; and as every one knows it is no part of the second table, therefore any legislation in behalf of Sunday is utterly excluded, so far as the two tables of the law are concerned.

But suppose that Sunday were truly the Sabbath; is there been any just ground for legislation, in the claim of the Sunday-law people, that there rest is disturbed by other people not keeping Sunday? It is difficult to see how one person's choice not to rest on a certain day can disturb the one who chooses to rest that day. Suppose I rest on Sunday; my neighbor across the way works on Sunday. Now how can his work, *on his own premises*, disturb my rest on my premises? It does not disturb my rest and it cannot. This we know, for we are acquainted

with the experience, not in keeping Sunday, it is true, but in keeping the Sabbath, and the principle is the same. There are thousands of Sabbath-keepers in the United States. They are found in city and country in every State and Territory in the Union. They all rest on the Sabbath of the Lord (Saturday), which is

acknowledged to be the busiest day of the week, and yet no such thing was ever heard of as a Seventh-day Adventist complaining of his rest being disturbed. We have churches in such busy cities as Chicago, San Francisco, Denver, and many others, where they meet for worship every Sabbath, and although in the midst of these busy cities, on the busiest day of the week, yet no one ever heard a complaint of their worship being disturbed by other people working. And if such complaints were made (which will never be), how much respect would it received from Sunday-keepers? Just none at all. It would be considered as wholly unworthy their notice. And this shows that their cry about their rest, worship, etc., being disturbed by people working on Sunday, does not spring from *principle*, but entirely from *willfulness*. Well they are consistent in that at least; for as we have shown in the articles that have gone before, that Sunday-keeping is *will-worship*, so, therefore, they are consistent in consulting their own *willfulness* alone in seeking to compel others to keep it. In their whole system there is no recognition of the principle of *equal* rights, but as we have shown in a previous article, it rests wholly upon the idea that "*might is right*." With them there is no recognition of the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of *his own* conscience, but every man must worship according to the dictates of the conscience of the Sunday-law claimant. Yet even this is not a true statement of the case, but rather that every man must worship according to the *will* of the Sunday-law claimant. We say "*will*" because in this case, as a matter of fact, there is no *conscience at all*.

In short, the more closely the Sunday institution, and the claims for Sunday laws are examined, the more plainly it appears that they rest upon no particle of right or equity. The more carefully they are weighed in the balances, the more decidedly they are found wanting. Instead of the National Reform movement being a work of reform, it is the opposite. Instead of its being a progression in the civilization of the nineteenth century, it is a retrogression to that of the twelfth century. Instead of its shedding a broader and purer light upon the intellectual world, instead of its turning the shadow *backward*, it swings it forward until the bright face of the intellectual dial-plate is covered with the black this of darkness of the Dark Ages.

In closing we give the following words of wisdom from Washington: "I have often expressed my opinion, that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable to God alone for his religious faith, and should be protected and worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience." And with this we say that the government has no right to enact laws making any of the duties of the first table a *test of good citizenship*.

ALONZO T. JONES.

*Oakland, Cal., Sept. 10, 1884.*

NOTE:—I believe that the principles laid down in this article will bear the test of just judicial criticism. If any think otherwise, I shall be glad to receive any suggestions they may make.

A. T. J.

October 2, 1884

**"Conscience and Sunday Laws" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 37 , p. 578.**

LAST week we remarked that with the Sunday-law advocates "there is no recognition of the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but every man must worship according to the dictates of the conscience of the Sunday-law client. Yet even this is not a true statement of the case, but rather that every man must worship according to the *will* of the Sunday-law claimant. We say *will*, because in this case, as a matter of fact, *there is no conscience at all.*"

That there is no recognition of the rights of conscience in others, is proved by the following quotation from the organ of the National Reform party, the *Christian Statesman*, of Nov. 1, 1883: "If there be any Christian who objects to the proposed amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me that it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in the matter." In the same article it is plainly shown that whoever does not keep Sunday stands in the same position as the infidel; and so it appears that what ever religious rights they may choose to have enforced by law, it must be so wholly out of respect for their wishes who will have it so, with no regard for the consciences of any who differ with them. And now as they so decided to show that they will not respect our consciences, we propose to show that in this thing at least, their action does not spring from conscience at all, and that therefore, on their part, there is no conscience for us to respect.

## CONSCIENC

Is defined by Webster's Unabridged to be "the moral faculty; the moral sense;" and, "the English word implies a moral standard of action in the mind." Now the only moral standard of action for the human mind that there is in existence, is the moral law, the law of God, the ten commandments. That this definition and this statement are strictly in accordance with the Scripture is readily seen by Heb. 10:15, 16: "The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and *in their minds* will I write them." "Written. . . with the spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." 2 Cor. 3:3. "So then," says Paul, "*with the mind* I serve the law of God." Rom. 7:25.

Again, "For if the *blood of bulls* and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the *flesh*, how much more shall the *blood of Christ* who through the eternal Spirit offer himself without spot to the God, purge your *conscience* from dead works to serve the living God." "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an *evil conscience.*" Heb. 9:13, 14; 10:22. So then the blood of

Christ cleanses the conscience "from dead works," "from evil," from *sin*. But how does the conscience discover that it is defiled by sin? Rom. 3:20 answers: *By the law* is the knowledge of sin. And 1 John 3:4. *Sin* is the transgression of *the law*.

Once more; Rom. 2:14, 15: "When the Gentiles, which have not the [written, see context] law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the [written] law are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness." When the Gentiles *do* the things contained in the *law*, their *conscience bears witness*. And by doing the things of the law, they show the work of the law written in their hearts, and to that their conscience bears witness. Observe, the conscience bears witness *only to the things contained in the law*. Therefore as much of the law of God as is in the heart *so much conscience* a man has, *and no more*. By these "proofs of Holy Writ," then, the definition above given is justified, and it is proved that the ten commandments are the moral standard of action of the human mind; that they are the detector of the stains of sin upon the conscience; that they are the great regulator of the conscience; and that, virtually, the law of God is conscience. And by these proofs it is clear that when, out of respect for the law of God, a person does what is commanded in the law, he acts conscientiously. And it is equally clear that when a person, with the law of God before him, chooses to go contrary to the plain reading of the text of the law, he does *not* act conscientiously, but willfully, and his own will becomes the standard of his mind, and so conscience is shut out.

The fourth commandment is the original and only moral standard of action that there is in the world regarding the observance of the Sabbath. It alone is the regulator of the conscience on that subject. By it alone can be detected Sabbath-breaking stains upon the conscience. Obedience to it, out of respect to the commandment and its Author, is conscientious obedience. Disobedience to it, even though we seek to substitute another day, cannot be conscientiousness.

"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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11. This commandment is just as plain as it can be written, even by the Lord himself. So that to every one who can read it, his duty is plain, and he is without excuse in disobedience. There is in it room for only one possible question; that is, What day is the seventh day? and having found it, honestly before God, to obey the word with all our God-given powers; and to *such obedience*, and to such only, *conscience bears witness*; such obedience is conscientious.

Sunday-keeping is no part of the law of God. The Sunday institution is not based upon the fourth commandment, nor is it sanctioned by it. No man can read the first day of the week, to Sunday, into the commandment without destroying the commandment. And outside of the fourth commandment no one claims any commandment for Sunday-keeping in the Bible. They know there is no such

commandment in all the Book. Therefore, as there is no commandment from God for the observance of Sunday, as there is the law of God on the subject, its observance *cannot be* a matter of conscience. Being not of God, there is nothing in it that can be recognized by the conscience, which is of God. Not resting upon the authority of God, it rests upon no authority that the conscience can respect. And there lies the weakness of the Sunday cause. If there were anything in it that would touch the conscience; anything that the conscience could recognize; if it rested upon authority that the conscience could respect, its advocates moving in the fear of God, would never have need to ask for human laws to compel people to observe it.

If, then, the Sunday institution and Sunday laws are not founded in conscience, from what do they spring? From

### **SUPERSTITION**

Superstition is defined by Webster: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rights *not commanded*." In the zeal and the efforts of the National Reform party of those who demand laws compelling the observance of Sunday, this definition is meant *exactly*. The keeping of Sunday religiously is the observance of a right *absolutely not commanded* by the Lord in any place in all his revelation to men. Let them show us a commandment from the Lord for the observance of Sunday and we will willingly and gladly keep it, and do all that we can possibly can to get all others to observe it; and thus on our part at least they will have no need of the enactment of laws enforcing its observance. Let them show us from the Bible, Old Testament or New, any such expression in favor of Sunday as that "ye ought" to keep it, or that "I have given you an example that ye should do" it, or that "happy are ye if ye do" it, and we will obey the injunction, and thenceforth will keep Sunday. We will keep it *conscientiously*. And until they shall open the Bible and show was a command for it, that we may see it and say, This is the word of God, until then we utterly refuse to keep it, civil law or constitutional amendment to the contrary notwithstanding. But they never can produce such a commandment, and they know it, and *therefore* they *will have* civil enactments and constitutional amendment to supply their defect, and the seek to remedy the fatal defect.

More, as we find in the Bible, in the moral law, that great regulator of the conscience, a plain commandment in joining the observance of the *seventh day* as the Sabbath of the Lord, our consciences oblige us to keep it so, out of conscientious regard for the authority of the Author of the law. And so long as that commandments stands, and they fail to produce from the word of God a commandment for us to keep the *first day*, just so long we refuse to give up the observances of *that which is commanded*, to adopt the practice of that which is not commanded. In other words, and according to the definitions given above, we refuse to yield our *conscience* for their *superstition*.

By some this may be thought strong language. But the question is not, Is it strong? but, Is it true? In the answer must be, according to the Scriptures, and the highest authority in the English language, *It is true*. And it being also true that

for the sake of the *superstition*, its advocates will annul the chartered liberties of this whole liberty-loving people; liberties which were bought with much blood and untold suffering; liberties for which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor; liberties which have been the vital principle in the work of every reformer from the day of Arnold of Brescia, to our own; liberties which are the legitimate outgrowth of the Reformation as a whole, and consequent on the spread of its enlightenment,—when all these must be ruthlessly torn away, and relentlessly crushed out, for the establishment of a *superstition*, we know of no words that would be too strong by which to characterize it. We cannot sit idly by and see all our so dearly-bought rights so cruelly taken away. They urge the contest upon us, and in the name of civil and religious liberty, in the name of him rights, and the name of conscience, in the name of Him who alone can cleanse the conscience from all stain, and in the name of Him who alone is Ruler of the conscience, we accept the issue. We accept the issue, and in *conscience* rejects the *superstition*.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**October 16, 1884**

**"Question and Answer" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 39 , p. 611.**

IN the first verse of Rev. 21, are we to understand that there is literally to be "no more sea," in the earth made new? J. C. H.

ANSWER.—We think not. You will see by Rev. 20:11, that the heaven and the earth fled away from the face of him who sat on the great white throne, "and there was no place found for them;" they were no more. In the verse to which you refer this is stated again, but in contrast with the new heaven and new earth. "I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea." In other words, the first heaven and the first earth were no more; the sea also passed away and was no more. And as there is to be a new heaven and a new earth, it is only reasonable to suppose that there will be a new sea. Especially as we read of the river of life and that its waters go "down into the plain, and go into the sea." Eze. 47:8. Besides this, that we read in Isa. 35:6 of the new earth; "in the wilderness shall water break out and streams in the desert." Now if there shall be rivers and streams flowing through the new earth, it is only natural to suppose that there is some place to which they flow, and that place a new sea.

More than this, when God made the heaven and the earth, in the beginning, he also said: "Let the waters be gathered together unto one place; . . . and the gathering together of the waters called he seas." Gen. 1:9, 10. Now if there had never been any sin on the earth, certainly this sea would have remained as long as the earth and its paradise remained, which of course would have been for ever and ever. But sin entered, and grew so great that the flood came, and by that the quantity of water was greatly increased upon the earth, because the "windows of heaven were opened," and the fountains of the great deep were

broken up. Gen. 7:11. In 2 Esdras 6:42 we have a hint of what the ancients thought of this; "upon the third day thou didst command that the waters should be gathered in the seventh part of the earth."

And so when "the earth and the heaven" because of sin shall flee away from the face of him who shall sit upon the great white throne, then this sea, which has been so greatly increased because of sin, will also flee away with them, and like them there will be found no place for it; it will be no more. Then when he who sits upon the throne says: "Behold I make all things new," the sea must be made new or it will not be true that he makes all things new. And so there will be not only a new heaven and a new earth, but a new sea also. All new.

Therefore we conclude that when John says, "and there was no more sea," he has reference exclusively to that sea that belongs with the earth and the heaven which she had just seen flee away, and for which no place was found.

Dr. Clarke says on this passage: "The sea no more appeared then did the first heaven and earth. All was made new."

The "Bible Commentary" says: "(2) The former 'sea' has passed away like the former 'earth,' but this does not preclude a 'new' sea, any more than a new 'earth.'"

A. T. JONES.

### **"Healdsburg College" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 39 , p. 623.**

BEING at Healdsburg College, on business, October 6 and 7, I took occasion to visit the College and the Students' Home. At the college I found more than ninety pupils, ranging from childhood to middle age, earnestly engaged in their studies, guided by a corp of seven teachers, besides the principal, Professor Brownsburger. I visited every room and listened to the recitations, all of which were very interesting; but that which impressed me most was the deep interest taken by the teachers. It seemed to be their greatest care that every one in the class should thoroughly understand the lesson. If there was anything that any one did not see clearly, he would state it frankly, then the teacher would take it up and go over it again, and even again and again, enlarging, and illustrating until every part of the lesson was made perfectly plain to every one. And all done with the most cheerful kindness; no sign of impatience, no censure. It is inconceivable that any one should go to school there without learning well and thoroughly everything that he studies.

At night I had the pleasure of enjoying the hospitality of the Students' Home. I do not say "boarding-house," for that would be a misnomer applied here. It was indeed a pleasure. Everything so tidy and in such perfect order; everything done with such cheerful alacrity; all tends to give that peaceful, pleasant, home influence which is really soothing and restful, and by which one feels that the blessing of God, and his angels abide there. Nearly fifty of the students dwell at the "home," and every one seemed to be entirely satisfied with the place and the surroundings. Indeed I cannot see how it could be otherwise. Every dwelling-room is nicely carpeted and nicely furnished, the table abundantly supplied with the very best of food, and that well-cooked. In truth nothing short of a first-class

hotel could equal the accommodations, and nothing short of a first-class home in every sense of the word could equal the influence of the Students' Home.

And I would say to Seventh-day Adventist parents on all the Pacific Coast, who have children to send to school, Don't fail to send them to Healdsburg College, and have them dwell at the Students' Home. Some will probably say, "The expense is so much more than at the public school at home." Admitting that the expense is somewhat more, it is absolutely true that the benefits are infinitely greater. So send them along. And to Seventh-day Adventists on the coast, who have not children to send, as well as all those who have, let not your hands be slacking furnishing means to the institution, that it may never lacking in its splendid efficiency. He who will be a friend of the Healdsburg College is the friend of the Third Angel's Message.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**October 23, 1884**

**"How to Honor the Reformers" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 40 , p. 626.**

IN the *Independent* of October 9, 1884, Rev. David Macrae, of Dundee, Scotland, gives an excellent article on "The Scottish Covenanters, and How to Honor Them," in which he tells some wholesome truth to those "who claim to be the Covenanters successors," which is as closely applicable to those who profess to be the successors of Luther, or Wesley, or any other of the Reformers, as it is to be the would-be successors of the Covenanters. With much more that is good, he says:—

"Some people seem to think that the more rightly they adhere to the Covenanters' doctrinal views, the more honor they do to the Covenanters themselves, and the more entitled they are to be regarded as their successors. But in point of fact, such people are doing discredit to the spirit of the Covenants, while adhering to the letter, and, under the impression that they are honoring the Covenanters, are doing them the greatest injustice. For, to adhere to the theological dogmas and political tenants of the Covenanters, in the form in which they held them, is to make the monstrous assumption that, if the Covenanters had lived till our time, they would never have got beyond the point where they stood in the seventeenth century. It is to assume that, after two hundred years of prayer for more light, they would never have got any, or, getting it, would have refused to receive it. It is to assume that they would have studied the Bible for two centuries, and never have learned anything more of its character, its purpose, and its meaning than they did. It is to assume that they would have watched the operations of God's providence, and witnessed the struggle and the development of Christianity for two hundred years, without learning anything more of God's ways, or of man's duty, then they did it first.

Such a supposition is far from complementary. Truth remains the same, but not man's knowledge of it. The motions of the planets are the same now as in Ptolemy's time; but Ptolemy's view of their motion was a mistaken view. His system had to give way before a fuller knowledge of the facts. There is a similar change and progress in theology; not in the facts on which a true theology is based, but in man's knowledge in interpretation of these facts. . . .

"Those, therefore, who are the true successors of the Covenanters, are not those who stand where the Covenanters stood two hundred years ago, but those who, advancing in the lines which the Covenanters struggle to keep open, stand now where the Covenanters themselves would have stood had they enjoyed the advantage of two centuries more of thought, and research, and Christian experience, such as the Christian commonwealth has had since their time. . . .

"The mistake of those who claim especially to be the Covenanters' successors is that they cleave to the Covenanters' errors, and allow the living principles by which these errors would have been rectified, to escape. . . .

"There is much, indeed, that our Christian churches of to-day have yet to learn from the Covenanters of two hundred years ago. Had they more of the Covenanters' loyalty to truth, we should not see so many doctrines maintained in the creed professed, which are no longer believed. We should not see churches professing to be Protestant the, paying two antiquated confessions of faith, and catechisms, the same homage which Catholics paid to the pope, only more shameful because less sincere.

"With such trust in the truth and fearless loyalty to conviction as the Covenanters had, we should see in the church is more men dealing with arrogance and error as Luther did when he nailed his theses to the church door at Wittenberg; as Cameron and Cargill did, when, with life at stake, they affixed their declaration to the marke, cross at Sanquhar, two hundred years ago. We should see the churches themselves entering more boldly upon the path of progress in reform, which such men kept open, and striving to do for this generation, with its new ones, what the Scottish Covenanters did so nobly for theirs."

We are glad of these words from such a source, for we see the spirit which they reproof, so persistently manifested in the churches of the present day, whenever the claims of the fourth commandment are presented. They act as though what the Reformers did not hold and practice must be rejected as, *prime facie*, false, and as though all that was ever to be learned of doctrine and progress in Bible truth, had been learned by the Reformers, and that the churches as their true successors are therefore the repositories of all truth, and the utmost limit of Christian progress; and that what ever arises that differs from what they believe, must be heresy just *because* it so differs. But as Dr. Macrae

says, such are not the successors of the Reformers, but they are rather the successors of those who persecuted them.

It has ever been so. The Lutherans were ready to pour out their furious invectives against Melancthon, only because, after Luther's death, he made some advance; and there stand the Lutherans yet, just where Luther left them, and where the advancing truth left them, and they still profess to be the true successors of Luther, and seek to honor him, by seeing no more in the noonday of the nineteenth century than Luther saw in the dimness and mist of the early dawn of the sixteenth. It would be only to repeat the same story, to tell of the other reformers in churches which have successively arisen, each of them persecuted in its turn by the one which had gone before; all, after becoming established and popular, resisting vigorously any advance in the knowledge of religious truth; all seeking to honor the leaders in their reform, by knowing no more truth than they did, and treating as heretics all who urge upon the attention of the people any Bible truth, however plainly expressed, which the leaders of their particular reform did not see. Yet all these reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Calvin, Arminius, and the Wesleys, were without exception heretics each in his time; but each one was a reformer. The reformer is always a heretic. He is always counted as an enthusiast, and very often a fanatic. Such is the heritage, in his day, of every reformer, and such he must expect to be counted, if he will do the work of a reformer. In the very nature of things it must be so. For He goes squarely against the established customs and order of things. He cries out against the popular ideas and practices of the day. And human nature is not going to be disturbed in its popularity, its pleasures, and its pleasant dreams, and take it all calmly. The waters of that immense stream are not going to be turned from their accustomed channel without resistance.

Nevertheless, knowing all this, and expecting it all, in knowing also the truth and the virtue of the principle which he advocates, the reformer as he really is, but heretic as he is held, out of pure love of the principal, urges it always, everywhere, and against all opposition, until finally he achieves its success, and compels its recognition. Just then the reform encounters its greatest danger, the discussion of which we reserve for another occasion.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**October 30, 1884**

**"Reform and Popularity" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41 , p. 642.**

"IT is the universal law that whatever pursuit, whatever doctrine, becomes fashionable, shall lose a portion of that dignity which it had possessed while it was confined to a small but earnest minority, and was loved for its own sake alone."—*Macaulay's England, Chapter 8, Paragraph 136.*

A short study of the history of reforms, will be sufficient to convince any one of the truth of this observation. Fashionableness, popularity, is the one great danger

of every reform. For just as soon as, from pure love of the principle, by self-denial, sacrifice, and faithful endeavor, it has been carried to that point where it compels recognition, and begins to grow popular, it receives accessions because of its popularity, and not because of its truth; because of its fashionableness, and not because it is loved; and this, as expressed above, inevitably detracts from that dignity which it possessed when it was loved for its own sake alone. This spirit soon pervades the whole body, leaders and all, and then the leaders dare not press any thing upon the people, more than they accepted because of its popularity, and soon, "like people like priest" (Hos. 4:9), it reaches the point where the special reform which they represent, cannot itself be preached in the simplicity and dignity with which it arose, because even that has become unpopular. And just as surely as one begins to press these things upon their notice, he will be slighted; and if he persists in it, he will as surely be accounted a "troubler of Israel," and will be ostracized, and if his work goes on, it must do so outside of the communion with which it has hitherto been connected. It must begin again in weakness, in humility, in self-denial, in reproached, and in separation, *because it is unpopular.*

In this very thing lies the reason and the philosophy of the *fact* stated by Wendell Phillips: "No reform, moral or intellectual, ever came down from the upper classes of society. Each and all came up from the protest of martyr and victim."

Again Mr. Phillips says: "No man, in the pulpit or on the platform, can be true to the truth, and at the same time be popular with his generation." The tendency of the truth, either moral or intellectual, is to reform, and no reform is ever popular. When it becomes popular, truth is compromised and loses its power. Whosoever, therefore, will love the truth must do so at the expense of his popularity. Christ illustrated these principles, in his choice of his disciples. The Pharisees, also, at the same time gave an illustration of the principles here evolved. When the officers had returned, not bringing Christ as they had been ordered, to their "Never man spake like this man," the answer was made, "Have any of the rulers were the Pharisees believed on him?" And when Nicodemus simply call their attention to a principle of justice and the law, which, if allowed, they knew must be in Jesus' favor, they cried out, "Art thou also of Galilee?" John 7:45-52. And although even among the chief rulers, there were some who believed in the truth he taught, and the evidences of his mission, they would not confess him, because of the Pharisees, and lest they should be put out of the synagogue. Then the apostle gives the gist of this whole subject: "For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." John 12:42, 43. They loved popularity more than they love the truth, and that, too, which they really believed to be the truth.

Yet "the common people heard him gladly;" because, as is well expressed by Robertson Smith: "The religious *life* of Israel was truer than the teaching of the Pharisees."—*Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Lecture 5, last paragraph but one.* They were willing to believe on him, to love him, and to the efforts of the Pharisees to take him, they were very pertinently asked, "When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles then [*sic.*] these which this man hath done?" The

Pharisees could not avoid seeing the force of this argument, for they could not deny that Messiah would certainly come; well, if when he should come he should do no more miracles than those which he had done, why was not this he? But no; all questions, all reasonings must be set aside because he did not foster their pride, nor promote their popularity. If he had gone to them, every part of his doctrine would have been by them warped into conformity with their proud lives; and so, if he would have his mission proved a success, if he would have the truth grow, in its purity, he was compelled to go to the common people, to those who would receive the truth, and the love of it for its own sake alone, to those who would conform their lives to the perfect form of the doctrine, and not seek to bend the doctrine into the imperfect shape of their evil lives.

This work of Christ, in his immediate presence on the earth, was not an exception to the rule by which the progress of his truth has been worked out. It was rather the laying down of the rule itself. Prof. Robertson Smith truly says: "Throughout the history of the church it has always been found that the silent experience of the pious people of God has been truer, and has led the people in a safer path, than the public decrees of those who claim to be authoritative leaders of theological thought.—*Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Lecture 5, last sentence.* And so again we are brought to the truth that no Reform has ever come down from the upper classes of society. And coming up from the protest of smarter and victim it has to meet all the pride of place and power of popularity, and with only the simple truth it overcomes all. The truth and the love of it is the reformer's "shield and buckler." The truth will reach the conscience and compel assent. Then the individual must make his choice, whether he will love the praise of men more than the praise of God, whether he loves popularity more than he loves truth. Truth is demonstrable, and even when a person decides against it in his practice, he cannot deny the evidence upon which the proposition is based. The only way in which he can justify his opposition is to *destroy the evidence.*

To illustrate: When many of the people believe on Jesus, basing their faith in his Messiahship on the fact that he had raised Lazarus from the dead, then the chief priest "consulted that they might *put Lazarus to death.*" John 12:10, 11. Exactly; the only way they could evade the truth was to destroy the evidence by killing Lazarus. They would go to the length of committing murder, rather than to acknowledge what they could not deny. The papal persecutions, and all others, have been carried on in the same channel. When the Bible was appealed to, it was destroyed. Then when the heretic in his words and his life gave evidence to the truth, his life was destroyed.

Opposition to the Third Angel's Message is conducted on the same principle. The substance of that message is reform on the ten commandments, particularly the fourth. Without special reference to that commandment, we may ask the "chief rulers" of any orthodox church in all the land, whether the ten commandments are the law of God; whether they are every one binding on all people; whether they are immutable, unchangeable; whether that is the fundamental law; whether it is the constitution of the moral world; whether it is the truth; whether the fourth commandment is as binding as the first or the seventh, or any other one? and to every one of these questions they will answer

emphatically, Yes. Then we may turn to the fourth commandment and read, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work;" and ask them to obey it, and what do they do? They attempt to destroy the evidence by abolishing the law. And from the positions taken by the National Reform Party, as well as from the message itself, we are assured that their endeavors will not be confined to the law, but that when they get the power, it will be extended against those who respect and maintain the obligation of the law. And still they will call that *reform*, which in every feature is contrary to the word of God, the truth, the basis of all reform. But in no single point does it agree with the principles of true reform. It arose and is carried on by those who claim to be authoritative leaders of theological thought, who, as quoted above, have never been safe guides. It comes down from the upper classes of society, which no reform has ever done, and which we have seen it can never do. Those who advocate it are popular, which Wendell Phillips declared no man can be "and be true to the truth." More than all these, the fundamental principle of the whole cause, viz., the Sunday sabbath, is a falsehood from its very inception. They may call it National Reform all they please, but the more it is examined in the light of truth, the more plainly it appears that there is not a single element of reform in the whole movement.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Note" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41 , p. 642.**

Since writing the above the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 16 has come to hand, containing a portion of a paper read by Rev. A. T. Pierson, D. D., before the Ministerial Union of Philadelphia, from which I clipped the following strong confirmation of the points of the foregoing article:—

"We are often fettered by our denominationalism. Brought up to exalt our sectarian standards, and use, and politics, we sometimes degenerate into religious partisans and politicians, espousing our sect, because it is our sect. We stand by our callers, whether it is the color of the blood or not! We preach and teach what we find in our denominational standards, whether or not we give an intelligence scriptural reason for our position. Have we the boldness to face opposition and ridiculed for the sake of the truth? And, if a candid, careful searching of the word should compel us to believe that our denominational position is unscriptural in any respect, would we simply follow the light God might give us, or consent to silence and compromise with conscience? Many of us are hindered in preaching the word and in directing the affairs of Christ's body, by the very officers of our church, and especially by ungodly trustees! If, out of profound convictions, born of prayer and spiritual travail, we should insist upon a new and more spiritual conduct of our churches, or preach some gospel truth that pierces the quick, there are some church officers who would come between us and the

congregation, and request us to keep silence or resign."  
A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 11:4-13" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41 , pp. 646, 647.**

**NOVEMBER 16–1 KINGS 11:4-13**

IN the present lesson our attention is turned from Solomon in his uprightness, when he was the beloved of the Lord, to Solomon in his degradation, when "the Lord was angry with" him; from Solomon building a temple for Jehovah, which the Lord accepted and hallowed for his own name, to Solomon building temples for Ashtoreth, and Chemosh, and Molech, and for the gods of all his strange wives, the abominations of heathendom, which God abhorred; from Solomon worshipping the God of Heaven in such a height of purity and faith, and with such wondrous acceptance that it brought the very presence of Heaven down upon the earth, to Solomon in such depth of iniquity worshipping idols, and joining in the murderous and licentious rites of all the heathen nations round about; from Solomon in the fear of God, and from a deep sense of sin, burning sweet incense to the Lord, offering to him the acceptable sacrifices of sheep and oxen, and praying to him for forgiveness, for light, for strength, and for wisdom, to Solomon burning incense to devils, helping on the sacrifice to them of smiling babes and innocent children, and opening the gates of iniquity by which the whole land should be stained with innocent blood. In short we are turned from the contemplation of "Solomon in all his glory," to the contemplation of Solomon and all his shame.

"KING Solomon loved many strange women." It seems that at this time Solomon cared for nothing but to have his own way. Contrary to the express command of the Lord, in Deut. 17:16, he did multiplied horses to and self and he carried on with Egypt a regular traffic in horses and chariots, until he had for himself one thousand four hundred chariots, which with three horses for each chariot—two to work and one in reserve—would make four thousand two hundred horses; then he had twelve thousand horsemen—cavalry—besides. But he did not conduct this trade for himself alone. He had horses and chariots brought out of Egypt for the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of Syria, and there can be hardly a doubt that this traffic in horses with the Hittites and the other nations led him into his sinful connection with these "strange women," for seven hundred of his wives were "princesses," the daughters of these heathen kings with whom he was trading in horses. Had Solomon been obedient to the Lord, he would have been saved from all this, for Deut. 17:18 says: "And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of this kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book. . . . and it shall be with him, and he shall read there in all the days of is life." In this which he was to write, and read for himself was contained particularly in the two foregoing verses forbidding the very thing which Solomon did. "He shall not multiplied horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiplied horses; for as much as the Lord hath said unto you,

Ye shall return no more that way. *Neither shall he multiplied wives to himself* that his heart turn not away." Solomon did send into Egypt, and multiplied courses unto himself; this led to the traffic with the heathen around him; this led him to the gathering to himself of the many strange women, and these led him to the final and fatal step, and his heart was turned away from his God.

"WHEN Solomon was old," the text says. Not old in years, for he was only about forty-nine, but the dissipation consequent upon having seven hundred wives, every one of them shamefully licentious, besides three hundred concubines, who could have certainly been no better,—all this made him "old" though only in the prime of his years.

"HIS wives turned away his heart after other gods." And what fearful Gods they were! Devils, the psalmist calls them (Ps. 106:37, 38); and devils they were.

"Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians." The "queen of heaven" of Jer. 7:18 and 44:19, the Astarte of the Greeks, the Venus of the Romans, and under different names worshiped by all of the ancient East, and though having different names, and yet was always worshiped in the same manner, and which is fully expressed in one word—*lasciviousness*. She was the female Baal, and corresponded to the moon as Baal did to the sun. She represented the female principle in generation as Baal did the male. She was always worshiped in connection with him, and the rites of her worship corresponded to that idea. Her priests were men dressed in women's clothes; her priestesses were harlots, and the only worship was prostitution.

647

MILCOM of the fifth verse is identical with Molech of the seventh, and Molech of the Ammonites is the same as Chemosh of the Moabites, and both are the same as Baal of the Canaanites and other Eastern nations generally. It is with Baal as with Ashtoreth above, although called by different names, he is the same god, and his worship the same amount all the ancient nations. He represents the sun; and the worship of Baal, Molech, Chemosh, or by whatever name, was sun-worship. The form of his worship is described in the words of the Bible about Ahaz (2 Chron. 28:2, 3): "For He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, and made also molten images for Baalim. Moreover he burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and *burnt his children in the fire*, after the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel." Baalim in the text is the plural form of Baal, and signifies the images of Baal in connection with Ashtoreth, set up and worshiped together. So we see that children born of the licentious worship of Ashtoreth, were burned in the fire in the worship of Baal. Not all of the children, of course, but such as they should choose to sacrifice. The priests of Molech (Baal) ranked above the princes, and were next to the king, and sometimes even the king himself was a priest, as in the case of the father of the infamous Jezebel, who was himself a priest of Ashtoreth, and was also dedicated to Baal. It was such daughters, of such men as these, from whom Solomon took his seven hundred wives. No wonder they turned away his heart from the Lord. No wonder that in cleaving to these in their impurity he did it at the expense of forsaking Jehovah, who will be worshiped in purity alone. No wonder that now we read in quick succession: "And the Lord

stirred up an adversary on to Solomon." Verse 14. "And God stirred up another adversary." Verse 23. "And Jeroboam . . . even he lifted up his hand against the king." Verse 26. No more can Solomon right as he did in his youth to Hiram: "But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent." 1 Kings 5:4. Adversaries on all sides, from the kings abroad and from his own subjects at home. Evil "occurrent" everywhere. From his own sowing of evil, springs and abundant harvest, and he has to begin the reaping. No more can he be called Solomon—*peace*—but rather Magor-misabib—*fear round about*, for there is fear on every side, and God above all against him, to rend the kingdom from him as though no longer fit to rule over men. And in closing we may quote the words used ages after by Nehemiah in correcting sins in Israel: "Among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel; nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin." Neh. 13:26.

SOLOMON'S life is an example and a warning. In his youth an example of how good God is to all who seek him in humility, and in entire dependence upon him, an example of how "the blessing of the Lord it maketh rich, and he addeth no sorrow with it." Prov. 10:22. In his latter days his life is a warning to all, of man's helplessness when he forsakes the path which the Lord has marked out for us to walk in. It shows that, however great a man's wisdom may be, or however grand may be his success, while serving the Lord in sincerity, all the wisdom that he had acquired will not keep him from becoming a fool, and that all the success that he had achieved will not prevent his making a miserable failure, when He ceases to serve the Lord. Therefore cling close to the word of God. "The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom." Job 28:28. "Good success have all they that do his commandments." Ps. 111:10 margin. The words of David to Solomon are still the words of the Lord to every one of the children of men. Know thou God "and serve with him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind; for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts, *if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsaken him, he will cast thee off forever.*" 1 Chron. 28:9.

ALONZO T. JONES.

## **November 6, 1884**

**"Reaping What They Have Sown" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 42 , p. 658.**

FOR forty years the Third Angel's Message has been being given to the world. For forty years the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus, have been held up before the people. All these years the truth that "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," has been declared with zeal, with energy, and with power. Opposition from many sources it has had to meet, but chiefly from the *ministers* of all the different denominations. These have never wearied in telling, by tongue and by pen, in public and in private, that "the Sabbath was a Jewish

institution, and is abrogated;" that "the Sabbath, with all the other commandments, was the law of Moses; that these were all ceremonial, and were all abolished," etc., etc. Now, when they try to impress upon their hearers the duty and the importance of keeping Sunday as Sabbath, they are met with the same arguments that they have used against the obligation of the Sabbath of the Lord.

In a paper read before the Ministerial Union of Philadelphia, Sept. 29, 1884, Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D.D., complains of this in the following words: "The sanctity of the Lord's day is but a remnant, if not a relic of the past; and if this process goes on, within the present century Sabbath sanctification will be among the curiosities of archeology and paleology! Christians apologize for this, on the ground that the 'Sabbath is a Jewish institution' and is abrogated, making no distinction between the *ceremonial* and the *moral* law. . . . Other disciples do away with the consecrated seventh of time as with the consecrated tenth of money, on the ground that *all time* and property are holy unto the Lord, and so the practical effect is that they consecrate *nothing*."

This is the sober truth, but the people are not to blame. These very apologies, in these very words, have been put into their mouths by the ministers, by the very ones who now complain against them. Little did these men think all these years that in thus opposing the Sabbath of the Lord they were brandishing a sword that would cut both ways; little did they think that they were hatching cockatrice' eggs that would break out into vipers to sting themselves, little did they think that in loosening the restraints of the law of God, they were thus sowing dragon's teeth; little did they realize that in making these objections, and in appealing to popularity, and worldly interest, against the Sabbath, they were destroying respect for the whole law of God, and implanting a disposition to break any command in so far as it conflicts with these interests.

The word of the Lord says: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." James 2:10, 11. The same consideration, or the same disposition that would lead a man to kill, would likewise lead him to commit adultery, or to steal, or to bear false witness, or to break the Sabbath, or to violate any or all of the commandments of God that come in his way. All will agree with that. Now turn it the other way, and it is equally true, whether all agree with it or not. The same consideration or disposition that will lead a man to break the Sabbath, will lead him under like circumstances to break any other of the commandments of God; because it is not out of fear of God nor respect for his law that he keeps so much of it as he does, but because otherwise public opinion would condemn him; but only let public opinion change so that it would wink at, or palliate, or justify what it now condemns, and he is ready to break any commandment that in any way conflicts with his worldly interests. So when the ministers play into the hands of the people, as they are doing, by inveighing against the Sabbath of the Lord, and, by appealing to public opinion or selfish interests, loosen those just and wholesome restraints which are placed upon human nature by the law of God, they are doing more than all else combined to

bring to the full those perilous times which the Scriptures portray, when men shall be "lovers of their own selves," "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-13. "But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way and from the evil of their doings." Jer. 23:22.

The ministers have taught the people to say: "If everybody else will keep Sabbath, I will." Now, when they call upon these for a stricter observance of Sunday, their teaching comes back to them in the words, "If everybody else will keep *Sunday*, I will." And so to satisfy the demand which they themselves have created, they are obliged to work up civil enactments under a constitutional amendment by which everybody shall be compelled to keep Sunday. For example: In his report to the *Christian Statesman* (Sept. 25, 1884), from Newton, Iowa, Rev. M. A. Gault, says:—

"J. B. Carnes raised the practical question why the Chicago and Rock Island Railroad could run large excursion trains on the 'sabbath' from Davenport to Colfax Springs, putting the fare so low as to tempt thousands to violate both the laws of the State and the law of God, by desecrating the sabbath. This railroad has been running excursion trains from Des Moines to Colfax Springs on the sabbath, for some time, and *ministers complain that their members go on these excursions*. . . . It is not difficult to persuade them that the National Reform movement presents the only effectual means of saving the sabbath. We need a sabbath law that will bind the Government and the corporation, as well as the individual." (By "sabbath" he means Sunday always.)

Again in the same paper is a selection from Rev. R. W. Clark, in which he says:—

"The Sunday press has been established in defiance of Almighty God. God says, Keep the Sabbath holy. The Sunday newspaper says, Thou shalt not keep it holy. . . . The public mind shall be filled with the current news and the latest transactions in the stock markets; the taste shall be so vitiated with fascinating tales, racy gossip, and scandal in high life and low, that there shall be no desire for things holy and spiritual. . . . The Sunday press says there shall be *no rest for even God's people*, except what is found in secular and frivolous reading and Sunday recreations. . . . The Puritan sabbath is obsolete. The times are changed, that is a truth; and if the sabbath in America is shattered, they will change more. For God says: 'The nation that will not serve me shall perish, yea that nation shall be wasted.'"

Just so. As long as there are excursion trains on Sunday, the church members will go on excursions. As long as there are Sunday newspapers, the church members will read "fascinating *tales*, racy *gossip*, and *scandal* in high life and low." Those things that should not be read at all, they will read on Sundays. Therefore the Sunday trains must be stopped, and the Sunday papers suppressed. Because they have not enough of the grace of God, nor the love of right, *to do right*, they insist that the Government shall take away the *opportunity*

to do wrong. Say they: We will have the "National Reform movement" take away all opportunity for us to do wrong, *then* we will all do right. And they will call that serving the Lord!! The devil himself could serve the Lord that way. *And he would still be the devil.* Then to cap the climax, they will quote that scripture, "The *nation* that will not serve me shall perish," being always careful to emphasize the word "nation." But we should like to ask: If the nation that will not serve the Lord shall perish, then how about the church members who will not serve him? And, if the church members will not keep Sunday till the nation takes away from them all opportunity to violate it, how can it be expected that the nation will keep Sunday without a like office being performed for it? Oh, "the National Reform movement presents the *only* effectual means of saving the sabbath." The National Reform movement will effectually guard the nation against all anti-Sunday influences or tendencies. Yes, great is National Reform. It alone can save the sabbath. It alone can save the nation. It alone can save the church. It is the *summum bonum*, the *ultimate thule*, the *ne plus ultra*.

Yet the National Reform movement has a more difficult task to accomplish than that of stopping Sunday trains, and suppressing Sunday newspapers; that is, to stop the progress of the Third Angel's Message. That message began in the United States, before the National Reform movement. It has developed a people here called Seventh-day Adventists. They keep with the rest of the commandments of God that one which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work." They are going to remain here as long as this is a nation; *they are not going to keep Sunday*, and they are going to use every fair means, by voice and pen, in public and in private, by prayer and faithful endeavor, to constrain all others to keep the seventh day, and oppose the keeping of Sunday. And how will the National Reform movement save the Sunday, and the nation, from these anti-Sunday influences? We shall see.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Proverbs 1:1-16" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 42 , pp. 662, 663.**

### **NOVEMBER 23—PROVERBS 1:1-16**

SOLOMON was a very voluminous writer. He spoke three thousand proverbs, and a thousand and five songs. He spoke of trees, from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that springs out of the wall. From all his writings, however, we have preserved to us only the present book of Proverbs, containing about four hundred, one song of which seems to have been the chiefest of all (Song. 1:1), and the short book of Ecclesiastes. It seems that from all the three thousand proverbs these were selected as being the best, "excluding all that were local, personal, or simply humorous," and retaining those only which fell in with the great moral and religious purpose of God in handing down his will to men. Here the child is taken, and, as it were, introduced to Wisdom herself in all her beauty, who, if he will allow her, takes him by the hand and leads him through the treacherous paths of youth to manhood, and to an old age which is itself a crown

of glory because found in the way of righteousness. Chap. 16:31. Here is instruction not only for the child and the youth, but for husband and wife, for father and mother, for the farmer, the merchant, the rich, the poor, the high, and the low. It is Wisdom's grand summary of instruction to the children of men.

THE purpose of the proverbs is stated in verses 1-4. "To know [give] wisdom and instruction; to perceive the words of understanding; to receive the instruction of wisdom, justice, and judgment, and equity; to give subtilty to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion." "To give subtilty"—acuteness, nicety of distinction, *i.e.*, the ability to distinguish the true from the false, to know the good, and to detect the bad; to see the right, and to discover any lurking tendency toward wrong.

663

"TO the simple."—On this we give the following from Dr. Clarke: "The word *simple*, from *simplex*, compounded of *sine*, without, and *plica*, a fold, signifies properly, plain and honest, one who has no bye-ends in view; who is what he appears to be; . . . but because *honesty and plain* dealing are so rare in the world, and none but the *truly religious* man will practice them, farther than the fear of the law obliges him, hence *simple* has sunk into a state of progressive deterioration. First it signified, as above, without fold, unmixed, uncompounded; this was its radical meaning. Secondly, as applied to *men*, it signified innocent, harmless, without disguise. Thirdly, such persons were rather an *unfashionable* sort of people, it sunk in its meaning to homely, homespun, mean, ordinary. And fourthly, as worldly men, . . . supposed that *wisdom, wit, and understanding*, were given to men that they might make the best of them in reference to *the things of this life*, the word sunk still lower in its meaning, and signified silly, foolish; and there, to the dishonor of our language and morals, it stands. . . . And *simplicity*, that meant at first openness, plain dealing, *downright honesty*, is now degraded to weakness, silliness, foolishness. And they will continue thus degraded till downright honesty and plain dealing get again into vogue." "To give subtilty to the simple" therefore signifies, to give, acuteness, tact, and nicety of distinction to the honest-hearted, the upright, the sincere.

"A WISE man will hear and will increase learning." Solomon has himself given us the meaning of wise as here used, "The tongue of the wise *useth knowledge aright*." Prov. 15:2. The right use of that which we have already learned not only creates a desire to learn more, but it imparts the ability to properly acquire and appreciate more. Such a man will indeed "increase learning;" he cannot help it; and every increase of such learning is an increase and strengthening of his wisdom. Wisdom therefore is not shown in the *amount* that we know, but in the *right use* of that which we know, however little it may be. "There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city. . . . Then said I, Wisdom is better than strength. Wisdom is better than weapons of war."

"AND . . . shall attain unto wise counsels." Literally, shall make himself a *pilot*. The cognate word is used thus in Eze. 27:8. That is he may gain "the power to steer his course rightly on the dangerous sea of life."

"THE fear of the Lord."—Not the slavish fear arising from dread of punishment. But that filial "fear" which springs from respectful reverence, and a fear to offend lest we cause pain to the one whom we have in view; that fears to do contrary to the wish of the one whom we serve, lest we disappoint his expectations of us and forfeit his confidence.

"IS the beginning of knowledge." The man who fears the Lord has entered upon a course of knowledge and wisdom, which is limited only by eternity. However little he may have acquired of knowledge, as the world goes, if he have the fear of the Lord, he has eternity before him, in which to increase knowledge. And though he have all the knowledge of all men of all the world, and have not the fear of the Lord, his little life is soon "rounded by a sleep," and all has ceased, all his knowledge is ended. For when he arises from the dead, it is to woeful destruction, and all that he was is brought to naught. The fear of the Lord *is* the beginning of knowledge.

"IF sinners entice thee consent thou not."—Or, as Dr. Clarke gives it, "*will* thou not," that is have a "*will* not" for all forms of evil enticement. There is nothing that will strengthen and confirm us in our determination to do right, and at the same time weaken the seducer to wrong, like a firm, decided, "I will not." If one would entice you to take strong drink, meet it with, I will not. If they would entice you to chew or smoke tobacco, or to run with them in 'ways that are dark and tricks that are vain,' give them a plain, I will not. They may sneer at, and make fun of you, yet in their hearts they will respect and honor you. The Lord says, "Them that honor me I will honor." "If sinners entice thee, *will* thou not."  
ALONZO T. JONES.

**November 13, 1884**

**"Perilous Times" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 43 , p. 674.**

"IN the last days perilous times shall come," says the Scripture. 2 Tim. 3:1. That we are in the last days, no one can doubt who will give any attention to the word of God on that subject, for that word has spoken so much about the last days that no one who will study, can fail to see that the times in which we live are those days. The disciples asked the Saviour, "What shall be the *sign* of thy coming?" Matt. 24:3. He answered, "There shall be *signs*." Luke 21:25. They asked for but one "sign," he said there shall be a number, "signs." Peter, quoting from Joel, says, "And I will show wonders in heaven above and signs in the earth beneath." Acts 2:19. These signs are so numerous, and in such places, that every one who is not warned by them will be without excuse. "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth." Luke 21:25, 26. Now count the number of places where these signs are to be. (1) In the sun; (2) in the moon, (3) in the stars, (4) and upon the earth, (5) and amongst the nations, (6) and upon the sea, (7) and among men themselves, their hearts

failing for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. Men will see these things coming, their hearts will fail them for fear, because of them, yet they will fail to draw from them the only lesson that there is in them, namely, the Lord is coming. He says: "When these things *begin* to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth night." These things began to come to pass in 1780. Then the sun was darkened, and the moon also, as the consequence. Again, the Saviour said, "When ye shall see all these things, know that he is near, *even at the doors.*"

Now is there any one of these things named by the Saviour as signs, which cannot be seen by any one at the present day? It is a historical fact that the sun and the moon were darkened May 19, 1780; and this fact is perpetuated as unexplainable, in each successive edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, the highest human authority in the English language. It is likewise a fact that in November, 1833, occurred the greatest star-shower ever known, which fact is perpetuated in the astronomical geographies and treatises, as well as in many other kinds of records. Again, what nation is at ease and in quiet? Not one. Our own nation, the best one of all, is not. It is a fact that there is distress with perplexity as never before in every nation. Mark the expression, "distress of nations, *with perplexity.*" Webster says, "We are *perplexed* when our feelings, as well as judgment, are so affected that we know not how to decide or act." Nations have been grievously distressed before, but they always knew just what to do to relieve themselves. The peculiarity of the present "distress of nations," is the "perplexity"—they do not know how to decide or act; they do not know which way to turn. Therein lies the sign, and nothing below the divine mind of Christ could have penetrated it. "The sea and the waves roaring," spreading affliction and calamity, and all can see it. "Men's hearts" *are* "failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." The cyclones, the waterspouts, and the fearful floods, carrying destruction in their paths, none knowing when nor where they will come, are the very embodiment of that which causes men's hearts to fail them for fear." There is not one of those signs in the heavens that may not be seen by all, in the most authentic records; and there is not one of these signs upon the earth that *is not seen* by all in the very fact itself. Be he believer or unbeliever, he does see all these things. This is the fact, but it only points to the other, and most stupendous fact, that the second coming of Christ is at the doors. He says, "When ye shall see all these things, *know* that he is . . . *even at the doors.*" The people *do* see all these things. He *is* at the very doors.

But it is not in these things that the peril lies which is referred to in 2 Tim. 3. These evidences only show that we are in the days when the perilous times shall be. The perils are from other causes: "In the last days perilous times shall come *for* [because] men shall be lovers of their own selves." And from this root, *selfishness*, grows the fearful catalogue of eighteen forms of sin, named in the following verses. In the sins of the last days lies the peril.

"As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:37. "The earth also was corrupt before God; and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh

had corrupted his way upon the earth." "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6:11, 12, 5. "Every imagination of the thoughts," on which Dr. Clarke says: "The very first embryo of every idea, the figment of every thought, the very materials out of which perception, conception, and ideas were formed were all evil." "And the Lord said my Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh." Again says Dr. Clarke: "They were flesh, wholly sensual, the desires of the mind overwhelmed and lost in the desires of the flesh." Every desire was fleshly, and every effort was only in the direction of satisfying such desires, with the natural and inevitable result, as the Saviour expresses it, "They were marrying and giving in marriage," and with nothing in view but the satisfaction of the fleshly desires, it was an easy step to where "They took them wives of all which they chose." Gen. 6:2.

Now let any one take the divorce records of any of the County or District Courts, in the United States, or the statistics which are compiled from these, and in view of the wonderful facility with which divorces are obtained, let him ask himself whether we are not fallen upon such times as were in the days of Noah? Whether men do not now take to them wives of all that they choose? In itself marriage is right. It was instituted by the Lord himself. It is the dearest relationship of the human race. It is honorable in all when it is entered into in the fear of God, and when the relationship is maintained in accordance with those sanctions which God has established. But when people are married to be divorced, and divorced to be married, all respect for the relationship and its obligations is annihilated, and the institution is destroyed.

From this the evil goes on in the descending scale to another stage mentioned by the Saviour, "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot . . . even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:28-30. That it is the moral condition of the world that is here referred to, as well as to worldly carelessness and lack of faith in the great event which is to come upon them, is plainly shown in 2 Peter 2, where he is writing of the same things spoken of by the Saviour; after giving the instance of Noah and his times, he takes up Sodom and Gomorrha, and speaks of "just Lot vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked; for that righteous man dwelling among them in *seeing* and *hearing* vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds."

Paul also shows that this is the point that is reached in the full development of the perilous times. He says: "For of this sort are they which creep into houses and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." But he not only shows what the condition of affairs will be, but he shows how it is brought about. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." 2 Tim. 3:6-8. "As [in the same manner] Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses." By turning to the record in the seventh and eighth chapters of Exodus, we learn that it was by miracles that these men withstood Moses, and Paul says as they did, "*so do these* resist the truth." Now if it be so, as all the other scriptures show that we are in the perilous times, for this specification to be met, and thus these positions be fully confirmed, there should be in the world at the present time, people who resist the truth (the word of God, John 17:17) by

working miracles, showing signs, and doing wonders. It is well known that Spiritualism does these things. It is equally well known that the very first of the efforts of Spiritualism everywhere is to destroy confidence in the Bible as the truth of God, and to resist its obligations upon the people.

In speaking of the second coming of the Lord, Paul says, "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." This shows that just before the Saviour comes, Satan, by power and signs and wonders, will resist the truth of his coming, and the truth which will prepare a people for his coming. It is thus then that Satan, by miracles, and signs, resists the truth of God, and brings to the full the last days as were the days of Noah and the days of Lot. If any one will know the possibilities of evil that are in Spiritualism, let him read Deut. 18:9-14, with the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus, and he will see what it did for those nations which dwelt in Canaan. And when in the last days these same "spirits of devils, working miracles," "with all power" "go forth to the kings of the earth and the whole world" *it is* "to gather them to the battle of the great day of God." Thirty-six years have these "spirits of devils" been going forth. Soon, very soon will they gather the nations to the battle of the great day. "Who is on the Lord's side?" We are in the perilous times. Who will escape? Christ is at the doors. Who is ready when he shall knock to open to him *immediately?* Luke 12:36.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Proverbs 8:1-17" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 43 , pp. 678, 679.**

#### **NOVEMBER 30—PROVERBS 8:1-17**

[THE subject of this lesson is "True Wisdom." We have therefore thought it wise to allow Wisdom to tell her own story, and we have no hesitation in saying, and we are sure that all will agree, that it is the best set of Sunday-school notes that ever was written.

ALONZO T. JONES.]

#### **WISDOM CALLS**

"WISDOM crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets; she crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates; in the city she uttereth her words, saying, How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge?" Prov. 1:20-22.

**November 20, 1884**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Proverbs 23:29-35" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 44 , pp. 694, 695.**

WHO hath woe? "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until till wine enflame them!" "Woe unto them that are might be to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; which justified the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him!" Isa. 5:11, 22, 23. "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness!" Hab. 2:15. We see therefore that the woe of those who tarry long at the wine, is not confined to the trouble and sorrow that come in this life as the direct result of drunkenness, but that it reaches to the fearful punishment that destroys men for their and iniquity. Woe, woe, terrible, dreadful, and irremediable. Now, God has opened a way of escape from it. Those who, through Christ, overcome, will be saved, but " No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God."

"LOOK not thou upon the wine." Here Solomon gives the true and only safeguard, Look not upon the wine. This is the true principle of temperance, and although it is expressed here in regard to wine, and although the lesson to-day is touching strong drink, yet true temperance, Bible temperance, Christian temperance, does not consist in abstinence from strong drink alone. Therefore we shall treat the subject on the broad basis of Christian temperance.

695

TEMPERANCE is self control. Whenever in any of his appetites or passions a man loses control of himself, he is intemperate. Says Paul, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." 1 Cor. 9:27. In other words, I, myself, am determined to be master of myself. The truly Christian temperance man is master of himself, and the servant of Christ. And it is only as a faithful servant of Christ that a man can be master of himself. Thus he becomes his own free man, and Christ's servant; a real manly man; then he "dare do all that becomes a man; he dares do more is none."

IN view of the actual meaning of the word, how few temperance people there are! How few who really and decidedly have control of themselves! Very few indeed there are who are not subject to some habit which must and will be satisfied at whatever cost. Thousands are the slaves of strong drink. All that they have, all that they can get, goes to satisfy that which is insatiable. Every effort to appease it only increases its demands, and its power to exact them.

BUT where there are thousands thus the slaves of strong drink, there are hundreds of thousands who are the slaves of tobacco. Their children may be clothed in rags, and go barefoot in the cold, they may even lack bread, but they never lacked tobacco. If they have no money with which to buy it, they will go into debt for it, and if they cannot get credit, then they will even beg. Men who would think it a shame to beg for bread, are not ashamed to beg for tobacco. Such abject slaves are they. Have such persons control of themselves? No; tobacco control; this is master and will be served.

THEN there are thousands who are slaves to opium; thousands slaves to arsenic; thousand slaves to morphine; thousand slaves to absinthe; thousand slaves to hasheesh; and though not so great in degree, yet the same in kind, thousands are the slaves to be beer, or the servants of tea, or of coffee. "What!" some may exclaim, "is the use of tea or coffee intemperance?" It is. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," article on "Drunkenness," what did you suppose we find? The following: "In short, from tea to hasheesh, we have through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, a sort of a graduated scale of intoxicants, which stimulate in small doses, and narcotize in larger. The physiological action of all these agents gradually shades into each other, all producing, or being capable of producing, consecutive paralysis of the various parts of the nervous system. Even tea cannot be regarded as altogether free from the last named effects. Tea-sots are well known to be affected by palpitation, and irregularities of the heart, as well as with more or less sleeplessness, and mental irritability, and muscular tremors, which in some culminate in paralysis, while positive intoxication has been known to be the result of the excessive use of strong tea." And of coffee the same authority says: "It produces a feeling of buoyancy and exhilaration, *comparable* to a certain stage of *alcoholic intoxication*." So the only difference between tea or coffee and alcohol drinks, is the degree of its effects, and not at all in the nature of the effects. All have the intoxicating quality, and as quoted, from tea to hasheesh, it is only a graduated scale of intoxicants, through hops, alcohol, tobacco, and opium, each one shading into the other. All are relatives in the family of drunkenness, and the use of any one of them is intemperance.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON, when asked why he did not learn to use tobacco, replied, "I will create to myself no necessities." In this sentence there is much of that philosophical insight which could see in the falling of an apple a lot of the universe. In the economy of the human system there is no provision for either stimulants or narcotics. If ever there is a demand for these things, it has to be created. And more, such things as stimulants and narcotics (poisons) are the only ones for which the necessity can be created. It is impossible to form the habit of using any one particular kind of food. Through the agency of the digestive process, each organ will take up its portion of that which is food, and by assimilation will renew itself, and thus vitality is maintained; in fact this is vitality. If a person be hungry, any kind of food will satisfy, whether it be fruit or vegetables, meat or bread. It is not so with narcotics and stimulants. The appetite for these has to be created. And when it is created for any one of them, it is for that particular one, and nothing but that will satisfy the demand. If the appetite be for tea, and nothing but tea will satisfy. If it be for alcohol, nothing else will do, and so on through the list. Then look not upon the wine, touch not tobacco, taste not any of all the list of intoxicants; create to yourself no necessity; be temperate (self-controlling) in all things; keep under your body, and bring it into subjection; the master of yourself, and thus your own free man. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself." "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3:21.

A. T. JONES.

**November 27, 1884**

**"Human Nature and Its Restraints" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 45 , pp. 708, 709.**

LET any one compare the two pictures drawn by Paul, the one in Rom. 1:28-31, of the iniquity of ancient heathenism, the other in 2 Tim. 3:1-8, of the iniquity of the last days, even among those who have "a form of godliness," and he will see that they are exactly alike. In view of all the enlightenment of the present day, many wonder how it can be that men will descend to that depth of violence and iniquity which the Scriptures portray as characteristic of the last days. From a surface view of the subject, judged simply by appearances, it would seem highly improbable, if not impossible. But "all things are not what they seem;" and we must be guided, not by what appears to be, but what *is*.

Human nature, unrestrained, is the same in all ages. Whether in the days of Christ, or two thousand years before, or two thousand years after; whether manifested in the inhabitants of Canaan, or in the inhabitants of the United States, it is always the same. It is for this very reason that the Bible fits men, wherever on the earth it may find them. It is a book not for one tribe only, nor for the human race. *And it is the only book in the world that is.* The reason for that is, that the book was given by the One who knows human nature in its very essence.

God made man upright. He made him to remain so; he made him to be holy, and ever and forever good; he bestowed upon him powers by which all that was intended for him, and expected of him, could be accomplished. But he turned from the bright course which God set before him; he sinned, and so sold himself to do evil; and now the sublime powers which the Lord bestowed upon him to be exerted in the way of righteousness, are prostituted to evil. Faculties that would have been effectual in the accomplishment of the purposes of God concerning him, are now just as effectual in the accomplishment of the purposes of Satan. In the words of Jer. 23:10, his "course is evil," and his "force is not right." If ever, then, man shall be raised from his fallen state; if ever his lapsed powers shall be restored; if ever his "course" is to be in the way of good; if ever his "force" shall be right; if ever he shall be fitted for that position which he was created to fill; if, in short, he is ever to fulfill the purpose of his creation, it is indispensable that the tendency of every faculty be restrained, turned into the right course, and trained to follow it. The Bible meets this necessity; it meets it in every part, and satisfies it to the full. Therefore, this of itself, is proof that *the Creator of man is the author of the Bible.*

Human nature, then, being the same everywhere, the only thing that makes one person to differ from another *is the degree of restraint* each one recognizes in his own case. If, in a person, all the restraints of the law of God are recognized, he will be a man fitted for the society and fellowship of the angels. If, on the contrary, none of these are recognized, he will be a man fit only for the

society and fellowship of demons. Upon many persons, and in many ways, these restraints exert themselves unconsciously, as in the case of the infidel, who denies the authority of the existence of God, and despises his word. Yet the principles of that word are so imbedded in the society of which he is a member that he yields obedience to them, while he thinks he is defying them; but transplant him to the state of society which he advocates, where none of these principles are recognized, and none exerted, and he will run as readily in the way of iniquity as the veriest heathen that ever dwelt in the land of Canaan. And that other class of persons who call themselves "Christians," or even "Christian ministers," who, in their opposition to the obligations of the ten commandments, can hardly frame sentences that will sufficiently express the bitterness of their contempt for the law of God, some of these declaring that "it is dead and stinks," others calling it an "old thunder and lightning law," one preacher that I know of wishing that he "could thunder" his contempt for it,—only let the time come when such seed shall have borne its fruit, when society in following such teaching shall have reached that condition which would be defined in the very opposite of the ten commandments, and they will go as greedily in that evil way as did Balaam of old.

Again, many will restrain themselves from *doing* evil through fear of punishment, but take away the prospect of punishment, or satisfy them that there will be none, and they will go to any length that circumstances may allow. Henry VIII., although he regarded not God, as long as he feared the pope, did not dare to divorce his wife, but when he had broken through that restraint, he *cut off the heads of three wives*, and only a witty speech saved the head of the fourth.

Less than a hundred years ago, and more than two hundred and fifty years after the triumph of the Reformation, when in France the party in power, by a national act, legislated God out of existence, and declared death an eternal sleep, men deified a harlot, and terror reigned. "Then came those days when the most barbarous of all codes was administered by the most barbarous of all tribunals; when no man could greet his neighbors, or say his prayers, or dress his hair, without danger of committing a capital crime; when spies lurked in every corner; when the guillotine was long and hard at work every morning; when the jails were filled as close as the hold of a slaveship; when the gutters ran foaming with blood into the Seine. . . While the daily wagon loads of victims were carried to their doom through the streets of Paris, the proconsuls, whom the sovereign Committee had sent forth to the departments, reveled in an extravagance of cruelty unknown even in the capital. The knife of the deadly machine rose and fell too slow for their work of slaughter. Long rows of captives were mowed down with grape shot. Holes were made in the bottoms of crowded barges. Lyons was turned into a desert. At Arras even the cruel mercy of a speedy death was denied to the prisoners. All down the Loire, from Saumur to the sea, great flocks of crows and kites feasted on naked corpses, twined together in hideous embraces. No mercy was shown to sex or age. The number of young lads and of girls of seventeen, who were murdered by that execrable government, is to be reckoned by hundreds. Babies torn from the breast were tossed from pike to pike along the Jacobin ranks. One champion of liberty had his pockets well stuffed with

ears. Another swaggered about with the finger of a little child in his hat. A few months had sufficed to degrade France below the level of New Zealand."—*Macaulay, "Essay on Barere."* And all this was done in the closing years of the eighteenth century; all this was after the light of the Reformation had been permeating Europe for two hundred and seventy-two years.

There is another course by which men reach the same state of cruelty. That is, not by denying the existence of God, but by making themselves the depositaries of what they choose to define as his will, and then holding themselves as the sole expositors and executors of that will. As in every single instance it is only *their own will* which is thus exalted to the supremacy, and therefore is of only human authority, the only way in which it can be enforced is by human enactment; and then instead of being simply executors, they make themselves *executioners* in carrying into effect their arbitrary will. Making their own will supreme, and themselves the sole interpreters of that will, even though they claim it to be the will of God, they just as veritably put themselves beyond restraint as do the men who deny God outright. Both classes reach the same point, and both commit the same enormous crimes, the one illustrated in the fearful orgies of the Reign of Terror, the other illustrated in the terrible torments of the Inquisition. So, therefore, after the above quotation descriptive of the Reign of Terror, it is not necessary to present a description of the crimes of the papacy, for, with the simple substitution of the stake for the guillotine, the same narrative is equally descriptive of the dealing of the church with heretics.

And now at this hour of the nineteenth century, and in our own country, under the profession of National Reform, the harlot daughters of the papacy are preparing to revive the spirit and times of the mother. For when, by constitutional authority, they, after the *similitude* of the papacy, shall have acquired a *power* similar to the papal, they will be in position to commit *excesses* similar to those of the papacy. Human nature without restraint, in these, is as ruinous as in those. True, they would comfort us with the assurance that they will not hurt a "hair of" our "heads." But all the authority that we have for that is their own words, which their actions contradict; for while they are repeating these assurances that they will not coerce any one, they are working most assiduously to obtain the power to coerce every one. If, having obtained that power, they do not intend to use it, even to the weight of "a hair," why do they strive so strenuously for it? We cannot understand why they should so tenaciously fight for powers which they do not mean to exercise. To say the very least, they will then possess the *privilege* to oppress dissenters; and if these oppressive privileges are to be nominal, and not real; if they really do not intend to exercise them, let them forego them; they lose nothing, and *then* we shall have reason to believe that they mean what they say. Otherwise, as we know that it is a giant's power which they want, so we know, by human nature as portrayed in human history, that when they get it, they will use it like a giant.

The Scriptures confirm all that this investigation suggest. In the beginning of this article we cited Rom. 1:28-31 as the description of ancient heathendom, and 2 Tim. 3:1-8 as the description of the last days of modern Christendom, and we find them exactly alike. But they are alike not only in effect; they are so in

accordance with the principle that like *causes* produce like effects. In Rom. 1:21 we read, "That, when they *knew God*, they glorified him not as God, *neither were thankful*;" in 2 Tim. 3, "Having a *form of godliness*, but denying the power," "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God," "*unthankful*;" in Rom. 1:28, "They did not like to retain God in their knowledge;" in 2 Tim. 3:8, "These also resist the truth." And for this cause in both instances they become "reprobate."

It is by resistance to the truth of God that men loosen its restraints upon them, and deliver themselves up to the sway of Satan. In the last days, it is only those who "received not the *love of the truth* that they might be saved;" in whom Satan works "with all power and signs and lying wonders." It is only those "who believed not the truth," who become so deluded that they "believe a lie." Only those are "damned" who had "*pleasure in unrighteousness*." 2 Thess. 2:9-12.

From the beginning of the world God has left no nation without witness. Acts 14:16, 17. By a *then* "present truth" he has witnessed to different ages. In obedience to that truth, and in the love of it, lay the salvation of the people in each respective age. In the last days God sends a message which reaches to the end of the world, and is therefore his last

709

message to the world. It is the Third Angel's Message, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-16. The commandments of God are truth. Ps. 119:151. The faith of Jesus is the faith of him who is the truth. John 14:6. Both together embrace the whole word of God, which is truth. John 17:17. And of that people who, in obedience to the message, keep "his commandments that they may have *right* . . . to enter in through the gates into the city"—when the glad day comes in which they *shall* enter in, it is said, "Open ye the gates that the righteous nation which *keepeth the truth* may enter in." Isa. 26:2. So, then, the Third Angel's Message is the embodiment of the truth of God to the last generation of men. To reject it is to reject the truth; to receive not the love of it, is to "receive not the love of the truth;" to resist it, is to "resist the truth."

Again, the commandments of God restrain men. "*Thou shalt not*" is their keynote. The faith of Jesus restrains men; "If any man will come after me, *let him deny himself*," exclaims Jesus. Therefore the Third Angel's Message in holding forth the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" presents the summary of all those restraints which are demanded in checking and transforming the tendencies of human nature, and in leading them by the "right course," to goodness and to God. And when the world shall deliberately reject the Third Angel's Message, it thereby places itself beyond those restraints, and is then ready to be led captive by Satan *at his will*; and then it is that he works with all power in them that perish "*because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved*."

By the Third Angel's Message, the harvest of the earth will be ripened for good or for ill; for glory or for shame; to be gathered into the garner of God, or to be bound in bundles to be burned. Attentive hearkening to the message, faithful obedience to its gracious truth, in the love of it, will fit a people to step from the turmoil of this world into the sweet peace of Heaven; rejecting the message and

despising its precious precepts, will plunge the world into that depth of iniquity for which the only remedy is, to be cast "into the great winepress of the wrath of God."

ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Eccl. 2:1-13" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 45 , pp. 710, 711.**

**DECEMBER—ECCL. 2:1-13**

"I MADE me great works." Solomon built "Millo and the wall of Jerusalem, and Hazor, and Megiddo, and Gezer, . . . and Beth-horon the nether, and Baalath, and Tadmor in the wilderness, in the land, and all the cities of store that Solomon had, and cities for his chariots, and cities for his horsemen, and that which Solomon desired to build in Jerusalem and in Lebanon, and in all the land of his dominion." 1 Kings 9:15-19.

"MILLO" was a strong fortification, or tower, that protected the city of Jerusalem on the north. It was renewed by Herod, and by him named Hippicus in honor of one of his friends; and as it stood completed by Herod, it was about one hundred feet high. It was made of white marble, each stone about thirty feet long by fifteen feet wide and seven and one-half thick.

"THE wall of Jerusalem" began at Millo, or Hippicus, and extended clear around the city; upon it were sixty towers. As the city grew and spread beyond this wall, a second one was built in after years, and still another, so that at the final destruction of the city by the Romans, there were three very strong walls about it, the outer one having ninety towers, the middle one, forty, and the "old wall," as before stated, having sixty, besides two other large towers corresponding to Hippicus, built also by Herod, and called respectively Phasaebes, and Mariamne.

"HAZOR" was the principal city and stronghold of the whole of North Palestine. "Megiddo" was a fortified city which commanded one of the main passes from the north into the hill country. Gezer was also a fortified city that commanded the Mediterranean coast road of communication between Egypt and Jerusalem. The two "Beth-horon's," "the upper," and "the nether," lay on the boundary line between the tribes of Ephraim and Benjamin, and guarded a pass on the road from Gibeon to the Philistine plain. Through this pass was the main way of approach into the interior of the country Philistia on the west, and from Moab and Ammon on the East. Tadmor (Palmyra) was built in an oasis in the desert of Hamath above Syria, "two days' journey from the Euphrates, and six long days journey from Babylon." This was built so that he might control the great caravan trade from the East. Even the ruins of Tadmor are a wonder and an astonishment, and what magnificence must have been displayed when it stood in its splendor.

"I BUILDED me houses." The chief one of these was one hundred and fifty feet long, seventy-five feet broad, and forty-five feet high, and was in three stories. It had a grand porch seventy-five feet long and forty-five broad, and all

the pillars and beams and floors were of the finest cedar of Lebanon, and the pillars were so many and so costly, and those in the porch were so tall, that it was called the "House of the forest of Lebanon." 1 Kings 7:1-7. Close to this was the "Tower of David built for an armory," on the walls of which there hung "a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men." Song 4:4. Then there was the great Judgment Hall, lined with cedar wood, where stood the ivory throne inlaid with gold, with its six steps, and two graven lions on each step, and also a lion at each arm; the seat a golden bull, and the back ending in a half-circle. Then there was the house for Pharaoh's daughter, and houses for all his wives and concubines. Then there were the cloisters, and reception rooms, and the magnificent banqueting hall. These all were made with walls and foundations of white stone, many of them twelve, and many fifteen feet in length. All were supported with pillars and beams of cedar and fir, decked with gold and silver, and the roofs and walls ornamented with beautiful stones set with gold and silver, after the style of the temple. Besides all these buildings in Jerusalem, he built a summer palace in Lebanon.

"I PLANTED me vineyards; I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kind of fruits." Literally, I made me *paradises*, beautiful parks for pleasure grounds. There was one of these, probably the principal one, about six miles from Jerusalem, at Etham. There he would go in stately progress out of the city in the morning, dressed in snow-white raiment, riding in his chariot of state, which was made of the finest cedar, decked with gold and silver and purple, carpeted with the costliest tapestry, worked by the daughters of Jerusalem. A body-guard of sixty valiant men attended him, of the tallest and handsomest of the young men of Israel, arrayed in Tyrian purple, their long black hair, freshly sprinkled with gold-dust every day, glittering in the sun.

"I MADE me pools of water to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees." These were necessary to keep his parks fresh and beautiful. There were three of them, all in the side of the valley of Etham. The upper pool was 380 feet long, 236 wide at the eastern end, and 229 at the western end, and 25 deep. Below this 160 feet was the middle pool, 423 feet long, 250 broad at the eastern end, and 160 at the western, and 39 feet deep. Below this 248 feet lay the lower pool, 582 feet long, 207 broad at the eastern end, and 148 at the western, and 50 feet deep. Each pool therefore covered somewhat more than two acres. They were partly hewn out of the solid rock, and partly built of masonry. All were lined with cement, all had flights of steps from top to bottom, and all three were connected together by conduits, and by an aqueduct connected with Jerusalem, so that not only his "paradise" at Etham was watered by them, but from them also his palaces and gardens at the city were supplied.

"I GATHERED me also silver and gold." "And all King Solomon's drinking vessels were of gold, and all the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold; none were of silver; it was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon." 1 Kings 10:21. "And the king made silver to be in Jerusalem as

stones." Verse 27. He "had at sea a navy" that went to Ophir, and once in three years came the navy bringing gold, and silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks. Verse

22. The gold that came to Solomon in a year was about \$17,752,640. This with what David left to him, \$2,904,000,000, amounted to \$2,921,752,640, or enough to have given nearly \$390 to each man, woman, and child in the whole kingdom. And all this was "Besides that he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants, and of all the kings of Arabia, and of the governors of the country." 1 Kings 10:15. That is, all this was beside the regular customs duties and taxes from his own kingdom. His navy brought at one voyage from Ophir \$13,068,000 (2 Chron. 8:18); at another it brought \$12,196,800 (1 Kings 9:28); the queen of Sheba gave him \$3,484,800 (chap. 10:10); and Hiram also gave him \$3,484,800. Chap. 9:14. Surely gold was plenty.

AFTER enjoying everything to the full, withholding not his "heart from any joy," then he could only look on all the works that his hands had wrought and exclaim, "*All was vanity and vexation of spirit!*" The word translated "vanity" means "breath" or "light wind," and its parallel is found in Isa. 40:6 and James 1:10, 11. All vanishes, all fades away, even life itself is but a vapor, appearing but "for a little time and then vanisheth away." James 4:14.

FROM verse twelve it seems that after he had seen all this greatness, and glory, and folly, he turns to the contemplation of himself and the time when he walked in "wisdom," and compares it with the years of his "madness and folly," and as his firm decision he leaves us this apple of gold in a picture of silver:—

*THEN I saw that wisdom excelleth folly AS FAR AS LIGHT EXCELLETH DARKNESS.*

ALONZO T. JONES.

## **December 4, 1884**

### **"Babylon Is Fallen" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46 , p. 722.**

[THE following picture of the condition of the Christian world, was given by Rev. Arthur T. Pierson in a sermon before the Ministerial Convention of Philadelphia, in September, 1884. This is only a part of the sermon however. We have selected some of the most striking portions; but I what is here given, as well as in much more that might be given, there is food for much solemn reflection by all. And in view of it who will say that the Third Angel's Message is out of place, in calling upon the people to come out of her, and keep the "commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus"?

ALONZO T. JONES.

### **"Notes on the International Lesson. Eccl. 12:1-14" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46 , p. 724.**

## **DECEMBER 21—ECCL. 12:1-4**

REMEMBER now thy Creator. Remember him as Creator. "There are gods many and lords many," but there is but one Creator, and he is the one living and

true God. It is by this fact that in his own word he distinguishes himself from all other gods; as in Isa. 40:18-20, 25, 26: "To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains. He that is so impoverished that he hath no oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to prepare a graven image, that shall not be moved." "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One. Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number; he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth." And again in Isaiah, thirty-seventh chapter, the king of Assyria wrote a letter to king Hezekiah, in which he said: "Let not thy God, in whom thou trustest, deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be given into the hand of the king of Assyria. . . . Have the *gods of the nations* delivered them which my fathers have destroyed, as Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph, and the children of Eden which were in Telassar?" "And Hezekiah received the letter from the hand of the messengers, and read it; and Hezekiah went up into the house of the Lord, and spread it before the Lord. And Hezekiah prayed unto the Lord, saying, O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubim, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; *thou hast made heaven and earth*. Incline thine ear, O Lord, and hear; open thine eyes, O Lord, and see; and hear all the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent to reproach the living God." And in answer to that prayer "the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand."

The fact that he is Creator is the primal reason given why all should worship him; and why he should be worshiped. "Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the Lord he is God; *it is he that hath made us* and not we ourselves." Psalm 100:2, 3. "Worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:7. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; *for [because] thou hast created* all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. 4:11. "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind." Job 12:10. "In him we *live* and *move* and *have our being*." Remember therefore thy Creator in the days of thy youth, and all thy days.

The fact that he performed the wonderful works of creation does not stand separated from him and us. He not only made these wonderful works; "He hath made his wonderful works *to be remembered*." Psalm 111:4. The proper remembrance of him as Creator can only be by remembering the creation. And he has not enjoined upon us the duty to remember him without fully showing us how to do it. He has established an institution, the observance of which will ever keep in the mind the remembrance of the Creator—an institution by which, if properly observed, it is impossible to forget him. That institution is the Sabbath of the Lord. "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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in

six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

"And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:20. It is by hallowing the Sabbath that it becomes a sign by which we know that he is the Lord. And it is thus a sign that he is the Lord, *because* "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested." Ex. 31:17. By hallowed observance of the seventh day we remember the "wonderful works" of the creation, and thus remember the Creator. This is God's own appointed way for us to remember him. It is the truth that the hallowed observance of the seventh day, the works of creation, and the remembrance of the Creator are inseparably connected. "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Again, the Lord's appointed way of bringing things to remembrance is by memorials. Num. 5:15. Of the passover the Lord said: "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial." Ex. 12:13, 14. "The censers of these sinners against their own souls, let them make them broad plates for a covering of the altar; . . . and they shall be a *sign* unto the children of Israel. . . . And they were made broad plates for a covering of the altar; to be a *memorial* unto the children of Israel." Num 16:38-40. Therefore when we read in the Bible of the Sabbath as a sign, we may lawfully read it as a memorial; thus Eze. 20:20: "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a *memorial* . . . that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." He desires that we shall ever have him in remembrance; to that purpose he established a memorial; that memorial is the Sabbath, and "the *seventh day* is the Sabbath." "Thy name, O Lord, endureth forever; and thy memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations." Ps. 135:13. "Remember now thy Creator."

"The preacher sought to find out acceptable words; and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd." The Lord is that one shepherd. Ps. 23:1. "We are the sheep of his pasture." Ps. 100:3. These words are the words of the Lord, and are therefore words of truth. "And further, by these, my son, be admonished; of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh."

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." In all the millions upon millions of books that have been or shall be made, there has not been a single principle of ethics set forth that is not contained in the ten commandments. And although many books are valuable, and worthy of deep study, yet the sum of all that is said in the books, and the most worthy subject of all study, is the law of God. Study it, therefore, ever and always with the prayer of him of old, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Ps. 119:18.

"For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." The law of God being the rule of life, it must be

the rule of judgment. "As many as have sinned in the law shall be *judged by the law*," "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." Rom. 2:12, 16. They who shall stand in the Judgment are those whose "delight is in the law of the Lord," and who meditate in his law day and night. Ps. 1. Oh, how carefully we must meditate herein, for it is a discernor of the very "thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12), and in that day the Lord "will make manifest the counsels of the heart" (1 Cor. 4:5), "with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." Oh, that we might realize how fearfully searching the Judgment will be! Then, too, we could realize the blessedness of that salvation, and the riches of that precious blood which blots out all our transgression, so that it is remembered no more forever. But realizing, faintly as we do, the awful importance of that event, we may pray with David: "Cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins, let them not have dominion over me. . . Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer." Ps. 19:12-14.

A. T. JONES.

**"The Missionary. Australia—Our New Missionary Field" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46 , pp. 730, 731.**

AUSTRALIA lies south of the equator, between the 10th and 40th parallels of latitude, and between the 113th and 153rd degrees of longitude. It measures 2,500 miles from east to west, and 1,950 from north to south. Take away West Virginia, Delaware, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia, from the United States, and then Australia and the United States are within eight square miles of being exactly the same size. It is nearly 8,000 miles from San Francisco, and the passage requires about a month. The mainland was known as Great Jova, to the Portuguese, early in the 16th century. In 1606 Torres sailed through the strait, which now bears his name, between New Guinea and the northeastern point of the mainland, while in the same year a Dutch ship named the *Dhayfhen* (Dove) touched the mainland at what is now Cape York. Ten years afterward another Dutch ship, commanded by Dirk Hartog, sailed along the west coast a distance of nearly 250 miles, and left on an islet at Shark's Bay, a record of his expedition engraved on a tin plate, which was found there in 1801. In 1618 two Dutch vessels explored the great gulf on the north, and named it Carpentaria, in compliment to Peter Carpenter, who was then governor of the Dutch East India Company. Nine years afterward (1627) another Dutch ship, the *Guldene Zeepard*, sailed along in sight of the whole southern shore.

The first Englishman that ever visited the island was a buccaneer, Captain William Dampier, who spent five weeks ashore near Roebuck Bay, in 1688. Again, in 1699, Dampier made a voyage to the same place, not now as a buccaneer, however, but with a commission from the English admiralty. He wrote a narrative of his voyage, giving an account of the trees, birds, and reptiles, that he saw, and of his encounters with the natives. Nothing more of importance was done for nearly a hundred years. In 1770 Captain Cook coasted along the whole

length of the eastern side of the island, from Cape Hicks (named after Lieutenant Hicks, who first sighted it) to Cape York, and through Torres Strait to New Guinea. In his second voyage (1773) he went to New Zealand, 1,200 miles southeast of Australia, and in 1777 he visited both Tasmania (140 miles south of Australia) and New Zealand.

The island is divided into six colonies, viz.: New South Wales, North Australia, Queensland, South Australia, Victoria, and West Australia. Of those, however, the three on the eastern coast, Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, with the extreme southern part of South Australia, are the principal ones. The government in each colony is by a legislature of two houses, the council and the assembly, and by a governor nominated by the queen of England, and all enactments of the legislature must be approved by the queen before they are legal.

### **NEW SOUTH WALES**

IS the oldest of the Australian colonies. Eighteen years after its discovery by Captain Cook, the British Government appointed it as the place where all their convicts should be sent; so it was first a penal colony. It then (1788) embraced about half of the whole island. In 1836 South Australia was cut off and erected into a new colony. In 1851 another division was made, and the colony of Victoria was established. In 1859 it was again divided, and the northern part was made a colony and named Queensland; so that now New South Wales is only about 500 miles square. It remained a penal colony till 1840, when England ceased to send its criminals there, and since that time it has increased very fast in population, so that now it has over 700,000 inhabitants. Its chief article of export is wool. It has extensive gold fields also, and is the richest part of the island in coal. It has three lines of railway, aggregating about 700 miles, and telegraph lines amounting to more than 8,000 miles. Sydney is the capital, and is a city of about 150,000 inhabitants.

### **QUEENSLAND**

AS before stated, was set off from New South Wales in 1859. The first settlers in this colony were also convicts sent from the home government. Its population is about 220,000. The principal products are corn, wheat, barley, and sugar cane. It, too, has rich gold mines also copper, coal, and tin, and in the north some pearl fisheries. It has over 400 miles of railroad, and nearly 5,000 miles of telegraph lines. Its capital is Brisbane, 500 miles north of Sydney, and has about 35,000 inhabitants. Ipswich is the second town in size, having about 8,000, about 35 miles from Brisbane. Rockinghampton, 400 miles northwest of Brisbane, is next in size; it has about 7,000. Warwick is considered the "prettiest and healthiest inland town in the colony;" it has a population of over 4,000.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

IS the second colony in size, and has a population of about 250,000. Its principal mineral is copper; it has some gold, a little silver, and large quantities of iron. Its chief products are wheat, oats, barley, and wine. Adelaide is the capital, and has about 35,000 inhabitants.

### **WEST AUSTRALIA**

DOES not amount to much. It has only about 30,000 inhabitants, only 78 miles of railroad, and its principal products altogether are wool, lead ore, and pearls.

### **VICTORIA**

IS the most southern part of Australia, and is the southeastern corner of the island. The first settlement was made there in 1835, when Melbourne was founded. It was separated from New South Wales, and made a colony in 1851. It is a little larger than Idaho, and by far the richest part of Australia. Fruit and vegetables of all kinds grow in abundance. Its mineral wealth is said to be unparalleled in any place of equal size. There are the richest gold fields in Australia; also copper, silver, antimony, zinc, cobalt, manganese, coal, iron, kaolin, bitumen, and other minerals, are all found in great abundance. The leading products are wheat, barley, and oats. Melbourne is its capital, and is also the largest city in Australia. Its population is over 200,000. The total population of the colony is nearly 900,000. It has more than 1,000 miles of railroad, and nearly 3,000 miles of telegraph lines. Victoria has the finest climate in all Australia; indeed, it has been set down as "delicious." The coldest weather ever recorded in Melbourne was only five degrees below the freezing point (27° Fahr.), and the hottest 111 degrees, but that was caused by a hot wind, called "brickfielder," which sometimes blows for a few hours in summer. The mean annual temperature for fourteen years was 57.6 degrees at Melbourne, and for the whole colony, 56.8 degrees. Being on the other side of the equator from us, of course their seasons are directly opposite to ours. That is, there spring is in September, October, and November; summer is December, January, and February; fall is March, April, and May; and winter, June, July, and August. This makes January and February the hottest months, when the thermometer marks from 100 to 108 degrees in the shade; and July the coldest month, when the temperature at the lowest is only two or three degrees below freezing. Besides Melbourne, Victoria has the following cities, with their respective populations: Geelong, 16,000; Ballarat, 48,000; Sandhurst, 27,000; Castlemaine, 7,000; Beechworth, 3,000; and Portland, 2,600.

731

Of these, Geelong is 40, Ballarat about 60, Castlemaine 77, and Sandhurst 100 miles from Melbourne. Beechworth and Portland are about 140 miles in opposite directions from Melbourne.

## RELIGION AND EDUCATION

The total population of Australia is about 2,500,000. Of these about 252,000 are Catholics, 5,500 Jews, and 42,500 Mohammedans and pagans, or about 300,000 in all, which would leave about 2,200,000 of what might be termed Protestants. Of these about one-half are supposed to be of the Church of England. There are nine bishops of the Church of England there, and of the Catholic Church one archbishop, and ten bishops. Statistics of the colonies are very scanty, but it appears that Victoria is far ahead of all the others in these interests as well as in everything else.

The number of public schools in Victoria is 1,664; instructors, 3,906; average attendance, 116,608; enrolled, 231,169. Number of private schools, 596; instructors, 1,700; scholars, 37,582. The total number of children receiving education in all the institutions of the colony is about 190,000.

In the colony of Victoria there are over 700 clergymen, 2,815 church editors, with sittings for 420,051 people; the usual attendance is estimated at 203,772, and the approximate number of services during the year, 226,343. This gives an average church attendance of about *one in every three* of the total population of the colony. This is a remarkable showing, but Mr. Forbes, the famous war correspondent, informs us that it is a common thing for the people to walk fifteen miles, or even more, to attend a single lecture. And if they will do that to hear a common lecture, what will they not do when the splendor of the Third Angel's Message shines unto them? We look forward to grand results of the Australian missionary work. May the Lord send his angels to prepare the way; may they accompany those who go; and may they stir up all who remain, and help us to cheer and hold up the hands of those who go.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**December 11, 1884**

**"National Reform and the Chinese" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 47 , p. 738.**

EVER since Congress passed the Chinese Restriction Act, the *Christian Statesman* has been in great tribulation, because of the great wrong committed by the nation in that piece of legislation. Now in this article we propose no discussion of the righteousness or unrighteousness of that act of Congress, or whether it was just or unjust in itself. Our controversy is with the *Christian Statesman*, on its own published propositions, all of which are editorial utterances, and therefore stand as authoritative principles of National Reform.

By act of Congress the importation, or emigration, of Chinese laborers was prohibited for a period of ten years. This act the *Christian Statesman* denounced at the time. The late political campaign has given occasion for it to renew its objections. In its issue of Sept. 25, 1884, among "the gravest moral evils, evils which threaten the very life of the nation," "*injustice to the Chinese*" is one. In its

issue of Oct. 23, 1884, it says that "the unchristian Chinese policy of the two great parties is part of the indictment which the better conscience of the country is charging upon them." Again, in its issue of Oct. 2, 1884, we read: "The two leading political parties have vied with each other in displaying their readiness to exclude the Chinamen from our shores, and have declared for the policy of exclusion, in their respective platforms. This policy, on the other hand, is felt by large numbers of Christian men to be *in violation of the natural rights of men*, as well as *contrary to the spirit and teachings of the religion of Jesus*, and increases the dissatisfaction with which, on other grounds, these parties and their platforms are regarded."

Now what do the *Statesman* and the National Reform Party propose instead of this? We read: "We may not shut the door in the face of any one who wishes to come and dwell with us. No nation has the right to do this, even for the preservation of religious character." "Make all men welcome to our shores, but give all men to understand that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . *Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality.*"

Let us analyze this position and see wherein it differs from the position of the political parties which it condemns. By the term "laws of Christian morality," the *Statesman* means the ten commandments. With this definition then it says, "Enforce upon all that come among us the ten commandments." Now "enforce," according to Webster, means "to force; to constrain; to compel; to execute with vigor." Therefore the *Statesman* says: "*Force, compel*, all that come among us to keep the ten commandments." "*Execute with vigor* the ten commandments upon all that come among us." But the second commandment forbids men to make, to bow down to, or to serve, graven images; and this bears with particular force against the Chinese, for they do make and worship graven images; so that it may fairly be said that of all the Chinese who should ever desire to come to this country, they would be, without exception, idolaters. Now when, by constitutional amendment, this shall have been declared a Christian nation, and notice shall have thus been given that all who come here will be compelled to keep the ten commandments, will that be a sufficient argument to induce the Chinese to abandon their idols that they may come here? Allowing all the wondrous efficacy that has been ascribed to National Reform, such could hardly be expected of it, for the Chinese are just as sincere in their worship, idolatrous as it is, as are the National Reformers in theirs; and it certainly will require something more than an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to convince them that their worship is wrong. So it is easy enough to tell what the Chinese will do when the time comes that they shall have to choose whether they will abandon their worship or come to the United States. With such an alternative they will never come to this country. Therefore the success of the National Reform policy will just as absolutely exclude the Chinese from this country as does the act of Congress which is now in force, and which is so unsparingly denounced by that party.

Now to show that the force that is given to their expressions, by the definitions before given, is not more than they intend, we give some more of their words on

this subject. In the San Francisco *Chronicle* of September 24, 1884, appeared an account of a Chinese procession in that city, in honor of their god Llow Wong. In the *Christian Statesman* of October 30, 1884, under the caption, "Idolatry Publicly Tolerated," the account is copied in full, and then commented on as follows: "The remedy lies, not in the exclusion of the Chinese from our shores, where they have from God a perfect right to come, but in the legal prohibition of their public idolatry, which they have from God no right to practice, and which *no Christian Government ought to tolerate* on its soil." "Odious it is, offensive to Christian sensibilities, provoking the anger of Heaven against the nation which tolerates it. But . . . the American people generally would doubtless be shocked by the suggestion that such open idolatry *should be suppressed by law*. But if this is, as claimed, a Christian nation, and if Jehovah is our God, why should the suggestion be considered as strange or impracticable?" It is plain, therefore, by their own declarations, that the Chinese cannot come to this country and bring their worship with them, and that, as we have seen, works the exclusion of the Chinese as effectually as any other means that could be employed. And all this must be done, it says, to "maintain our Christian character;" and this, too, after stating explicitly, as above, that "no nation has the right to do this even for the preservation of religious character." The *Statesman* may talk of the servility of the political parties all it pleases, but if there ever was a political party that exceeded the National Reform Party in hollow pretense, or sham principle, we should like the *Statesman* to point it out.

There is another phase of this question. Suppose that while the United States refuses to "tolerate" the worship of the Chinese, they should refuse to "tolerate," in their country, the worship of the Christians. Suppose that when this nation has "suppressed by law" the worship of the Chinese, they should retaliate and suppress by law the worship of the Christians. What could this nation do? Remonstrance would come with very poor grace from the nation that first committed the intolerance. And so the sword of National Reform would cut both ways; it would not only shut the Chinese out of this country, but would shut Christianity out of China.

Now let us draw a comparison between the action of Congress which the *Statesman* condemns, and the action of the nation which it would approve.

IT CONDEMNS

IT APPROVES

An act of Congress which excludes the Chinese.	An amendment to the Constitution the effect of which will be the same.
An act which excludes The Chinese for <i>ten years</i> .	An act which would exclude them for <i>all time</i> .
An act of Congress which might be repealed by any subsequent Congress.	An act the effect of which would be the same, and which could not possibly be effected by less than three-fourths of the whole nation.
An act which excludes only one class of Chinese— Laborers.	An act which will excluded all classes of Chinese.

An act which excludes only one class, and one nation for ten years. Christians—ex- cludes all classes of all na- tions for all time.

Therefore, if the action of Congress and the political parties are by the National Reform Party to be condemned seven times, surely the National Reform Party itself must be condemned seventy times seven.

A. T. JONES.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Acts 20:7-15" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 47 , p. 743.**

**DECEMBER 28—ACTS 20:7-15**

"AND upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." This is counted, in the lesson, the "golden text;" but it is not only in this lesson that it is counted so, it is deemed of the "utmost importance" by all who keep Sunday, because of its being the only recorded instance in the New Testament of a meeting on that day. Now let us carefully and fairly examine the whole narrative and see what example there is in it in favor of Sunday keeping. And mark, if it be an example in one point, it is an example in every point.

WHEN was this meeting held? "Upon the first day of the week." Who were they that composed the meeting? "The disciples came together," and "Paul preached unto them." For what did they come together? "Came together to break bread." It is plain, then, that Paul and the disciples at Troas came together to break bread, on the first day of the week.

NOW there is another important question: What part of the first day of the week was it when they came together? "Upon the first day of the week *when the disciples came together* to break bread . . . *there were many lights* in the upper chamber *where they were gathered together.*" And Paul "continued his speech until midnight." This meeting therefore *was in the night* of the first day of the week. Now, according to the Bible, when does the day begin? Lev. 23:27 says: "On the *tenth day* of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement." Verse 32: "It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest; . . in the *ninth day* of the month at *even*, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." Deut. 16:6. "At *even* at the *doing down* of the sun." So, then, the tenth day of the month was from sundown on the ninth day till sundown on the tenth day. In other words sunset marks the beginning of a new day. This is strictly according to the order of God at the creation. Gen. 1:2: "And the earth was without form and void and *darkness* was upon the face of the deep." So far all was darkness. "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." God "commanded the light to shine out of darkness." 2 Cor. 4:6. Thus darkness being upon the earth and light following, darkness is naturally the first part of the day. "And the evening [darkness] and the morning, [light] were the first day." Gen. 1:5.

THIS is confirmed in the New Testament. In Mark 1:21-28 we read of the Saviour teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath day. And in verses 29-31, that forthwith when they come out of the synagogue they went into Simon's house and healed Peter's wife's mother of the fever; then in verse 32 it is written, "And at *even*, when *the sun did set*, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils." They would not carry the diseased to him on the Sabbath, but just as soon as it was past, at the setting of the sun, they brought them all, "and all the city was gathered together at the door." Dr. Clarke says: "The sick were not brought out to our Lord till after sunset, because then the Sabbath was ended." See on Matt. 8:16. And as the Sabbath ended, so the first day of the week began, at the setting of the sun. These are Bible facts, and accordingly if a meeting is held in the night on the first day of the week, it must be held between *sunset* on Sabbath (Saturday) and *sunrise* on Sunday. Therefore this meeting at Troas was on what we now call Saturday night. It was impossible for it to be on any other night, and still be on the first day of the week.

WITH this agree many eminent commentators. Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul" says: "*It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath. On the Sunday morning the vessel was about to sail.* The Christians of Troas were gathered together. . . The place was an upper room. . . . *The night was dark.* Many lamps were burning in the room where the congregation was assembled." Professor Hackett says: "The apostle then waited for the expiration of the Jewish Sabbath, and held his last religious service with the brethren at Troas . . . on Saturday evening, and consequently resumed his journey on Sunday morning." Kitto says: "In fact, the Jewish civil day began, as it still does, not with the morning, but with the evening; thus the Sabbath commences with the sunset of Friday, and ends with the sunset on Saturday. Under this arrangement the night seems to have been regarded . . . as *belonging to* and *ushering in the day that follows.*" He quotes from Tacitus "*nox decreet diem videtur,*" *i.e.*, night appears to lead the day. "Indications of this primeval order exist among many nations, and even we have 'sevensnight' and 'fortnight' to signify seven days and fourteen days." Prynne says of this meeting: "For my own part I clearly conceive that it was upon Saturday night, . . and not the coming Sunday night. Because St. Luke records that it was upon the first day of the week when this meeting was, therefore it must needs be on the Saturday evening, not on our Sunday evening, since the Sunday evening in St. Luke's and the Scripture account was not part of the first, but of the second day, the day ever beginning and ending at evening." So, then, it is a fact that this meeting at Troas was upon what is now called Saturday night.

PAUL preached till midnight, then Eutychus fell out of the window; Paul went down and restored him to life, came up again, and *then* they broke the bread. Mark, the bread was not broken *till after midnight*. And when he had broken the bread, and eaten, and talked till break of day, *then* he started "afoot" for Assos, twenty miles away, *on Sunday morning*.

BUT his eight companions on the voyage had already gone. "We went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos." Verse 13. In fact, they were not at the meeting at all. Now let us read the narrative again, and to more easily get this point, we will

italicize the distinguishing words. Begin with the fifth verse: "These [seven] going before tarried for us at Troas. And we [Paul and Luke] sailed away from Philippi . . . and came unto *them* to Troas, . . . where *we* [all] abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when *the disciples* came together . . . Paul preached unto *them* . . . and there were many lights . . . where *they* were gathered together. . . And *they* brought the young man alive." Notice, he says *we* abode at Troas seven days. He does not say that on the first day of the week *we came together*, but, "*the disciples* came together." He does not say, Paul preached unto *us*, but, "Paul preached unto *them*." He does not say, There were many lights where *we* were gathered together, but, where *they* were gathered together. He does not say *we* brought the young man alive, but, "*they* brought the young man alive." But where were the "*we*?" what were "*we*" doing all this time? Ah! he tells us. "*We went before to ship, and sailed unto Assos.*" It is a fact, therefore, that Paul's eight traveling companions were not at this meeting at all, but, instead, were aboard the ship sailing to Assos. And this was by the direction of Paul himself. "*We sailed unto Assos, there intending to take in Paul; for so had he appointed, minding himself to go afoot. And when he met with us at Assos, we took him in, and came to Mitylene.*"

AGAIN, the record says they were at Troas on the "first day of the week." The same record (verse 15) says that "the next day" they sailed from Mitylene "and come over against [or abreast of] Chios." And this is proof positive that they went from Troas to Mitylene on the first day of the week, which makes fifty miles that Paul traveled, and seventy miles that his companions, by his appointment, traveled on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and sometimes called the "Christian Sabbath." Once more: The "first day of the week" they went from Troas to Mitylene, about seventy miles; "the next day" they went from Mitylene to Chios, about seventy miles; "the next day" they went from Chios to Samos and Trogyllium, about seventy miles; and "the next day" to Miletus, about thirty miles, and from there Paul sent for the Ephesian elders (verses 13-17), all of which shows that they traveled just as far on the first day of the week as they did on any other day of which the record speaks. And that proves that Sappater, and Aristarchus, and Secundus, and Gaius, and Tychichus, and Trophimus, and *Timothy*, and LUKE, and PAUL considered the first day of the week as no more sacred than "the next day," or "the next day," or "the next day."

NOW if this be the account of how the first day of the week should be observed, then how much Sabbath observance is there about it? Just none at all. And if this be, as is claimed, the example of the observance of the first day of the week by the apostles and primitive Christians, then how many of them observed it as any more sacred than the other days of the week? Not one. A. T. JONES.

**December 18, 1884**

**"Axiomatic Theology" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 48 , p. 754.**

JOSEPH COOK has now been on the Pacific Coast about a month, on a lecturing tour; first in Portland, Oregon, later, and even now (Dec. 10), in San Francisco. He seems to pride himself on his being the exponent of what he calls "Axiomatic Theology." "An *axiom* is a *self-evident* truth which is taken for granted as the basis of reasoning."—*Webster*. *Self-evident* is "evident without proof or reasoning; producing certainty, or clear conviction, upon a bare presentation to the mind."—*ib.* Axiomatic theology is a good thing, therefore, provided what is taken as the basis of reasoning be really self-evident, provided it be really an axiom. But when that which is taken for granted is the very thing to be proved, it then becomes just anything but axiomatic. This is bad enough; but when the "basis of reasoning" is not only *not* "evident without proof," but is *incapable of proof*; when it is not only *not* "a self-evident truth," but is not truth at all, it is far worse; and when such passes, and is applauded, as "Axiomatic Theology," methinks that were Shakespeare alive he would not ask so skeptically, "What's in a name?"

"Does Death End All?" is one of Mr. Cook's "Axiomatic Theology" lectures; and the "axiom," the "self-evident truth" which is taken as the basis of his reasoning, is *the immortality of the soul*. Theologically, "immortality is the perpetuity of existence after it has once begun."—*McClintock and Strong*. Philologically, immortality is "unending existence."—*Webster*. The immortality of the soul, therefore, is the perpetual, the unending existence of the soul. Now when this is stated as self-evident, and then laid as the basis of reasoning on the question, "Does death end all?" the conclusion must inevitably be in the negative. Then Mr. Cook says: "If we can satisfy ourselves in the negative on this point, then we may safely believe in the immortality of the soul." Certainly. Lay down a proposition to which there is no possibility of an answer except in the negative, then satisfy yourself of that negative, and you can safely believe your proposition. Prove the negative by your proposition, then prove your proposition by the negative, and you can rest assured that you are right. Thus: The soul is immortal, therefore death *cannot* end all. Death *does not* end all, therefore the soul is immortal. And this is "Axiomatic Theology."

Mr. Cook says: "The germinal matter that weaves the sponge is, as far as science can determine, identical with the same that weaves the brain. There is a weaver somewhere. Life is the cause of form in matter. Cause goes before effect. Life goes before organization. If it goes before, why may it not survive?" Let us grant it all for a moment, and see what it proves. "Life is the cause of form in matter." Life is the "weaver" in the sponge, as in man. "Life goes before organization." "The weaver goes before his weft" in the sponge as in man. "If life goes before organization, why may it not survive?" "Why may not the weaver survive his weft?" "If it weaves this body, why may it not weave another after it leaves this?" (I heard him say it.) Now if that argument proves an immortal soul for man, it just as decidedly proves the same for the sponge, because he says "the germinal matter that weaves . . . is identical" in both. And that is "Axiomatic Theology."

Next he said: "We have been all the evening in the moonlight and starlight. Now [holding up an open Bible] we stand in the sunlight." "Christ brought life and

immortality to light." Christ did not bring life and immortality to light by demonstrating the immortality of the soul. It was by *the resurrection of the dead*. And this is as far from the immortality of the soul as is heathenism from Christianity; as far as is falsehood from the truth. And when Mr. Cook tries to train the fact of Christ bringing life and immortality to light, into the defense of the immortality of the soul, he involves himself in a difficulty which reminds us of Macaulay's description of some of Gladstone's arguments in favor of Church and State. "His artillery . . . is composed of two sorts of pieces, pieces which will not go off at all, and pieces which go off with a vengeance and recoil with most crushing effect upon himself." In Mr. Cook's appeal to the Scriptures, what did he prove? This: "The fact of the resurrection of Christ is as well authenticated as is the fact that Napoleon lived. Christ taught of life, death, and the resurrection. He lived, died, and proved it." This argument, instead of proving the positions already taken in his lecture, effectually destroyed them all, by showing plainly that future life can only be by the resurrection of the dead; that without a resurrection there is no Garfield, Lincoln, nor Washington; that without a resurrection there is, in his own words, "no more immortality for you and me than there is for a snuffed candle." So instead of saying he had been "all the evening in the moonlight and starlight," I should say he had been in the fog. And that instead of really coming out into "the sunlight" of the Bible, he dragged the Bible into the fog with him. But such is "Axiomatic Theology" on the subject of the immortality of the soul.

So must it ever be. The immortality of the soul cannot be proved. Without the Bible, life after death cannot be proved. And with the Bible it can only be proved by a resurrection of the dead. By the resurrection of the dead, and by that alone, the Bible sets before us the hope of a future life; and without the resurrection there is no life after death. Macaulay indeed stated the truth when he said, "In truth, all the philosophers, ancient and modern, who have attempted, without the help of revelation, to prove the immortality of man, from Plato down to Franklin (or Joseph Cook we would add), appear to us to have failed deplorably."—*Essay, Von Ranke*.

It is confessed by all, that the immortality of the soul is not taught in the Old Testament; it is only claimed from the New Testament, because there it is said that Christ brought immortality to light. But how did he bring it to light? Read 2 Tim. 1:10, "brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel*." What is the gospel? Read 1 Cor. 15:1-4: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you . . . by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you. . . . For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ *died* for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was *buried*, and that he *rose again* the third day according to the Scriptures." The death, burial, and resurrection of Christ is the summary, the substance of the gospel. By this therefore Christ brought life and immortality to light. It could not be by his death, for that was the common fate of all men. It could not be by his burial, for that was familiar to all living. Therefore it could have been only by his resurrection. By that he brought into the light, he demonstrated, "life and immortality." Now men are to "seek for it" (Rom. 2:7) through Christ (Rom. 6:23),

and obtain it by the resurrection, at the coming of the Saviour. 1 Cor. 15:51-54; 1 Thess. 4:15, 16.

The "immortality" which Christ brought to light, and the "immortality of the soul," are two widely distinct things. This is proved by Acts 17:18. When Paul was at Athens, the very headquarters of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the philosophers encountered him, and some said, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, *because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection.*" And again when he preached the same thing to the highest court of that intensely intellectual city, "When they heard of the *resurrection of the dead* some *mocked.*" If Paul had preached to them Jesus and the immortality of the soul, they never would have "mocked" nor called him a "setter forth of strange gods." To them that would have been nothing "strange;" with that they were thoroughly acquainted. This text, therefore, is proof positive that the immortality which Christ brought to light is *not* the immortality of the soul. We may, and do, therefore, deny *in toto*, the immortality of the soul; but we believe, and trust implicitly in the "life and immortality," which Christ brought to light; and we expect to obtain it in the way in which he brought it to light.

If the immortality of the soul be the truth, we wish some one who believes it would tell how Christ brought it to light. Without fear of successful contradiction, we state, and emphasize it, as a *fact* that *there is not a single element of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul held by Christians, which was not held and taught more than three hundred and fifty years before Christ came into the world.* This being the fact, we ask in all reason, how much or what part of that doctrine did Christ bring to light? The doctrine of the immortality of the soul nullifies the mission of Christ.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Acts 20:17-27" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 48 , pp. 758, 759.**

**JANUARY 4—ACTS 20:17-27**

GOLDEN TEXT: "Repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." In all the preaching of the gospel by John the Baptist, by Christ, and by all the apostles, "repentance" was the first great requisite upon which they insisted. "Repent ye," cried John the Baptist. Matt. 3:2. Said Jesus, "Repent ye." Mark 1:15. "I am . . . come to call . . . sinners to repentance." Matt. 9:13. "I say unto you there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Luke 15:10. "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein the most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not." Matt. 11:20. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas." Matt. 12:41. And in reference to the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, he said: "I tell you . . . except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." When the twelve were sent forth, "they went out, and preached that men should repent." Mark 6:12. After his resurrection

Jesus said to the twelve that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke 24:47. On Pentecost, when men asked the apostle, "What shall we do?" Peter answered, "Repent;" and again in Solomon's porch after telling them that they had "killed the Prince of life," Peter said, "Repent ye therefore." Paul at Athens declared to them that God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Actgs 17:30. And to Agrippa, he said that he had showed "throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent." Acts 26:20. To the Ephesus state of the church, Christ said: "Remember from whence thou art fallen and repent." To the Pergamos state of the church he said, "Repent." To Sardis he said, "Repent." And to the Laodiceans, the last of the church, he says, "Be zealous therefore, and repent." Rev. 2:5, 16; 3:3, 19. From the first book of the New Testament to the last, the voice of the Lord to sinners is, REPENT.

WHAT is repentance? Some say, Godly sorrow for sin is repentance. It is not. There can be no true repentance without godly sorrow, but godly sorrow is not repentance. Paul

759

says, "Godly sorrow *worketh* repentance." 2 Cor. 7:10. To repent signifies "to change one's mode of thinking, feeling, and acting,—reformation of life."—*Greenfield*. Godly sorrow, *i.e.*, a sorrow before God, and that takes him and his will into account, a sorrow because the evil of an ill-mannered life has been offensive to him,—this "worketh," this leads to a reformation of life, a manner of life which is not conformed to this world, but is transformed by the renewing of the mind, by which is proved "what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Rom. 12:2. This repentance, "reformation of life," must be thorough, it cannot be confined alone to the mind, to our *opinions* of things; our change of mind must be shown in actions. This the Scripture shows: "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance," margin, fruits "answerable to amendment of life." Matt. 3:8. "That they should repent and turn to God and *do works* meet for repentance." Acts 26:20.

WHAT are "works meet for repentance"? What are "works answerable to amendment of life"? "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind." "Put off . . . the old man, which is corrupt, [and] put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth. . . . Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good. . . . Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you; . . . and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Eph. 4:22-32. Here, among other things, it is said, "Let him that stole steal no more." But that is not all. He must give back that which he stole. "When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, *give again that he had robbed*, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die." Eze. 33:14, 15. "Then it shall be because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that

he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found, or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it unto him to whom it appertaineth in the day of his trespass offering. . . . And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him." Lev. 6:4-7. Such are works which show amendment of life. Such show that the heart has been touched, and wishes to stand right with God and man. Godly sorrow for the wrong, turning from the wrong, and then, as far as possible, making the wrong right,—that is repentance.

REPENTANCE has to do with the principles of right. Therefore men must be shown their sins, else they never can repent. But "sin is the transgression of the law," and "by the law is the knowledge of sin." There can be no true repentance without reference and respect to the law of God. They who will preach to men to repent, must set before them the law of God, and by it show them their transgressions. This is the way the apostles preached; Peter said: "Him . . . ye *have taken*, and by wicked hands have *crucified and slain*." And when they heard this, they cried, What shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent. "Repentance toward God" must be shown, because it is the law of God which we have transgressed, and because by that law is the knowledge of sin, of which we are to repent.

"AND faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." It is not enough to be sorry for the sin. It is not enough to turn from the sin. It is not enough that the wrong is made right with our fellow-man. All these together are not enough. All these are essential, but they are not enough. The wrong must be made right with God. The guilt of sin must be removed; the sin itself must be taken away. Christ alone can remove the sin and the guilt of it. And it is alone by faith in him that we can receive the forgiveness of sin. It is alone by faith in his blood that our sins can be blotted out. It is alone by faith in his atonement that we can receive the remission of sins; faith in his life, because he lived as our example (1 Pet. 2:21); faith in his death, because he died "for our offenses;" faith in his resurrection, because he "was raised for our justification" (Rom. 4:25); faith in his life again, because "he ever liveth to make intercession for us" (Heb. 7:25).

"REPENTANCE toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," is the synopsis of the Christian story. And the deeper that repentance goes, the higher faith will reach. If there were more genuine repentance in the world, there would be more abiding faith in Christ in the world.

ALONZO T. JONES.

***The Signs of the Times, Vol. 11 (1885)***

**January 1, 1885**

**"The Support of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 1, p. 2.**

IN commending Joseph Cook's lecture, "Does Death End All?" Dr. Gibson, of San Francisco, said: "I have been so convinced of the truth under that lecture that it made me feel a great deal larger than I am;" and also that he had heard others express themselves in the same way. We have not the least doubt of it. As the whole aim of that lecture is to support the immortality of the soul, the natural result is to make men think themselves a great deal larger than they are. Vanity, pride, and self-conceit, are both the root and the fruit of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. This was the incentive presented in the first mention of the subject presented in the first mention of the subject that was ever made to human beings. Gen. 3:4: "And the serpent said unto the woman, *Ye shall not surely die; . . . ye shall be as gods.*" In other words, they should be made to think themselves a good deal larger than they really were.

It was this same idea that led the Greek philosophers in their search into the nature of man. This is well expressed by Gibbon. "It must be confessed, that, in the sublime inquiry [with regard to the immortality of the soul], their reason had been often guided by their imagination, and that their imagination had been prompted *by their vanity*. When they viewed with complacency the extent of their own mental powers, when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labors, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of death and of the grave; they were unwilling to confound themselves with the beasts of the field, or to suppose, that a being, *for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration*, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration. With this favorable *prepossession* they summoned to their aid the science, or rather the language of metaphysics." In looking at themselves they became filled so full of admiration of themselves that they could only decide that they were immortal, and then, having rendered that important decision, they admired themselves more than ever, and this again more thoroughly convinced them of their essential immortality; which again increased their vanity, and so on *ad infinitum*.

And those of modern times who make much of this doctrine are in this in no way different from the ancients. They cannot be, and believe the doctrine, for this is a property which is inherent in the doctrine itself. A property not simply retroactive, but doubly so; a kind of double-back-action property, as it were. And by it thousands have built themselves up so high in their own estimation that they can see no possible use, much less any need, of a Saviour. Other thousands do not deny that men will be saved, yet admit it only on the ground that they are so great that the Lord is obliged to save them or else lose his credit as being God. While there are yet others who will allow that they must be saved, yet it appears to be a great condescension on their part to consent to it.

The most artless confession that we remember ever to have seen on the subject of the immortality of the soul we find in McClintock and Strong's encyclopedia; it is extracted from an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and is as

follows: "It is said that much of the reasoning employed by pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul is unsound. This is a fact, and yet by no means invalidates their right to believe in the conclusion which they deduced illogically. Believing a proposition firmly, we are satisfied with the mere pretense of an argument for its support; and searching in the distance for proofs which can only be found in immediate contact with us, we discover reasons for the belief which, long before we had discovered them, was yet fully established in our own minds; and yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine, although, in point of fact, the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them. If they were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their weakness would be obvious at once; but as they have nothing to sustain, their insufficiency is the less apparent; our belief continues, notwithstanding the frailness of the arguments which make a show of upholding it, and thus the very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion, which remains firm in spite of them.

Let us look this over again. 1. It is a fact that the reasoning employed by the pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul, is unsound, is illogical. Yet this "by no means invalidates their right to believe the conclusion." That is, a conclusion is *sound* which is reached by *unsound* reasoning! A *logical* conclusion can be reached by *illogical* arguments! 2. "Believing a proposition firmly, we are satisfied with the *mere pretense of an argument* for its support." It is said that "an open confession is good for the soul." We believe this to be an open confession, and we believe it is *prevalent* for the immortality of the soul; and we are glad to be able to publish the confession of its most earnest advocates that those who believe the immortality of the soul, are satisfied with the "mere pretense of an argument" for its support. 3. "Yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine. Although in point of fact the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them." That is, reasons that are "a mere pretense" are sufficient to uphold the doctrine; while it is a "fact" that it does not rest upon them. In other words the doctrine is *held up* by something that *does not hold it up* at all! A wonderful structure that. 4. "If they [these pretenses that don't hold it up] were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their *weakness* would be obvious at once; but as they have *nothing to sustain*, their insufficiency is the less apparent." That is, these pretenses are sufficient to uphold the doctrine, but it does not rest upon them, and if it *did* they would not uphold it. Yet we are satisfied with their strength, because *as they have nothing to sustain*, we do not know how weak they are. And then he presents this astonishing deduction: "The very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion."

Now let us get at the gist of the whole argument as contained in the above quotation. We will let him state the premises and we will draw the conclusions.

### FIRST SYLLOGISM

Major premise: The "mere pretense of an argument" sustains the immortality of the soul.

Minor premise: "This pretense sustains nothing."

Conclusion: Therefore the immortality of the soul is *nothing*.

### SECOND SYLLOGISM

Major premise: The immortality of the soul is "supported by *mere pretense* of an argument."

Minor premise: Pretense, is "unreal," is nothing.

Conclusion: Therefore the immortality of the soul is *supported by nothing*.

Out of these two conclusions we form a

### THIRD SYLLOGISM

Major premise: The immortality of the soul is supported by nothing.

Minor premise: The immortality of the soul is nothing.

Conclusion: Therefore the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is that wherein nothing supports nothing, and nothing is supported by nothing, and *that* is NOTHING.

And this is what we have for a long while believed on the subject.

ALONZO T. JONES.

### **"Notes on the International Lesson. Acts 20:28-38" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 1 , p. 6.**

#### **JANUARY 11—ACTS 20:28-38**

"TAKE heed therefore unto yourselves." This is the first duty that is presented in the Scriptures, for the consideration of those who are placed in authority in the church. And here in his final charge to the elders of the church at Ephesus Paul does not fail to set it before them. You, elders, are the guides. "Take heed *therefore* unto *yourselves*." Jesus said: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever *shall do* and *teach them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Those will not be called great in the kingdom of heaven who teach the commandments but do not do them. It is only those who *do* and teach them that shall be called great there. For it is only those who *do* them, whose teaching will be of any avail.

IT is so likewise with the elders of the churches. They are to be "ensamples to the flock;" they "must be blameless, sober, of good behavior," &c. 1 Tim. 3:1, 2. He who will fulfill those scriptures which are given for the special guidance of the elders *must* take heed unto himself. So Paul again in writing to Timothy says: "Take heed unto thyself and to the doctrine." One of the qualifications of an elder is that he shall be "apt to teach," and that he shall hold "fast the faithful word, that he may be able *by sound doctrine* both to *exhort* and to *convince* the gainsayers." Titus 1:9. Yet before any of these, comes the duty, "take heed unto thyself." Then take heed unto the doctrine; "*for in doing this* thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4:16. The office of a bishop (elder) is

indeed "a good work," and he who will fulfill its obligations will thereby be a good man. And to fulfill those obligations he needs to study diligently the chart laid down in Timothy, Titus, and 1 Peter 5.

"TAKE heed to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Watching for souls as they that "must give account." Heb. 13:17. Taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but *willingly*; not for filthy lucre, but of a *ready mind*, being ensamples to the flock. "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5:2-4.

TO "FEED the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." "Feed the flock of God." "Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds: Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flocks? . . . The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd: and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered. My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill; yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them." Eze. 34:2-6. "He that entereth in by the door [Christ is the door. John 10:9] is the shepherd of the sheep, . . . and the sheep hear his voice; and he calleth his own sheep by name, and *leadeth them* out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep, *he goeth before them*, and the sheep follow him; for they know his voice." John 10:2-4. Feed the flock of God.

7

"FOR I know this that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." From Paul's first letter to Timothy it seems that these grievous wolves were the Judaizing teachers, who made a great merit of long genealogies (1 Tim. 1:3, 4), and pretended to be apostles (Rev. 2:2). These were the greatest enemies of the church all through the apostolic age, at Ephesus and almost everywhere else, even following Paul from one place to another, stirring up the people against him, and making the brethren evil affected toward him. And it was only a manifestation of his faithfulness to the church when he gave this warning and charge to the elders; and afterward he left Timothy there specially to guard the church against these evil influences as well as against the other class mentioned.

"ALSO of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Hymeneus and Alexander, mentioned in 1 Tim. 1:20, were of these, and made "shipwreck of faith," and went so far as to "blaspheme," and had to be delivered unto Satan. Hymeneus is again named in 2 Tim. 2:17, and with him another, Philetus, who had so far erred from the truth as to say that the resurrection was past already; and these were thus trying to "overthrow the faith of some." Another one, Diotrefes, loved to have the "pre-eminence among them." So much so, in fact, as to refuse to receive John, the beloved disciple, "prating" against him with malicious words, and not content with that he would

not receive any of the ministering brethren, and still more, forbade others who were willing to entertain them, and if any did receive them he cast them out of the church. 3 John 9, 10. He not only would draw away disciples after him, but he was not willing that anybody but himself should have any disciples.

REMEMBER the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." It is true. How many believe it.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**January 8, 1885**

**"Vain Philosophy" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 2 , pp. 25, 26.**

DANIEL WEBSTER said: "There is more of valuable truth yet to be gleaned from the sacred writings, that has thus far escaped the attention of commentators, than from all other sources of human knowledge combined." This is a true saying, and worthy of all acceptance. From the days and works of Origen to the present there has been a vast deal more of valuable truth that has escaped the commentators than they have ever discovered. The commentaries are valuable for one thing, that is, to show us the meaning of many of the Hebrew and Greek words, which cannot be brought out fully in a translation. With this exception, the value of any commentary, in points of doctrine or duty, is a minus quantity. Indeed almost all the commentators have the faculty of "darkening counsel by words without knowledge;" of creating difficulties where there are none. One of the best Bible scholars of modern times said that commentators are to the Bible what curtains are to windows. A window is made to let in the light; a curtain obscures it, or shuts it out.

These thoughts have been suggested by reading the Sunday-school lesson notes in the different denominational papers and publications which propose to help in understanding the International Lessons; but particularly by the notes on Acts 20:2-16, Paul at Troas. In the eighth verse Luke says, "There were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." On this Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., in the *Sunday School Times*, comments as follows:—

"Why does Luke find it best to introduce the number of lamps in the chamber where Paul preached? Meyer answers, that the fall of the young man was thus at once perceived. But if so, there is no reason for mentioning the fact in the introductory way, before anything is said of Eutychus Clumpre more naturally explains the mention as account for the closeness of the room, which led to the sleep of Eutychus. It seems to be a sufficient explanation that the air was bad, and this comes fitly from the physician Luke."

Notice, the question is, Why does Luke mention the number of lights where they were gathered together? One answers, Because the fall of the young man was thus perceived. Another answers that it accounts for the heat and closeness of the room, which caused Eutychus to go to sleep. And Dr. Woolsey sums it all

up in his saying that "it is a *sufficient explanation* that *the air was bad*." The first of these has made the discovery that there were many lights in the upper chamber, so that they might know when a person fell out of the window. We wish that from the height of his great erudition, he had condescended to tell us whether it was so common a custom for people to fall out of the window that they must take lights to the place of meeting, so that they might see them fall? The second finds that there were many lights, because the room was hot and close. The third, who was an instructor in Yale College for fifty years, renders the profound decision that there were many lights where they were gathered together, *because the air was bad*. We wonder why the thought never occurred to them that the meeting was *in the night*, and there were many lights *because it was dark*.

This idea of the air being bad, however, occurs in several places in the notes. H. Clay Trumbull, in giving his "Illustrative Applications" says: "Heat and smoke in a close and crowded room are solid obstacles to an intelligent hearing of the gospel, even with an inspired apostle for a preacher. Ventilation is often an important means of grace. That young man who sought it in the window, was doing his best to keep awake, even at the risk of his life." According to this we have: 1. Heat and smoke in a close and crowded room. 2. This was a solid obstacle to an intelligent hearing of the gospel. 3. Ventilation is a means of grace. 4. This young man sought this, his only means of grace, on that occasion. And behold *he went so sound asleep* as to fall out of the window. Now if that was the effect of ventilation (the means of grace) upon the only one who had it, what could have been the condition of those in the body of the room, who had no ventilation, no means of grace? And yet on the other hand, if the windows were so wide open that a man could fall through, we cannot help wondering how the room could be "hot and close," and how, with windows so wide open, there could be no ventilation!

But by turning to the very next page of the same paper our wonder on this point is removed. Under the heading "Oriental Lesson-Lights," we read: "The 'upper room' is the large and airy chamber beneath the roof. . . with large latticed windows on three sides through which the cooling breeze blows. This seems to have been the kind of room in which Paul's meeting was held." By this we find that the room, instead of being "*hot and close*" was "*large and airy*," that instead of there being "no ventilation," a "cooling breeze" could blow through. And although that wonder is removed, it is replaced by another, viz., we wonder which of these teachings (?) the Sunday-school scholars and teachers are to believe. Are they to believe the room was "hot and close" or "large and airy"? Are they to believe that there was no ventilation, or are they to believe that "a cooling breeze" could blow through the room?

There is another subject in this same lesson that gives room for more vagaries. That is, "the first day of the week." President Woolsey says of this, "The first day of the week, on which the Christian people gathered to break bread, to celebrate the resurrection of Christ." Now any one can read in 1 Cor. 11:26, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death." In view of this we wish Dr. Woolsey would tell us how that, in commemorating the

*death* of Christ, they *in the same act* could celebrate his *resurrection*. Again he says: "The time, in the present instance, for partaking of it, was omn the evening of our Sunday." O that we wish he or some one else would tell us, if this was our Sunday evening, how that breaking of bread *after midnight* on Sunday night, could be any possibility be on the first day of the week?

In the same paper Faith Latimer gives "Hints for the Primary Teacher," in which she says: "When Paul was a young man, what was his name? He had been brought up a strict Jew, and all Jews kept the last day of the week as the Sabbath; but after Paul became the servant of Christ, he kept holy the first day of the week, and so did all Christians." The Bible says nothing about this, and we should like to know how she knows it. Next she asks, "What made the change?" but gives no answer, nor any hint of what answer she expects shall be given. We should like exceedingly to hear the answers to that question that will be given by the different teachers in the Sunday-schools. How many will give the Bible answer: "He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear our the saints of the Most High, and shall *think to change times* and laws" (Dan. 7:25), and show that the Papacy was what made the change? Further she says: "Who rose from the dead on the first day of the week? *From that time it was called the Lord's day.*" On this we state these facts: Matthew wrote in A.D. 61, thirty years after the resurrection of Christ; Mark wrote about A.D. 63, thirty-two years after; Luke wrote the Gospel and the Acts about A.D. 64, thirty-three years after; Paul wrote 1 Corinthians A.D. 60, thirty years after; and John wrote the Gospel in A.D. 97, *sixty-six* years after, and every one of them called it "the first day of the week." Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; John 20:1, 19.

We can only wonder how persons can become so

26

infatuated with themselves as authorities, as to make statements to be accepted as scriptural, which upon the slightest investigation are found to be flatly contradictory to the Scriptures. But such "wonders will never cease," at least not as long as men will love falsehood more than truth, and their own will more than the word of God.

Space forbids pursuing these fallacies any further; but every one of these can be found in a single number of the *Sunday School Times* (Dec. 20, 1884), and yet the list is not exhausted. And we are the more sorry to see them there, because the *Times* is generally exceptionally good.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**January 15, 1885**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Acts 21.15-26" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3 , p. 38.**

**Meeting with the Elders.**

[ON the lesson this week, we know that we can do no better than to give the following article, which we take bodily from Mrs. E. G. White's "Sketches from the Life of Paul." It will bear reading several times, and so will the book from which it is taken.

A. T. J.

**January 22, 1885**

**"The California Sunday Law Again" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 4 , pp. 57, 58.**

IN the SIGNS of January 1, was printed a note concerning the movement, set afoot in the Oakland churches by Dr. McLean, of the First Congregational Church, Oakland, to secure a re-enactment of the Sunday law, that was repealed two years ago; and it was stated that "Dr. McLean was appointed to read a paper at the next meeting of the Congregational Club, on 'How to Get a Suitable Sunday Law.'"

Of that next meeting we have quite a full report in the San Francisco *Chronicle* of January 6, and knowing that all our readers are interested in this subject, we insert the report, with some comments of our own. The *Chronicle* says:—

"At the meeting of the Ministerial Union yesterday morning, Rev. Dr. McLean presented the subject of a Sunday law, and desired to have an expression of opinion on the part of the members of the union, as to the feasibility of attempting to secure the re-enactment of the late Sunday law of the Penal Code, or one similar to it. He said he appeared as chairman of a committee, appointed by the Pastors' Union of Oakland, to confer with the Ministerial Union and take such action in the matter as might be thought advisable. The four other members of the committee were present and would speak for themselves. For himself he would say that while he felt deeply the necessity of a law for the protection of Sunday from desecration, he had serious and increasing fears that such was the present condition of political parties, and such the state of public opinion on the subject, that any effort made at this time to secure the passage of such a law as was needed would prove fruitless. But this was certain, at least, that the subject ought to be presented by the pastors in their pulpits, and the public conscience brought up to that point where such a law could be enacted and enforced. The other members of the committee expressed their views, most of them in favor of immediate and vigorous action for the re-enactment of the Sunday law, and hopeful of its success. Several members of the union followed with brief remarks, chiefly in favor of entering upon an immediate agitation of the subject, looking to the enactment of a penal Sunday law by this Legislature, and, on

motion, a committee of five was appointed, from as many different denominations, to act at once in the matter, preparing petitions to send through the State, and also a draft of such a law as is desired. This committee is composed of Rev. Dr. McLean (Congregational), Rev. Dr. M. M. Gibson (Presbyterian), Rev. Dr. Sines (Methodist), Rev. Dr. Gray (Baptist), and Rev. Mr. Githens (Episcopal)."

In the *Pacific*, and the *California Christian Advocate* appears what we suppose to be an address of the Ministerial Union, to which is appended a resolution that was adopted at the aforementioned meeting. The address says:—

"The friends of the Christian Sabbath are deeply pained in witnessing the high-handed and defiant desecration of all that is sacred and righteous in this holy day. . . . It is hostile to our religion. We cannot shut our eyes to this evil without incurring a fearful responsibility. It is time for action. We hope therefore that the following resolution will receive the prompt and hearty indorsement of the brethren throughout the State:—

"*Resolved*, That the Ministerial Union of San Francisco, hereby requests each Preachers' Meeting, or Association of Ministers, in the State, to unite in agitating the subject of securing some proper legislation in favor of a judicious Sunday law; and that the pulpits of the State are requested to present this subject on (or as near as possible to) the last Sunday in January."

But the most interesting part of the proceedings in that day's meetings, is contained in the rest of the report as given in the *Chronicle*:—

"In the afternoon the Congregational Club held its usual monthly meeting. The discussion turned on the same general subject, but took a theological turn, the principal point being the ground upon which Sunday observance should be based. Rev. Mr. Macy, of the Green Street church, opened the proceedings with a paper in which he based the observance of Sunday strictly on Scripture authority, treating it as the legitimate successor of the Sabbath and made binding by the four commandment."

It seems that the case stands thus: The Pastors' Union is composed of all the pastors of Oakland; the Ministerial Union is composed of all the pastors of San Francisco; and the Congregational Club is composed of the Congregational ministers of both Oakland and San Francisco, but who, at the same time, are members of the Pastors' or Ministerial Union as the case may be. Now in the forenoon of January 5 these ministers all meet together in behalf of their respective Unions, and are "deeply pained at the desecration of all that is sacred and righteous in this holy day" (Sunday), and all favor "immediate and vigorous action for the re-enactment of a penal Sunday law." Then in the afternoon of the same day, they meet and discuss the question, Why should Sunday be observed at all? They first decide to compel everybody to do a certain thing, and then ask why it should be done.

But that is not the worst; *they cannot agree among themselves* as to why Sunday should be kept. Rev. Mr. Macy, who opened the discussion, makes

Sunday "binding by the fourth commandment." As the fourth commandment says plainly, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," it must be that Mr. Macy holds that the commandment to keep the *seventh day* can be obeyed by keeping the *first day*. Then let us carry the principle a little further. Suppose he, with others, succeeds in obtaining the enactment of a law in the State of California, which will command all to "keep the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday;" will he allow that we can obey that law by keeping the seventh day? If not, why not? If by keeping the seventh day we could not obey the *law of California* which enjoined the observance of the first day, how can he, by keeping the first day, obey the *law of God* which enjoins the observance of the seventh day? And why will men persist in presenting to the court of the Most High and against the law of God, a plea that would not be admitted in the court of a justice of the peace, against the law of California? We are not surprised at all at the remark that follows: "Several of the clergy who followed differed with him widely." It is difficult to conceive how anybody could agree with him, who was able, and had any disposition to reason.

"Rev. Professor Mooar, of Oakland, said he did not rest the observance of Sunday on any positive command. The observance was a *voluntary tribute* on the part of Christians to Jesus and his resurrection. If there had been a transfer of Sabbath obligation from the seventh day to the first, it would have been so stated, plainly, somewhere in the New Testament. Rev. John Kimball agreed with Dr. Mooar, and so did Rev. Dr. Sexton, of London, England, a visitor to the Club."

And so do we. It is the absolute truth that Sunday observance rests on no command of Scripture. It is a "voluntary tribute" on the part of men which makes void the commandment of God, and against which we are directly warned by the word of God. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility . . . after the commandments and doctrines of men, which things indeed have a *show* of wisdom in *will-worship*." Col. 2:18-23. That is exactly what it is, *voluntary humility*, and *will-worship*, self-chosen worship (Conybeare and Howson), and through it, thousands will be beguiled (deluded, deceived, cheated) of their reward.

But in the service of God there is no room for any such worship. Christ said: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you say . . . we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17:10. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the *whole duty* of man." Eccl. 12:13. No man can do more than his duty. But all that is our duty, God has commanded. Therefore, *nothing can be duty toward God, that has not been commanded by God*. These men say plainly (and truly) "there is no command for the observance" of Sunday. Therefore it

58

follows that when they demand the power to compel all to keep Sunday, they seek to compel all to do what is *not their duty* to do. And thus they usurp the authority, and transcend the power, of God.

Rev. Dr. Sexton, of London, said further:—

"It is an historical fact that the early Christians were wont to go from their Sunday meetings to their ordinary labors. Rev. Joseph Rowell said he agreed with Dr. Moor, and thought that Justin Edwards, in his 'Sabbath Manual,' had unconsciously misquoted the Christian Fathers on this point."

These too are solid truths. It *is* a fact that the early Christians went to their ordinary labors on Sunday (Acts 20:13-15); and whether "unconsciously" or consciously, it is a fact that Justin Edwards in his "Sabbath Manual" *does* misquote the Fathers on the Sunday question. These points are not new to us; they have been familiar to Seventh-day Adventists for years, but we are glad to see the truth of our positions admitted by Sunday advocates themselves.

"Rev. Professor Dainelle took a different view, and said the observance of one day in seven was a cosmic law and of imperative obligation."

But if it be simply an indefinite "one day in seven," that is enjoined in the commandment, it was so established by the Lord himself, and what right have the preachers of California to go beyond the Lord, and make the day definite? If the Lord has not fixed the day, what right have they to fix it?

In view of the positions taken in this discussion, we would ask, Where is there anything "sacred," or "righteous," or "holy" about the Sunday at the desecration of which these gentlemen are so "deeply pained"? Dr. Macy reads a paper in which a position is taken which, if correct, would show that the day is sacred, that it is holy. But immediately he is followed by a half-dozen, or more, men, all of whom dispute the truth of his position, and assert that there is "no positive command" for its observance, that it is "a voluntary tribute on the part of Christians," etc.; all of which shows decidedly that the observance and obligation of the day are only of human origin and authority, and that therefore the day lacks every element of sacredness, of righteousness, or of holiness. And these men in thus asserting and maintaining the human origin and obligation of the Sunday institution, in that assert that theirs is a "self-chosen" worship. If they would stop there, if they would content themselves with their "self-chosen worship," and allow others equal liberty of choice, we could have no cause of complaint; but when they go beyond this and seek by penal law to *compel* everybody else to do as *they* choose, then we solemnly protest, and much more when they would compel us to do this in positive disregard of the plain commandment of the Lord himself, spoken with his own voice, and written with his own hand.

It appears, therefore, that what causes these *reverend* gentlemen to be so "deeply pained" is that they can't have their own way; and so they labor and long for a "penal law," by the vigorous enforcement of which they can compel all people to comply with their wishes. And we have no doubt that they will be "deeply pained" until this is accomplished. Others have had a like painful experience. Paul III was "deeply pained" that any would not submit to the church, and so he established the inquisition. Torquemada was "deeply pained" that there should be any Jews in Spain, so he must have an edict issued banishing every Jew and Jewess, man, woman, and child, unless they would become papists. Innocent III. was "deeply pained" that in Languedoc and Provence there was a

"high-handed and defiant desecration of all that was sacred and righteous in the holy" church, and so the Albigenses were extirpated. Innocent VIII. and his successors for four hundred years were all "deeply pained" that in the valleys of Piedmont there was a people whose practices were "hostile to *their* religion," and so against the Waldenses there was kept up a perpetual crusade. But why specify? The history of the papal church is simply a series of just such "deeply painful" experiences as these Oakland and San Francisco pastors and their co-laborers in the United States now have. And in every instance relief was sought in the same way that these seek it, namely, by the power of penal statutes of the civil law. Question: In what single thing do Protestants now protest against the work of the papal church? ALONZO T. JONES.

NOTE.—Since the foregoing was put in type, we have received the *Herald of Truth* (Baptist), of January 15, in which we find the following from the editor, Dr. G. S. Abbott:—

"'The Sabbath Question,' as discussed in the Congregational Club, of San Francisco, brought out many variant opinions, showing at least large freedom of thought. We expect to find that the discussion has furnished our Seventh-day Adventist friends a feast of *lean*, instead of *fat* things. It was that kind of a feast, in some respects, to us."

A. T. J.

**January 29, 1885**

**"The Principles of Protestantism" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 5 , pp. 73, 74.**

IN our article last week on the California Sunday Law discussion, we were led to ask the question, In what single thing do Protestants now protest against the work of the papal church? We now propose to follow up that inquiry.

"Protestant—One who protests. Especially a Christian who protests against the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church."—*Webster*.

"Protestants—Is a collective name for all genuine believers in evangelical Christianity—those who protest against the errors and renounce the communion of the Romish Church."—*McClintock and Strong*.

The term *Protestants* was first applied in derision to the princes and delegates of the Reformed faith, who, in 1529, entered their *protest* against the decrees of the second diet of Spires; and that term was extended from those who signed the protest, to all who embraced the fundamental principle involved in it. The principle is this:—

"The Bible is not to be interpreted and used according to tradition, or use, and wont; but to be explained by means of itself, its own language and connection. This doctrine—that the Bible

explained independently of all external tradition, is the sole authority in all matters of faith and discipline—is really the foundation-stone of the Reformation."—*McClintock and Strong*.

"The bold voices of all the Reformers soon proclaimed this powerful principle, at the sound of which Rome is destined to crumble away. 'Christians receive no other doctrines than those which are founded on the express words of Jesus Christ, his apostles and prophets. No man, no assembly of doctors, are entitled to prescribe new doctrines.'"—*D'Aubigne, Reformation, Book 2, chap. 7*. "Luther then vigorously proceeds to lay down the fundamental principles of the Reformation—*The word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God*."—*Id., Book 3, chap. 9*.

"'The Scripture, without any commentary,' says he on another occasion, 'is the sun from which all teachers receive light.' Such are the principles of Christianity and the Reformation. According to these venerable words, we are not to take the Fathers in order to throw light on Scripture, but Scripture to throw light on the Fathers. The Reformers and the apostles held up the word of God alone for light, just as they held up the sacrifice of Christ alone for righteousness. To attempt to mix up human authority with the absolute authority of God, or human righteousness with this 'perfect righteousness of Christ, is to corrupt Christianity in its two foundations. Such are the two fundamental heresies of Rome, heresies, moreover, which some teachers would fain introduce, though, doubtless, in a modified form, into the bosom of the Reformation.'"—*Id., Book 9, chap. 5*.

These fundamental principles, and these words of the illustrious historian, are appropriate to-day, and will be even to the end of the world. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was not simply for Europe and the sixteenth century alone, but it must extend to all nations and be for all time. Says D'Aubigne, "The Reformation is Jesus Christ." And as Christ liveth ever, so the Reformation will be a living, practical movement while the world stands. Protestantism is Jesus Christ; and as the papacy stands arrayed against Christ till the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom (Dan. 7:21, 22), even so Protestantism will be a living, active principle with those who serve Christ, till the day that he comes, and his saints enter into his everlasting kingdom. The last of the saints of God who live in the world, and who leave the world alive, are those who carry on the most persistent protest against the papacy and its allies. And when they leave the world, singing a song that no man can learn but they, it is the song of "victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name." Rev. 15:2.

From the fundamental principles above given, it is plain that Protestantism is not simply a negation. It does not rest simply upon a denial of certain dogmas of the papacy, but it goes at once to the root of the whole matter, in the assertion that "*the word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God,*"

is the rule of faith and practice for the human race. To affirm this proposition is to deny *in toto* the principles of the papacy. This was the intent of the proposition when it was first stated; this was the effect of it; so it was then understood by the papacy, and so it is still. To assert this was the strongest protest that the assembled princes and delegates could make on April 19, 1529; it is the strongest protest that can now be made. Protestantism, therefore, is not a negation, except as it is involved in an affirmation; and the force of the negation is proportionate to the power of the affirmation. He who the most consistently, and the most earnestly, affirms this proposition, is the strongest Protestant, the greatest reformer, and stands nearest to Christ.

And this is just the obligation that is laid upon every one who becomes a servant of God and of Christ. The perfection of this declaration is the goal that must, and will, be reached by that people who get "the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name." "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen." Isa. 43:10-12. "And ye shall be witnesses unto me," said Christ. Acts 1:8. When a man amongst men is called to be a witness, he is sworn to tell "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;" and shall the Lord require less in this respect than is required by man? Christ says: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." John 18:37. But he is not alone in this; read again this verse from Isaiah, "Ye are my witnesses, *and* my servant whom I have chosen." Since Christ left the world, his servants are *his* witnesses, and witnesses of God, bearing witness to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. "Pilate saith unto him, What is the Truth?" and did not wait for an answer. However, the question is answered for all, in the prayer of Jesus, "Sanctify them through thy truth; *thy word is truth.*" John 17:17. Therefore, as the word of God is truth, and we are his witnesses, we must, in precept and practice, testify to *the word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God.* Every Christian, therefore, must, in the very nature of the case, be a Protestant.

We read again: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Matt. 4:4. Mark, he does not say, "by some of the words," nor "by the words," but, "by *every word.*" This takes all of the word of God. The word of God was *all* written for our learning, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Again, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it." "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deut. 4:2; 12:32. "Every word of God is pure. . . . Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30:5, 6. We see therefore, again, that the Lord demands of us that we do *all* that he has commanded, neither less nor more. We are not to add to his word, nor diminish aught from it. Now when any man, or any act of men, practice, or teach others to practice, less than the Lord has commanded, *i.e.*, to refuse, and teach

others to refuse to do what the Lord *has commanded*, they virtually "take away" from the word of God. And when such do, and teach others to do, as duty toward

God, anything that the Lord has *not commanded*, they virtually "add to" the word of God. How much more, then, when they strive for the enactment of penal laws, by which to *compel* people to do that for which they themselves declare there is no command of God. Such are not Protestants, such are not reformers, such are not the servants of God.

In view of these principles, is it not proper for every one to inquire, Am I a Protestant? Am I a true witness of God and of Christ?

Further inquiry next week, if the Lord will. ALONZO T. JONES.

**February 5, 1885**

**"An Appeal for the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 6 , p. 84.**

THE following tribute to the value of the Old Testament, we extract from an address by Prof. W. H. Woolery (Disciple), delivered before the Adelpian Society of Bethany College, West Virginia, Dec. 13, 1884, and printed in the *Christian Standard* (Disciple), January 10, 1885. We agree with the editor of the *Standard*, that is "deserves attention, not merely as a plea for the study of Hebrew, but for its manly advocacy of the Old Testament Scriptures as essential to a proper understanding of the New." In view of the fact that in the last quarter of a century there has been no more bitter opponents of the Old Testament than the Disciple Church, it is a "manly advocacy of the Old Testament Scriptures." And because of this, and because of the endorsement of the leading paper of the denomination, we think it deserves particular attention, and we are glad to publish from this source such statements as, "*The ten commandments are neggets of gold,*" etc. We commend to all, and especially to the members of the Disciple Church, the careful perusal of the address.

A. T. J.

**"Protestantism, or Not?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 6 , pp. 89, 90.**

BEARING in mind the principles of Protestantism, scriptural and historical, as presented in last week's issue, we proceed with the inquiry, whether the churches which are professedly Protestant are really Protestant or not. Of course we cannot take up and consider the different denominations one by one; that would be an endless task. There are, however, certain tenets which are held by all Protestant Christendom and upon which they can be brought to the test once for all. We shall choose two of these, which are held so nearly universally that as a matter of fact there are but two denominations which stand as exceptions to each, and only *one* of these two denominations stands as an exception to *both* points of doctrine. These two tenets are of special importance, because they are to be the main subjects of controversy until the consummation. Moreover, in the discussion of these two is involved all the doctrine that pertains to the salvation of men.

The first of these is, *The unconditional immortality of man*, or, an otherwise expressed, The immortality of the soul. Although this doctrine is so nearly universally believed by Protestants, and held by them of such vast importance, yet so far is it from being believed and maintained in accordance with Protestant principles, it is held in defiance of them. Remember, "the Bible and the Bible alone" is the rule of Protestants. "The word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God," is the Protestant motto. Therefore the Protestants to consistently hold the immortality of the soul, the doctrine must be plainly declared in the Bible, it must be the word of God, and must be upheld by the *whole* word of God.

Webster defines *immortal*, "exempt from liability to die." "One exempt from death." The unconditional immortality of man therefore is the doctrine that man is *not liable to die*, that man is *exempt from death*. But every person who has ever read the Bible at all knows full well that such an idea is in direct opposition to that book from beginning to end. "All have sinned." "The wages of sin is *death*." "*Death* passed upon all men." "In Adam *all die*." It is not necessary to multiply passages to sustain a truth that is so plain. The force of the Scriptures is evaded, however, by the subterfuge that these statements refer to the body, and not to the soul at all; but that this is only a subterfuge, and a very poor one, appears instantly by the fact that the Scriptures speak thus emphatically of the *soul*, whatever may be claimed for it. "The *soul* that sinneth *it shall die*." Eze. 18:4. "He hath poured out his *soul unto death*." Isa. 53:12. "All they that go down to the dust shall bow before him; and *none can keep alive* his own *soul*." Ps. 22:29. Again, so far is the Bible from attributing immortality to man that it states directly the contrary. "Shall *mortal* man be more just than God." Job 4:17. "O Lord thou art our God; let not mortal man prevail against thee." 2 Chron. 14:11, margin. So that in whatever form the unconditional immortality of man may be held, it is equally contradictory to the word of God.

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul cannot be found in the Bible. It cannot be held in harmony with the Bible as it is. This is plain from the few texts already cited, and these could be multiplied to the whole extent of the word of God. And those who advocate the doctrine, do so at the expense of every principle of Protestantism. Instead of shaping the doctrine by the Bible, they make the Bible conform to the doctrine. The language of the Bible is forced into channels where that of no other book would be allowed to go. Words when found in the Bible are made to mean exactly contrary to what they mean when found in any other place in human language. And all to sustain the dogma of the immortality of the soul. But that is just where this method of interpretation belongs. It was the introduction of this doctrine into the Christian church, that created the necessity for this scheme of interpretation. The one man who, more than any other, is responsible for it was Origen, who lived from A.D. 184 to 253. Says Mosheim:—

"The Christian doctors who had applied themselves to the study of letters and philosophy, soon abandoned the frequented paths and wandered in the devious wilds of fancy. The Egyptians [Alexandrians] distinguished themselves in this new method of

explaining the truth. . . . Origen was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man, enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it. . . . He alleged that it was not in their literal force and import that the true meanings of the sacred writers were to be sought, but in a mysterious and hidden sense. . . . In this devious path he displays the most ingenious strokes of fancy, though generally *at the expense of truth*, whose divine simplicity is rarely discernible through the cobweb of allegory. Origen expresses himself in the following manner: 'The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so shall not attain to the kingdom of God. The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.' But the philosophy which this great man embraced with such zeal was one of the sources of his delusion. He could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that sacred book according to its literal sense."—*Church History, century 2, part 2, chap. 5, paragraphs 1, 5.*

There is exposed the secret of the whole matter. "He could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted." What were these opinions? He was "enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy." And *that* was the immortality of the soul. Now in Plato's discussion of the nature of the soul he maintains that it is imperishable, indestructible, immortal, deathless, etc., etc. But the Bible, speaking of wicked men, says they shall "die," "they shall utterly perish," their "end is destruction," that man is "mortal," etc. It is not at all strange therefore that Origen could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted, because these opinions, and the statements of the Bible, are as entirely opposites as it is possible for things to be. And so, not finding any support in the Scriptures for this doctrine, he invented a scheme by which he could find not only that, but whatever he wanted. That is, to give a meaning to the Bible language directly opposite to what it says. And Origen's method of interpretation is perpetuated to this day by those who attempt to maintain, by the Scriptures, the immortality of the soul. However, this is not strange, because, as the doctrine was dependent wholly upon this scheme of interpretation for its birth into the Christian church, so, without that scheme, it could not live there for a day.

We have a most pertinent illustration of this subject in a late discussion by the Congregational Club, of San Francisco, as reported in the *San Francisco Call* of Jan. 20, 1885:—

"Rev. Prof. Mooar, of the Pacific Theological Seminary, opened the discussion upon the question of 'Conditional Immortality,' . . . and showed that there was no sufficient ground in Scripture for the position that immortality is a special gift, granted only to believers, while others are annihilated."

Let us read a few texts: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life." "He that *believeth* on the Son *hath everlasting life*; and he that believeth *not* the Son, *shall not see life*." John 3:16, 36. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, *and believeth on him*, may have everlasting life." John 6:40. "He that *hath* the Son *hath life*; and he that *hath not* the Son of God, *hath not life*." 1 John 5:12. "For the wages of sin is death; but the *gift* of God is eternal life *through Jesus Christ* our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Now if these scriptures do not show positively that everlasting life, immortality, is the "gift of God" to those alone "who believe" on the Son, we should like the reverend professor to tell us what they do show. More, if the Lord wanted to tell men that those who believe on Christ shall have everlasting life, and that those who do not believe on him shall not have life, but shall perish; if he wanted to tell them that those who have the Son have life, and those who have not the Son of God have not life; if he wanted to tell men that eternal life is a *gift* from him through Christ, will Professor Mooar please convey to us some idea of the way in which it could be done more plainly than it is done in the words above quoted?

But how does the Professor avoid the plain statements of these texts? Why, just as Origen did before him, in the same cause, he "objected to the canon of interpretation" that the "Scripture must be taken in its most literal and obvious sense." And "Professor Benton agreed with Dr. Mooar . . . though there were not a few passages which, literally interpreted, would seem to support that view." So the Scriptures, literally interpreted, *i.e.*, taken as they read, will not admit of unconditional immortality, therefore they must not be taken in their plain, "obvious" meaning, but must be taken in a mystical sense, in a hidden meaning, which none but reverend professors and theological leaders of thought, can know or understand. Where is there any real difference between this and the theory of the papal church? The papacy says the Scriptures are mysterious, that they have mystical meanings, that they are not to be literally interpreted, and that none but the priests, those who are educated for that purpose, can interpret them correctly, and that therefore the common people have no business to read the Bible. These so-called Protestants say, Oh, yes, give the common people the Bible; let them read it; howbeit they will fall into great error, because it is not to be taken in its "most literal and obvious sense." If between these there is any advantage it certainly appears to be in favor of the papal church, for it has at least the merit of consistency.

The fundamental principle, the foundation-stone, of Protestantism is that—

"The Bible is not to be interpreted and use ac-

90

ording to tradition, or use and wont [custom], but to be explained by means of *itself, its own language* and connection."

But we have seen that the language that is used to express and explain the immortality of the soul, is *not* the language of the Bible; that in support of this doctrine the Bible is not "explained by means of itself," but by means of the doctrine, and *contrary to itself*; and that so the "sufficiency of the Scripture" is virtually denied; and as is well expressed by McClintock and Strong, "*Those who*

*deny its [the Scripture's] sufficiency, are not in principle Protestants.*" Therefore from all these considerations it is inevitable that all who maintain the immortality of the soul *are not Protestants.*

ALONZO T. JONES.

**February 12, 1885**

**"Protestants, or Not? No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 7 , pp. 104, 105.**

THE second point upon which the practice of Protestants can be brought to the test of Protestant principles is *the Sunday sabbath*. With but two exceptions (Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists), all Protestants keep Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath. But it is with this, as it is with the idea of the immortality of the soul, instead of Sunday-keeping being in harmony with Protestant principles, it is in defiance of them. The word of God furnishes men with the only account of the institution of the Sabbath. That word likewise gives to men, in plain terms, the law of God which regulates the institution. Here it is:—

"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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

This is the only Sabbath law that there is in the world. It commands the observance of the *seventh day*. Every reason, every provision, of the commandment has reference solely to the seventh day; and it is subversive of the commandment to make any part of it apply to any other than the seventh day of the week. To this agree the word of God, the whole word of God. The person who obeys this commandment as it is written, can give to every one who asks why he keeps the seventh day for Sabbath, the excellent answer, The word of God commands it.

It is not so with the Sunday. To the question, Why do you keep Sunday? no man can answer that the word of God commands it. In all the Scriptures there is neither authority nor reason given for the practice of keeping Sunday. And instead of the practice being directed by the Bible, the Bible is made to conform to the practice. Men have grown up in the practice of keeping Sunday, and when their attention is called to the fact that Sunday is not Sabbath at all, and the plain words of the commandment are cited and supported by the unanimous testimony of the Bible, instead of at once correcting their conduct by the Scripture, they set to work most diligently to contrive something by which they can make it appear that the practice is right. And in this contrivance to save appearances, there is

nothing too far-fetched, nothing too illogical, nothing too puerile to be accepted with avidity, if there is any possibility of making it in any way effectual.

One of the most common of these contrivances is usually expressed in about this formula: My father

105

and mother, my grandfather and grandmother, and all my people kept Sunday, and I guess if they are saved I can be. But such argument is very defective. 1. It makes the actions of men, instead of the word of God, the standard of duty. It is guided by what men have done, rather than by what they *should have* done. 2. It rests upon the idea that we can be as good as our fathers were, by doing simply what they did. This is a very serious mistake, a mistake which should be well understood, and which we shall endeavor to point out.

The principle that governs the acceptance of all our actions is expressed in this scripture: "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. 8:12. And it is illustrated in the Saviour's words: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak [margin, excuse] for their sin." John 15:22. These people living according to what light they had, were accepted of God, but Jesus came speaking the word of God as never man spake, which their fathers had not heard, bringing great light which their fathers had not seen, and when they rejected this light, this additional truth, they had no excuse for their refusal to receive it. And the words of Jesus that "they have *no excuse* for their sin," is a plain notice to all people that each one individually is responsible for the truth which is brought to his notice, and that the Lord will accept no excuse for its rejection. In the Judgment the question to us will not be what our fathers did, but *what did we*.

The work of the Reformation has been progressive. From the extreme darkness into which the world had been plunged by the supremacy of the papal church, the light of the truth of God has been advancing step by step, from the energetic protest of Luther and his associates, through the like action of his successors, until our own day. And they who still endeavor to carry forward the work of the Reformation are the true Protestants. But as we have before shown, this can be done only by persistently asserting the supreme authority of the Bible, the word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God. And when, in the onward march of the Reformation, additional light shines forth from portions of the word of God, when truths are brought forth which have hitherto been in obscurity, it is the most un-Protestant of all actions to present the plea that our fathers did not do thus and therefore we need not, and thus seek to evade the truth and refuse to walk in the light. If such a plea be allowable at all it were so in the ages that have gone before, and the Reformation would have ended where it began; nay, it never could have even begun. So such argument, logically considered, lands us plumply upon Catholic ground; in fact, the same argument was used by the Catholic defenders in their opposition to Luther and his work; in short, it is a Catholic and not a Protestant plea.

It is true that the Jews were a stiff-necked and rebellious people, but that is only to say that they were human. Yet, though they were often rebellious, they

were, likewise, at times, willing and obedient; and one of these occasions of their willing obedience is one of the most apt illustrations of this subject that we find in the Bible. In the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, after the people had returned from Babylon, we read that they all gathered together as one man into the street, and spake to Ezra "to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. . . . And he read therein . . . from the morning until midday; . . . and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. . . . And on the second day . . . they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month; and that they should publish and proclaim in all their cities, and in Jerusalem, saying, Go forth unto the mount, and fetch olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches, and palm branches, and branches of thick trees, to make booths, as it is written. So the people went forth, and brought them. . . . And all the congregation of them that were come again out of the captivity made booths, and sat under the booths." Now here is the point: "*For since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel done so.*" Certainly there, if ever, the plea would have been justifiable, that "our fathers did not do this, and why should we?" for since the days of Joshua—under Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and David, and Elijah, and all the prophets *but Malachi*—the children of Israel *had not done this, and these knew it.* But they asked no question, they made no plea, about what their fathers had done; here was the duty plainly written, and when they read it they immediately set about obeying it. The word of God said it, and that was enough. It was their duty to do it, if never a person in the world had done it.

So it is with us. The word of God says plainly "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." So far as we are concerned, it is our duty to keep the seventh day—the Sabbath of the Lord—whether our fathers kept it or not. Yea, even though it had never been kept by a man in this world, it would be just as absolutely our duty to keep it as though it had been kept by every person who ever lived in the world. God has commanded it, it is therefore our duty; and we repeat, our duty is to be regulated, not by what men have done, but by what they should have done; by the commandment of God, and not by the actions of man. Unswerving loyalty to the word of God is the sum of the Christian religion, and of Protestantism.

These principles are indisputable. They are genuine Protestant principles, but before them the institution of the Sunday sabbath cannot stand for a moment. This is clearly proven by the methods employed in defense of Sunday-keeping, the most prominent of which is the universal appeal to the so-called Christian Fathers. One of the fundamental principles of Protestantism is, "We are not to take the Fathers to throw light on Scripture, but Scripture to throw light on the Fathers."—*D'Aubigne, Reformation, Book 9, chap. 5.* Yet, in defiance of this principle, all Protestant denominations appeal to these Fathers in support of the Sunday institution, and by that very thing they demonstrate that they are not Protestants. And that is not all. Stuff that the Fathers never wrote is passed off as theirs, and held up as of authority which we are to accept in matters which

concern our salvation. It makes no difference, however, whether the Fathers wrote what is attributed to them or not; what they did not write is of just as much authority as what they did write, and that is of no authority whatever.

Suppose that Ignatius, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, etc., even the whole gang of the Fathers, had said. The first day of the week is the Sabbath, would that prove that it is so? Not by any means. It would simply prove that they said what is false, that is all. The word of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." That word is truth, and when men say anything that differs from it, they say that which is false. Luther says of the Fathers:—

"When God's word is by the Fathers expounded, construed, and glossed, then, in my judgment, it is even like to one who straineth milk through a coalsack, which must needs spoil and make the milk black; even so likewise God's word is of itself sufficiently pure, clean, bright, and clear. But through the doctrines, books, and writings of the Fathers it is very sorely darkened, *falsified*, and spoiled."

"Although it becometh not me to censure the Fathers, yet, notwithstanding, the more I read their books, the more I find myself offended; for they were but men, and (to speak the truth) with their repute and authority they did *undervalue and suppress* the books and writings of the sacred apostles of Christ."

"Among all the writings of the Fathers, I took most delight to read St. Austin's [Augustine's] works; but since the time that (by God's grace) I understood St. Paul, I could esteem nothing of any Father whatsoever; they are all of very small value."—*Luther's Table-Talk*.

Melancthon said:—

"How often did not Jerome commit mistakes! how often Augustine! how often Ambrose! how often do they differ in opinion! how often do they retract their own errors! . . . There is only one volume inspired by the Spirit of Heaven, pure and true throughout. . . . There is philosophy enjoined us in regard to the Book of God; and it is, to employ it as the . . . one by which all the opinions and maxims of men must be tried."—*D'Aubigne, Reformation, Book 5, chap. 7*.

We will again quote D'Aubigne's words, for they are peculiarly applicable at this time, and especially in this connection:—

"We are not to take the Fathers to throw light on Scripture, but Scripture to throw light on the Fathers. The Reformers and the apostles held up the word of God *alone* for light, just as they held up the sacrifice of Christ alone for righteousness. *To attempt to mix up human authority with the absolute authority of God, or human righteousness with this perfect righteousness of Christ, is to corrupt Christianity* in its two foundations. Such are the two fundamental heresies of Rome, *heresies*, moreover, *which some teachers would*

*fain introduce, though, doubtless, in a modified form, into the bosom of the Reformation.*"—*Id., Book 9, chap. 5.*

Through the channel of the Sunday-sabbath institution, this which he calls heresy, this "attempt to mix up human authority with the absolute authority of God," has at last found a large place in "the bosom of the Reformation;" so large, indeed, that when that shall succeed which its most earnest advocates are laboring to accomplish, namely, a penal Sunday law, that which passes as Protestantism will be, not such, but an exact image of the papal church.

We see, then, that the language used to express and explain that Sunday, or the first day of the week, is the Sabbath, is not the language of the Bible; that in support of this institution of the Bible is not explained by itself, but by tradition and the Fathers, and contrary to itself; and that so the sufficiency of the Scripture is virtually denied; and, as quoted last week. "Those who deny its sufficiency are not in principle Protestants," therefore it is inevitable that all who maintain the doctrine that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Sabbath of the Lord, *are not Protestants.*

A. T. JONES.

**"The 'Pacific' and the Sunday Law" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 7 , p. 106.**

THE *Pacific*, of February 4, is out with a defense of the positions of the Congregational Club, which we discussed in the SIGNS of January 22. In defense of the efforts for the re-enactment of the penal Sunday law in California, it attempts the usual distinction between the civil and the religious aspect of the day, and with the usual degree of success. It says:—

"Nothing needs to be made plainer than the distinction between civil Sunday and Christian Sunday."

It is true that, under the circumstances, nothing *needs* to be made plainer, but it is a fact that no one who claims such a distinction has ever succeeded in making it plain. Most assuredly it is not made plain in the address of the Ministerial Union. In that there is no hint of a "civil Sunday," but of a religious one solely. We quote:—

"The friends of the Christian Sabbath are deeply pained in witnessing the high-handed and defiant desecration of all that is *sacred and righteous* in this *holy day*. *It is hostile to our religion.*"

Will the *Pacific* please take this passage and point out the distinction in it between the civil Sunday and the Christian Sunday? Or will the *Pacific* take the complete address, as printed in its own columns, and show in it any such distinction at all? In view of these terms, "desecration," "sacred," "righteous," "holy day," "hostile to our religion," as used in the address, the plea of the *Pacific* that the Sunday law is to be "in the interest of such . . ." as "health," "good order," "the freedom and stability of the commonwealth," etc., is most lame and impotent.

Again it says:—

"The fourth commandment, which designates one day of the seven as specially dedicated to God, remains in our Bible, and we propose to recognize its authority and its wisdom."

Yes, they are going to recognize the authority of the fourth commandment, by violating it at every opportunity. They propose to recognize its wisdom by totally disregarding it. See:—

"But it is an undeniable fact that that weekly day, in the Christian Church, came to be observed on Sunday rather than Saturday. This was brought about by *no express law*. It was a spontaneous tribute."

Here is a plain admission that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of Saturday; but with "no express law," by simply "spontaneous tribute," the Christian church disregards the day enjoined by the commandment, and substitutes Sunday instead. They will break the commandment of God, and then mend the matter by their own merit! They will commit sin and then atone for it by their own "voluntary tribute"! And in this way they propose to recognize the authority of the fourth commandment! Dear *Pacific*, when you get your penal Sunday law, will you allow us to recognize its authority in this way? If you will we shall be glad. Further, if such is your idea of proper recognition of the law of God, will you please point to a person in this wide world who does not "recognize" its authority?

In our discussion of this subject before, we said: "Nothing can be duty toward God, that has not been commanded by God," because of the words of Christ, "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say . . . we have done that which was our duty." And, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the *whole duty* of man." We stated that, as man can do no more than his duty, and as the commandments of God contain his whole duty, therefore nothing can be duty that is not commanded. The *Pacific* notes this argument and says:—

"The voluntary tribute of grateful hearts to the Redeemer is obedience to command. For gratitude to the Saviour is certainly a duty."

Yes, gratitude to the Saviour is undoubtedly a duty. But we wish to inquire by what principle of righteousness it can be that one duty can do away with another. How is it that gratitude to our Saviour can supplant obedience to our Creator? Is it true that we must obey God in order to obey Christ? that we must dishonor the Father in order to honor the Son? Is gratitude to Christ, and his salvation from sin, best displayed in contempt of God, and his law by which is the knowledge of sin?

But this is not all; these people are not content to thus show their own "gratitude;" they want to compel everybody else to show their gratitude in the same way. If they would content themselves with showing their "gratitude" in their own way, and allow others equal liberty, we should not have so much cause of complaint; but when they propose to compel us by fine and imprisonment to show our gratitude in their way, then we most decidedly object.

ALONZO T. JONES.

**February 19, 1885**

**"Protestants or Not? No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 6 , pp. 121, 122.**

WE have found that those who maintain the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and those who maintain that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Sabbath, are not Protestants. There are other doctrines held by certain professedly Protestant denominations, such as sprinkling for baptism, and infant baptism, which can no more be held in consonance with Protestant principles than can these, but such are found only in some of the different denominations; while the two which we have noticed, *taken together*, touch every Protestant denomination in the world (with one exception), and show them to be not in principle Protestants.

We do not state this as a matter for exultation, nor to make capital of it, but simply as a solid fact deduced from sound principles. Nor will it do for any one to allow his prepossessions to hide his eyes from these things. They *are* facts, and it is high time to look them fairly in the face, and to plant ourselves firmly upon pure Protestant principles; for the time is coming, and coming soon, when genuine Protestantism will be a protest, not only against the papal church as such, but against papal principles under the garb of Protestantism. Because in the effort to sustain the Sunday institution, professed Protestants are willing to follow papal principles even to the full length of using to the utmost the arm of the civil power, to compel the observance of rites which are wholly religious. When, by the amendment to the United States Constitution, there shall be in this country a union of church and State, and when by this the united Protestant churches shall have gained the supremacy in the affairs of this nation, and all this for the express purpose of enforcing by penal statute the observance of the Sunday institution, which is wholly Catholic, what will that be but the triumph of Catholic principles? and this too through those who should be Protestants. And to accomplish this they are not only willing, but glad, and even anxious, to join hands with the Romish Church. As early as 1876 the *Christian Statesman* printed the following from a speech by Rev. W. W. Atterbury, Secretary of the New York Sabbath (Sunday) Committee:—

"One or two principles should always be observed in these efforts. First, avoid all entangling alliances with temperance, Bible, and common school laws, and concentrate the friends of the Sabbath [Sunday]. In New York, by this plan, the co-operation of the Roman Catholics had been secured."

Again says Mr. Atterbury:—

"The Protestant and the Roman Catholic. . . have alike an interest in maintaining our Sunday law."

The very latest Sunday law book, less than two months from the press, presents as one of the main "elements of hope" for the success of the Sunday

law movement in the nation, the fact that the Catholic Church is sharing in it. This too in the face of the following, from a letter written to the author of the book, by "Father Sylvester Malone, one of the most influential priests of Brooklyn":—

"I am just in receipt of your letter, in which you put to me several questions in reference to the teachings of the Catholic Church on what *all Christians owe as their duty to the command of God*. 'Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day.' In the first place, I have to remark that the Sabbath of the Jews was celebrated on the last day of the week, and not on the first, which we Catholics call the Lord's day. *For this change we have only the authority of the Catholic Church.*"—*The Sabbath for Man, by Rev. W. F. Crafts, page 65.*

Thus professed Protestants join heart and hand with Catholics in compelling all people to observe an institution which has "only the *authority of the Catholic Church.*" True, they deny this, but they *cannot disprove it*. Every attempt at disproof only strengthens the proof; every effort they make to get out of the Catholic bog only sinks them deeper into it. The only defense of Sunday that can be made

122

is by Catholic argument. And to try, by Catholic argument, to defend from a Catholic position only the more entangles them in the maze of this mistress of witchcrafts, and mother of abominations.

It is well known that the late Catholic Council at Baltimore, in its pastoral letter, took strong ground in favor of a "strictly religious Sunday." This, together with the fact that the same council observed Thanksgiving in accordance with the President's proclamation, is matter of great gratulation on the part of so-called Protestant papers, all over the country. It is looked upon as an indication of the final accommodation of the differences that now separate between Protestants and Catholics.

The New York *Independent* says:—

"The New York Sabbath Committee could hardly do a better thing than to reprint for general circulation that eloquent and able section of the pastoral which treats of Sunday observance."

We should not be at all surprised to see this suggestion carried out. And what an edifying thing it will be, to be sure, to see Protestants circulating Catholic tracts, directing Protestants how to keep Sunday!

Again says the *Independent*:—

"For our part, we rejoice to know that there is a 'Puritan' element in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States. . . . To the New Orleans writer, and the 'Christian Indies,' and the fathers of the pastoral, we extend our Christian salutations; and, pending the *settlement of the questions which have separated Protestants and Catholics for centuries, let us stand together in condemnation of Sunday dissipation* and other such evils, whether those who practice them disgrace the Catholic or the Protestant name."

But the *Independent* is not alone; here comes the *Christian Union* and says:—

"For the well being of this country it is not important, perhaps not even desirable, that all Roman Catholics should become Protestants; but it is of prime importance that they should understand one another. . . . So important do we regard a good understanding between these two classes of Christian voters that we should be glad to see a system of pulpit exchanges brought about; we should like to see Dr. Hall telling the worshipers at St. Ann's some Sunday morning what Protestantism really is, and Father Preston in Dr. Hall's pulpit telling the Presbyterian congregation what Roman Catholicism is. Why not? Since these two congregations are to live side by side, why should they not know at first hand what each other's opinions are? We are, for this reason, very glad that Monsignor Capel has come to this country and has spoken on Roman Catholic themes to Protestant auditors. We have asked him to tell our readers in our own columns what the Inquisition is. He has accepted, and we hope that he will make the best showing he can of that historical institution of Romanism."

So there is to be a settlement of the questions that have separated Protestants and Catholics, and this is to be by mutual apologies. The Catholics are to apologize for the Inquisition, and the Protestants are to apologize *for being called Protestants*, we suppose. We can conceive of nothing else for which they could make apology to the papal church. But in view of existing circumstances we rather think that that is the proper thing to do, for it certainly is a misnomer for them to call themselves Protestants while the only doctrine that they maintain with any degree of activity is wholly Catholic, and while they are on the very eve of enforcing this doctrine by Catholic methods.

By all this we plainly see the forces shaping themselves for the exact fulfillment of Dan. 7:21, 22: "I beheld, and *the same horn made war with the saints*, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and *the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.*" By every specification of the Scriptures, this "horn" is proved to represent the papal church. It did make war against the saints for the time and times and the dividing of time—the 1260 years—up to A.D. 1798; then its power was broken (Rev. 13:3), but it appears that it was only for a season, for the text shows that it afterward renews the war, and continues it till the saints possess the kingdom. Then the question arises: How can it be possible for the papal church to regain the power to persecute the people of God in the United States, when the Catholics are in the minority, and the Constitution forbids the enactment of any "law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"? And the answer comes swiftly and explicitly: By the Protestants securing an amendment to the Constitution, declaring this to be a "Christian nation," and placing "*all* Christian laws, institutions, and usages" on an undeniably legal basis in the very charter of this Government, and by this securing laws for the strict enforcement of Sunday observance, which rests for its authority upon the Catholic Church alone, this great nation is to be turned into a *sect* and delivered bodily into the cruel power of Rome, and compelled to do

fealty to her,—compelled "to worship the beast whose deadly wound was healed." Rev. 13:8, 11-17.

This is exactly what the papacy wants; this is what she longs for; but she knows that she dare not attempt it in her own name. She sees also that there is no need of attempting it in her own name. She sees the Protestant churches holding her own doctrines; she sees them sustaining these doctrines by her own methods; with joy she sees them exalting her pet institution, the Sunday, to the highest place in the nation; with exultation she sees them putting forth their strenuous efforts to accomplish the Constitutional amendment and the union of church and State. Thus exultant sits the "well-favored harlot," smiling benignly upon her dutiful daughters, pampering their pride and flattering their vanity by pretended concessions in public celebrations of Thanksgiving and official deliverances on the sacredness of Sunday. And they, in their excessive verdancy, receive her hypocritical smiles and treacherous concessions as veritable evidences of divine favor, and, in return, they the more diligently pander to her ruinous power and her blasphemous ambition.

Dr. Van Dyke, one of the foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in America, said in the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1885:—

"The mission of Protestantism, as such, is ended."

Within his meaning, and in view of the evidence which we have here adduced, who can dispute the Doctor's proposition? When Protestantism deliberately proposes the settlement of the questions which have for centuries separated it from Catholicism; when it states in sober earnest that "it is not even desirable that all Roman Catholics should become Protestants;" when it proposes to "stand together" with Catholics in support of an institution that is wholly Catholic, and "in condemnation" of all who choose to disregard such institution; when it proposes to form the adulterous connection of church and State to trust in man and to make flesh its arm; then who shall say that its mission is not ended? Aye, its mission is certainly ended, and that most shamefully.

And after this shameful display of herself, who shall say that Babylon is not fallen? And why should not the Lord in mercy send a voice from Heaven crying to the honest souls that are in her, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not *partakers of her sins*, and that ye receive not of her plagues"? Rev. 18:2-4. And when, by cruel oppression, her sins shall have "reached unto Heaven," why should not God remember "her iniquities," and "in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double"?

"As *such*," Protestantism is indeed ended. But as represented in faithful allegiance to the word of God in opposition to all earthly powers, it is not ended. For at the very time when this union of Church and State, and of Protestantism and Romanism, is being effected, to compel people to worship the papal church, there is a "little flock," a despised company, who publish to all the world the word of God, saying: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God. . . . Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

And although "war" is made against them by the beast and his image, by both Catholics and professed Protestants, yet they get "the victory over the beast and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." Rev. 15:2, 3. The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, embrace the word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God; they are the truth; to keep them truly, is to be a true witness for God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and is a protest against even "Protestantism as such," as well as against Catholicism. And now, in taking leave of this subject, we subjoin two sentences from the famous Protest at Spire, which are as fully applicable at this time as when first delivered:—

"This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine, and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all human vanities that are set up against it *shall fall before the face of God.*"

ALONZO T. JONES.

**March 5, 1885**

**"Does God Claim the First Day of the Week?" *The Signs of the Times*  
11, 10 , pp. 153, 154.**

DOES God claim the first day of the week? This is a question that has been agitated for a long time, but more especially in the last forty years. During this time it has been actively declared by tongue and pen that Sunday has no claim whatever to any sacredness, but that, according to the Bible, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and that this is the only day that was ever made sacred, or that God has ever claimed as being in any way peculiarly his own. This has been disputed, of course, by almost all people, because nearly all keep Sunday. But the one thing lacking to Sunday-keepers all these years is a "Thus saith the Lord," in favor of the Sunday as a sacred day, or that it should be kept at all. Sabbath-keepers have called repeatedly for the scripture that commands that the first day of the week shall be kept. They have even offered large rewards for the discovery in the Bible of any such text. And we have known Sunday-keepers, too, who would have given a good deal to find such a text plainly written in the word of God.

This is a question too that is every day coming to be of more and more importance to all people; and we are watching with intense interest the development of the controversy. And we notice that as the truth becomes more widespread that the seventh day is, and that Sunday is not, the Sabbath, the defense of Sunday becomes more bold in its assertions; that, as it becomes more and more apparent that the Sunday-sabbath institution lacks the essential element of truth, its defenders more positively assert that which is false. The

latest that we have seen in this connection is the assertion that God does claim the first day of the week to be his, and so plainly, so decidedly too, that there can "be no arguing or quibbling about it." If that be true, certainly the Sunday-sabbath controversy must soon be forever settled. If the Lord does really claim the first day of the week, so plainly as to preclude all argument, that will surely be a "Thus saith the Lord;" that is what we all want, and to that we will all willingly yield.

But not to hold our readers in suspense, we will lay before them this decisive (?) "claim." Rev. David Gregg, the Sunday-school lesson commentator for the *Christian Statesman*, in the issue of that paper for December 25, 1884, says:—

"When the seventh day of the week was the Sabbath, God claimed it as his day, and that made its hours consecrated time. If God in any way claims the first day of the week, its hours must be treated just as the hours of the seventh day were. Now does he claim it? He does. And that there may be no arguing or quibbling about it, he stamps his name upon it. The Spirit of inspiration speaking through the apostle John distinctly calls it '*the Lord's day*.'"

There you have it. But for all he has pronounced to the contrary, we think there is room here for some argument. 1. He does not tell us where it is that the apostle John "distinctly" calls the first day of the week the Lord's day. 2. We look through the gospel according to John, and although we read there twice, the expression "first day of the week" (John 20:1, 19), in all this book there is no such term as "the Lord's day." 3. We look through the three epistles of John, and in them there is no mention of either the first day of the week or the Lord's day. 4. We turn to the book of Revelation, written by John, and there we find the term "the Lord's day," but in all the book not a hint of the first day of the week.

Now we want to know where it is that the spirit of inspiration by the apostle John "distinctly calls the first day of the week the Lord's day." When in one book the apostle speaks of the first day of the week, and in another book of the Lord's day, without a word of explanation of either term, the only natural, reasonable, or logical impression that could be gathered from it is that he refers to two different days. If in John 20:1 it were written, The first day of the week, which is the Lord's day; or, if in Rev. 1:10 it were written, I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, which is the first day of the week, then all would be plain, then we should have it "distinctly" called the Lord's day; then, indeed, there would be no ground for argument. All such connection, however, is lacking. And when Dr. Gregg, or anybody else, presents such a connection, he has to manufacture it. And with *such* arguments anything that is wanted can be "distinctly" proven. All that there is to do, is to find two terms that have no connection whatever, or a single term that says nothing at all on the subject under consideration, then assert loudly that your proposition is proven, and lo, it is done.

But Dr. Gregg is not done yet; he goes on to show that "the first day of the week was observed without discussion and without ambiguity as the Lord's day;" and he does it just as easily, and as "distinctly" (?) as he showed that it is the Lord's day. He says:—

"The Spirit of inspiration, speaking through the apostle John, distinctly calls it '*the Lord's day.*' Stamped with the Lord's own name, we are to recognize the claim of Christ when with his own lips he says: '*The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath.*' In accordance with the teaching of these direct words. . . . is the teaching of this perceptive history, which tells us how Paul spends the first day of the week at Troas."

It is astonishing that any person can be so reckless in his treatment of Scripture. It is inconceivable how he can believe his own argument. The occasion that called forth these words from the Saviour was, that the Pharisees had accused his disciples (and thus him indirectly) of doing that which was not lawful to do on the Sabbath day. (Matt. 12:1-9. Mark 2:23-28.) Does any man in the wide world suppose that the Pharisees referred to the first day of the week, when they accused the disciples of breaking the Sabbath? No, the only day that could possibly have been referred to by the Pharisees as the Sabbath, was the seventh day. Therefore when Christ, in refuting their accusation, said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day," he had reference to the seventh day of the week, and to no other. Therefore the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath of which Christ is Lord. And it is a willful perversion of Scripture to make of this saying a reference to anything else than the seventh day.

So also it is with the expression "the Lord's day." It was written by the finger of God on the table of stone, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." Now Christ, who made the Sabbath, and who made the table of stone on which these words were written (John 1:3), declares, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." Put these two expressions together—"Sabbath of the Lord," "Lord of the Sabbath"—and who can deny that they both refer to the same identical person and thing? But in neither of these is the Sabbath referred to apart from the *day*, as many argue. The commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath *day.*" Christ says, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath *day.*" Then we have, the Sabbath *day* of the Lord, and the Lord of the Sabbath *day*. It is impossible to fairly deny that both of these refer to the *same person* and to the *same day*. And this proves to a demonstration that the Sabbath day of the Lord, the day to which

154

he [*sic.*] Pharisees referred when they accused the disciples, the day to which Christ referred when he refuted their accusation, the seventh day of the week, *is the Lord's day.* And we repeat, It is a perversion of the Scriptures to make this expression refer to any other than the seventh day, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

Yet says Dr. Gregg, "In accordance with the teaching of these direct words. . . . Paul spends the first day of the week at Troas." That is, Paul spends the *first day* of the week in accordance with the teaching of words that refer solely to the *seventh day* of the week. We don't believe a word of it. Paul had a better sense of what obedience is, than that signifies. We know that a great many people of our own day are trying to do this, but it is not obedience, it is not in "accordance with the direct words" of the Lord. But, more, Paul was at Troas in A.D. 58; John wrote these "direct words" in A.D. 96. Therefore Dr. Gregg's

argument is that Paul spent the first day of the week at Troas, in accordance with words that were not in existence till *thirty-eight years afterward!* But to flatly contradict itself, sound reason, and the word of God, is as near as the defense of the Sunday institution ever approaches to the truth.

ALONZO T. JONES.

NOTE.—It would perhaps be well to call attention to an important concession that is made by this writer. In the first extract given above it will be seen that he says, "When the seventh day of the week was the Sabbath," &c. This is a plain admission that the term "seventh day" in the fourth commandment is not indefinite, meaning simply one day in seven, but that it refers to the definite seventh day *of the week*.

A. T. J.

**March 12, 1885**

**"The Teaching of the Apostles" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 11 , pp. 169, 170.**

WE do not here refer to what the apostles really taught, but to the document found about a year ago, written by—no one knows whom, at a time when no one knows, which purports to be a summary of what was taught by the apostles, and which, therefore, is entitled "The Teaching of the Apostles."

Since its discovery this document has been made a great deal of, in fact a great deal more prominence has been given it than it can possibly deserve. For no one claims that any of the apostles ever saw it, or ever heard of it; the best authorities placing its origin in the first half of the second century, or, in figures, *about* A.D. 140.

In the new Sunday book of W. F. Crafts this precious (?) find is again pushed to the front in the following manner:—

"The recent discovery and publication of 'The Teaching of the Apostles' shortens and simplifies the argument for the change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week."

But as the "Teaching" says nothing about either the Sabbath or the first day of the week, it is difficult to see how it "simplifies the argument for the change," unless, indeed, it be by furnishing a new and good opportunity to commit a fraud. At any rate, that is just what has been done to utilize it in the argument for the change. And if they propose to abandon all attempts to sustain the change by the Scriptures and rest it wholly—where it rightly belongs—upon fraud, pure and simple, then we cheerfully confess that the argument (?) for the change has been greatly simplified by the publication in English of the "Teaching of the Apostles."

However, some may ask, Even though the "Teaching" does not speak directly of the Sabbath nor the first day of the week, does it not mention the Lord's day? We answer, No, decidedly. There is no such phrase in all the book. And in the place where the translation reads "Lord's day," Dr. Crafts himself admits that the word "day" *is not in the Greek*. Then what right have they to put it in? If the writer

of the "Teaching" meant "day," could he not have written it? When the Revelator wanted to say Lord's day he wrote in Greek *Kuriake hemera*, "Lord's day." And also, when the writer of the "Teaching" meant day he said day. In chapter 4 we have *nuktos kai hemerus*, "night and day;" in chapter 8, *tris test hemeras*, "thrice a day;" in chapter 11, *hemeran mian*, "one day;" in chapter 12, *duo he treis hemeras*, "two or three days;" in chapter 16, *eschatai hemerais*, "last days;" but in chapter 14, in which he is made to say "day" there is no such word as *hemera*, "day," now anything that demands its insertion; so it is sheer invention to make it read Lord's day.

But even if the "Teaching" contained the plain Greek phrase *Kuriake hemera*, Lord's day, it would still devolve upon the Sunday advocates to show that it meant the first day of the week, because the same term is used in the Scriptures and by no means does it refer to the first day of the week. Again, even though it should plainly speak of the first day of the week, and plainly command that it should be kept, it would not relieve them in the least, for it would still be incumbent on them to prove that it comes from proper authority. And we need not go outside of the document itself to successfully impeach its credit in the estimation of all people who have any regard for the rights of property. We here make the distinct charge that the document entitled "The Teaching of the Apostles," *plainly teaches that it is right to steal*. In chapter one we find these words: "If one that is in need taketh, *he shall be guiltless*." And to show that it is theft that is meant, we have but to read right on: "But he that is *not in need* shall give account whereof he *took* and whereunto; and *being in durance* [imprisonment] shall be questioned touching

170

what he did, and he shall not go out thence until he give back the last farthing."

According to this precious document then, all that is requisite is to be "in need," and then if he "taketh, he shall be guiltless." A man is sorely in need of a suit of clothes; he "taketh" one and "shall be guiltless." Another is in need of a horse; he "taketh," and "shall be guiltless." Another is in great need of bread; he "taketh" a sack of flour, and "shall be guiltless;" and so on to the end of the catalogue. How the socialists, the communists, the nihilists, and the anarchists generally, may be glad and shout for joy, and fling their ready caps in air at sight of "The Teaching of the Apostles," this wondrous screed, this last, best gift to the rascals! How aptly they can apply Dr. Crafts' words: "The recent discovery and publication of 'The Teaching of the Apostles' shortens and simplifies the argument" that one man has no right to have more than another, and that those who have must divide with those who have not and are too lazy to work! And, too, it "shortens and simplifies the argument" for the man who has read the command "Thou shalt not steal;" all he has to do is to convince himself that he "is in need," and lo! he "taketh" and "is guiltless." Oh, yes, that fellow did a great thing when he got off all this as the teaching of the twelve apostles! It is a pity he did not leave his name along with it, so that Dr. Crafts and his Sunday law associates might have canonized him.

About A.D. 140, then, we are to *suppose* that this copy of "The Teaching of the Apostles" was first given to the world, and in it *some one* says that the

apostles taught thus and so. But we have on our table a copy of The Teaching of the Apostles, which is certainly of earlier date than that. It bears unmistakable evidence of having been written in the first century, even in the very days of the apostles themselves. We would willingly submit it to the closest scrutiny of the most critical scholars of the present day, feeling assured that they would pronounce it a production of the first century. Yet in this copy we find that, even in that day, *some one said* that the apostles taught: 1. That it is right to do evil that good may come. 2. That it is not right to marry. 3. That there is no resurrection. 4. That Christ was not divine. 5. That the Lord's supper could be celebrated by selfishness, drunkenness, and gluttony. 6. That all things are lawful, even to lasciviousness. 7. That Paul was not an apostle. 8. That the resurrection was then past. 9. That it was not lawful to eat with Gentiles unless they were circumcised. 10. That in their meetings all should speak at once. 11. That the gospel that Paul preached was not the true gospel at all. 12. That the second coming of Christ was then actually impending, so near indeed that Christians need do no work at all. All this, and much more of like tenor is there set forth by *somebody* as the teaching of the apostles. But in relation of all these and of the other of which we have spoken, we simply turn to the New Testament, the true teaching of the apostles, and we find that these are all false as false can be. Paul describes it a slanderous report to say that he said, "Let us do evil that good may come," and if he had ever heard of the report that the apostles taught that, "If one that is in need taketh, he shall be guiltless," we may imagine how swiftly and witheringly he would have rebuked the slanderous tongue or person that published it.

No, such is *not* the teaching of the apostles of Christ; but it shows how very degenerate Christianity has become, when it receives so gladly, and extols so highly, as the veritable teaching of the Spirit of God, a production that is a shame to man. It shows, too, to what lengths this degenerate Christianity will go whenever occasion allows, and it emphasizes the already urgent necessity of holding fast the word of God. Surely the time *has* come when they will not endure sound doctrine; and in view of all these things Paul's charge is now all-important: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; *preach the word.*"

A. T. JONES.

**March 19, 1885**

**"Service of Self" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 12 , pp. 185, 186.**

IN Paul's catalogue of the sins that are characteristic of the last days, in the church as well as in the world, selfishness stands at the head. "Men shall be lovers of their own selves." 2 Tim. 3:2. From this root spring all the branches that the apostle has named; and if we kill the root the branches will die of themselves. Our eyes and our endeavors should ever be upon this; because it is so insidious, so deceitful, that many acts, even of our own, which we think are acceptable

service to the Lord, are not so in fact, but are service of ourselves—selfishness. We need, therefore, to constantly examine ourselves (2 Cor. 13:5) by the strictest possible tests, that we may discover the real motive of our actions. There is not an act that we can commit, but what may spring from selfishness, whereas all ought to spring from benevolence; and we need to know as nearly as possible for ourselves, whether we are really serving the Lord or serving ourselves.

Here is one who gets up Sabbath morning, some one asks him, Are you going to church to-day? No, I think I will not go to-day; there is not going to be any preaching. If there was to be preaching I would go. So when the preacher comes round he goes, and probably thinks he is serving the Lord. But he is serving himself; he is actuated by sheer selfishness. Is your wish to glorify God? is it to do your part in encouraging and edifying the church? You can do it as well on the Sabbath when there is no preaching at your church as when there is. It is your duty to go to the place of meeting on the Sabbath, and if your wish is to serve God, you will never ask yourself whether there is to be preaching or not.

Again, very often when the time comes to go to prayer and social meeting, perhaps we don't feel like going; we think over it awhile and decide to not go, but knowing it is our duty to go and knowing that we are expected to be there, we feel uneasy at home and finally decide to go; not because we want to, not because we are glad to, but to *relieve ourselves* of uneasiness, and it is selfishness. Then when we reach the place of meeting it is the same process over again; we don't feel like speaking or praying and so we wait and wait, the meeting is almost over, the time is nearly expired, we have neither prayed nor spoken; we know we ought to do one or the other, we know we are expected to do so, we know we do not and shall not feel easy unless we do; so, to *relieve ourselves*, we get up and say "I am glad to be here," etc., with a mannere and in a tone in which there is no element of gladness, and all simply to relieve ourselves and which is therefore selfishness.

Once more, there are those who will do no missionary work till near the close of the quarter, and there is only a short time till they will have to make a report, and they have done nothing which they can report, so they will take up a few tracts or papers, and rustle round and distribute them somewhere, not with any particular consideration of the precious truth which they are handling, not with any burden for souls for whom Christ died, but primarily, if not solely, *to have something to report*, to satisfy, and relieve *themselves*, and which therefore is selfishness. And so we might, and in fact so we need, to trace to its source every act of our lives, and see for ourselves whether we are serving God, or serving ourselves. By so doing we shall develop and cultivate benevolence, cheerful well-doing and willing service in the cause of our Master.

The Scripture sets before us the one single motive that must actuate all our service. That motive is, *love for Christ*. Any other motive, any other inducement, whatever it may be, is too low. We must keep ourselves reined up to this supreme incentive. Christ himself set it before us in his own words. In his twice repeated question to Peter, "Lovest thou me?" he gives us the supreme rule by which to detect the motive by which we are actuated. The true intent of this passage (John 21:15-17) has been too often lost by passing it by as simply

intended to recall to Peter's mind, in a delicate way, his triple denial of the Lord. We do not deny that such impression was conveyed to Peter, but we regard it as equally undeniable that there is in it a deeper meaning than that,—even this, that to Peter, and to all others, before they enter upon any service of the Lord, he asks the searching question twice repeated, "Lovest thou me?" And when we can answer that question in the affirmative, as did Peter, then, and not till then, are we prepared to do anything in the name of Him "who hath loved us and hath washed us from our sins in His own blood."

Then when Sabbath comes the question will not be, Shall I go to church to-day? but it will be "Lovest thou me?" and all will be decided at once. When the occasion of the prayer and social meeting comes, there will be no question about whether we shall go, or whether we shall take part when we do go, but "Lovest thou me?" will decide it all. In doing missionary work of whatever kind, "Lovest thou me?" will settle the matter of reporting, long before the end of the quarter. That all-important question repeated o'er and o'er, and answered o'er and o'er, will rid the heart and mind of all selfish-

186

ness, and plant, and cause to grow, the beautiful tree of benevolence, bearing abundantly its sweet fruit, joy, gladness, willingness, readymindedness, and cheerfulness, in all the service of the Lord, and God will be glorified in his saints. "More love to thee, O Christ! more love to thee."

A. T. JONES.

### **March 26, 1885**

#### **"Let Us Be Sober" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 13 , pp. 201, 202.**

IN 1 Thess. 4:15-17, Paul sets forth the coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the righteous living caught up with them to meet the Lord in the air. Then in the next chapter he proceeds thus: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you." This being written to the "brethren," and to those too who are to be alive on the earth when the Lord comes, he says, "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" but that these are "all the children of the light and the children of the day;" and that thus they know "perfectly" in regard to the "times and the seasons," and that therefore it is not necessary for him to write of these. Although these are so much the children of the light that they know these things perfectly, yet to any one who will read carefully this fifth chapter of first Thessalonians clear through it will appear very plain that the apostle did not think that there was no need that he should write unto them in regard to the *duties* that would devolve upon them, in view of the times and the seasons which they would know so perfectly.

One of these important duties which he would specially impress upon us is to be sober. "Let us who are of the day be sober;" "let us watch and be sober." In his letter to Titus also Paul insists upon this. He commands that Titus shall teach "that the aged men be sober;" "the aged women likewise;" "that they may teach

the young women to be sober;" "young men likewise exhort to be sober minded;" "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus 2. Thus he calls upon aged men and aged women, young men and young women, all to be sober. Nor is it simply soberness as opposed to drunkenness, upon which the apostle insists; but sober-mindedness. The mind must be so inclined to soberness that the whole life will be but the expression of it. Webster says that "*sober* is opposed to *flighty*." That upon which the Scriptures insist therefore, is a character words, as stanch, solid, not puffed up, but *built up*.

Remember that these exhortations to sobriety are written to those who will be alive when the Lord comes; it is in view of that important event that he writes; and for the further reason that the Scriptures show plainly that lightness and trifling will be characteristic of this very time. And Paul in reasoning out of the Scriptures saw this and therefore set up this standard against it. Notice in 1 Thess. 5:3 he says, "For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them; . . . and they shall not escape." Now turn to Jer. 23:16—and read: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Harken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; they make you vain; they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me, The Lord hath said, *Ye shall have peace*; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, *No evil shall come upon you*." Here is pointed out the very cry of "Peace and safety" which Paul names, and here follows too the very destruction to which Paul refers, "Behold, a whirlwind of the Lord is gone forth in fury, even a grievous whirlwind; it shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. The anger of the Lord shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the thoughts of his heart; *in the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly*."

Here then are the very sentiments of Paul's argument. "Peace"—"ye shall have peace," and "safety"—"no evil shall come upon you;" and this at the very time when the anger of the Lord is to

202

fall grievously on the head of the wicked; Paul expresses it, "sudden destruction cometh upon them;" Jeremiah says it shall be in the latter days; Paul says, just before the coming of the Lord. It is impossible to read the two passages together without reaching the conclusion that it was to this very passage in Jeremiah that Paul had reference when he wrote that in 1 Thess. 5. This is made sure when we read in Jer. 25:15, 33, and find that this "whirlwind" is that which marks the culmination of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture in the seven last plagues (Rev. 16), when that "great voice" is heard from "the temple of Heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done." And this assurance is made doubly sure when we read onward in Jeremiah 23 to verse 32 and find there: "Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and *by their lightness*; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." The apostle reading this scripture saw how that "lightness" and trifling would characterize the "peace and safety" prophets, and, knowing the "times and

the seasons," he impresses upon all, the important words, "*Let us watch, and be sober,*" and thus he would, and he would have us, lift up a standard against the lightness and trifling that will prevail even in the pulpit.

Jeremiah is not the only one of the prophets that points this out. Zephaniah says, "Her prophets are light and treacherous persons; . . . they have done violence to the law." Zeph. 3:4. But all this is because "like people, like priest" (Hos. 4:9), and because the "people love to have it so" (Jer. 5:31); therefore Isaiah says: "Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever (margin, the latter day); that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that *will not hear the law of the Lord*; which cry to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits; get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us." Isa. 30:8-11. Paul's comment on this passage is, "The time will come [it has come] when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4:3, 4. The "sound doctrine" which they will not endure, is, according to Isaiah, the law of God; "children that will not hear the law of the Lord." Of these it may be said as of Ephraim of old, "I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted a strange thing." Hos. 8:12. And because that they will thus not receive the love of the truth that they may be saved, "Wherefore thus saith the Holy One of Israel, Because ye despise this word, and trust in fraud [margin] and perverseness, and stay thereon; therefore this iniquity shall be to you as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant." Isa. 30:12, 13.

The Lord therefore not only calls us to be sober-minded, but he directs us to that which if given a place in the mind, will create staidness and solidity of character; to that which will not puff up, but which will build up, that is the law of God. At the time when they will not hear the law of the Lord, he sends a loud cry to all the world. "Here are they that *keep the commandments of God*, and the faith of Jesus." At the very time when their disposition is to "depise this word," he declares, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; *preach the word.*" May we all who are waiting for the coming of the Lord come humbly to him praying the prayer, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." May he put his law in our minds, and write it in our hearts. And knowing the times and the seasons, let us "watch;" knowing the lightness and the trifling, let us be "sober;" knowing the willfulness and the rebellion, let us be "willing and obedient;" knowing how the word of the Lord is despised, let us honor it; knowing how the law of God is cast down, let us exalt it.

A. T. JONES.

**April 2, 1885**

**"Light Literature the Bane of Purity and Peace" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 14 , pp. 217, 218.**

LAST week, in studying the Scripture injunction to be sober, we found that it is especially insisted upon in the last days, because that its opposite—"lightness"—will be most prevalent; and in the definition of the word we found that, "*sober* is opposed to *flighty*." *Flighty* is thus defined: "Indulging in flight, or wild and unrestrained sallies of imagination, humor, caprice, etc.; given to disordered fancies and extravagant conduct; volatile, giddy;" and this is exactly what is referred to in Jer. 23:32, where it is declared that "lightness" is a characteristic of the last days; and it is the events foreshown in Jer. 23:16-32, to which Paul has reference, when, in 1 Thess. 5:6, 8, he exhorts us to "be sober."

Now let any sober-minded person take this definition of "flighty," and, bearing it in mind for a week, compare with it the actions of the people generally, as they come under his notice either by direct observation, or as reported in the daily papers, and we are sure that he will be ready to admit that certainly these are the times pointed out in these scriptures. And the longer he conducts the observation, the more thoroughly will he be convinced that this is so. And another thing of which he will be convinced by such observation is that the one source, more than all others, whence this instability, this flightiness, this lightness springs, is the "light" literature that is found everywhere, low and high, from the hovel to the palace, from the gamins to the pampered heirs of millions.

Light literature it is called, and properly so, for light it is. In it is embodied every element that tends to lightness. There is not a single idea contained in the definition of flighty that is not demonstrated in this light literature. The mind, like the body, is, in this respect, an assimilation of what it feeds on; and the mind that dwells upon this kind of literature soon becomes as light and shallow as the stuff that is read. It is a poison to the mind as veritably as is whisky, or tobacco, or any other poison, to the body; and like other poisons it creates an appetite which nothing but itself can supply; and as there is absolutely nothing in it by which the mind is fed, developed, or strengthened, the more of it that is devoured, so much the more is demanded, and so much weaker and more morbid the mind becomes. And so the mind is rendered almost useless for any sober purpose; it is almost if not altogether impossible for such a mind to concentrate itself upon a subject that requires deep thought; to follow a line of sound reasoning; or to appreciate the principles that underlie the most important concerns of life.

One of the most noticeable instances in proof of this is the fact that when the attention of such is called to the benefits to be derived from the study of the Bible, the complaint is made that they cannot remember the Scripture when they do read it; while at the same time they can remember the characters and their career, in the whole course of perhaps a half-dozen of the continued stories in the *Ledger*, *Weekly*, *Saturday Night*, *Chimney Corner*, *Fireside Companion*, and other such namby-pamby papers, pamphlets, etc. If the mind were as diligently and persistently bent to the study of the Bible, if it were brought into such sympathetic harmony with the Scripture as it is with these stories, there would not be the least difficulty in remembering it. Then all its glorious beauty would

pervade the mind; its rich treasures would there be bestowed; its important truths would enlighten, and its sound principles confirm the mind, which would thus be fed, developed, strengthened, and ready for every good work.

We do not say that the Bible alone must be read, to the utter exclusion of every other book; this the Bible itself would not allow; but we do say that the Bible must be read before any other production. It must lead the way; it must guide the mind; it must be the center whence every line of thought radiates; upon its principles must every course of conduct be founded. Without this there can be no well built, properly rounded, symmetrical life in this world; with it the universe becomes our own, to study and to enjoy. The Bible will show us what we are and how to become what we ought to be; it will guide us through all the mazes of human history; it will lead us to the enjoyment of the wealth of the wondrous works of God; it will enable us to think the thoughts of the Almighty, after him. Thus we may honor God, and be an honor to the human race. And thus the life that we now live will be simply the beginning of that to which there is to be no end; and the habits of mind, and the courses of thought, will be those which are never to cease, nor to be broken in upon.

It is not so with the light literature of which we write. Of that the nature and the tendency are, in every respect, directly the opposite, so that in it all there is no good thing. But it is asked, Are not these stories pictures of real life? No. They are altogether fictitious; the very name, "novel," means "a fictitious tale or narrative;" but the fictitious part is not the worst, it is "intended to *exhibit the operation of the passions*, and particularly love."—*Webster*. There is expressed the dangerous, the destructive influence of this kind of literature. The passions are given full swing. All the baser elements of human nature,—envy, jealousy, hatred, strife, deception, ingenious trickery, murder,—are exhibited in their most active energy. Obscenity is forbidden by the law, but in this respect what this literature

218

lacks in plain expression, is amply made up in suggestiveness. So that even were it granted that it is real life that is portrayed it would still be altogether objectionable, because it is the action of the worst elements of human nature that is pictured.

In the definition above given, it is said that it is "particular [sic.] love" that is intended to be exhibited, and these are sometimes called "love stories," but, whatever may be intended, it is not love that is therein exhibited; it is simply an exhibition of extravagant, misguided passion. And this counterfeit is dressed in all the gorgeous and dazzling array that rhetoric can invent, and is paraded as love; the readers of these stories mistake it as such; and then, of course, to them, anything that lacks the distinguishing traits of the leading characters in the stories, cannot be love. So when, unfortunately, the time comes when they shall choose for themselves, the choice must be made in accordance with the most approved style of romance; it must be made in opposition to the most sacred wishes of parents and friends, so that the consummation of it must be by an elopement or a secret marriage, and then—

Ah! then the fiction vanishes and the fact appears; then the romance ends and the reality begins; the glamour of years is swept away in a day; it is found that true, genuine love is something widely different from this dazzling array of platitudes; and that this one all-essential element of a happy wedded life is sadly lacking. Then there follows, as the inevitable consequence, disgrace or a life of misery, and in the very nature of the case there is absolutely no power that can prevent it.

These dangers beset us on every hand. Parents of precious children, and even those professing to be Christians, will so far forget their duties toward God, toward their children, and toward themselves, as to spend their time in devouring this poison. Is it by filling the mind with such wild ideas, with such base thoughts, with such vain imaginations, that it is to be prepared to receive the things of the Spirit of God? Is it by such means that a people are to be prepared for the coming of the Lord? Of a truth, "Of the times and the seasons" of his coming we need not write so much, but of the duties, and the manner of life by which we must be prepared to meet him, we must write more. "Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." "Abstain from all appearance of evil. And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

A. T. JONES.

**April 9, 1885**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Acts 28:16-31" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 15 , pp. 230, 231.**

APRIL 26—ACTS 28:16-31

**Paul at Rome.**

ST. PAUL had seen many magnificent cities, but never one which was approached by a road so regular and so costly in construction as Rome. As they passed each well-known object, the warm-hearted brethren would point out to him the tombs of the Scipios and Cecilia Metella, and the thousands of other tombs, with all their architectural beauty, and striking bass-reliefs and touching inscriptions; and the low seats for the accommodation of travelers at every forty feet; and the numberless statues of the Dei Viales; and the roadside inns, and the endless streams of carriages for travelers of every rank—humble birotae and comfortable rhedae, and stately carpenta—and the lecticae or palanquins borne on the necks of slaves, from which the occupants looked luxuriously down on throngs of pedestrians passing to and from the mighty capital of the ancient world.

How many a look of contemptuous curiosity would be darted at the chained prisoner and his Jewish friends as they passed along with their escort of soldiers!

But Paul could bear all this while he felt that he would not be utterly lonely amid the vast and densely-crowded wilderness of human habitations, of which he first caught sight as he mounted the slope of the Alban hills. And so through ever-lengthening rows of suburban villas, and ever-thickening throngs of people, they would reach the actual precincts of the city. It was thus that the dream of Paul's life was accomplished, and thus that in March, A.D. 61, in the seventh year of the reign of Nero, under the consulship of Cesennius Petus and Petronius Turpilianus, he entered Rome.

Here the charge of the centurion Julius ended, though we can hardly suppose that he would entirely forget and neglect henceforth his noble prisoner, to whom, in God's providence, he owed his own life and the safety of the other prisoners intrusted to him. Officially, however, his connection with them was closed when he had handed them over to the charge of the Prefect of the Pretorian guards, the honest and soldierly Afranius Burrus. So far, Paul was fortunate, for Burrus, as an upright and humane officer, was not likely to treat with needless severity a prisoner who was accused of no comprehensible charge—of none at any rate which a Roman would consider worth mentioning—and who had won golden opinions both from the Procurators of Judea and from the centurion who had conducted him from Jerusalem. A vulgar and careless tyrant might have jumped to the conclusion that he was some fanatical Sicarius, such as at that time swarmed throughout Judea, and so have thrust him into a hopeless and intolerable captivity. But the good word of Julius, and the kindly integrity of Burrus, were invaluable to him, and he was merely subjected to that kind of military custody which was known as *observatio*.

For the first three days he was hospitably received by some member of the Christian community, and was afterwards allowed to hire a lodging of his own, with free leave to communicate with his friends both by letter and by personal intercourse. The trial of having a soldier chained to him indeed continued, but that was inevitable under the Roman system. It was in mitigation of this intolerable concomitant of his imprisonment that the good will of his Roman friends might be most beneficially exercised. At the best, it was an infliction which it required no little fortitude to endure, and for a Jew it would be far more painful than for a Gentile. Two Gentiles might have much in common; they would be interested in common topics, actuated by common principles; but a Jew and Gentile would be separated by mutual antipathies, and liable to the incessant friction of irritating peculiarities.

That St. Paul deeply felt this annoyance may be seen from his allusions to his "bonds" or his "coupling-chain" in every epistle of the captivity. Yet even over these coarse, uneducated Gentiles, the courtesy, the gentleness, the "sweet reasonableness" of the apostle, asserted its humanizing control. If he was chained to the soldier, the soldier was also chained to him, and during the dull hours until he was relieved, many a guardsman might be glad to hear from such lips, in all their immortal novelty, the high truths of the Christian faith. Out of his worst trials the apostle's cheerful faith created the opportunities of his highest usefulness, and from the necessities of his long-continued imprisonment arose a diffusion of gospel truths throughout the finest regiment of that army which less

than a century later was to number among its contingents a "thundering legion," and in less than three centuries was to supplant the silver eagles of the empire by the then detested badge of a slave's torture and a murderer's punishment.—*Farrar.*

THE Jews who had been banished from Rome some years previous, had been tacitly permitted to return, so that large numbers were now to be found there. To these, first of all, Paul determined to present the facts concerning himself and his work, before his enemies should have opportunity to embitter them against him. Three days after his arrival at Rome, therefore, he called together their leading men, and in a simple, direct manner stated the reasons why he had come to Rome as a prisoner.

"Men and brethren," he said, "though I have committed nothing against the people or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans, who, when they had examined me, would have let me go, because there was no cause of death in me. But when the Jews spake against it, I was constrained to appeal unto Cesar; not that I had ought to accuse my nation of. For this cause therefore have I called for you, to see you and to speak with you because that for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain."

He said nothing of the abuse which he had suffered at the hands of the Jews, or of their repeated plots to assassinate him. His words were marked with caution and kindness. He was not seeking to win personal attention or sympathy, but to defend the truth and to maintain the honor of the gospel.

In reply, his hearers stated that they had received no charges against him by letters, public, or private, and that none of the Jews who had come to Rome had accused him of any crime. They also expressed a strong desire to hear for themselves the reasons of his faith in Christ. "For as concerning this sect," they said, "we know that everywhere it is spoken against." It was supplanting the religion of their fathers, and causing disputations and dissensions which they considered injurious to the people.

Since they themselves desired it, Paul bade them set a day when he could present to them

231

the truths of the gospel. At the time appointed, many came together, "to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening." He related his own experience, and presented arguments from the Old Testament scriptures with simplicity, sincerity, and power. Upon some minds, at least, his words made an impression which would never be effaced. All who were honestly seeking for truth were convinced, as Paul spoke of what he knew, and testified of what he had seen.

He showed that religion does not consist in rites and ceremonies, creeds and theories. If it did, the natural man could understand it by investigation, as he understands worldly things. Paul taught that religion is a practical, saving energy, a principle wholly from God, a personal experience of God's renewing power upon the soul.

He showed how Moses had pointed Israel forward to Christ as that Prophet whom they were to hear; how all the prophets had testified of him as God's great remedy for sin, the guiltless One who was to bear the sins of the guilty. He did not find fault with their observance of forms and ceremonies, but showed that while they maintained the ritual service with great exactness, they were rejecting Him who was the antitype of all that system.

He declared that in his unconverted state he had known Christ after the flesh, not by personal acquaintance, but by the conceptions which he, in common with others, cherished concerning his character and work. He had rejected Jesus of Nazareth as an impostor because he did not fulfill these expectations. But since Paul's conversion, his views of Christ and his mission were far more spiritual and exalted than the Jewish conception of the long-promised Messiah. He asserted that he did not present to them Christ after the flesh. Herod had seen Christ in the days of his humanity; Annas had seen him; Pilate and the chief priests and rulers had seen him; the Roman soldiers had seen him. But these had not seen him with an eye of faith, and discerned him spiritually as the glorified Redeemer. To apprehend Christ by faith, to have a spiritual knowledge of him, was more to be desired than a personal acquaintance with him as he appeared on earth. The communion with Christ which Paul now enjoyed, was more intimate and more enduring than a mere earthly and human companionship.

Some of Paul's hearers eagerly received the truth, but others stubbornly refused to be convinced. The testimony of the Scriptures was presented before them by one who was their equal in learning and their superior in mental power, and who had the special illumination of the Holy Spirit. They could not refute his arguments, but refused to accept his conclusions. The prophecies which the rabbis themselves applied to Christ were a great annoyance to these opposing Jews; for the apostle showed that the fulfillment of these very prophecies required them to accept of Christ.

His humble entry into Jerusalem, his rejection by his own people, the treachery of Judas, the paltry sum paid for his betrayal, his death as a malefactor, even the bitter stupefying draughts offered him in his dying agony, the lots cast upon his garments, his victory over death and the grave by the resurrection on the third day, his final exaltation on the right hand of God,—all these were in direct fulfillment of the words of the prophets. But the more

conclusive the arguments presented, the more determined were the Jews in their opposition. Frenzied with malice, they reiterated their assertions that Jesus of Nazareth was a deceiver.

Further argument was useless. Paul closed with a solemn address, in which he applied to them the words of Isaiah, before quoted by Christ himself: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Eesias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive; for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their ears have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Paul's words had not been in vain. Some fully accepted Jesus as the world's Redeemer, and, despite the opposition of their former brethren, became earnest advocates of the truth.

The truth always involves a cross. Those who will not believe, oppose and deride those who do believe. The fact that its presentation creates a storm of opposition, is no evidence against the truth. The prophets and apostles imperiled their lives because they would conscientiously obey God. And our Saviour declares that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

This is the Christian's legacy.—*Mrs. E. G. White, in Sketches from the Life of Paul.*

TO THOSE persons who make such an outcry against the International Lessons from the Old Testament, as containing "no Christ," "no gospel," &c., we would commend the careful study of Acts 28:23 in the lesson for April 26: "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them *concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.*"

In the law of Moses and in the prophets, Paul could find enough about Jesus to keep him talking a whole day, "from morning till evening;" but nowadays "eminent theologians," "doctors of divinity" (?), and "gospel leaders," can go over them for a whole year and yet find "no Christ" and "no gospel" at all! It would naturally be thought that those who can talk so learnedly of "Pauline theology" and "Christocentric faith," might know more of real Pauline theology, and real Christocentric faith, than to talk of "no gospel and no Saviour for the children," whenever the lessons are taken from the Old Testament. If there were more study of the Old Testament, there would be fewer objections to it.

A. T. J.

**April 16, 1885**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. May 3—Ephesians 6:1-13.  
Obedience" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 16 , pp. 246, 247.**

"CHILDREN, obey your parents in the Lord." Thus is given the command for the obedience of children. But children have to learn obedience, as they have to learn everything else; and this must be taught them by those whom they are to obey. Happy are those children whose parents know, and understand, and practice, the principles of true obedience; that so, they may properly instruct the children in this first duty, and all-important principle of life. Until the children become old enough to know God; until they reach the age of accountability to him; until they become old enough to be personally responsible to him in the choice which they make, whether to be for good or ill,—until this stage is reached in the lives of the children, so far as obedience and their knowledge of right and wrong are concerned, the parents are to the children in the place of God. Happy are those parents who realize and fulfill this great responsibility. And happy, thrice happy, are those children whose parents, realizing this, shall have so taught them the way of truth and right, that when this time comes, when they shall be as it were delivered to themselves, it may be easy for them to "refuse the evil and choose the good."

"FOR this is right." This is the reason that Paul gives as to *why* children should obey their parents; and in it is embodied the true principle of all proper obedience, whether to parents or to God. Is a thing right? do that thing because it is right. Is a thing wrong? refuse it because it is wrong. This is the principle laid down by the apostle, to be inculcated by the parents, on the minds and hearts of the children. So that whenever they meet the temptation to do this or that, there will be just one only question to be decided, Is it right? But is this done? Is this principle cultivated in the hearts of the children, that it may grow as they grow, and so become a part of themselves—ingrained in the very nature?

HOW stands the fact? Is it not rather the truth that this principle is seldom thought of, and still more seldom inculcated? Is it not the truth that almost as a general thing when a child shows hesitation in obeying, or a disposition to not obey, a reward of some kind is promised if he will do it, so that he is really *hired* to obey? It was the Lord's commendation of Abraham that "I know him that he will *command* [not hire] his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Gen. 18:19. Here we see that the fulfillment of the Lord's promise to Abraham was dependent upon how his children should conduct themselves, and their proper conduct was assured by the fact that Abraham would command them, and thus they should keep the way of the Lord.

ANOTHER notable instance is that of the house of Eli, where parental laxity *forfeited* the promise of God. "And there came a man of God unto Eli, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord." "I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me forever; but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Sam. 2:27, 30. Wherein had Eli not honored the Lord? "And

honorest thy sons above me." Verse 29. How was this? "Because his sons made themselves vile and he *restrained them not*." 1 Sam. 3:13. "And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house: when I begin, I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever *for the iniquity which he knoweth*; because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever." 1 Sam. 3:11-14.

HERE are the two ways of the dealings of parents with their children, and the results that follow each. Abraham commanded his children and they kept the way of the Lord, and an eternity of blessedness and joy came to Abraham and to his seed. Eli restrained not his children, and experienced the truth that children left to themselves bring their parents to shame; he forfeited the promise, and turned away from his house the blessing of God forever. In these two instances are illustrated two very important texts of Scripture. In Abraham, this one, "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old he will not depart from it." Prov. 22:6. In Eli, this one, "The rod and reproof give wisdom; but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame." Prov. 29:15. These texts are both strictly; literally, true, and neither of them more so than the other. But it would seem that if there is any one particular text of the Scriptures, the truth of which is doubted, it is this one of Prov. 22:6.

THE failure, however, is not in the Scripture, but in the mistaken application of it. The text says, "*Train* up a child," &c., but the child is not trained and does not go in the right way, and thus the failure is charged to the Scripture. To let the child run subject to ha-hazard influ-

247

ences all the week and then take him to meeting or Sabbath-school, or both, on the Sabbath, is that to *train* him? Is that the way in which men train themselves, their horses, or any of their animals? No, the term "train" would never be applied to such treatment of anything—but a child. When a man wants to train a colt, he spends hours at it every day. If he wants to train himself for a foot-race, a boxing match, or any other athletic sport, he puts himself through severe discipline every day. And so everybody understands and applies the word "train," except in the application of this text of Scripture. But here, as a general thing, all special instruction is given on the Sabbath alone, and then in most cases by others than the parents. Such is not to *train* up a child in the way he should *go*, and so he has no fixed habitual principle to keep him in the way he should go.

BUT how shall it be done effectually? Paul tells us plainly: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." *Nurture*, is fostering care. *Admonition*, is counseling against a fault or error, instruction in duties. This direction of the apostle's, therefore, is to bring or train them up in the fostering care of the Lord, in the counsel and instruction of the Lord. The Lord, in his word, has given full directions in regard to the fostering care, the counsel, and the instruction, in which he will have parents to train up the children: "Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon

your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house, and upon thy gates; that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them, as the days of heaven upon the earth." Deut. 11:18-21.

"FINALLY, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand."  
A. T. JONES.

**April 15, 1885**

**"Be Strong and of a Good Courage" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 16 ,  
pp. 249, 250.**

"BE strong and of a good courage" was the word of God to Joshua as the children of Israel were about to cross Jordan, and to enter the promised land, and this is his word to every one who enters his service. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed." And then he gives the reason, "For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." "I will be with thee; I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee."

There is nothing more certain than that the Most High rules in the affairs of men, and in the lives of those whose endeavor is to serve him, there is nothing more insisted upon than the unqualified recognition of this fact. The Saviour says the Father feedeth the fowls of the air. "Are ye not much better than they?" And the lilies of the field he clothes with more glory than all that in which Solomon was arrayed in the height of his wealth, grandeur, and power, then, "How much more shall he clothe you." One sparrow, worth less than a cent, "shall not fall on the ground without your Father." "Fear not ye therefore, *ye are of more value than many sparrows.*" We need not multiply these strong assurances of the Lord's care for his people, except to assert the all o'ershadowing one given by Paul "He that *spared not his own Son*, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" Rom. 8:32. If God's care for men led him to give his only begotten Son, for *his enemies* (Rom. 5:10), having given

250

him, how shall he not *with him* freely give all things *to his friends*? (John 15:14.) Will he freely give the greatest possible gift, and withhold the least? No, no! "All things are yours; and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." 1 Cor. 3:23.

It is plain therefore that to be without courage is to be without faith for the Christian to become discouraged is simply to lose confidence in the goodness, the care, the love, and the promises of God. Yet how often we hear the plaint, "I

am almost discouraged," expressed in a tone that plainly shows that the "almost" part of it is superfluous. But to all such the Lord says, "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; . . . I will be with thee; I will not fail thee nor forsake thee." Christ is our example in this as in everything else. He was despised and rejected of men, he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the faces of men were hid from him, and by them he was not esteemed. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Yet in full view of all this it was written of him, "He shall not fail *nor be discouraged*." Isa. 42:4. And having passed through it all, his last words to his disciples before going over the brook Cedron were, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." John 16:33.

This is the direct consequence of not being discouraged. If we yield to discouragement we never can overcome. If Satan can only succeed in turning our attention away from the Lord and his goodness and ever-ready help, and so get us into doubt and distrust and thus into discouragement, he knows that his part of the battle is won. Our privilege is therefore to be strong *in the Lord* and in the power of *his might*. To put on the whole armor of God, that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. And it is with the shield of *faith* that we shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. Of faith, not of doubt; and if faith, then *courage*; and if faith and courage, then *victory*. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage." And "thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," *who never was discouraged*.

From the scattered, lonely ones how often there come such expressions as follows: "It is hard to be a Christian alone." "It is hard to live out the truth alone." "It is hard to keep the Sabbath alone." "I love the truth, but I cannot do much alone." Now we have strong sympathy for these persons, and in our prayers we make mention of all such, but at the same time we are perfectly satisfied that there is a different, and much better way of looking at the matter than to always consider it a "hard" thing to do this or that, in the circumstances which surround us. Wherever you are, that is the only place in which you can serve the Lord. If you are alone, the only possible way for you to serve the Lord, is to serve him alone. And if you be alone, and the providence of God does not ordain otherwise, is it not best to accept the situation cheerfully and make the most of it? Because we repeat, that is the only situation in this wide world in which you can obey the truth, and if you obey it at all you must obey it there; if you be a Christian at all you must be one right where you are.

Now a few words in regard to the idea that a great many have, and which is often expressed as above: "I love the truth, but I cannot do much alone." You can do your duty, and that is all the Lord asks you to do. And that you must do alone, for no person can do it for you. And doing your duty is all that you can do for yourself, or for the cause of God. Many a time it happens in the life of a Christian that the greatest honor, and the greatest service, that he can possibly do his Lord is done singly and alone. To illustrate: After the battle of Waterloo, as the allied armies were marching to Paris, Blucher determined, against the will of Wellington, to blow up the bridge of Jena, because it stood as a monument of the defeat of the Prussian arms. When he had actually begun to mine the bridge, so

as to lay his train to blow it up, Wellington placed an English sentinel on the bridge and went ahead. "A single sentinel. *He was the British nation*; and if Blucher had blown up the bridge, the act was to be held as a rupture with Great Britain."

Suppose now, that soldier had made the plea that is made by some professed soldiers of the cross of Christ—I love my king, I love his cause, but I cannot do much alone. Would it not have been a miserable plea? He was placed there alone, and if he did anything at all he must do it alone. More, in that place, alone though he was, he represented the kingdom of Great Britain, and he was to stand in his place on that bridge as the representative of his sovereign and his kingdom. So it is with the Christian. He represents his Sovereign and his kingdom. And if his Sovereign chooses him, and puts him in a certain place alone, in that place he is the kingdom of God, and what greater honor can his King bestow? And cannot the soldier of Christ stand in his place, as well as did this English soldier in his? Cannot the representative of the kingdom of God prove faithful to his trust, as did the representative of the kingdom of England to his? Is it not more important that he should? Are you a soldier of Christ? Are you alone? Then put on the whole armor of God and stand faithfully.

It is recorded of Abraham that he was the friend of God. But how did it come about that God could speak of Abraham as "my friend"? It was because Abraham when left alone was faithful to God. The world had proven false to God. Even Abraham's own father and relatives were idolaters. It came to pass that God wanted friends in the world, and Abraham alone was found keeping the commandments of God and obeying his voice; and thus proving himself faithful when all around him were recreant, the God of Heaven and earth calls him "Abraham, my friend." Now, once more the Lord wants friends. His word is despised, and his law is trampled under foot. Who now will walk in the steps of that faith which our father Abraham had? Are you alone in the midst of those who will not keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus? Then show yourself a friend of God by keeping them so much the more faithfully for being alone. Yea, let all of us be faithful soldiers of Christ. Let all of us be friends of God. Let all of us be strong and of a good courage.

A. T. JONES.

**April 23, 1885**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Philippians 2:5-16" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 17 , pp. 262, 263.**

**MAY 10—PHILIPPIANS 2:5-16**

"LET this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." In the verses previous to this Paul exhorts us to likemindedness. It is not in this epistle alone, but in several others that he presents this subject. Indeed it is the chief duty of Christians to be of one mind. In 1 Cor. 1:10 it is written: "Not I beseech you,

brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be *perfectly joined together in the same mind* and in the *same judgment*." In Rom. 15:5, 6 we read: "Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be likeminded one toward another according to Christ Jesus; that ye may with *one mind* and *one mouth glorify God*, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." And in Phil. 2:2 Paul says: "Fulfill ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, being of *one accord, of one mind*. . . . Let each esteem other better than themselves."

IN that last prayer of Jesus, before he went over the brook Cedron into Gethsemane, this was his one great request, "*That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one, even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.*" John 17:21-23. Here three times in quick succession the prayer is that all who believe on him may be one; and twice is expressed the consequence of such unity, "That the world may believe" that he is the Son of God. The great heart of him who gave his life for the world, yearns for the belief of those for whom he died. A few then believed in him, and through these is he to be made known to the world, and that the world may believe their testimony they must be united. Burdened with this great argument, he prays with an earnestness only second to that in Gethsemane, that all his followers *may be one*, that so the world may believe that he was sent of God, and so believing be saved.

CHRIST not only prayed thus but he made ample provision for the fulfillment of his prayer. "*I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.*" "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:15-17, 23. Thus "our fellowship is "formed "with the Father, and with his son Jesus Christ." And this is the *only possible way* in which we can have true fellowship one with another. For if this man has, by the Holy Spirit, fellowship with the Father and with the Son; and if that man has, by the Holy Spirit, fellowship with the Father and with the Son, they *must have* fellowship one with another, for the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit *are one*; and those who have fellowship with these *must be one* likewise.

WE repeat, they must be one; it is impossible that they should not be, *as long as they keep the unity of the Spirit*. But Satan is alive, he is active and determined, he will stir up division, strife, contention if it be possible, and there is where each one must ever be watchful, earnest, and vigilant, that he be no one through whom the adversary may wound the previous body of Christ. Paul's warning is that "of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to *draw away disciples after them.*" Acts 20:30. There is the secret of all perverseness and division—self-exaltation, to draw away disciples after them. Instead of being disciples they want to be masters. Instead of exerting themselves, in meekness and quietness, to gain disciples to Christ, they seek, in

willful self-assertion, to draw disciples after themselves. But that is not all, they will "draw away disciples," that is, they will endeavor in their perverseness to draw disciples of Christ away from him unto themselves. "Take heed to yourselves." "Let no man deceive you." Let no man deceive himself.

"I THEREFORE the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; *endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit* in the bond of peace." As we have seen, the Holy Spirit is the pledge of our unity with the Father and the Son, and the means of our attaining unity one with another, and here is set before us our duty to endeavor to keep this unity of the Spirit. And the basis of that unity is the word of God, which was written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It is this word in which all are to be of the same mind and about which all are to speak the same thing. It is in the truth of God that all are to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. It is in the faith and work of Christ that there is to be no division. For he said, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." And, "Thy word is truth." John 16:13; 17:17. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." 1 Cor. 2:14, 16. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." But "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Rom. 8:9, 14.

"MADE himself of no reputation." Is has been said that—

"The purest treasure that mortal times afford,  
Is—spotless reputation."

But *character* excels reputation, as far as light excels darkness. Thousands of men to-day are living on their reputation, while their characters are as black as night. Thousands have the reputation of being very charitable, who at the same time have so little character that they will rob the fatherless, oppress the widow, and grind the faces of the poor. Many have the reputation of being the very exemplars of liberality, giving abundantly to the church, to the Sunday-school, and to missions, who at the same time are so destitute of character as to rob their employers, their customers, or their creditors, that they may support their reputation of being liberal to the cause of religion. If there were a vastly greater demand for character, and a good deal less of a willingness to be dazzled by reputation, the world would be much better off than it is. A good reputation can be made in a day, but years are required to make a character. A good reputation can be made by one single act, but it requires all the acts of a good life to form a good character, even in the eyes of men.

IT is character alone that is acceptable to God. No brilliancy of reputation can dazzle him. He demands truth in the inward parts. "God looketh on the heart." And here people make a great mistake as often as in anything else. Thousands when called upon to obey the truth of God, will put first their reputation, and what they think is their influence, and will make their allegiance to God—their character—yield to these. Christ "made himself of no reputation;" so likewise did

he who was the figure of Christ, he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt." So it will ever be. The disciple is not greater than his Lord. The people of God have ever been subject to reproach; the truth of God has always been unpopular, and men often have the opportunity to follow Christ most closely by, like him, making themselves of "no reputation." Often it becomes necessary for us to forfeit reputation before men, that we may perfect character before God.

"HE humbled himself." He, the only begotten Son of the Highest, he by whom all things were created, for our sakes became poor, and was despised, afflicted, tormented, and crucified; he, the King of glory. Another, one of the very highest of created beings, determined to exalt himself to be like the Most High. He who exalted himself is to be abased to the lowest hell. He who humbled himself has been highly exalted, and has been given "a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." With the one who exalted himself—short exaltation, eternal humiliation. "Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." Matt. 23:12. "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." 1 Pet. 5:6.

"DO all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation." Jesus said, "Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." Matt. 10:16. But how many of us consider that we *must be* wise as serpents *to be* harmless as doves.

"AMONG whom ye shine as lights in the world." Said Jesus, "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid." Matt. 5:14. This is sometimes quoted "cannot *easily* be hid," but the Lord did not say so. He said it "*cannot* be hid." When a man professes the name of Christ, men themselves expect him to depart from iniquity. Wherever he is know he cannot be hid. If his life is consistent with his profession, well; if it is otherwise, it cannot be hid. So with the light. "*Ye shine*," says Paul. We often hear persons say, "I want my light to shine." We need have no care about the fact of its shining. "Ye are the light," says Christ. "Ye shine," says Paul. If we have professed the name of Christ, our light will shine, and we cannot prevent it. But *how* it shall shine is for us to control. "If therefore the light that is in

263

you be darkness, how great is that darkness!" Matt. 6:23. "Take heed therefore that the light that is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35. It is not the *fact* of our light shining, but the *manner* of its shining, about which we are to be concerned. "Let your light so shine before men, *that they may see your good works*." "Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles; that, whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." 1 Pet. 2:12.

"HOLDING forth the word of life." If we will have our light to "so shine" that men may see our good works, *then* we can hold forth to men the word of life, with hope of its being accepted, and *then* we may rejoice in the day of Christ, that we have not run in vain, neither labored in vain. "Wherefore work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."  
A. T. JONES.

**May 7, 1885**

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Philippians 4:4-13. Christian Contentment" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 18 , pp. 278, 279.**

**MAY 17—PHILIPPIANS 4:4-13**

"AND the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." To enjoy peace is the Christian's privilege. Genuine peace belongs to the Christian alone, and if he has it not, he is living far below his prerogative. "Acquaint now thyself with him (God) and be at peace." Job 22:21. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." John 14:27. "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest. . . . There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Isa. 57:20, 21. There is no peace apart from a course of obedience to God. "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." Isa. 48:18. God has made ample provision, and has given abundance of assurance of peace, and it may be ours if we will only let it.

PAUL says, "And *let* the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful." God has called us to peace, he wants us to enjoy it; he wants us to let it rule in our hearts; but we allow so many things to come upon our hearts to perplex and annoy, that his peace cannot rule, we do not let it. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee." Isa. 26:3. Our minds must be stayed on him; our trust must be in him; then, and for this reason, it is that he can and will keep us in perfect peace. It is upon these same conditions that Paul bases our enjoyment of the peace of God which passeth all understanding. He says, "*Be careful for nothing; but in everything* by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." We are to yield to him implicitly, to trust to him wholly, and count his choice the best; to say freely and from a full hearts, "Thy will be done." Does not he know more about us than we know about ourselves? Does not he know all that awaits us, before it comes to pass, while we know nothing about it? While we know not what a day may bring forth, he knows the end from the beginning. Then is not he the only one to trust? "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Jer. 17:7.

JESUS again and again presses this thought upon us. And he tries his very best to show us how abundant, how far-reaching, and how intricate the care of our Father is for us. The texts are familiar to all, but the lesson of the texts is familiar to very few. He instances the birds of the heaven, and that "your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?" If he feeds the birds, and we are of *much more* value than they, then will he not "much more" feed us without our wearying ourselves with anxiety about it? Then he says, "And why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; . . . yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." See Solomon arrayed in his robe of snowy whiteness, his jeweled kingly crown upon his head, sitting on his royal throne of ivory and gold, of which "there was not the like made in any kingdom;" or see him in his chariot of the cedar of Lebanon, its spokes of solid silver, "the bottom thereof of gold, the covering of it of purple," drawn by the most beautiful horses, and surrounded by sixty of the finest young men in the kingdom, clothed in garments of Tyrian purple, and their long hair sprinkled with gold dust so that it sparkled with the reflected sunbeams. It required a great deal of anxious thought to set Solomon in all this glory, yet what was it all compared to the "tint that decks the rose, or paints the lily fair"? Nothing. Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

WHEREFORE, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you? Matt. 6:30.

BUT the Saviour is not done yet. In Matt. 10:29 he says: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father." Four farthings make an English penny, but that is two cents of our money. Two farthings therefore would equal one cent, and one farthing equals one-half a cent. Two sparrows therefore being sold for half a cent, the value of one sparrow would be but the half of half a cent, or one-quarter of a cent. One sparrow, of the value of only a quarter of a cent, "shall not fall on the ground without your Father. . . . Fear ye not therefore, *ye are of more value than many sparrows.*" What our Saviour would have us understand, is that nothing of as much importance as a quarter of a cent, can befall the child of God without the Father's notice; that his care for his children is so great as this. Yet this is not expressive enough. Jesus goes a step further, as far as he can in human language: "*But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.*" Nothing, therefore, of as much importance as a single hair can come upon a child of God without the Father's notice. Taking these four illustrations together, it would seem that the Saviour tried to draw out our minds to grasp the greatness of the Father's care for us, and that human language cannot express it.

IT was in view of this that Peter said, "Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you." 1 Pet. 5:7. And why shall we not? Has he not done all that he can to assure us of his loving care? And having done all this, can we not trust him? It was thus that David saw it: "Trust in the Lord and do good; . . . and verily thou shalt be fed. . . . Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him; and he shall bring it to pass." Psalm 37:3, 5. It is for us to do what our hands find to do, to do it in the fear of God, and leave all the consequences with him. "And we know that

all things work together for good to them that love God." Rom. 8:28. Appearances may be otherwise, as with Jacob of old, when he cried out in anguish, "Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away; *All these*

279

*things are against me.*" Gen. 42:36. But instead of all these things being against him, God was making every one of them work for his good. So it is with us all; there will be times when apparently all things are against us, but we have no right to think so, because all these things happened to those of old for examples, and they are written for our admonition. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. Therefore, "Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is the rock of ages." Isa. 26:4, margin.

PAUL had learned this lesson of trust; he had learned upon whom to cast his care. And thus he had learned Christian contentment. "For I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content." Phil. 4:11. And having learned this he could rejoice in the Lord. This the Philippians knew, for it was in their own city where Paul and Silas were beaten with "many stripes," and in their own prison where the feet of these two men "were made first in the stocks," and where at midnight they "prayed and sang praises unto God. . . And suddenly there was a great earthquake. . . and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed." Acts 16. They knew of these things and could recognize the voice of him who, though still a prisoner in chains, could sound the cheerful note, "Rejoice in the Lord." "Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, Rejoice."

THE Scriptures recognize no such idea as that we cannot control our thoughts. The wicked is directly commanded to forsake his thoughts. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." Isa. 55:7. The Lord wants us to think his thoughts. "For 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." Isa. 55:8, 9. Yet, "Though the Lord be high, he hath respect unto the lowly." He dwells not alone in the high and lofty place, but "with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." The Lord by his Spirit has moved men to record the thoughts which he has concerning us, and which he would have us think concerning him, ourselves, and one another. "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:5.

BUT those things of which God would have us think, can never be better written than they have been by Paul, as chosen in the lesson for to-day: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, *think on these things.*" And thus we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, shall be changed into the same image from glory to

glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.  
A. T. JONES.

**May 14, 1885**

**"The Uncertainty of Geological Science" *The Signs of the Times* 11,  
19 , p. 292.**

ARCHIBALD GEIKIE, LL. D., F. R. S., Professor of Geology, University of Edinburgh, spoken of by the New York *Independent* as "an author who is surpassed by none of his compeers in scientific attainment and hardly equaled by any of them for his gifts in the imparting of knowledge," is the author of a "Text Book of Geology;" and also the author of the treatise on geology in the latest edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica;" therefore we shall doubtless be justified in accepting his work as the latest, the ablest, and the best contribution in favor of geological science as it is at the present day. After reading and studying it through three times, the impression left by it upon my mind is that expressed by the title which I have placed at the head of this article.

In this discussion we propose no comparison of geology and the Bible. We intend to examine geological science on its own merits. We want to know upon what it rests. We want to know what its merits are. We want to know whether indeed it has any merit that would justify a comparison with the Bible.

Geology is defined as "the science which investigates the history of the earth." "Its object," as stated, "is to trace the progress of our planet from the earliest beginning of its separate existence, through its various stages of growth, down to the present condition of things." "It seeks to determine the manner in which the evolution of the earth's great surface features has been effected."

But it is only by a proper understanding of the *present* order of things, that the *past* can be made out. He says: "Only in proportion as we understand the present, where everything is open on all sides to the fullest investigation, can we expect to decipher the past, where so much is obscure, imperfectly preserved, or not preserved at all. A study of the existing economy of nature ought thus to be *the foundation* of the geologist's training."

So, then, here we have properly, at the very beginning, laid down the foundation of geological deduction. And we may, properly enough, inquire, Is this foundation secure? is it a foundation upon which we can firmly stand and safely build? Let Mr. Geikie answer. In the very next paragraph he says:—

"While, however, the present condition of things is thus employed, we must obviously be *on our guard* against *the danger* of unconsciously *assuming* that the phase of nature's operations which we now witness has been the same in all past time, that *geological* changes have taken place in former ages in the manner and on the scale which we behold to-day, and that at the present time all the great geological processes, which have produced changes in the past eras of the earth's history, are still extant and active. Of course we may *assume* this uniformity of action, and use the *assumption* as a *working hypothesis*. But it

ought not to be allowed any firmer footing, nor on *any account* be suffered to blind us to the *obvious truth* that the few centuries wherein man has been observing nature, form much too brief an interval by which to measure, the intensity of geological action in all past time. For aught we can tell, the present is an era of *quietude* and *slow change*, compared with some of the eras which have preceded it. *Nor can we be sure* that, when we have explored *every* geological process now in progress, we have exhausted *all the causes* of change which even in comparatively recent times have been at work." And in another place (No. 1, under the Age of the Earth) he says plainly that this assumption "may be *entirely erroneous*."

According to this, "the foundation of a geologist's training" is an "assumption;" and this assumption must not be allowed a "firm footing" because it may blind us to an *obvious truth*," and because it also may be "*entirely erroneous*."

And here, after having a—yes, *the*—foundation, he has as certainly destroyed it, and we might exclaim, not exactly with the psalmist, "If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the" geologists "do"? If, therefore, the foundation be assumption, the superstructure can be nothing more, and this also is just as plainly stated as is the foregoing, as follows:—

"In dealing with the Geological Record, as the accessible solid part of the globe is called, we cannot too vividly realize that at the best it forms but an *imperfect chronicle*. Geological history cannot be compiled from a full and continuous series of documents. From the very nature of its origin, the record is necessarily fragmentary, and it has been further mutilated and obscured by the revolutions of successive ages." "Enormous gaps occur where *no record* has been preserve *at all*. It is as if *whole chapters and books were missing* from an historical work."—See *Part V., Gaps in the Geological Record*; also in the Introduction.

But what degree of reliability could be placed in the deductions of one who should presume to give the exact course of events in a certain history, when "whole chapters and books were missing" from the only extant historical record of the events? None whatever. For it is entirely by conjecture that the events of the missing parts must be made up. This is particularly so of the geologists' deductions, for, as we have seen, there are not only "whole chapters and books missing," but they are not sure that they have the correct interpretation of those which remain. Therefore they guess at the course of events in that part of the record which remains, and then supply the missing parts by other guesses; and so it is a guess all around.

*Geology reveals no beginning—*

"It is still true that in the data with which they are accustomed to deal as comprising the *sum* of geological evidence, there can be found *no trace of a beginning*. The oldest rocks which have been discovered on any part of the globe have probably been derived from other rocks older than themselves. Geology, by itself, has not yet revealed, and is little likely ever to reveal, *a trace* of the first solid crust of our globe. If, then, geological history is to be compiled from direct evidence furnished by the rocks of the earth, it *cannot begin at the beginning* of

things, but must be content to date its first chapter from the earliest period of which any record has been preserved among the rocks."—*Part I, Cosmical Aspects*. If, then, it begins at an uncertain place, and follows an uncertain course, and sometimes no course at all, how can the ending be anything else but uncertain?

In Part II., Geognosy, he discusses the *Age of the Earth, and Measures of Geological Time* from which we extract the following. He says that the age of the earth may be attacked from either the geological or the physical side. First the geological:—

"This geological argument rests chiefly, upon the observed rates at which geological changes are being effected at the present time, and is open to the obvious preliminary objection that it *assumes* the existing rate of change as the measure of past revolutions,—an *assumption* which may be *entirely erroneous*, for the present may be a period when all geological events march forward more slowly than they used to do?" "If we assume that the land has been worn away, and that stratified deposits have been laid down *nearly* at the *same rate* as at *present*, then we must admit that the stratified portion of the crust of the earth must represent a *very vast* period of time. Dr. Crall puts this period at not less, but much more, than sixty million years." "On any supposition it must be admitted that these vicissitudes in the organic world can only have been effected with the lapse of vast periods of time, though no *reliable* standard seems to be available whereby these periods are to be measured. The argument from geological evidence is strongly in favor of an interval of probably not less than one hundred million years since the earliest form of life appeared upon the earth, and the oldest stratified rocks began to be laid down."

Yes, no doubt, "if we assume" that such and such is one case, "probably" the balance will follow. But why are we called upon to "assume" an "erroneous assumption" only for the purpose of reaching an indefinite conclusion? This "argument from geological evidence," is like the famous essay on "Snakes in Ireland," viz., "There are no snakes in Ireland." So likewise, there is no geological evidence, and he says so. Why may we not just as rightfully assume that these changes and revolutions have been wrought in short periods, or even *suddenly*! Many of them have certainly been made violently. A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Tim. 1:15-20; 2:1-6. The Faithful Saying" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 19 , pp. 294, 295.**

"THIS is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." It would seem that this expression had become a "saying,"—a kind of proverb among the Christians, and upon which they dwelt in great measure, and which Paul would now give his most emphatic endorsement. It is a saying "worthy of all acceptance." That is his mission, that is his name. The term Christ Jesus, being Greek, and simply transferred into the English, and not translated, the full meaning, without a translation, is not

discerned. But with a reference Bible the real meaning is easily obtained from the marginal readings.

JESUS is a Greek word, and in English means Saviour. Matt. 1:21, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus [margin, Saviour], for he shall save his people from their sins." In other words, Thou shalt call his name Saviour, *because* he shall *save his people* from their sins. The word Christ is also Greek, and in English means Anointed. John 1:41. "We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ," [margin, the Anointed]. These two terms, Christ and Jesus, being placed together, therefore, mean in English, *The Anointed Saviour*; and as he came to save sinners, the phrase Christ Jesus means, The Anointed Saviour of sinners. Bearing this in mind, it is wonderful what a depth of meaning is given to the Scriptures in our reading of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not simply a bare name, but a glorious title, which in its depth of meaning absorbs both words, all time, and eternity.

AND he is able to save. All power in Heaven and in earth is given to him. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17. He upholds "all things by the word of his power." It was his voice that "spake, and it was done." It was he who commanded, and it stood fast. It was by "his word," and "by the breath of his mouth," that "the heavens," and "all the host of them" were made. And he, though Creator of all, was made flesh, for the suffering of death. And that he might bring many sons unto glory, he chose to be made the perfect Captain of salvation, through suffering. For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, "I will declare they name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." Heb. 2:9-12.

WHEN wonderingly the prophet cried, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength?" the answer came, "I that speak in righteousness, *mighty to save*." Isa. 63:11. He is a mighty Creator; he is just as mighty a Saviour. "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." "Though ye have lain among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold." Ps. 68:13. Paul knew of the power of this salvation, when Christ in his great mercy and long suffering, apprehended him, a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious, and turned him to himself, and counted him faithful. And thus, says Paul, in him Christ showed his long-suffering for a pattern to them who should afterward believe on the Saviour to life everlasting. That is, Paul would convey to all the assurance that, as Christ's mercy reached him, so it is abundant to all who will believe in Jesus. And "I will put my trust in him."

"NOW UNTO the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor, and glory forever and ever. Amen." This is the only place in the Bible where the word "immortal" is used. In the revised New Testament it is not used at

all. But in our common version it is used this once, and, as all can see, it refers solely to the eternal King. In 1 Tim. 6:15, 16, immortality is used thus, "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; *who only hath immortality*, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." The word "immortality" is used again in 2 Tim. 1:10, where Paul says that Christ has brought it to light; and again in Rom. 2:7, where it is spoken of as one of the things for which we must see; and again in 1 Cor. 15:53, 54, where it is said that it will be put on at the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the change of the righteous living, at the last trump. The Bible story of immortality is very short, plain, and easily understood. Thus: God only has it; Christ brought it to light; men must seek for it; and those who do, will obtain it at the resurrection of the just. This is the Lord's exposition of the subject, and therefore the only true one.

"HOLDING faith and a good conscience." Be careful of the conscience. Be sure you have a good one, and then be very careful to keep it good, and be sure that you do so. Try your conscience by the word of God; this points out the only way to get a good conscience; this is the only test by which we may know that we have a good conscience, by which it may be kept good. The following from the *Sunday School Times* is to the point: "Neither in the Bible nor in the practical experience of the race, is there anything to indicate that a man has within himself a safe and sure guide of duty. On the contrary, as we see it, a man must depend for teaching from outside of himself, in order to know the right from the wrong. God does give to every man an internal monitor which tells him that he ought to do right, but not an internal instructor which tells him what is right. In this sense, a man's conscience is a monitor, but is not a teacher; a prompter, but not a guide. Conscience tells a man that he ought to do right. A man's duty is to do right; not merely to do what he thinks to be right, but to do what is right. Hence 'it is not always *safe* for a man to do what his conscience approves;' 'to do that which he thinks he ought to do.' It is only safe for him to *know* what he *ought to do* and do *that*. It is not always safe for a man to do what he *thinks* he ought to do; but it is safe for a man to do what he ought to do; and man must have a better guide than his conscience, in order to be always in the path of duty and of safety."

295

"WHO will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." The will of God in this direction has been abundantly manifested. He has done all that he can do that men may be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. In Isa. 5:4, the Lord says, "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" "He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," and if salvation is not obtained in him, it cannot be obtained at all. He is made to all men "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," and "*whosoever*" (any person whatever) believeth in him shall not perish but shall have everlasting life. But it must be a genuine belief,—a real faith.

FAITH without works is dead, so every man's faith must be manifested in works,—in doing. It will do no good to call him Lord, Lord, and *do nothing*. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 6:46. He that heareth the sayings of Christ and *doeth* them, has built his house upon the rock. He is become the author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey* him. Heb. 5:9. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. 1:19, 20. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." This is the divine order in following the Saviour. First, deny self; next, take up the cross, and then follow him. But this is not the course that is followed to any great majority of professed Christians. But without these there is no such thing as following Christ.

THE grace which brought this great salvation to all men teaches this very thing. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, *teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*" Titus 2:11-14. All this the grace of God teaches, and all this he would have us learn. But how few there are who learn it! There are a great many peculiar people in the world, but very few of the right kind of peculiar people. The kind of peculiarity of which God approves is that which is shown in zeal of good works.

NOTE again the things which Paul says the grace of God teaches. It teaches us self-denial; it teaches us to live soberly, righteously and godly; and it teaches us *to look for "that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."* But how many who profess to be partakers of the grace of God, are taught by it to thus look for that glorious appearing of the Lord? Now as the grace of God which brings salvation, teaches men to look for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, if the amount of the grace of God among men is measured by the number of those who have learned to look for that glorious appearing, then how much of the grace of God is there in the professedly orthodox Christian world to-day? Reader, are you thus taught by the grace of God to look for the glorious appearing of the Lord? "We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also *that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.*"

A. T. J.

**May 21, 1885**

**"Uncertainty of Geological Science. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 20 , p. 308.**

(Continued.)

THE argument from physics is just about as inconclusive as that from "geological evidence." He says:—

1. "Sir William Thompson, applying Fourier's theory<sup>4</sup> 1 of thermal conductivity, pointed out some years ago (1862) that in the known rate of increase of temperature downward and beneath the surface, and the rate of loss of heat from the earth, we have a limit to the antiquity of the planet. He showed, from the data available at the time, that the superficial consolidation of the globe could not have occurred less than twenty million years ago. . . . nor more than four hundred million years ago; . . . he inclines rather toward the lower than the higher antiquity, but concludes that the limit, from a consideration of all the evidence, must be placed within some such period of past time as one hundred million of years.

2. "The argument from tidal retardation proceeds on the admitted fact, that, owing to the friction of the tide-wave, the rotation of the earth is retarded, and is therefore much slower now than it *must have been* at one time. Sir William Thompson contends that had the globe become solid ten thousand million years ago, or indeed any high antiquity above one hundred million years, the centrifugal force due to the more rapid rotation *must have* given the planet a very much greater polar flattening than it actually possesses. He *admits*, however, that, though one hundred million years ago that force *must have been* about three per cent. greater than now, yet '*nothing we know* regarding the figure of the earth and the disposition of land and water would justify us in saying that a body consolidated when there was more centrifugal force by three per cent. than now, might not now be *in all respects like the earth*, so far as we know it at present.'"

Thus, first, he contends that if the earth had become solid one hundred million years ago it would have been much flatter at the poles than it is, yet is willing to admit that had it become solid then, we do not know but that it would have been now just as it is. Then if the result is the same in either case, where is the use of going back one hundred million years, or ten thousand million years, for the start? And so "Professor Tait concludes that this argument, taken in connection with the previous one, probably reduces the possible period which can be allowed to geologists to something *less than ten millions* of years." "What a falling off is there, my countrymen!!" From ten *thousand* million to simply *ten* million! May we hope from this that they will finally reach the reasonable limit?

But Mr. Geikie has not yet exhausted his "argument" on the age of the earth; he presents his *third* from physics, thus:—

3. "The third argument, based upon the *age* of the *sun's heat*, is confessedly *less reliable* than the *two previous ones*."

But the "two previous ones" themselves are confessedly unreliable, and, if the third be admitted as "confessedly *less reliable*" than they, how much reliability has geological science for the age of the earth?

The secret, however, of the whole matter is exposed in his last remark on this subject:—

"One hundred million of years is probably amply sufficient for all the requirements of geology."

Yes, the geological ship has been launched upon the tide of speculation, and nothing less than one hundred million years will give her sea-room.

Next in order, we come to Part IV., Structural Geology—Order of Superposition—*The Foundation of Geological Chronology*:—

"As sedimentary strata are laid down upon one another in a more or less nearly horizontal position, the underlying beds must be older than those which cover them. This simple and obvious truth is termed *the law of superposition*."

Again, Part V., under "*Use of Fossils*":—

"The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks." "For geological purposes, therefore, and indeed for all purposes of comparison between the different faunas and floras of different periods, *it is absolutely essential*, first of all, to *have the order of superposition of strata rigorously determined*. Unless this is done, the most fatal mistakes may be made in Paeontological chronology."

And yet again, Part VI., No. 1:—

"In every stratigraphical research the fundamental requisite is to establish the order of superposition of the strata. Until this is accomplished, it is *impossible* to arrange the dates and make out the sequence of geological history."

This would be all plain and easy enough, if the rocks always and everywhere were lying in their true and original position. But in some places "the rocks composing huge mountain masses have been so completely overturned that the highest beds appear as if *regularly* covered by others which ought properly to underlie them."

Let us bring some of these statements together in the form of a parallel that we may more readily see their mutual bearing.

"The underlying beds must be older than" "The rocks comprising huge mountain those which cover them. This simple masses have been so *completely* and obvious truth is termed the law of *overturned* that the *highest beds* appear superposition."

as if *regularly covered* by others which ought properly to underlie them." In such instances "the *apparent superposition* may be deceptive."

So then "this simple and obvious truth" is *not* the truth. And then what becomes of the law of superposition? We rather incline to the opinion that it has been "completely overturned" as well as have been the mountain masses, and at the same time that they were. If, therefore, the apparent superposition may be deceptive, how are we to guard against deception? If huge mountain masses are lying in a directly inverted position to that of the valleys or the plains, how can we

tell which is "upside down"? And how is the true order of superposition to be settled?

Just here the geologist's *summum bonum*, the fossil, comes in, thus:—

"It is by their characteristic fossils that the *divisions* of the stratified rocks can be *most satisfactorily made*. Each formation being distinguished by its own assemblage of organic remains, it can be followed and recognized even amid the crumplings and dislocations of a disturbed region."

Again:—

"But it is *mainly* by the remains of plants and animals imbedded in the rocks that the geologist is guided in unraveling the *chronological succession* of geological changes."

And further, one of the uses of fossils is plainly stated to be "to furnish a guide in geological chronology whereby *rocks* may be classified *according to relative date*, and the facts of geological history may be arranged and interpreted as a connected record of the earth's progress." From these statements it plainly appears that it is by the *evidence of fossils* that the "order of succession," or "superposition," or "relative age of strata" is made out.

Yet under "*Relative Age of Fossils*," is this equally plain statement:—

"The *chronological sequence* of fossils must be determined *first of all* by the order of superposition of their enclosing strata;" because "*there is nothing in the fossils themselves*, apart from experience, *to fix their date*."

Here are two statements that we wish to place side by side, that it may be seen what they really say. And what they do say, although it may appear surprising, can be sustained by a greater number of quotations than are here already given.

"It is mainly by the *re mains* of plants" The *chronological sequence* and animals [fossils] *imbedded in the*[succession] of fossils [remains] must be *rocks* that the geologist is guided Indetermined first of all by the *order of* unraveling the *chronological successionsupreposition* [chronological succession] of geological changes." of their enclosing strata."

One of these says that the *relative age of the rocks* is determined *by the fossils*. The other says that the *relative age of the fossils* is determined *by the rocks*.

What is this but reasoning in a circle? Thus, for instance, the geologists say to us, "Here is a stratum of rock that was deposited fifty millions of years ago." But we ask, "How do you prove that?" They reply, "We prove it by the fact that in it are imbedded organic remains of the earliest forms of life that appeared on this planet." But again we ask, "How do you prove that to be the earliest form of life?" The reply is, "We prove that by the simple fact of their being imbedded in that particular stratum of rock." Yes, certainly, prove each by the other, and they will then both be true. All this may be *geological*, but it assuredly is not *logical*, nor is it according to established rules of evidence.

A. T. J.

**"The Sabbath-School. Notes on the International Lesson. May 31–2  
Tim. 3:14-17; 4:1-8. Paul's Charge to Timothy" *The Signs of the Times*  
11, 20 , pp. 310, 311.**

"AND that from a child thou has known the holy Scriptures." Timothy was certainly one to whom had been fulfilled the injunction of the Lord upon parents. "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6:6, 7. And thus he grew up with an unfeigned faith. But this was only the fruit of the same unfeigned faith that was in his mother Eunice, and also in his grandmother Lois. This faithful mother had made it her work to instruct her child, when a child, in the holy Scriptures. And so effectual was her work that when her child grew to manhood he was one who was "well reported of by the brethren," and was chosen of the Lord to bear his truth to the world. It would see, too, that this was done by the mother alone, because, "his father was a Greek [a Gentile]." Acts 16:1-3. And as Timothy and his mother are spoken of as believers, and the father simply as a Gentile, it is evident that he did not accept the faith in Christ. This is simply an example of what a faithful mother can do, with the word of God, notwithstanding the adverse influence of an unbelieving husband.

"THE holy Scriptures." What writing is meant by this term? Certainly what is now called the Old Testament. It is impossible that it should be anything else, because when Timothy was a child there was no part written of what is called the New Testament. And in no place in the New Testament are the writings of the New Testament spoken of as the Scripture, but in every instance where that term is used it has sole reference to the Old Testament. Christ, after reading a portion of Isaiah, said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke 4:16-21. And on the day of his resurrection, on the way to Emmaus "he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." It was out of the Scriptures that the apostles reasoned with the people concerning Jesus, and by which they proved that he is indeed Christ (Acts 2:14-21, 25-35; 7; 13:14-41; 17:2, 10-12; 28:23); and the Old Testament was the only Scripture they had. We do not say that the New Testament is not Scripture; we simply say that it was not *then* Scripture, because it was not then written. And even had it been written it could not have been to the apostles a source of appeal, because that would have been simply to appeal to their own words. It is the Old Testament, therefore, to which Paul here refers and which he calls "the holy Scriptures" and which he declares are able to make wise unto salvation.

"ARE able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus." Christ Jesus is the great central point of the Old Testament as well as of the New. Whoever studies the Old Testament without Christ in view, studies it in vain. He is the one great object of all faith, of the prophets as well as of apostles. As before referred to, he himself "expounded unto them *in all Scriptures*" the things concerning himself. Peter, in Acts 3:22-24, says that Moses, "and *all the prophets*

from Samuel and those that follow after, *as many as have spoken*, have likewise foretold of these days." And Paul in Rome "persuaded them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening." How then can it be that these holy Scriptures can be neglected and a full view of Christ obtained? How can preachers do justice to their calling and despise the Old Testament?

"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God." It is still the Old Testament to which he refers. It is this that he declares is given "by inspiration of God." We are aware of the other reading that is given to this text to the effect that "all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable," &c., but the text is correct as it stands. Peter says of the prophets that "the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Pet. 1:11. And Paul, in another place, says: "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God." 1 Thess. 2:13. Notice that this was written to the Thessalonians, and it was with them that he reasoned "out of the Scriptures," and he declares that that was the word of God. So when Paul says that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," that is what he means, and that is what we believe. And when he says that it is all "profitable," we believe that, and would slight none of it, but would reverently use it "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

BECAUSE as it was given of God for this purpose, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," no man can be perfect, no man can be furnished unto all good works, who neglects it. We repeat that we do not hold to these things of the Old Testament to the exclusion of the New. We accept the New as being as fully the word of God, and as fully given by inspiration of God, as is the Old. We would take neither to the exclusion of the other. All, Old and New, is the word of God; all is given by inspiration of God; all is profitable. They who accept the Old Testament and reject the New are wrong. They who accept the New and reject the Old are equally wrong. The New cannot be fully understood without the Old, neither can the Old be fully understood without the New. And there is the book of Revelation; that can not be fully understood without all the rest of the Bible together. We have heard a good deal about keys to the book of Revelation, but the best of all keys is a thorough understanding of all the other parts of the Bible.

"I CHARGE thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, *Preach the word.*" This solemn charge is to all men who enter upon the work to which Timothy was called, as well as to him. In another place he says to him, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." And in another place, "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all." It is the duty, therefore, of the minister, to study the word of God, meditate upon it, give himself wholly to it, then preach it.

BUT alas! how little the word of God is studied even by the majority of ministers at the present day. It is no unusual thing to hear prominent ministers

quote as veritable Scripture that of which there is no hint in the Bible. But as little as it is studied, how much less it is preached! True, the text is taken from the Bible, it may be a verse, it may be only a part of a verse, or perhaps a single word. Then a learned essay is read, or a fine display [*sic.*] of rhetoric is made, which is just as apt to be directly contrary to the word as otherwise. As has been well expressed by Moody, "They will find the text in the Bible, and then go all over Christendom for the sermon." And that is supposed to be preaching the word! But it is

311

nothing of the kind. He who puts the most of the word of God, properly delivered, into his sermon, does the best preaching.

ABUNDANCE of directions are given in the Bible as to how to preach the word. We will transcribe some. "I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God. . . . And thou shalt *speak my words* unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. . . . Moreover he said unto me, Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go, get thee. . . unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." Eze. 2:4, 7; 3:10, 11. "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, *let him speak my word faithfully*. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. 23:28, 29. "And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; . . . and Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people (for he was above all the people); and when he opened it, all the people stood up, and Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God. And all the people answered Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands, and they bowed their heads, and worshiped the Lord with their faces to the ground. So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Neh. 8:4-6, 8. Such as that is genuine preaching. What a happy thing it would be for the people if it were everywhere followed to-day. Paul did so, and Peter did so. Let us do so. Preach the word.

"FOR the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." Considerable objection is made in these days to the preaching of doctrine. And that is the very thing that is commanded to be preached. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to *doctrine*." "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the *doctrine*; continue in them; for in *doing* this thou shalt both *save thyself and them that hear thee*." "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of *double honor, especially* they who labor in the word and *doctrine*." 1 Tim. 4:13, 16; 5:17. "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able *by sound doctrine* both *to exhort* and *to convince* the gainsayers." Titus 1:9. "*Exhort* with all longsuffering and *doctrine*." 2 Tim. 4:2. "But speak thou the things which become *sound doctrine*." No man can obey the Scriptures and neglect doctrine. The minister must give attendance to doctrine; he must take heed to doctrine; he must labor in doctrine; he must speak doctrine; he must convince gainsayers by doctrine; and he must exhort by doctrine. And this too, at the time, and for the

very reason, that they will not endure sound doctrine. When people despise the word, then is the very time when the word must be preached. Speak *thou* the things which become sound doctrine.

"A CROWN of righteousness . . . at that day." This has reference solely to that one great day,—the day of Christ's appearing. Then it is that Paul, with all other righteous men, dead and living, will be rewarded. "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14. "When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. 5:4. Thus the apostles, the prophets, and all the faithful ones of old, looked to "that day" for the consummation of their hope. Thus they "obtained a *good report* through faith," but "received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. 11:39, 40. Behold he comes quickly, his reward is with him, his work before him. Crowns of righteousness and of glory are his to give "in that day," to all those who love his appearing. Are you waiting for his glorious appearing? Will you "love his appearing"? To them *that look for him*, he appears unto salvation. Heb. 9:28.

A. T. J.

### **"Sanctification" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 20 , p. 314.**

SPURIOUS sanctification has assumed a new phase. Finding in Acts 26:18 that Jesus has spoken of "them which are sanctified by faith that is in me," there are those who claim sanctification by faith alone. Only believers in Christ and you are sanctified. Others there are who claim sanctification by the Holy Spirit alone. Either of these is just as near right as the other, for both are wrong. And if sanctification should be claimed by both faith and the Spirit, still it would be a false claim; all three are alike spurious.

It is true, as we have seen, that Jesus sent Paul to the Gentiles "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them *which are sanctified by faith that is in me.*" It is also true that Paul wrote that "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation *through sanctification of the Spirit.*" 2 Thess. 2:13. And it is equally true that Christ himself prayed to the Father for his disciples, "*Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.*" John 17:17. All three of these expressions are true. And when they are all taken together, and met according to the purpose of God, true, genuine sanctification will be the inevitable result. But when the attempt is made to take either of them alone, or any two of them together, the grace of sanctification is perverted, and a spurious sanctification, a terrible deception, is the sure result.

These three passages of Scripture, taken in their proper order, state the true doctrine of sanctification. And it will be found that they are given above in their proper order. We now propose a short study of this subject in this order.

1. "*Sanctified by faith.*" "Without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that

diligently seek him." Heb. 11:6. James, in writing to us about asking of the Lord, says: "But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering; for he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord." James 1:6, 7. Faith is the foundation upon which Christian character is built. Faith is the beginning and to it all other graces come in addition. 2 Pet. 1:5-7. It is by faith alone that we must be justified. It is only by faith in Christ that we can obtain the forgiveness of sins. "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20:21. In the council of Jerusalem as to the relation which the Gentiles bore to the gospel, Peter said that God "put no different between us and them, purifying their hearts *by faith*." Acts 15:9. Therefore it is plain that the first thing in sanctification is faith in Christ. When that is exercised, then the forgiveness of sins is received, then the Holy Spirit is given; and so comes

2. "*Sanctification of the Spirit*." Paul says, in speaking of Christ: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, *after that ye believed*, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." Eph. 1:13. As circumcision, outwardly, of the flesh, in the letter, made with hands, was the seal of the righteousness of the faith which Abraham had; so circumcision, inwardly, of the heart, in the Spirit, made without hands, is the seal of the righteousness of the faith which we must have in Christ (Rom. 4:11; Eph. 1:13; Rom. 2:28, 29; Col. 1:11). Now we will designate some of the offices of the Holy Spirit.

(a) A witness of the forgiveness of sins, and that thus we are the children of God. Heb. 10:15-17. "The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;" then he said, "And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16.

(b) An earnest of our inheritance. "Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." Eph. 1:13, 14. An *earnest* is "a part paid beforehand on a contract, as security for the whole." God enters into covenant with men, and to those who will accept his Son, he promises an inheritance. But the time is not yet come when the inheritance can be given; it is not yet redeemed. So until that time does come, until it is redeemed, he gives to his people the Holy Spirit as the earnest, the security of the inheritance. Another definition is, that "an earnest gives assurance that more is coming of the same kind." By receiving the Holy Spirit we become partakers of the divine nature, and by this "earnest" God gives assurance that more is coming of the same kind, even so much more, that, "when he shall appear, *we shall be like him*, for we shall see him as he is.

(c) As a guide into the truth. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:26. The Holy Spirit then is to teach us the things that Christ has said. And as the spirit of

Christ spoke the Old Testament as well as the New (1 Pet. 1:10-12), this is to say that the Holy Spirit is to teach us the word of God. This is confirmed by John 16:13. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." And as Jesus said, "Thy word is truth," it is plain that the Spirit is to guide us into the word of God. Again, "He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." Verse 15. The Holy Spirit therefore, as teacher of the word of God, as guide into the word of God, is to take these things of God and show them unto us, to show us their breadth of meaning, that we may know how to apply them to our lives and conform our ways to them. Compare Ps. 119:18; Eph. 1:17, 18, and Acts 26:18.

Just here is where those fail who claim sanctification. Even granting, for the sake of the argument (and for that reason only), that they have received the Holy Spirit, instead of allowing him to fulfill his office of teacher of the word of God; instead of having him take the things of the word of God, and show unto them; instead of allowing him to guide them into the word of God; they seek to make him the guide *independent of the word of God*; and not only that, but in many instances *directly contrary* to the plainly written word which he himself has spoken. Such spirit is not the Spirit of God; such is not his office; he is not divided against himself. Again, this makes him the end, instead of the means, which is to pervert the way of the Lord. In no single instance, in this connection, is he made the end; but in every instance he is set forth as the *means* by which we may reach the end which God has in view for us. And again, to make him the guide independent of the word, is to make him speak of (from) himself. But Christ plainly declares, "He *shall not* speak of (from) himself." A. T. J.

(*To be concluded.*)

**May 28, 1885**

**"Uncertainty of Geological Science (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 21 , p. 324.**

(*Continued.*)

TO show that we have not pressed any of these statements into service to make a point, we wish to continue this line a little further.

Under Part IV., "*Relative Lapse of Time Represented by Strata and by the Intervals Between Them,*" we read:—

"As a rule, we should infer that the time represented by a given thickness of similar strata was less than that shown by the same thickness of dissimilar strata, because the changes needed to bring new varieties of sediment into the area of deposit would usually require the lapse of some time for their completion. But this conclusion might often be erroneous." "But in all speculations of this kind we must bear in mind that the length of time represented by a given depth of strata *is to be estimated* merely from their

*thickness or lithological characters. . . . But the relative chronological importance of the bars or lines in the geological record can seldom be satisfactorily discussed merely on lithological grounds; this must mainly be decided on the evidence of organic remains [fossils]. By this kind of evidence it can be made nearly certain that the intervals represented by strata were in many cases much shorter than those not so represented; in other words, that the time during which no deposit of sediment went on was longer than that wherein deposit did take place."*

Again, Part VI., No. 5:—

"The relative chronological value of the divisions of the geological record *is not to be measured by the mere depth of strata*. Of 'two sets of rocks, the total depth of both groups together may be, say one thousand feet. Elsewhere, we may find a single unbroken formation reaching a depth of ten thousand feet; but it would be *utterly erroneous* to conclude that the latter represented ten times the length of time shown by the two former.' '*Fossil evidence furnishes the chief means* of comparing the relative value of formations and groups of rock. A break in the succession of organic remains marks an interval of time often *unrepresented by strata* at the place where the break is found. The relative importance of these breaks, and therefore, probably, the comparative intervals of time which they mark, may be estimated by the difference of the *facies* of the *fossils on each side.*'"

Further, Part V., under "*Doctrine of Colonies:*"—

"While the mere fact that one series of rocks lies unconformably on another proves the lapse of a considerable interval between their respective dates, the relative length of this interval may sometimes be demonstrated by the means of *fossil evidence*, and *by this alone*. *But fossil evidence may be made to prove the existence of gaps which are not otherwise apparent.*" "A few species may pass from one into the other, or perhaps every species may be different. In cases of this kind, when proved to be not merely local but persistent over wide areas, we must admit, notwithstanding the apparently *undisturbed* and *continuous character* of the original deposition of the strata, that the abrupt transition from one *facies* of fossils to the other *must represent* a long interval of time *which has not been recorded by the deposit of strata.*"

And so by this line of quotations we are brought again around the geological circle, thus:—

"The first and fundamental point is to" *When the order of succession of determine accurately the order of organic remains [fossils] among the superposition [succession] of the strata stratified rocks has been determined, Until this is done, detailed they become an invaluable guide in the paleontological [fossils] classification investigation of the relative age of rocks may prove to be worthless.*"—Part V. and the structure of the land. And the under *Subdivisions by Means of Fossils. true succession [superposition] of strata may thus be confidently established.*"—Part VI., No. 4.

The grand argument is this: (a) Until the true order of succession of the rocks is accurately determined, the evidence of fossils is worthless. (b) Until the true order of succession of the fossils has been determined, the evidence of the rocks is worthless. But (a) it is by "fossil evidence, and by this alone," that the succession of the rocks is determined. (b) It is by the order of succession of the rocks that the true succession of fossils is determined. Upon which we would simply remark that, as the evidence of fossils is worthless without the true order of the rocks; and as the evidence of the rocks is worthless without the true order of the fossils; then the whole system that is built upon on such evidence (?) can be nothing less than worthless. Such is Geological Science. And we are certain that it comes within the scope of Paul's words in 1 Tim. 6:20.

As the Science of Fossils "is looked upon as a branch of Geology, seeing that its assistance is *absolutely indispensable* in many of the most familiar and fundamental problems of the latter science," we might spend a little time in an inquiry as to the real inherent value of fossils themselves.

One quotation, already made, may properly be repeated as the head of this division,—Part V., under *Age of Fossils*:—

"There is nothing in the fossils themselves, apart from experience, to fix their date."

Again, No. 2, under *Use of Fossiles*:—

"Consider, for a moment, what would happen were the present surface of any portion of Central or Southern Europe submerged beneath the sea, covered by marine deposits, and then re-elevated into land. The river-terraces and lacustrine marls formed *before the time of Julius Cesar* could not be distinguished by any fossil tests from those laid down in the *days of Victoria*. . . . So far as regards the shells, bones, and plants preserved in the various formations, it would be *absolutely impossible* to discriminate their relative dates; . . . yet there might be a difference of two thousand years or more between many of them. They would be classed as geologically contemporaneous, but the phrase is too vague to have any chronological value except in a relative sense. *Strict contemporaneity cannot be asserted* of any strata merely *on the ground of similarity, or identity of fossils*. . . . Similarity or identity of fossils among formations geographically far apart, instead of proving contemporaneity, ought rather to be looked upon as

indicative of *great discrepancies in the relative epochs of deposit*. . . . When, however, the formations of distant countries are compared, all that we can safely affirm regarding them is that those containing the same or a representative assemblage of organic remains belong to the same epoch in the history of biological progress in each area; but we cannot assert that they are *contemporaneous unless* we are prepared to include within that term a *vague period* of perhaps *thousands* of years."

These extracts show a considerable degree of uncertainty about fossil science, but the uncertainty is made absolute by the following relation of the discoveries of M. Barrande, a distinguished author of a geological treatise.

He "drew attention more than a quarter of a century ago to certain remarkable intercalations of fossils in the series of Silurian strata of Bohemia. He showed that, while these strata presented a *normal succession* of organic remains, there were nevertheless *exceptional bands*, which, containing the fossils of a *higher zone*, were yet included on different horizons among inferior portions of the series. He terms these *precursory bands*, 'Colonies,' and defined the phenomena as consisting in the partial co-existence of two general faunas, which, considered as a whole, were nevertheless successive. . . . This original and ingenious doctrine has met with *much opposition* on the part of *geologists* and *paleontologists*. Of the *facts* cited by M. Barrande, there has been *no question*, but other explanations have been suggested for them. . . . Much of the opposition which his views have encountered has probably arisen from the feeling that if they are admitted, they must *weaken* the value of *paleontological evidence* in defining geological horizons. A paleontologist, who has been accustomed to deal with certain fossils as *unfailing* indications of particular portions of the geological series, is *naturally unwilling* to see his *generalizations upset* by an attempt to show that the fossils may occur on a *far earlier horizon*."

But: "There seems every probability that such migrations as M. Barrande has supposed in the case of the Silurian fauna of Bohemia have again and again taken place."

Here, then, is a doctrine based upon "facts" of which there has been "no question," which have again and again taken place, yet it meets with "much opposition" from geological scientists simply because it weakens the theory which they have adopted; simply because they are unwilling to have their "generalizations upset." A queer kind of "science" that, that holds to "generalizations" in the face of unquestioned "facts" which prove such generalizations to be wholly false. A very questionable kind of science indeed, we think, that clings tenaciously to a theory against the evidence of facts.

Nor is this all. It is impossible to lay down lines by which can be marked the distinction of periods of either strata or fossils. Some would be geologists talk learnedly of "six periods" of geological development, clearly defined according to

the period theory of the days of Gen. 1. Hugh Miller was probably the most prominent instance of this, and when he lived it was admitted on the theory of the "generalizations" above mentioned, which, as we have seen, have been "upset." Proof of this we have in the Encyclopedia Britannica, article Hugh Miller:—

"When he occupied the chair of the Royal Physical Society of Edinburgh, in 1852 [he died in 1856], he could look the most eminent representatives of contemporary geology in the face, and claim their assent to the possibility of drawing definite lines of demarkation [*sic.*] between the Tertiary, Secondary, and Paleozoic strata. He could speak of the 'entire type of organic being' as altering between these periods. 'All on the one side of the gap,' he could dare to affirm, 'belongs to one fashion, and all on the other to another and wholly different fashion.' In the thirty intervening years [to 1882] every form of the cataclysmal [the deluge] scheme of geological progression has been discredited. It has become *impossible* to obtain anything like a *consensus* of opinion among scientific men as to the placing of those frontier lines between period and period. 'Geographical provinces and zones,' says Professor Huxley, 'may have been as distinctly marked in the Paleozoic [primary, first] epoch as at present, and those seemingly sudden appearances of new genera and species which we ascribe to new creation, may be simple results of migration.'"

All these things simply demonstrate the conclusion before reached as to the utter worthlessness of the deductions of the geological scientists.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Heb. 1:1-8; 2:1-4. God's Message by His Son" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 21 , pp. 326, 327.**

**JUNE 7—HEB. 1:1-8; 2:1-4**

"GOD . . . spake . . . by the prophets." God is the author, the matter is his, the words are his, and he spake them to the people by the prophets. That which the prophets have spoken therefore is the word of God. These men spoke not of themselves, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1:21. The Bible needs to be defended less, and preached more. The very best defense of the Bible is to preach it faithfully. And then, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear, nevertheless it is the word of God that has been spoken. If they will hear, it is the word of God that they hear; if they refuse it is the word of God which they refuse. Great is the responsibility of him who stands before the people with the word of God. "He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully." "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; . . . that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 4:11. "I have set watchmen upon the walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night; ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he

establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth." Isa. 62:6, 7. "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth." Isa. 62:1.

"Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." As God spoke by the prophets, so also he hath spoken by his Son. It is altogether a wrong conception of his mission, that many now have who oppose the law of God—that he came as a lawgiver, to set up a new law and a new word in opposition to the old. He was "that Prophet," not a lawgiver. "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." Deut. 18;18, 19. When he came, he accordingly declared, "For I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." John 6:38. "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. . . . Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 12:49, 50. And as the mission of the prophets "in time past" was to bring the people to the law of God (Neh. 9:29); so it was pre-eminently the mission of Christ to magnify the law and bring the people to its observance.

"Whom he hath appointed heir of all things." As he is heir of all things, so "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:29, 26. "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8:17. There are several of such "if's" as this, in Paul's writings. "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." Heb. 3:14. "To present you holy and unblamable and unreprouvable in his sight, *if* ye continue in the faith." Col. 1:22, 23. "It is a faithful saying, For *if* we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; *if* we suffer, we shall also reign with him; *if* we deny him, he also will deny us." 2 Tim. 2:11, 12. We can deny him in refusing to suffer for him, as really as in any other way. And these promises are to those who suffer for him. We are joint-heirs if we suffer with him. We shall reign with him, if we suffer with him. Blessed suffering!

"There is suffering ere the glory,

There's a cross before the crown."

It was so with the Master, and the servant is not greater than his Master, neither is the disciple greater than his Lord. And, "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Rom. 8:18.

"By whom also he made the worlds." "God . . . created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:9. "Without him was not anything made that was made." And this mighty One, who was before all worlds by the word of his power, "was made flesh, and dwelt among" men. He who was higher than all angels, who made all angels, was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death; and having by himself purged our sins, sits at the right hand of the throne of the

Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. He has entered into the presence of God for us; and, having obtained eternal redemption for us, he makes intercession for us.

"A more excellent name." "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." As his goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity (Micah 5:2; Hebrew), so he has obtained the excellent name of "Son" of the Father, the "eternal God." Yea, he has obtained a "more excellent" name than that, for the Father calls his God, saying, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. . . . Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." That is, God the Father speaks to God the Son, and says, "Thy throne, Of God," &c. And further the Father says to the Son, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands." And when he brought him into the world, he said, "Let all the angels of God worship him." This is he who died for us. This is he who hath humbled himself, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, and for this reason God hath also again highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. This is the more excellent name of the most excellent Saviour of sinners, "Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. 9:6.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip." This Wonderful One has spoken to us. His words are spirit; they are life. No better, no greater, words can ever be spoken to the children of men; and if these be let slip, all is gone; if these be despised, it is ruin, for there are, and can be, no others. "Whosoever will not

327

hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Hold fast his words, and do not let them go, for he is thy life, and the length of thy days, and blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

"How shall we escape?" He not only has given us *words* of life, he has given his life itself, for our salvation. If this be neglected, how *can* salvation be obtained? Is there a more precious life to be given? No. Is there a greater One to come than He? No. "What could have been done more, that I have not done?" saith the Lord. Yes, all has been done. Therefore the question is not, How shall we be saved if we neglect it? But it is, "How shall we *escape*, if we neglect so great salvation?" This fearful death, this awful sacrifice, this great salvation, has not been accomplished in vain on either hand. Those who appreciate it shall enjoy it; those who neglect it shall not escape. "For, if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?" If ever transgression of the word spoken by angels was recompensed, how much more shall it be to the

transgressors of the word spoken by Him who is so much better, so much higher, than the angels. "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

A. T. J.

**"Sanctification. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 21 , p. 330.**

(Concluded).

IN further consideration of the office of the Holy Spirit we give the following from John 16:7-11, and Rom. 5:5:—

(d) To convince of sin. "And when he is come, he will convince the world of sin." Verse 8. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. And the Holy Spirit can convict no man of sin before the God, except by the law of God, "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20. And without conviction there can be no conversion. So the matter stands just thus: There can be no conversion without conviction; and there can be no conviction without the law; therefore, where the law of God is despised there can be no conversion; hence neither sanctification nor salvation, *call* it what they will.

(c) To convince of righteousness. "He shall convince the world of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more." "All unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5:17. "Sin is the transgression of the law." Righteousness is the opposite of unrighteousness. And as unrighteousness is transgression of the law, righteousness is obedience to the law. Therefore, in convincing of righteousness, the Holy Spirit convinces of *obedience to the law of God*.

(f) To convince of judgment. "He shall convince the world of judgment." "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." Rom. 2:12, 16. "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2:12. As, therefore, in the Judgment men's acts are to be compared with the law of God, the office of the Holy Spirit in convincing of judgment is to enable us to see the law of God as it is, that we may have our transgressions washed away by the blood of Christ, and that we may obey the law as we ought; thus to convince us of judgment now while there is hope, that when we shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ, our lives may be found in perfect harmony with the holy law of God, and that so we may stand in the Judgment.

(g) To shed abroad the love of God. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5:5. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3.

By all these evidences we see that the office of the Holy Spirit, in every instance in the life of the Christian, is to spread the law and word of God before

him, and to impress upon him the duty and knowledge of *obedience*. Now we bring direct proof that this is exactly what sanctification of the Spirit is, and nothing else. "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the . . . elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, *unto obedience*." 1 Pet. 1:1, 2. There we have it. Our proof is positive that the Holy Spirit is given to us *to teach us to obey* the written word of God, and that true sanctification of the Spirit is *unto obedience* to that written word. And any sanctification that is not "unto obedience" to the law of God, is spurious sanctification; it is a deception and a snare to

3. "*Sanctify them through thy truth*." The last text was proof that sanctification of the Spirit is "unto obedience." Here we have another text from Peter on the same subject: "Seeing ye have purified [sanctified] your souls in *obeying the truth through the Spirit*." 1 Pet. 1:22. Here we have then the truth that men are elect through sanctification of the Spirit *unto obedience*, but they are not sanctified until they *have obeyed* the truth, the word of God, through the Spirit. The truth of God cannot be obeyed except through the Holy Spirit. The law of God is spiritual (Rom. 7:14), the word of Christ is spirit (John 6:63), but man is carnal. Therefore "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:7-9. The Holy Spirit is given to take away the carnal mind, and make us spiritually minded, that so we may discern the things of God (1 Cor. 2:9-16), and thus he takes the things of God and shows them unto us. Thus by the Spirit of God, we can see our duty in the truth of God, and then we can obey that truth through the Spirit, and so we are sanctified through the truth.

True sanctification is through the truth. The other two steps are only preparatory to this final one. The sanctification of faith is unto receiving the Holy Spirit; sanctification of the Spirit is unto obedience to the truth; and having obeyed the truth through the Spirit, *we are sanctified*. He who rests upon faith, and claims to be sanctified, is deceived. He who rests upon the Spirit and claims to be sanctified, is deceived. Likewise he who rests upon both faith and the Spirit, and claims to be sanctified, is deceived. He who rests upon nothing short of faith, and the Holy Spirit, and obedience to the truth, he alone is truly sanctified. It is by obedience to the truth that we are to be sanctified. The man who is living in obedience to the whole truth is wholly sanctified. But if there be any part of the truth of God that a man is not obeying, he is not wholly sanctified. He may yell "Hallelujah," "Bless God," "Fully saved," "Wholly sanctified," etc., etc., to the end of the brassy catalogue, but as long as there is a single point of the law and truth of God which he is not obeying, we know by the word of God that he is *not* sanctified, and that he *is* deceived.

We know that as long as we are in this world we must grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour. In order to a growth in grace, there must be new faults discerned in ourselves, and additional victories gained. In order to a growth in knowledge, there must be additional truths learned from the word of God, and as they are learned they must be obeyed, if we would be sanctified. So,

in the very nature of the case, true sanctification is a work, and a work, too, the period of which is measured only by the length of our stay in this world. However, when the Lord comes in glory, he will find a company of sanctified ones waiting and looking for him: they will have been sanctified through the truth, for it is written of them, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12. And again: "In their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God." Rev. 14:5. We thank God for the grace of true sanctification, but we pray to be forever delivered from every kind of sanctification that is *not* through *obedience to the truth of God through the Spirit*.  
A. T. J.

**"Testimony No. 32" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 21 , p. 331.**

WE take this occasion to speak a word further to our brethren in regard to this important work. As time grows shorter, the importance of diligence in the work committed to us, and of carefulness in individual action, becomes greater. And in this Testimony the attention of all is again most forcibly called to the dangers and duties that lie all about us. This number is of special importance to all in every department of our great work—to the minister, the missionary, the colporter, and the canvasser; to parents, to children, to husbands, and to wives; to the sick, to the well, to physicians, and to nurses; to churches, and to individuals.

We would not attempt to select any one part as more important than the others, but we will mention a few of the portions which are particularly worthy of careful and repeated perusal. These are: "The Influence of Unbelief—Deceitfulness of Sin—Marriage with Unbelievers—The Manufacture of Wine and Cider—The Support of City Missions—Young Men as Missionaries—Importance of the Canvassing Work—Business and Religion—Responsibilities of the Physician—The Coming Crisis—Joshua and the Angel."

This number is put up in durable shape, being well and handsomely bound in cloth. It contains 238 pages of closely printed matter, and the price is only 50 cents. Let the orders come in, large and fast. Nobody will be enriched by it but the buyers.

A. T. J.

**June 4, 1885**

**"Uncertainty of Geological Science (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 22 , pp. 340, 341.**

IN closing these proofs of the untrustworthiness of fossil evidence, we can do no better than to present the words of Dr. Geikie himself, in Part V., under "*Use of Fossils.*" He says:—

"As fossil evidence furnishes a much more satisfactory and widely applicable means of subdividing the stratified rocks of the earth's crust than mere lithological characters, it is made the basis

of the geological classification of these rocks. Thus we may find a particular stratum marked by the occurrence in it of various fossils, one or more of which may be distinctive, either form occurring in no other bed above or below, or from special abundance in that stratum. These species might therefore be used as a guide to the occurrence of the bed in question, which might be called by the name of the most abundant species. . . . But before such a generalization can be safely made, we *must be sure* that the species in question *really never does* appear on any other platform."

But by Barrande's "facts" in regard to Colonies we never can be sure that a certain species "really never does appear on any other platform," until the whole earth has been explored outside and inside, from center to circumference. This is even admitted in the argument which we read further.

"This evidently demands wide experience over an extended field of observation. The assertion that a particular species occurs *only on the* horizon manifestly rests on *negative* evidence as much as on positive. The paleontologist who makes it cannot mean more than that he knows the fossil to lie on that horizon, and that, so far as *his experience* and that of others goes, it has never been met with anywhere else. But *a single example* of the occurrence of the fossil on a different zone would *great damage* the value of his generalization, and *a few* such cases would *demolish it* altogether."

Now, as we have seen that the undisputed facts, as developed in Barrande's "doctrine of Colonies," show that just "such cases," "have again and again taken place," therefore it is proven that whatever generalizations have been built up on the evidence of distinctive species of fossils, are, by these facts, "demolished altogether." So it is said:—

"Hence all such statements ought at first to be made tentatively [experimentally]. To establish a geological horizon on limited fossil evidence, and then to *assume* the *identity* of all strata containing the same fossils, is to *reason in a circle* and introduce utter confusion into our interpretation of the geological record."

If, now, it be true, as the Professor states in his introduction to the subject of fossil science, that without some knowledge of this "progress in modern geology would be impossible;" according to the *very knowledge* of fossil evidence displayed in these quotations, how much of the progress of modern geology is reliable?

After showing so forcibly as he has, the utter unreliability of fossil evidence in giving the succession of strata, he proceeds to the discussion of that very subject—the succession of strata—and shows that it is by such evidence that that is fixed. Of the Upper Silurian group he says:—

"The formations which in the British Islands are classed as Upper Silurian, occur in two very distinct types. So great, indeed, is the contrast between these types that it is *only* by a comparison of

*organic remains* that the whole can be grouped together as the deposits of one great geological period."

Again, under the "Cambrian," he says:—

"Murchison worked out the stratigraphical order of succession from above, and chiefly by the help of organic remains. He advanced from where the superposition of the rocks is clear and undoubted, and for the first time in the history of geology ascertained that the transition-rocks of the older geologists could be *arranged into zones* by means of *characteristic fossils* [the very thing which he has just shown is unreliable] as satisfactorily as the secondary formations had been classified in a *similar manner* by William Smith. *Year by year* as he found his Silurian *types of life* [fossils] *descend farther and farther* into lower deposits, *he pushed backward* the limits of his Silurian system."

The limits of the Silurian system, therefore, are fixed by the evidence of fossils, and by that alone. This too in the face of the statement that until the order of succession of the strata is accurately determined, fossil classification may prove to be "worthless."

Of the Old Red Sandstone, he says:—

"It is important to observe that in no district can these three [lower, middle, and upper] subdivisions be found together, and that the so-called middle formation occurs *only in one* region—the north of Scotland. The classification, therefore, does not rest upon any *actually ascertained* stratigraphical sequence, but on an *inference* from the *organic remains*" (fossils). And: "This view *has been accepted everywhere* by geologists." Until recently, Professor Geikie alone has called in question, "the existence of any *middle* division."

The Old Red Sandstone, otherwise called Devonian, is an established group in geology, and has been accepted everywhere by geologists, consequently it forms an important, integral part of the whole geological system, and yet it confessedly rests *only* upon an "*inference*" *from fossils*, while the Professor has previously abundantly shown that no reliable, "positive" inference can be drawn from fossils, and that the order in time of fossils themselves *must be established* "first of all" by the order in position of the stratified rocks.

This, as well as each of the other divisions of this subject, might be easily carried much beyond its present length; but we do not wish to extend it immoderately. However, this is sufficient to demonstrate from the oldest geological treatise itself, that in this single instance does the science proceed upon any certain data. And even this is plainly stated by Professor Geikie:—

"From all these facts it is *clear* that the geological record, as it now exists, is *at the best* but an *imperfect* chronicle of geological history. *In no country* is it complete. The lacune of one region must be supplied from another. And *in proportion to the geographical distance* between the localities where the *gaps occur* and *those whence the missing intervals are supplied*, the *element* of

*uncertainty* in our reading of the record *is increased.*"—See closing portion of *Gaps in the Geological Record, in Part V.*

If, then, there be a distance of a foot between the place where a gap occurs and the place where the missing link is found, there is uncertainty to just that extent. And if the distance be a hundred feet, or a thousand feet, or a thousand miles, or ten thousand miles, the "element of uncertainty" is proportionally "increased." Therefore, is a "gap" be found in Kansas, and the "missing interval" be found in Siam, this being the utmost "geographical distance" that could possibly occur, the "element of uncertainty" would be infinite.

The one essential element that is lacking in all these productions on geology is *demonstration*. Assumption upon assumption, and inference upon inference, are proposed upon confessedly uncertain data, and from that, then *speculation*, to an unlimited degree, is indulged in, and all this is offered to us in the name of science! But we would respectfully enter a demurrer, and ask: Geological gentlemen, give us *demonstration*, instead of speculation, and then every point so established we will gladly accept.

But again: *Geology is not susceptible of demonstration.* Astronomy is. Therefore there is no speculation upon the courses of the planets and stars, and the times of their revolution. When in 1845 and 1846 Adams in England, and Leverrier in France, virtually weighed the solar system, and found that another planet was required to give the true balance, and then each in his place made his calculations upon paper, as to where the then unknown planet should be, and each from his place wrote to an astronomer telling him to direct his telescope to a certain point in the heavens, and find the required planet, and he did so, and found it, *that was science.* When, from the fall of an apple, Newton reached the law that governs every particle of matter in the universe, *that was science.* Let geology give us some such instances as these, and we will believe all that is proved by them.

We have said that geology is not susceptible of *demonstration*, and for proof of this, quote Heb. 11:3: "Through *faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear;" also verse 1, Faith is "the evidence of things *not seen.*" If the formation, the growth, and the structure of the earth, can be *shown* by geology, if it can be demonstrated, so that it may be a *matter of knowledge*, just then it will be removed from the field of faith. As faith is the evidence of things *not seen*, just so soon as geologists can cause us to see *how* the worlds were framed, just that soon there is no longer any faith about it. But the God of the universe has placed "the framing of the worlds by his word" at the very head of the list of the objects of faith, and we doubt, exceedingly, whether it shall ever be removed from that chief place, before the dawn of that glorious day when faith itself shall be utterly lost in sight. But—

"When that illustrious day shall rise,"

And we shall dwell amidst and above those worlds of light, and shall see the face of Him who sits upon the throne, and "know even as we are known," and "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," *then*, we hope to *fully know* the awful sublimity of the Almighty Fiat.

Of the evidences of the uncertainty of geological science as deduced in this series of articles, we now, in conclusion, present the following

### SYNOPSIS

1. (a) "Only in proportion as we understand the present, can we expect to decipher the past."

(b) But "we must be on our guard against the danger of assuming that nature's operations" at present are the same as in the past.

(c) "We may assume this."

(d) But "this assumption may be entirely erroneous."

2. (a) The Geological Record "is at the best but an imperfect chronicle."

(b) "Enormous gaps occur" wherein there is "no record at all."

(c) In that which is considered as "the sum of geological evidence there can be found no trace of a beginning."

(d) Therefore "it cannot begin at the beginning of things."

3. (a) "The stratified portion of the crust of the earth, must represent a very vast period of time."

(b) But "no reliable standard seems to be available, whereby these periods are to be measured."

4. (a) Geological Science "*contends* that had the globe become solid ten thousand million years ago," it "must have" had a much greater flattening at the poles than it now has.

(b) But it "*admits*" that had the globe become solid then, "nothing we know" would justify us in saying but what it would have been now just as it is.

341

5. (a) "The underlying beds *must be* older than those which cover them."

(b) But "huge mountain masses have been so *completely overturned* that the *highest beds*" are *under* those which *ought* to be under them.

(c) And "in such instances the apparent superposition *may be* deceptive."

Exactly, it "must be" one way, and it "may be" another, and so.

(d) "This simple and obvious truth is termed the law of superposition."

Oh! ah! yes, very (?) "simple," exceedingly (?) "obvious," sublime (?) "truth."

6. (a) "The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks." "It is absolutely essential *first of all* to have the order of superposition of strata rigorously determined.

(b) "Unless this is done, the *most fatal mistakes* may be made in paleontological [fossil] chronology."

(c) But "*it is by* their characteristic *fossils* that the divisions of the stratified rocks can be most satisfactorily made.

(d) Yet, "the chronological sequence [succession] of fossils must be determined *first of all* by the order of superposition [succession] of their enclosing strata."

7. (a) Until the true order of succession of the rocks is accurately determined, the evidence of fossils is worthless.

(b) But it is "by fossil evidence and by this alone," that the true order of succession of the rocks is determined.

Such is geological science as it is. Here we close our examination of it for the present. We have endeavored in every instance to get at the real gist of the statements of the science, and to do it fairly. We are satisfied that we have not pressed a single point beyond what it will legitimately bear. Therefore the proposition stands proven to a demonstration that, as for the present state of geological science, the only *certain* thing about it is its UNCERTAINTY. A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Heb. 9:1-12. The Priesthood of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 22 , pp. 342, 343.**

**JUNE--HEB. 9:1-12**

"A WORLDLY sanctuary." "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the showbread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly." Heb. 9:1-5.

THIS is the inspired synopsis of the description of the worldly sanctuary. The complete description is given in Ex. 25-31 and 35-40. When the Lord first gave directions in regard to it, he said: "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering. And this is the offering which ye shall take of them; gold, and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and shittim wood, oil for the light, spices for anointing oil, and for sweet incense, onyx stones, and stones to be set in the ephod, and in the breastplate. And let them make me a sanctuary; *that I may dwell among them.*" Ex. 25:2-8. The sanctuary, therefore, was the dwelling-place of God among the people. It was so in the wilderness; it was so in the time of the judges, of Samuel, of Saul, of David, and until Solomon built the temple after the same pattern that this was built, and which, from the day of its dedication "when the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord," was the dwelling-place of the Lord, amongst the children of Israel.

THE sanctuary was about forty-five feet long and about eighteen feet wide. It was divided into two apartments by a vail, and these two apartments were called "the holy place and the most holy." Ex. 26:31-33. In the holy place were placed the candlestick (lampstand) on the south side, the table of show bread on the north side, and the altar of incense at the west side, close to the vail. Within the vail, in the most holy place, was placed the ark of the covenant. In the ark were the tables of stone, on which were the ten commandments, and the other things above mentioned by Paul. The top of the ark was the mercy seat, and on each

end of it was a cherub, both of them stretching forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings. Ex. 25:18-20. "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Ex. 25:22.

THIS sanctuary was all arranged for the service of God. "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God." Heb. 9:6. This service was altogether for the purpose of taking away the sins of the people. When any one had "done somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord his God," when the sin which he had sinned came to his knowledge, then he was to bring his sin-offering to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, he was to lay his hand upon the head of his offering and confess his sin, and it was accepted for him. Then the offering was to be killed before the Lord, the blood taken

343

by the priest in a basin and taken into the holy place, some of it sprinkled before the vail, some of it put upon the horns of the altar of incense, some of it on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering that stood before the tabernacle, and all the rest of the blood poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering. Lev. 4. Thus, when the blood (which was the life, Lev. 17:10) of the offering was taken into the sanctuary and placed upon the holy vessels, the sins which by confession had been laid upon the offering, were conveyed into the sanctuary.

THIS was done every day throughout the year, morning and evening, for the whole congregation, and at any time for individuals who brought their offerings. But in the end of the year "went the high priest alone" into the most holy place, "not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Heb. 9:7. This day in which the high priest went into the most holy place, was called the day of atonement. And the service which he that day accomplished was called cleansing the sanctuary. That was to remove from the sanctuary all the sins that had been conveyed into it during the year. This was done by the high priest first casting lots upon two goats, one of which was thus chosen for the Lord, and the other left to be the scapegoat. Then the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell was offered for a sin-offering, and the blood was taken by the high priest into the most holy place, and sprinkled upon the mercy seat and before the mercy seat seven times, then he went out into the first apartment to the altar of incense and sprinkled the blood upon it seven times. This was to "make an atonement for the holy place," and for "the tabernacle of the congregation," and for the altar, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of all their transgressions in all their sins." This uncleanness was because of sins, because no person ever went into the sanctuary except the priests, and they only in the service of God, and no person ever went into the most holy place except the high priest.

AND when the high priest had "made an end of reconciling the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar," he took the live goat and laid both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins,

putting them upon the head of the goat, and sent him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; "and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." See Lev. 16. This was the completion of the yearly round of the service of God as conducted in the sanctuary according to the ordinances established by the Lord.

BUT this sanctuary, with all its services, with all its offerings, with all its priests, and its high priest, was only "a figures for the time then present." "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. 9:8, 9. These things upon the earth were patterns of things in Heaven. Verse 23. These holy places made with hands were the figures of the true holy places in Heaven itself. Verse 24. Christ was not a priest on earth (Heb. 8:4), therefore he did not enter into these holy places made with hands. But he is a high priest in Heaven, and there he is a minister of the true sanctuary of which the earthly was but a pattern. "We have such a high priest, who is set at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Heb. 8:1, 2.

THIS sanctuary that was upon the earth, was a figure of the sanctuary that is in Heaven. The offering of beasts that was made and which could not take away sin, was a figure of the offering of "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The blood that was brought into the earthly sanctuary for sin, was a figure of the blood of Christ by which he has entered into the heavenly sanctuary now to appear in the presence of God for us. The high priest on earth was a figure of Christ, our high priest in Heaven. The ministry of the high priest in the sanctuary on earth was a figure of the sanctuary on earth was a figure of the ministry of our high priest, Christ, in the sanctuary in Heaven. The ten commandments which were in the ark of the testimony in the temple on earth, were but a copy of those which are in the ark of his testament in the temple in Heaven. Rev. 11:19. That which was sin then, is sin now. That by which sin was made known then, is that by which sin is made known now. That is, the ten commandments, and they read now exactly as they read then. By the commandment the seventh day was the Sabbath then, by that same commandment the seventh day is the Sabbath now.

ALL these priests, services and offerings could not really take away sin, "could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." Heb. 10:4; 9:9. Christ's service, his offering, his blood alone can take away sin, their as well as ours. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9:15. Through these offerings, all from Adam onward, looked to Christ for redemption from their transgressions; through his own offering, all from Christ to the end of the world, must likewise look to him for redemption from their transgressions. Thus, he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. There is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved (Rev. 13:8; Acts 4:12); there is no other priesthood by which we can be reconciled to God; neither is there any place

where real atonement is made for the sins of men, other than in the most holy place of the sanctuary in Heaven.

A. T. J.

**June 11, 1885**

**"'Evolution' and Evolution" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 23 , pp. 356, 357.**

IN view of the fact that not only Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. McCosh but almost all of the acknowledged scientific teachers, not only in the United States, but in Europe, are avowed evolutionists, it may be of interest, and perhaps of value, for us to notice briefly what evolution really is, and what is its manifest tendency. Some time ago the *Independent* presented the following list of evolutionists:—

"Of all the younger brood of working naturalists whom Agassiz educated, every one—Morse, Shaler, Verrill, Niles, Hyatt, Scudder, Putnam, even his own son—has accepted evolution. Every one of the Harvard professors whose departments have to do with biology—Gray, Whitney, A. Agassiz, Hagen, Goodale, Shaler, James, Farlow, and Faxon—is an evolutionist, and man's physical structure they regard as no real exception to the law. They are all theists, we believe; all conservative men. They do not all believe that Darwinism—that is, natural selection—is a sufficient theory of evolution; they may incline to Wallace's view, but they accept evolution. It is not much taught; it is rather taken for granted. At Johns Hopkins University, which aims to be the most advanced in the country, *nothing but evolution* is held or taught [italics ours]. In the excellent University of Pennsylvania all the biological professors are evolutionists,—Professors Leidy and Allen in Comparative Anatomy, Professor Rathrock in Botany, and Professor Lesley in Geology. We might mention Michigan University, Cornell, Dartmouth, or Bowdoin; but what is the use of going farther? It would only be the same story. *There is scarcely an exception to be found.* Wherever there is a working naturalist, he is sure to be an evolutionist. We made an inquiry of two ex-presidents of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One wrote us, in reply: 'My impression is that there is no biologist of repute nowadays who does not accept, in some form or other, the doctrine of derivation in time, whatever be the precise form in which they suppose the evolution to have occurred.' His successor replied, 'Almost without exception, the working naturalists in this country believe in evolution. . . . In England and Germany the belief in evolution is almost universal among the active workers in biology. In France the belief is less general, but is rapidly gaining ground. . . . I

should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution, as being as *incompetent* as one who doubted the Copernican theory.' We challenge the *Observer* to find three working naturalists of repute in the United States, or two (it can find one in Canada) that are not evolutionists. And where a man believes in evolution, it goes without saying that the law holds as to man's physical structure."

In this article, however, we do not propose a complete analysis of evolution, but only an examination of the leading phase, and of its manifest tendency; and that is, as stated by Mr. James Sully, joint author with Prof. T. H. Huxley, of the Article Evolution in "Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth edition, this:—

*"It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation. Just as the biological doctrine of the transmutation of species is opposed to that of special creations, so the idea of evolution, as applied to the formation of the world as a whole, is opposed to that of a direct creative volition."*

In view of this statement of the highest authority on the subject of evolution, is it not equally clear that these professors of Harvard, and Yale, and Brown, and Bowdoin, and Amherst, and Princeton, and Cornell, and Johns Hopkins, and Michigan, and Pennsylvania Universities, and the teachers of science in England, Germany, France, and the United States, and those who accept their teaching, are all in direct antagonism to the Bible? For whatever else the Bible might be held to teach, it assuredly does teach this one thing, that God created all things.

And it is purposely that we write "Bible," instead of "Genesis" alone; for it is not alone the testimony of Genesis, but of the whole Book, that "God *created all things*." "In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth. . . . And God *created* great whales, *and every living creature* that moveth." Gen. 1:1, 21. "So God *created man*." Gen. 1:27. "And the Lord said, I will destroy *man* whom I have *created*." Gen. 6:7. "God *created man upon the earth*." Deut. 4:32. "Thus saith God the Lord, he that *created* the heavens," etc. Isa. 42:5. "I have made the earth and *created man* upon it." Isa. 45:12. "Hath not one God *created* us?" Mal. 2:10. Now the words of Christ (Mark 13:19), "For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God *created* unto this time." Of man he says (Mark 10:6), "But from the beginning of the *creation*, God *made them male and female*." God "*created all things* by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:9. "By him were *all things created* that are in heaven and that are in earth, *visible and invisible*." Col. 1:16. "Thou hast *created all things*." Rev. 4:11; also Rev. 10:6; 14:7. So just as surely as evolution is "directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation," so surely are those who hold to evolution placed "directly antagonistic" to the Bible. And this will plainly appear from their own words as we proceed.

Because the disciples of Darwin have pressed his *theories* into service as *facts*, evolution has come to be considered (and not improperly) as almost, if not entirely, synonymous with Darwinism. Yet there is a distinction claimed, and this claimed distinction it is which has given rise to the two kinds of evolution suggested in our heading. It is stated as follows by the *Independent* of January 8, 1880:—

"In the first place let it be clearly understood that evolution, or development, is not synonymous with Darwinism. A man may be an evolutionist and not be a Darwinian. Let us explain.

"The doctrine of evolution is this: That all the existing forms of animal and vegetable life have been produced through the process of successive birth and generation from original vital germs. This is all. The doctrine of evolution does not assert how the first germs came, whether by God's special creation, or by the unaided action of law out of inanimate matter. Nor does the doctrine of evolution assert how or why, whether rapidly or gradually, under what laws or what providence, the evolution has proceeded as it has. These are theories of evolution, which are brought forward to account for its operation; but they are not the doctrine of evolution itself. *The doctrine of evolution is opposed to the doctrine of creationism*; and it teaches simply that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God, but were produced by birth out of plants and animals previously existing.

"Now, Darwinism—properly so called—is not evolution, but a theory or hypothesis of evolution. It has become confused in the unscholarly popular mind with evolution, because it was the way in which Charles Darwin first explained evolution. Darwinism is the theory that evolution is explained by the law of Natural Selection; *i.e.*, a law of variation by which the young of any animal vary slightly from their parents. Those of the young whose variations help them in the struggle for existence are more likely to live and propagate their kind. . . . Thus, by slow gradations, and by the retention of favorable minute changes, all present life was evolved. This is one theory of evolution, and is called by Darwin's name, 'Natural Selection,' or by Spencer's name, 'Survival of the Fittest.' This Darwinism is not necessarily atheistic. Darwin himself allowed that life may have been started by a few created germs. But, once started, on Darwin's theory, there is no further need of God. Law produces everything, from the diatom to the oak, from the amúba to the man. According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the produce of physical evolution as is the physical structure itself. Given two or three germs at the beginning perhaps—or perhaps not—and given the laws which we find, then there is no more use for God, and all things have come out as we find them with none of his supervision. There may have been a God once, but law and not God is the great Creator."

Apparently, there is a great deal said here, but in reality there is very little. Let us analyze this statement, and see wherein lies the actual difference, if any, between these two statements of evolution and Darwinism.

1. Evolution says all forms of life come in successive births and generation from original germs. Darwinism says the same.

2. Evolution does not say how the first germs came. Neither does Darwinism.

3. Evolution says that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God. Darwinism says exactly the same.

4. Evolution says these were produced by birth, out of plants and animals previously existing. Darwinism is identical with it here also.

5. Darwinism holds that this birth and generation of plants and animals in succession, is according to established law. Evolution being "directly antagonistic" to *creationism*, how else can successive birth and generation proceed but in accord with the law universal of birth and generation? So in this also they are identical.

6. Darwinism says that the process of evolution has been very slow. The foregoing statement of evolution says that it *does not assert* whether the process has been rapid or gradual, but we have abundance of evidence to show that this is not correct. And we need go no farther than the editorial columns of the *Independent* to prove its incorrectness. In an editorial entitled "Deliver Us from Our Friends," in December (?) 1879, appears a quotation from Wallace's "Natural Selection," as follows:—

"We can with tolerable certainty affirm that man must have inhabited the earth a thousand centuries ago, but we cannot assert . . . that there is any good evidence that he positively did not exist for a period of ten thousand centuries."

And the whole tenor of the article, which is a defense of evolution, is that the evolution of man is a process of ages upon ages; and it says that the evidence that man was pre glacial, *i.e.*, that he existed scores or hundreds of thousands of years ago, and that he was fashioned out of apes, "is so strong that it is *very unsafe* to deny" it." (Italics his.)

Again, what room has evolution to show its successions of "birth and generation" if the earth by only six thousands years old? The very language in which evolution is defined and explained, asserts that the process has been gradual. And further, if evidence were produced that the process had been rapid, it would immediately turn the scale in favor of creationism, and evolution would be destroyed. Admitting, however, that evolution makes no *assertion* either way, does it not make very loud *demands* for "hundreds," or "thousands," or even "tens of thousands of centuries"? If not, to say nothing of Darwin, why do Wallace, and Le Conte, and A. S. Packard, and De Quatrefages, Hughes, Evans, and all the rest,

357

speak and write of it in no other language than such as the above? And these *demands* are nothing short of an *assertion* of the absolute poverty of evolution with less than "thousands and tens of thousands of centuries," and therein asserts its "gradual" process, and fully agrees with Darwinism where it says: "The high antiquity of man . . . is the *indispensable* basis for understanding his origin."—*Descent of Man*, 1, p. 3.

.7. The process "once started in Darwin's theory there is no further need of God." Evolution says the same, as the following from Professor Huxley shows:—

"If all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste."

Again:—

"But living matter once originated, there is no necessity for another origination, since the hypothesis postulates the unlimited . . . modifiability of such matter."—*Encyclopedia Britannica, Article "Biology."*

So again we see that *consistent* evolution and Darwinism are identical.

It is unnecessary to pursue this line further, as everything that might be brought to bear upon the subject would simply confirm the points already made, that consistent evolution and Darwinism are essentially synonymous. The simple fact is, and is plainly shown by Mr. Sully, that to Darwin, first of all, belongs the honor of first reducing the theory of evolution to "a substantial basis of fact." And whether in England, Germany, or the United States, evolution without Darwin is, as the phrase goes, the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Pet. 1:1-11. Christian Progress"  
*The Signs of the Times* 11, 23 , pp. 358, 359.**

**JUNE 21—2 PET. 1:1-11**

"PRECIOUS faith." It is of peculiar interest to notice this apostle's use of this word "precious." "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, . . . but with the *precious blood* of Christ." 1 Pet. 1:18, 19. "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and *precious*. . . . Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, *elect, precious*; . . . Unto you therefore which believe he is *precious*." 1 Pet. 2:4-7. "The trial of your faith, being much more *precious* than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1:7. And here he writes this letter to those who have "obtained like *precious faith* . . . through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

THUS we have presented to us the precious Son of God, given to be a precious Saviour, who redeemed us by his precious blood. Our faith in him is a precious faith, and the trial of our faith itself is precious; all more precious than gold that perisheth. Surely upon us, who believe in Christ, has come the fullness of the blessing pronounced of old upon Joseph. "Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the earth and fullness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush." Deut. 33:13-19. And added to all this "are given unto us exceeding great and

precious promises." Precious, precious indeed, are the gifts and promises of God.

"AND beside this, giving all diligence, *add*." Now begins *our* part of the work. Through faith in Christ we have received, by the mercy of God, the forgiveness of sins, have been made partakers of the divine nature, and now we must begin to "work out" our "own salvation with fear and trembling." Phil. 2:12. God gives it to us to "add," and while we "add," he "*multiplies*" (verse 2) "grace and peace." While we "add," in our obedience, each Christian grace to our lives, he multiplies grace by which we may add the next. So that as before, sin reigned unto death, even so now grace reigns, through righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. 5:21.

"ADD to your faith." Justification is entirely by faith without works. David "describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." Rom. 4:6. This righteousness is imputed because of faith, and that alone. Abraham "was strong in faith, . . . and *therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness*. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." Rom. 4:20-24. But if we must be justified by faith without works, then what is the use of works? What use? Why to show the virtue of our faith, to be sure, and to maintain our justification, that is, to keep from sin, for if we sin we need justification again, and must again be justified by faith. "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye *sin not*. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John 2:1. Good works therefore are to maintain a righteous character before God, and because we must work out our salvation. The justification that has been obtained by faith must be retained by works. It is gotten without works, but it cannot be kept without works. Without works all faith will avail nothing. It is dead. James 2:14-26.

SO PETER says, "Add to your faith *virtue*." Is your faith of any account? Is there any virtue in it? Show it by a consistent Christian course of conduct in all things. Your faith is in God, and you are to add to it the virtues of God. This is what you are called for. This is that for which he has chosen you, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of him that hath *called us to glory and virtue*.

ADD to virtue *knowledge*. "Being fruitful in every *good work* and *increasing* in the knowledge of God." Col. 1:10. "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet *more and more in knowledge* and in all sense [margin]." Phil. 1:9. "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 3:18. It is in his word that God has given us a knowledge of himself and of his dear Son, our Lord and Saviour. And to grow in knowledge we must study that word. There is nothing in this world that feeds, strengthens, enlarges, and enlightens the mind as does diligent study of the word of God. This is just what is commanded, Giving all *diligence*, add to your faith virtue and to virtue knowledge.

ADD to knowledge *temperance*. Temperance cannot be known, much less practiced, without the knowledge of God as revealed in his word. Temperance does not consist of abstinence from strong drink alone. A person may be grossly

intemperate and never touch a drop of strong drink. A person may be intemperate in drinking cold water, or in eating good food. How often it happens that persons will exert themselves till they get very hot and thirsty, then drink too much cold water; it may be only a little, yet too much; and so make themselves sick, or kill themselves outright; and all because of a lack of self-control—intemperance. Temperance is self-control. True temperance is "temperance in all things"—self-control in all things—because there is nothing that may not be carried to excess and so made an injury. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." Rom. 14:22.

ADD to temperance *patience*. James says: "Let patience have her perfect work, that ye

359

may be perfect and entire." Chap. 1:3. But it is absolutely impossible for a person who is intemperate in anything, to be patient in all things. These graces are put, by inspiration, in their proper order, and not one of them can be added out of its place. We cannot add temperance to virtue, neither can we add patience to knowledge; we cannot add godliness to faith, nor charity to godliness, leaving the other out. Each one must be added just as God has placed it. When we have added temperance (that means control your temper as well as your appetite), then we can add patience, and not till then.

THEN to patience we can add *godliness*, and we cannot add it to anything but patience, and as long as we are impatient we are ungodly. Godliness is god-likeness. It is doing as God would do. And how would he do if he were here? He would do just as he did when he was here. His name was called Immanuel, that is, God with us. "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," said Jesus. John 14:9. "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. "And ye are complete in him." Verse 10. A godly life is a Christ life in the world; we are in his stead here; and we can reach godliness only through faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, and patience.

ADD to godliness, *brotherly kindness*. When a person has reached this place he can fulfill the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and not before. Christ did this, and God commanded us to do it. And when we have added the graces that precede it, it will be a good deal easier for us all to do, because we shall then not think so much of ourselves as to render it impossible for us to love our neighbor as we do ourselves. That is the trouble with thousands of people, they cannot love their neighbor as they love themselves, because they love themselves too much. But when we follow the course mapped out by Peter here, by the time we reach brotherly kindness, we shall see so little in ourselves that is lovable that we shall have no difficulty in loving our neighbor as the commandment directs. We shall have no trouble in finding in him just as much good as is in ourselves.

ADD to brotherly kindness *charity*. "And charity is the bond of perfectness." Col. 3:14. "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, *thinketh* no evil." Charity loves God with all the

heart *and* its neighbor as itself. "And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves." 1 Pet. 4:8.

"FOR if these things [these things that must be added] be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that *lacketh these things* is blind, and cannot see afar off, and *hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.*" There is the whole secret of backsliding set forth in a single sentence. He that lacks these additions of the Christian virtues, will be barren and unfruitful, and will forget that he was purged from his old sins. He adds nothing, and how can God multiply to him?

"WHEREFORE the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for *if ye do these things*, ye shall never fall." There is God's surety against our falling from grace. If we do these things, we shall never fall. But if we do not do these things, how *can* we stand in the great day when the towers fall?

"FOR so [in this way, by this means] an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." There is no other way opened, there is no other means provided by which that abundant entrance can be ministered unto us. Here is our work set before us each day as it comes. We live but a day at a time, and the Lord wants us to live in to-day. "To-day if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts." Each morning as we arise set our faith anew upon Christ as our Saviour; then show the virtue, the worth of our faith by confessing him before men, both in our words and our lives; then study the words of God for knowledge to guide us during the day; then practice the temperance—the self-control—that is enjoined everywhere and in all things in the word of God; then add patience in all the affairs of the day; add godliness by exemplifying the life of Christ among men by doing good; add brotherly kindness in all our associations with our neighbor; and all crowned by adding sweet charity, the bond of perfectness; the love of God shed abroad in the heart, loving him with all the heart, and loving our neighbor as ourselves, thus completing the day with a well-rounded Christian character. Can it not be done one day? Can it not be done to-day? That is all the Lord asks of us. Do "these things" to-day "while it is called to-day," and so to-day each day as God gives us opportunity to do. And we shall then never fall, but unto all such an abundant entrance will be ministered into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

A. T. J.

### **"Political 'Christian Ideals'" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 23 , p. 361.**

THE *Churchman* in urging the need of "Christian ideals" in politics, says: "The law of sacrifice, which lies at the basis of Christianity, is the eternal law in politics also, and the truth announced by Christ is indelible, that he who would be chief must make himself a servant." Oh, yes! And when the time comes that, to hold office in this Government, a man must accept the "Christian ideal" of the church, what masterly exemplars there will be of the law of sacrifice in politics! And how actively they will obey the truth, and make themselves servants that they may be

chiefs! That is done in politics now and how much more then, when, by it, they can exemplify a "Christian ideal"! But when the law of sacrifice is followed for the sole purpose of getting into office, and when a man makes himself a servant for the express purpose of becoming chief, we have serious doubts of both the sacrifice and the servitude.

A. T. J.

**June 18, 1885**

**"'Evolution' and Evolution. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 24 , p. 372.**

BUT now as evolution is so "directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation," what do those persons, who pretend to hold to both evolution and the Bible, do with those scriptures which speak of the creation of the world, of man, etc.? Why, that is all set aside as "not historical," "not historically correct," etc. Wm. Hayes Ward, D.D., editor of the *Independent*, in his issue of February 26, 1880, says:—

"For reasons which almost, if not quite, compel their assent, one of which is the general acceptance of the doctrine of evolution, many believe as I do, that the story of the creation and fall of man, told in Genesis, *is no more the record of actual occurrences* than is the parable of the prodigal son [*italics ours*]. Dr. Dorner, the greatest among German evangelical theologians, whose name is honored here as in Germany, holds that this story *is not to be accepted as history*. So hold perhaps a quarter, perhaps a half, of the educated ministers in our leading evangelical denominations. When Dr. Boardman, of Philadelphia, repeated with great applause and then published a year ago his lectures on the Bible cosmogony, *taking this view*, I do not remember that a *single* Baptist paper in the North found any fault. . . . Nevertheless, Paul doubtless believed that the story of the fall was true historically, and used it as an illustration convenient and pertinent for the purpose he had in mind. But it cannot be proved *that God might not properly allow* Paul to use the illustration, which occurred to him as being to his purpose, *even though it were not an actual verity*." But ("be astonished, O ye heavens, at this!!!") "we do know that a commandment given on Sinai assumes as a reason for working six days and resting on the seventh, that God made the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh; *but we know* that this statement *is not historically correct*. The world was *not* made in six days."

Now is it sufficient to say simply that evolution is antagonistic to creationism? Is it not antagonistic to the whole Bible, and even to the Creator himself, when in reply to the words of Jehovah, spoken with a voice that shook the earth, "In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth," the evolutionist boldly asserts, "We know that the world was *not* made in six days"? It is sufficiently astonishing in itself, to realize that a man could be so boldly irreverent as to thus flatly contradict the living God in the only words ever written by his own hand; but our astonishment is increased when we realize that this same man claims to be a Christian, and not only that, but is a "Rev.," a "Doctor of Divinity;" and more, that

he is only one of thousands of the same titled gentlemen who hold to the same views.

Again Dr. Ward says in an editorial:—

"But we are told that certain statements—for example, as to the origin, the early history and character, and the age of man—are made in the Bible, and that their acceptance as historical facts is binding upon any one who accepts the Christian system taught in the Bible. To this we have replied that if is [*sic.*] this true, Christianity is already gone, and to the educated mind the Bible is already gone, or very soon must go, because the scientific authorities, the only authorities on which we can depend, are now substantially agreed in holding and teaching certain theories about man's origin, as well enough established, which are quite inconsistent with the story in Genesis of the creation of man and woman. This we have stated as a fact, and have concluded that the friends of the Christianity which we so heartily believe in and support, must adopt a theory of the Bible which will not put God's word into direct contradiction with the teachings of our best authorities in science. We have said that we, laymen in science, are compelled to allow the now well-nigh unanimous authority of our best teachers, that man was physically, at least, evolved from irrational animals, and has lived on the earth scores of thousands of years." (This is from the editorial before quoted, entitled, "Deliver Us from Our Friends.")

So, then, it appears from all this that the Bible is of no authority at all, but the "scientific authorities are the *only* authorities on which we can depend;" and to these "authorities," we all, and the Bible, and even the Lord himself, must bow in unquestioning credence; for, as is said in another place:—

"It is so generally taught that it is inevitable that our thinking and scholarly young men will generally accept it on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter."

And by this same token the "inevitable" result is that the word of man supplants the word of God. And right in the face of all this, we are gravely told that "this evolution is held and taught in harmony with the Christian faith. And that it is not and cannot be so held and taught, is betrayed by Prof. Francis L. Patton, in an article on this subject originally published in the *Interior*, and quoted in the "Editorial Notes" of the *Independent*. He says:—

"Neither the preacher who cries 'infallible Bible' without showing that it is infallible, nor the priest who cries 'infallible church' without giving proof of her claims, will satisfy the man who, with all earnestness in his eye, and all uncertainty in his speech, asks, What must I do to be saved? Thus church must defend the doctrines she preaches. The pulpit must meet the skeptic with something better than assertion and something more satisfying than earnestness. And if the pulpit has not the time to do this work, and the existing societies have no interest in it or no means of carrying it on, it is not a day too soon for those who know the importance of the controversy to put their heads together to *devise a scheme* for the preparation of a *literature suited* to the wants of the doubters of the day." (Italics ours.)

Exactly! the literature of the Bible is not suited to the wants of the scientific doubters of the day, and therefore the evolutionists must devise a scheme to prepare something that will suit them. And what a blessed scheme that will be, of man's devising, and above all, when he is an evolutionist! It will suit though. And then when the man, not with all "earnestness" in his eye and "uncertainty" in his speech, but with all pride in his eye, and all arrogance in his speech, asks, What must I do to be saved? the answer comes from that splendid scheme, Believe in evolution; deny the plain statement of positive facts of the Bible; flatly contradict the words of the Lord, although spoken with his own voice, and written by his own blazing finger on tables of stone; and instead accept evolution "on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter," and hold them as "the only authorities on which you can depend," and thou shalt be saved. Yea, evolution and Darwinism shall be the stability of thy times and strength of salvation; and great shall be the peace—of the apes.

That will suit them every one and every time. And even if it should not, all that will be necessary is simply to "devise" another "scheme" "suited to the wants of the doubters" of this.

But not to treat them cavalierly, we will examine that other form of evolution known as "Theistic Evolution;" that is, a form of evolution which acknowledges God; and inquire where in the theory this acknowledgment comes in, and why. It is plain from all that has gone before that this acknowledgment of God, especially as a Creator, does not lie at the beginning; because, as has been often stated, "evolution is opposed to creationism," is "directly antagonistic" to it. And as evolution is opposed to creation generally, or once for all, so biology, its chiefest handmaid, is opposed to special creations; *i.e.*, of any interference of a creator after the process has started. And in this, evolution and biology are both plainly consistent, and reasonably so, too; because it is certainly a reasonable position before quoted from Prof. Huxley, that:—

"If all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste."

Further he says:—

"If the hypothesis of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter; for by the hypothesis the condition of the globe was at one time such that living matter could not have existed in it."

Now surely, upon this basis, it is no more than reasonable and consistent, to suppose that if living matter could arise entirely of its own evolutionary power from not-living matter, and start onward in its progress without a creator, it certainly could keep itself a-going just as easily without him.

Then what is it that impels these other gentlemen to the adoption of theistic evolution, *i.e.*, that God has interfered in a certain place? There is just one thing, and that alone, and herein is the pivot upon which turns the whole theistic process; and that one thing is, *the immortality of the soul*. Believing as these men

do, in the immortality of the soul, it is impossible to adopt such an idea, or doctrine, as that immortality should be evolved from materiality, and therefore God must have interfered in the process just at the place where the immortal soul was bestowed upon man. But the moment that view is adopted, there appears the inconsistency also; for theistic evolution, holding, in common with evolution "straight," the antagonism to the doctrine of creationism; when it admits the interference of God in behalf of the immortal soul, it therein admits the doctrine of creation; for assuredly the bestowal of immortality upon that which has been evolved from apes and lower forms of animals is nothing short of a creative act, or volition, of God. And the inevitable consequence is, the doctrine is inconsistent with itself.

A. T. J.

**June 25, 1885**

**"'Evolution' and Evolution. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 25 , pp. 388, 389.**

(Continued.)

NOW for proofs that the soul is the *main*, if not the only, point of distinction between these two forms of creation. It appears dimly in our first-quoted statement of Darwinism; thus:

"According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the product of physical evolution as is the *physical* structure itself."

And again in the foregoing list of leading evolutionists the qualifying word "physical" is applied thus:—

"Man's *physical* structure they regard as no real exception to the law." "And where a man believes in evolution, it goes without saying that the law holds good as to man's *physical* structure."

Plainly implying that his *mental* structure is held as an exception. But Darwin has shown conclusively, not by speculation, but by genuine science, that the difference in the mental power of man and that of the lower animals consists not in kind but in degree. And surely none of these theistic evolutionists, ultra as he might be, would deny at least some mental structure to the lower animals. Consequently, when they differ from Darwinism, it can only be on that one point of the immortality of the soul.

Happily, however, we are not left to this conclusion drawn from qualified statements, necessary though it may be, but we have the unqualified statement itself by one of the highest authorities on evolution. Mr. Sully, before quoted, says:—

"At first sight it might appear that the doctrine [of evolution] as applied to the subjective world, by removing the broad distinction

between the human and the animal mind, would discourage the hope of a future life for man's soul."

Exactly; and this is consistent with evolution throughout, and consequently when these "orthodox," "evangelical" gentlemen, holding fast to that intensely "orthodox" and "evangelical" doctrine, the immortality of the soul, adopt evolution, they are compelled to adopt such a form of it as will admit this doctrine, even though it involve them in the glaring inconsistency of antagonizing "creative activity," and then being obliged to antagonize their antagonism to save their theory.

But of what worth is all this "contrivance to save appearances" if the soul be *not immortal*? It is "nothing worth." And as the soul is absolutely *not* immortal, but in this, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" (Eccl. 3:19), this consideration removes the whole and sole ground of distinction between the two forms of evolution; and then this would-be *theistic* evolution appears just where consistency and the logic of pure evolution demand that it should appear,—that is, in the bald reality of atheistic evolution,—and brings out the plain truth that there is no such thing as theistic evolution.

But when this so-called theistic evolution, resting only upon a fallacy the exposure of which so surely lands it in atheistic evolution, is so wide-spread, so almost all-pervading in the orthodox and evangelical churches, schools, and colleges, are we not brought in another form to the contemplation of the text, "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Not alone, Shall he find faith in his second coming? but, Shall he find faith at all? In studying these evil tendencies of the times, we are persuaded that "when the Son of man cometh," he will not find faith in his word, he will not find faith in himself, he will not find faith in God the Lord, the Creator of all. And we are also persuaded that we are again coming fast upon the time in the world's history, when "in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom" will know "not God" (1 Cor. 1:21); and when again, as of old, it shall please God "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." And in view of it all, we feel as never before, how holily, how unblamably, how sacredly, we whom it may please God to call to do the preaching, should conduct this holy work—how humbly, meekly, and again, as of old, not with excellency of speech or of wisdom,—not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in *demonstration of the Spirit* and of power. May God help us all, in these dark and trying times, and when they become still more fearfully dark and trying.

Now just a few words before closing, upon the foundation of evolution. In a former article, is a quotation of the words of a, then, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, saying that he "should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution as being as incompetent as one who doubted the Copernican theory." Does this president mean to assert that the theory of evolution is as well established as is the Copernican theory? If so, will he or any other evolutionist please give three laws in proof of it that will correspond to Kepler's Three Laws? Or will he give us *one* law that will correspond to *any one* of Kepler's Three, and which will be as susceptible of demonstration as are Kepler's? Nay, verily. It is with this as with geology,—simply

and only "perhaps," "no doubt," "probably," and "must have been," and these repeated over and over again, and then all of them capped with an "assumption."

Professor Clifford says:—

"Of the beginning of the universe, we know nothing at all."

Professor Huxley says:—

"The fact is, that at the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy direct evidence that abiogenesis [spontaneous generation] does take place, or has taken place, within the period during which the existence of life on this globe is recorded." Yet he says that this "fact does not in the slightest degree interfere with the conclusion from other considerations, that at some time or other, abiogenesis must have taken place."

What kind of *science* is that wherein *facts* do not in the *slightest degree* interfere with a hypothesis? And why is it that they do not? Oh! because:—

"If the hypothesis [supposition] of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter."—*Encyclopedia Britannica, Biology.*

To be sure. And so the Creator, revelation, reason, and *facts*, even as acknowledged by themselves as facts, must all stand aside, so that a *supposition* may have free course to run and be glorified. With a little more of this kind of "science" we should, "doubtless," be almost tempted, "perhaps," to cry out for "about the space of two hours." Great is the science of the evolutionists!

Mr. Sully says, after speaking of the "gaps" in their knowledge, and the limits set to the explanation, of evolution:—

"The question arises whether these apparently permanent gaps in our scientific knowledge can be filled up by extra-scientific speculations."

That is, these gaps are to be filled not only by "speculations," but they are not to be even scientific, but "extra [above, outside of] scientific speculations."—*Enc. Brit., Evolution.*

Now we come to Darwin himself, who Mr. Sully says is entitled to "the first notice as the one to whom belongs the honor of working out this theory of evolution upon a substantial basis of fact;" and of whose work Professor Huxley says:—

"'The Origin of Species' appeared in 1859, and it is within the knowledge of all whose memories go back to that time, that henceforward the doctrine of evolution has assumed a position and acquired an importance which it never before possessed."

Owing to the important place which he holds in this doctrine, we hope we may be pardoned for giving him quite an extended notice; but it will need to be in nothing but his own words; for, as will be seen, the words themselves are all-sufficient to show the "substantial" (?), "scientific" (?), or "extra" scientific basis of evolution. We quote from Darwin's "Descent of Man," Appleton's Edition, 1871. (Italics ours.)

Page 23. "*No doubt* he [man] inherits the power [of smell] in an enfeebled and so far rudimentary condition from some early

progenitor to whom it was highly serviceable, and by whom it was continually used. We can thus *perhaps* understand how it is as Mr. Mandsley has truly remarked, that the sense of smell in man is singularly effective in recalling vividly the ideas and images of forgotten scenes and plans."

Page 81. "It is *probable* that the early ape-like progenitors of man were likewise social. Although man, as he now exists, has few special instincts, having lost any which his early progenitors may have possessed, this is no reason why he should not have retained from an extremely remote period some degree of instinctive love and sympathy for his fellows."

Page 103. "In order that an ape-like creature should have been transformed into man, it is necessary that this early form, as well as many successive links, should all have varied in mind and body. It is *impossible* to obtain *direct* evidence on this head; but if it can be shown that man now varies. . . . there can be little doubt that the preceding intermediate links varied in a like manner."

Page 144. "Nevertheless it may be well to own that *no explanation*, as far as I am aware, has ever been given of *the loss of the tail* by certain apes *and man*."

Page 150. "In regard to bodily size or strength, we do not know whether man is descended from some comparatively small species like the chimpanzee, or from one as powerful as the gorilla."

Page 151. "The early progenitors of man were *no doubt* inferior in intellect, and *probably* in social disposition, to the lowest existing savages."

Page 154. "It is therefore highly *probable* that with mankind the intellectual faculties have been gradually perfected through natural selection, and this conclusion is *sufficient* for our purpose. Undoubtedly it would have been very interesting to have traced the development of each separate faculty from the state in which it exists in the lower animals to that in which it exists in man; but neither my ability nor my knowledge permits the attempt."

Page 189. "If the anthropomorphous apes be admitted to form a natural sub-group, then, as man agrees with them, . . . we may *infer* that some ancient member of the anthropomorphous sub-group gave birth to man."

Page 191. "But we must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole simian stock, including man, was identical with, or even closely resembled, any existing ape or monkey."

Page 192. "At the period and place, whenever and wherever it may have been, when man first lost his hairy covering, he *probably* inhabited a hot country. We are *far from knowing* how long ago it was when man first diverged from the Catarrhine stock, but this may have occurred at an epoch as remote as the Eocene period."

Page 195. "In attempting to trace the genealogy of the mammalian, and therefore of man, lower in the series, we become involved in greater and *greater obscurity*."

Page 198. "The early progenitors of man were *no doubt* once covered with hair, both sexes having beards; their ears were pointed,

389

and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail, having the proper muscles. . . . At a still earlier period the progenitors *must have been* aquatic in their habits; for morphology plainly tells us that our *lungs* consist of a modified *swim-bladder*, which once served for a float. The clefts on the neck in the embryo of man show where the branchee once existed. These early predecessors of man . . . *must have been* as lowly organized as a lancelet or amphioxus, or still more lowly organized."

Page 205. "The most humble organism is something much higher than the inorganic dust under our feet."

Yes, of course, to be born of an ape is vastly higher than to be fashioned by the perfect hand of the living God!!! And we are given to understand by the president of the American Association, etc., that such a string of great swelling words as this is from beginning to end, is no more to be doubted as science than is the Copernican theory, which is demonstrated by the exact science of mathematics! It is scarcely to be wondered at that such a theory is atheistic. And no warning of the Bible is more pertinent to the present times than that one in 1 Tim. 6:20, 21: "O Timothy, *keep that* which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and *vain babblings*, and oppositions of science *falsely so-called*, which some professing have *erred concerning the faith*."

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 12:6-17. The Revolt of the Ten Tribes" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 25 , pp. 390, 391.**

### **JULY-1 KINGS 12:6-17**

WITH the beginning of the third quarter we enter again upon the study of the Old Testament. The close of the Old Testament lessons for last year, was at the end of Solomon's reign. We learned how Solomon forsook his wisdom and plunged into the depths of folly; how that he loved "many strange women," women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites; how that he went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the ammonites; how that he built "high places" for Chemosh of Moab, and Molech of Ammon, and for all the gods of his strange wives; and how that for it the Lord stirred up adversaries on every hand which were adversaries all the days of Solomon. And then to crown it all the Lord said unto Solomon, "Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee,

and will give it to thy servant." "Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom; but will give one tribe to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake which I have chosen." 1 Kings 11:11, 13.

BY Solomon's sins, a fearful train of evils was laid. In his iniquities there was sown the seed from which sprang a most abundant harvest, which was reaped in long years, and even ages, of suffering, of sorrow, and of bitterness. How little he thought, how little any one things, of this! Yet there is nothing surer, there is nothing more diligently inculcated by the word of God, than this one thing, that sin cannot be committed with impunity. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. 6:7. "Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same." Job 4:8. Nor is this confined to the immediate acts. "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the *fruit of his doings*." Jer. 17:10. Remember therefore that when wickedness is sown nothing but wickedness can spring from it, and the fruit that is borne, enters into the computation of the reward, whatever it may be. If the reward be the reward of the wicked, it will be the greater according to the fruit of the wickedness committed. And if by the mercy of God the sin is forgiven, and if, by patient continuance in well-doing, the reward of the righteous be obtained, yet the fullness of that reward will be diminished according as the *fruit* of wickedness shall abound.

SIN is a terrible reality. "And be sure your sin will find you out." Num. 32:23. Nowadays it has become quite a common thing, even almost tacitly understood, that young men must sow their "wild oats." Yes; and nearly all do so, but it were well to remember that, from the beginning of sin, never yet was there sown a particle of such "wild oats" that did not spring up and bear fruit abundantly, all of which must be reaped, in one place or another, in sorrow and in dread. There is absolutely no escape, no wind will blast it, no mildew will smite it; it cannot be plucked up by the roots,—it must be reaped. "*Whatsoever* a man soweth, *that* shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." It is not in vain that God has written in the table of his law, "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." Ex. 20:5, 6.

IN accordance with the word of the Lord to Solomon, the prophet Ahijah told Jeroboam that ten of the tribes should be given to him, and he should reign over them. Jeroboam was the son of Nebat of the tribe of Ephraim, and his mother's name was Zeruah, and at this time a widow. As Solomon was building Millo, and repairing the walls of the city of David, he saw Jeroboam among the workmen, and "seeing that he was industrious, he made him ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph" (Ephraim). As Jeroboam was going out of the city of Jerusalem one day, Ahijah met him and drew him aside into the field. Then Ahijah took his own outer garment, tore it into twelve pieces, and said to Jeroboam, "Take thee ten pieces; for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee." And although the Lord told him plainly that this should not be done while Solomon

lived, yet like a great many before his time he could not await the Lord's time and so he attempted to seize the kingdom before the time. "He lifted up his hand against the king," and therefore Solomon sought to kill him. "Then Jeroboam fled into Egypt, unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon."

REHOBAM succeeded Solomon on the throne of David, and of course expected to reign over all the tribes of Israel, and so went to Shechem to be acknowledged as king. But there was a hitch in the proceedings. Israel had sent word to Jeroboam in Egypt and called him up to Shechem, and it may well be supposed that with the ambitious schemes that he had in hand even while Solomon lived, that he would suffer nothing to be settled by which Rehoboam should rule over all. But besides this, the people had a real grievance. In Solomon had been fulfilled, in a great measure, the prophecy of Samuel when the people chose a king in the first place. "He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and

391

will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants." 1 Sam. 8:11-17.

ALL this had been done by Solomon; and all to support his heathen wives. The burdens of the people had really been made heavy, and now they ask relief from some of these. But of this, Samuel had also told them, "And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day." 1 Sam. 8:18. And so when they ask Rehoboam to relieve them he only mocks them. He first consulted the old men who gave him wise counsel, but he had not sense enough to follow it, but instead turned to the "young men that were grown up with him."

AND a fine set of counselors these were! Let us see for a moment under what influences he and these young men had grown up. Rehoboam was the son of Solomon by Naamah *an Ammonitess*. 1 Kings 14:21. And we read in 1 Kings 11:18 that all these heathen women burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods. These gods were Molech, and Ashtoreth, and Chemosh, and Baalim. These represented the male and the female principles of generation, and all the rites of their worship corresponded to that idea, and is expressed in the one word, lasciviousness. Their priests were men dressed in women's clothes; their priestesses were harlots, and their most acceptable worship was by prostitution, and burning the offspring in the fire.

SUCH were the influences amidst which these young men had grown up, and such was the training that they had had, by which they should be fitted to become counselors in an emergency that involved one of the greatest kingdoms then in the world. How could the issue be anything else but fatal? And so it was. They said, "Thus shalt thou speak unto this people *that spake unto thee*." Thus implying that it was an act of rebellion for them even to speak to him of their grievances. And he was to say to them, "My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins." "My father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." There could be but one result. The people answered the king, saying, "What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse; to your tents, O Israel; now see to thine own house, David." 1 Kings 12:16.

THUS comes, fast following, evil upon evil as the fearful fruit of the sins of Solomon. It was only for David's sake that all this did not happen in Solomon's own day. And even now, when it did come about, it was still for David's sake that there was a tribe left to Rehoboam at all. Chap. 11:12, 13, 26. "Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God." His mercy is upon children's children to such as fear him, and in visiting iniquity, transgression, and sin, yet in wrath upon the disobedient, in mercy he remembers those who have been obedient. Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those who hate him, and showing mercy unto thousands of generations of them who love him, and keep his commandments. "And I will delight myself in Thy commandments, which I have loved."

A. T. J.

**July 2, 1885**

**"'Evolution' and Evolution. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 26 , p. 404.**

*(Concluded).*

OF those who have read, attentively, these articles on Evolution, and those on Geology would preceded these, no one can fail to see the striking similarity in the essential characteristics, and the manner of treatment, of the two so-called sciences, as drawn from the writings of their most eminent representatives. To carve this, as it were, in bold relief, on the brazen faces of these two sciences, we present the following:—

In the *Independent* of May 27, 1880, appeared an article by President Gregory, of Lake Forest University, Ill., on the question, "Is Evolution Science?" in which occurred the following quotation, and comment:—

"Take, as illustration of the quality of the so-called science, the well-known passage from Mr. Darwin: 'The early progenitors of man were, *no doubt*, covered with hair, both sexes having beards. Their ears were pointed and capable of movement, and their bodies were

provided with a tail. . . . The foot . . . was prehensile, and our progenitors, *no doubt*, were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm, forest-clad land. . . . At an earlier period the progenitors of man *must have been* aquatic in their habits.'

"When men laud this as 'advanced science,' we have to say that it is a double 'no doubt,' and a 'must have been' resting on a hypothesis which is conceivable, but has not a fact to support it. We protest, in the name of sound thinking, against the almighty *must-be-ity* with which the evolutionist constructs his system; and we do it for the same reason that we protest against the equally patent *must-be-ity* and *per se-ity* of the speculative philosophers and theologians. . . . Let us have real science, and not sham science."

Now we present for comparison with the above from "Darwin's Descent of Man," an extract from Geikie's Geology, and see whether President Gregory's "protest" will not lie with equal weight against each.

The third paragraph under Park III., Dynamical Geology, reads as follows:—

"At an early time in the earth's history, *anterior to any* of the *periods of which a record remains* in the visible rocks, the chief sources of geological action *probably* [italics ours] lay within the earth itself. The planet still retained a great store of its initial heat, and *in all likelihood*, was the theater of great chemical changes, giving rise, *perhaps*, to manifestations of volcanic energy somewhat like those which have so marvelously roughened the surface of the moon. As the outer layers of the globe cooled, and the disturbances due to internal heat and chemical action became less marked, the influence of the sun, which *must always have* operated, would then stand out more clearly, giving rise to that wide circle of superficial changes wherein variations of temperature and the circulation of air and water over the surface of the earth came into play."

So on this we too would say, "When men laud this as 'advanced science,' we have to say that it is simply" a "probability" linked with a "likelihood" and sustained by a "perhaps," and all supported by a "must have operated," with not a fact to underlie any of it, because it is all concerning periods of which there is no "visible record." In the words of President Gregory, "we protest, in the name of sound thinking, against the almighty 'probabilities,' and 'perhaps's,' and 'must have's,' with which the geologist, as well as the evolutionist, constructs his system." And with him we say, "Let us have real science, and not sham science."

We would not be understood as being, in the slightest degree, opposed to true science. On the contrary, we will yield to none in genuine admiration of science; but it must be "real science, and not sham science,"—a science which, when it says "doubtless," means doubtless in its absolute sense of having removed all doubt by sound reasoning and demonstrative evidence; and not as it is used by the "falsely so-called" science of our day, simply to give expression to a whole system of doubt. The truth is, that the most charming book, the Bible always excepted, of course, that we have ever had the pleasure of reading, is the most profoundly scientific book that we ever read. That is, "Maury's Physical

Geography of the Sea." He does not deal much in such terms, but when he *does* say "doubtless," it *is* doubtless. As an illustration of what we regard as genuine science, we give the following from Lieutenant Maury's treatise, sections 88-93:—

In December, 1853, the fine new steamship, *San Francisco*, sailed from New York bound for California with a regiment of United States troops on board. While crossing the Gulf Stream she was overtaken by a fearful gale, and by one single blow of a terrible sea, one hundred and seventy-nine persons,—officers and men,—were washed overboard and drowned, and the ship so crippled that she was simply adrift. The next day she was seen by a vessel, and again the next day by another; but neither of these could render any assistance, and so she was left still adrift. When these two ships reached the United States, they reported the matter; and vessels were sent out by the Government to search for and relieve the drifting ship. But the questions were, Which way should they go? and where should they look? Appeal was made to Maury, and he, sitting in the National Observatory, prepared a chart of the Gulf Stream for that time of year, and from a point where the disabled ship was last seen, he drew, as it were, upon the waters of the trackless ocean, two slightly diverging lines, thus, and said that the ship had drifted between them. Then one of the relief cutters, which was at New London, Conn., was told to go along a dotted line between these two lines, thus, to the last dot, and there she would see the object of her search. And right in sight of that very place the disabled ship was found. (For full particulars see the work referred to.)

That was science in the fullest sense. When evolution can show such accuracy as that, it may lay claim to being a science; but it is entitled to no such claim as long as "facts can in no way interfere with the theory." And yet Lieutenant Maury was so much a lover of God and the Bible that he saw God's greatness manifested in every and all of the winds, currents, and creatures of the air and the ocean, and constantly found the beautiful truths of the Bible, most beautifully demonstrated in the "wind in his circuits," and by the rivers which "run into the sea," as well as in the "sweet influences of Pleiades," and held his reverence for the Bible at such a height that in one instance at least, and which he had recorded, he actually gave up, entirely, a generally accepted theory, because, for one reason, as he himself says, "I found evidence in the Bible which seems to cast doubt upon it." And so, like the true scientist that he was, he gave up the human theory, adopted the view that the bible seemed to present, and soon demonstrated it as a scientific truth, although it was in direct opposition to one of the most eminent geologists of the day. That is the kind of science that we love; because, being based on the truth of God, it is a part of the truth of God itself. And so, consequently, when a man departs from the truth of God as recorded in nature, we can expect nothing else than, as we think is plainly shown by the evidence of this series of articles, that they will depart from the truth of God as recorded in revelation.

But as evolution, with all its "no doubts" and "must have been's" has never been able to give, as Mr. Darwin says, an explanation of the "loss of the tail" by "man," so on the other hand, geology with all its "probabilities," etc., cannot tell whether its changes have been wrought by the means conjectured, or by other,

and totally different means and at the same time much more rapidly than is allowed in any of the calculations of geologists. And therefore we, as evolutionists, are willing to admit as a "working hypothesis" that man, as man, was *created*, and created, *without a tail*. And as geologists, we will admit as a "working hypothesis" that "once upon a time" "the windows from on high were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were *broken up*," and that "a flood of waters covered the whole face of the earth." And the "probabilities" are, "no doubt," that, "in all likelihood," we, as evolutionists and geologists, "must be" just as near right about these things as "perhaps" are the evolutionists and geologists of the "advanced science" school.

But that geology and evolution are essentially alike, is not all. Evolution is absolutely dependent upon geology. Without geology, evolution can have no place. Proof:—

"The *high antiquity of man*, . . . is the *indispensable basis* for understanding his origin."—*Darwin, Descent of Man, Vol. 1, p. 3, Appleton's Edition of 1871.*

So geological science goes before and gives to the earth, all the way from *ten millions* to *ten thousand millions*, of years of growth and development, and thus the course is laid wide open, and the field entirely cleared, so that there is nothing to obstruct, in the slightest degree, the wildest flights of even the evolutionary imagination. Thus geological science furnishes to the full, the element of "high antiquity" which is demanded as "the indispensable basis" of evolution. Then evolutionary science follows after, and upon this "basis" builds up its atheistical structure. And thus the two "falsely so-called" sciences unite, not only to destroy faith in the word of God, but to rob the Creator of his prerogative and remove him from his throne.

Geological science goes before and upon the basis of its deductions demands that we give up the *first chapter of Genesis*. With this as its "indispensable basis" evolution follows after, and upon *its* deductions demands that we give up *the whole Bible*. But that Book, from beginning to end, has been given to us as being, what it is in truth, *the word of God*, and:—

"I charge thee *therefore* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; PREACH THE WORD." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2.

"The voice said, Cry. And he said What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth;" "but THE WORD OF OUR GOD SHALL STAND FOREVER."

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 12:25-33. Idolatry Established" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 25 , pp. 406, 407.**

**JULY 12–1 KINGS 12:25-33**

"THEN Jeroboam built Shechem." He enlarged and fortified the city, and made it his capital. Shechem is one of the most noted places mentioned in the

Bible. It was the first place at which Abraham stopped, when he departed out of Haran and came into the land of Canaan; there the Lord appeared to him and made him the promise of the land; and there he built his first altar in the land of Canaan. Gen. 12:6, 7. When Jacob came out of Mesopotamia, on his journey back to his own land, he pitched his tent before the city, and "bought a parcel of a field, where he spread his tent." Gen. 33:18, 19. In this "parcel" of ground at Shechem, the children of Israel buried the bones of Joseph, which they had brought out of Egypt. Josh. 24:32. On each side of it, on Mts. Gerizim and Ebal, stood all the people after crossing over Jordan, when the blessings upon the obedient, and the curses upon the disobedient, were pronounced. Josh. 8:33. Here all Israel assembled to make Rehoboam king; here they rebelled and chose Jeroboam; and thus it came that he made it his capital. It was near the town that the Saviour, "being wearied with his journey, sat thus" on Jacob's well, when the woman of Samaria came to draw water. See John 4:1-42. Shechem was thirty-four miles north of Jerusalem.

"AND Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David; if this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem." There probably was some truth in this observation. For, as all were to assemble in Jerusalem three times in the year especially, besides the many other important occasions of worship; and as the Levites that were in all the cities would have to go up from time to time to fill the order of their course in the temple service; the chief religious interest would be at Jerusalem, and therefore the interests of the whole nation would be centered there, and Jeroboam's rule would be to a certain extent only nominal. Even if all this were so, it could only be for the best interests of the nation in every way. But that was nothing to Jeroboam. Like every other professional politician, his own personal interests must take precedence of everything, even to the usurpation of the prerogatives which God had reserved to himself.

"WHEREUPON the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold." These calves were the images of the Egyptian gods. Jeroboam had learned about them and their worship, during his sojourn in Egypt, when he fled from Solomon. The worship was of the same degraded nature as that of the gods of the Ammonites, Moabites, and Zidonians, with the exception of burning the children in the fire.

"AND he set the one in Bethel." It was, no doubt, an easy task to turn the people to Bethel instead of Jerusalem to worship, for there Abraham had built an altar and had worshiped, both before and after he went to Egypt (Gen. 12:8; 13:4); there the Lord appeared unto Jacob, and there Jacob set up a pillar, and called it God's house (Gen. 28:10-22); there Jacob built an altar when he returned with all his substance from the house of Laban, and there the Lord appeared to him again, and renewed to him the promise made to Abraham and Isaac (Gen. 35:6-15); in the troubled times of the judges there was the ark of the covenant, and there the people came to inquire of the Lord (Judges 20:18-28); and there Samuel went in his circuit once a year to judge Israel. So when Jeroboam built an altar there, and established a system of worship, idolatrous though it was, he could appeal to them upon all these sacred memories, as against Jerusalem, and especially when by the cry, "These be thy gods, O Israel,

which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," he would palm off upon them the idols as simply representations of the God of their fathers.

"AND the other put he in Dan." Dan was already the place of an idolatrous worship by the tribe of Dan. When the tribe of Dan sought for an inheritance in the land, they first sent out five men, who, in their search, came to Laish, and found a place where there was "no want of anything that is in the earth," and returned and told their brethren. Then the tribe sent 600 armed men to take the place. As they were on the way, they came to the house of Micah of Mount Ephraim, and there they found a graven image, and ephod, a teraphim, and a molten image, and a Levite whom Micah had hired as his priest in the worship of these his gods, and the Danites took priest, idols, and all, and carried them with them to Laish. They attacked and destroyed Laish, and there they built a new city and called it Dan, and established their idolatrous worship there, and maintained it till the captivity of the ten tribes. It was easy enough, therefore, for Jeroboam to set up his golden calf at Dan, and to turn the people there to the worship of it, not only because the people were prone to idolatry, but because they were actually practicing it.

AND so with one place of worship in the northern, and another in the southern, part of his kingdom, he could present very forcibly his next appeal: "*It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem.*" Yes, it is too much for you to go to the place that the Lord himself appointed, and to worship him as he has directed. It is too hard for you to obey the Lord, you can obey me, that will be much easier. It is too hard for you to travel away down to Jerusalem, here is a place to worship almost at your own doors as it were; this will be ever so much easier for you. These are thy gods, anyhow, that brought you out of Egypt. You worship the same gods here that they worship at Jerusalem, only in a little different way; but then everybody cannot see alike; there is unity in diversity; we are all only branches of the same church; we are only different departments of the same army; the Lord is the one great Commander! Yes; Jeroboam could thus offer them ease, and that is the one thing desirable with many who pretend to worship the Lord. They will willingly worship if they can only do it in their own way. But such people don't worship the Lord, they worship themselves.

BUT was Jeroboam the last one who ever held out to the people such inducements? Hardly. We need not go very far to find the same thing to-day. When the Sabbath of the

407

Lord, and the coming of Christ, are now presented to the people, and their holy claims urged upon them, there are plenty of would-be leaders, who, like Jeroboam, will appeal to their love of ease. "Oh," say they, "it is not necessary for you to keep the Sabbath. Just think, you will lose your position, and your standing in society and in your church. And oh, worse than all, those people who keep the Sabbath, and are looking for the Lord, don't have any church fairs, nor festivals, nor "mum" socials, nor fish-ponds, nor grab-bags, nor sleeping-beauties, nor kissing-bees, nor gambling—why you cannot even put up your young ladies at public auction, and sell them to the highest bidder! And that is "too much for you," just stay where you are. We worship the same God that they

do, only in a different way. Of course we don't do as he has commanded, but all cannot see alike, you know."

BUT in all this as in that of old, "*This thing became a sin.*" It is not the service of God at all. All such are "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God," and he commands, "From such turn away." This is what was done by a great many in that time, for we read: "And the priests and the Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him [Rehoboam] out of all their coasts. And after them, out of all the tribes of Israel, *such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God* of Israel came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers." 2 Chron. 11:13, 16.

"AND he made an house of high places, and made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi. And Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that [is] in Judah, and he offered upon the altar. So did he in Bethel, sacrificing unto the calves that he had made: and he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made. So he offered upon the altar which he had made in Bethel the fifteenth day of the eighth month, even in the month *which he had devised of his own heart*; and ordained a feast unto the children of Israel: and he offered upon the altar, and burnt incense." 1 Kings 12:31-33. "And he [God] shall give Israel up because of the sins of Jeroboam, who did sin, and who made Israel to sin."

AND from that day forward neither Jeroboam, nor Israel, ever knew safety. What he and they supposed the easiest way proved the hardest possible way. So it has ever been, and so will it ever be with every one who chooses his own way. Man's way leads direct to perdition; the Lord's way leads straight to paradise. Man's ways is the hardest way; the Lord's way is the easiest of all ways. Christ said, "My yoke is easy." And the only easy way is to deny self, take up the cross and follow him. There is no other.

A. T. J.

**July 16, 1885**

**"When Was the New Testament Written?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 27 , p. 420.**

WE propose to give some facts of history, showing the fulfillment of the lines of prophecy of the Scriptures; but before entering upon that subject, direct, we have thought best to present some facts which show the times when the prophetic books were written. We propose to deal in *facts*; we shall have very little to do with mere opinions.

It is a fact that the Bible exists to-day. It is also a fact that books are written in opposition to it. These things none can deny. It is equally undeniable that nearly *one hundred years* ago Thomas Paine wrote a book against the Bible, which proves that the identical Bible which is in existence to-day was in existence then. About *three hundred and sixty-five years ago*, Luther in Germany, Zwingle in Switzerland, and Faber in France, each and all opposed the corruption of the

church of Rome, and this opposition was based wholly upon the Bible. The Bible was preached, it was translated, it was printed and distributed in great numbers. It cannot be denied that the Bible was in existence then. We can go back nearly *two hundred years* further, and Wycliffe in England had a Bible, expounded it to the people, exhorted them to study it for themselves, and even translated it into the English language.

But, not to be tedious, we will at once go back *more than fifteen hundred years*, to A.D. 331-361. Julian was emperor of the Roman empire, and wrote in opposition to Christianity, and of course *opposed the doctrines* of the New Testament. But he never pretended to "*deny the truth*" of the gospel history, as a history, though he denied the deity of Jesus Christ asserted in the writings of the evangelists; he acknowledged the principal facts in the gospel as well as the miracles of our Saviour and his apostles." He mentioned Matthew and Luke by name, and presented the objection to the genealogy of Christ as given by them, that is urged to this day. "He recited the sayings of Christ in the very words of the evangelists; he also bore testimony that the gospel of John was composed later than the other evangelists, and at a time when great numbers were converted to the Christian faith both in Italy and Greece; and alluded oftener than once to the facts recorded in the Acts of the Apostles." "He expressly states the early dates of these records; he calls them by the names which they now bear. He all along supposes, he *nowhere questions*, their *genuineness* or *authenticity*; nor does he give even the slightest intimation that he suspected the whole or *any part* of them *to be forgeries*."—*Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2.*

This, being "testimony from an enemy, is the strongest kind of evidence" in favor of the New Testament, and proves that it was in existence in A.D. 331. But we have more of the same kind. One hundred years before Julian, A.D. 233, lived Porphyry, "the most sensible as well as the most severe adversary of the Christian religion that antiquity can produce." "He had conversed with the Christians in Tyre, in Sicily, and in Rome." "He was of all the adversaries of the Christian religion the best qualified for inquiring into the authenticity of the sacred writings. He possessed every advantage which natural abilities or political situation could afford, to discover whether the New Testament was a genuine work of the apostles and evangelists, or whether it was imposed upon the world after the decease of its pretended authors. But *no trace of this suspicion* is anywhere to be found, nor did it ever occur to Porphyry to suppose that it was spurious. *He did not deny the truth* of the gospel history, but *actually considered the miracles* of Jesus Christ as *real facts*." He also notices the difference between Paul and Peter in Gal. 2:11. But the objections of Porphyry were not confined to the New Testament; he attacked the Old Testament also, especially the prophecy of Daniel, declaring that it was written "after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes."—*Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2; and Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century, by Principal Cairns, Lecture 1, sec. 3.*

This proves that the Bible was extensively known as far back as A.D. 233; for how could a man write in opposition to a thing that did not exist?

But we may go back sixty years further, to A.D. 176, or thereabouts, and we find Celsus, another "infidel writer, and one of the greatest enemies with whom

Christianity had to contend. He not only mentions by name, but quotes passages from, the books of the New Testament, so that we know that we have the *identical books* to which he referred." "The miraculous conception is mentioned with a view of accusing the Virgin Mary of adultery; we also recognize Joseph's intention of putting her away, and the consequent appearance of the angel warning him in a dream to take her as his wife; we meet with a reference to the star that was seen at his birth, and the adoration paid to the new-born Saviour by the Magi at Bethlehem; the murder of the infants by Herod, in consequence of his being deceived by the wise men, is noticed, as also the reappearance of the angel to Joseph, and his consequent flight into Egypt. Here, then, are references to all the facts of our Saviour's *birth*. Again, we are informed of the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove, and the voice from Heaven at the baptism of our Saviour in Jordan; we hear also of the temptation in the wilderness; we are told that Christ was constantly attended by a certain number of disciples, though the number is not correct. There is an allusion to our Saviour's conversation with the woman of Samaria at the well; and a reference, less distinct, to the attempt of the people of Nazareth to throw him down the rock on which their city was built. Here, therefore, is ample testimony to his *baptism* and the facts immediately following it."

He "also pretends to believe in the *miracles* of Christ; and those of healing the sick, feeding the five thousand men, and raising the dead, are expressly mentioned, though they are attributed to magical influence. Several passages also in our Saviour's sermon on the mount, are quoted *verbatim*, and his predictions relating to his sufferings, death, and resurrection are recorded. Nor are the *closing* scenes of the life of the Saviour noticed with less exactness. We meet with the treachery of Judas, and Peter's denial of his Master; we are informed that Christ was bound, insulted, beaten with rods, and crucified; we read of the gall which was given him to eat, and vinegar to drink; and we are insulted with an unfeeling jest upon the blood and water that flowed from our dying Redeemer's side. He mentions some words which were uttered by Christ upon the cross, and alludes to the earthquake and darkness that immediately followed the crucifixion. There is also mention made of the appearance of the angels at the sepulcher, and of the manifestation of Christ to Mary Magdalene and the disciples, after his resurrection." "The difficulty of one angel or two," at the tomb, "is noticed." "Jesus is reproached for needing to have the stone rolled away by an angel." Now he says, "These things are from your own writings, for you fall by your own authority."—*Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2*; and *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century, by Principal Cairns, Lecture 1, sec. 3*.

There can certainly be no controversy about the existence of the New Testament in the times of Julian, Porphyry, and Celsus, and, as has been remarked, not one of these able writers pretended to call in question the authenticity of the *records* of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. It would be just as reasonable for us to-day to deny the facts of the Reformation by Luther, as to expect that Julian should deny the existence of the records of the ministry of Jesus; just as reasonable for us to-day to deny the facts of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, as to suppose that Porphyry could deny the faithfulness of

the New Testament history. Just as wisely could we reject all the evidences of the American Revolution, as to suppose that Celsus could reject the evidences of the life of Jesus in the world.

It would certainly be the supremest folly for any man to deny the reality of any one of these three world-stirring events. Just as supremely foolish would it have been for any of these three men to deny the event that was then moving the world as it had never been moved. An event the results of which were threatening the very existence of the empire of Julian as it had existed for hundreds of years, could not well be denied. Each of these men, more especially Celsus, had ample means and ability, and the *will* also, to disprove the authenticity of these sacred records, had it been possible; and the very fact that not one of them even pretended to attempt any such thing, proves that that thing was impossible. We will close this paragraph with Principal Cairn's closing observation on Celsus, before quoted. He says:—

"His testimony here is evidently of the greatest weight; and his position, was at once an immediately succeeding writer and an enemy, gives the gospels a recognition which could have come from no other quarter, even from later unbelief in the earlier centuries. *It is impossible for modern unbelief to shake this foundation*, or to resolve those materials which Celsus has attested as so solid and documentary, into the mist and vapor of shifting tradition. What he assails is not a cloud, but a fortress well defined, and the mark of studied attack and siege. It is *too late* now to obliterate his lines and parallels, which have even been added to the intrenchments against which they were directed."

As the last, but not by any means as the least authority in confirmation of the early date of the New Testament, we introduce Gibbon, the prince of historians. He says:—

*"The Christian Revelation was consummated under the reign of Nerva."—Decline and Fall, chap. 21, sec. 7.*

This indisputable authority carries us back beyond Celsus *sixty* years, for the reign of Nerva began in A.D. 96 and ended in A.D. 98. Here is a chain of authorities, not a single link of which can be broken, which, taken together, prove to an *absolute certainty* that the New Testament was written at the time when it claims to have been written.

So much for the New Testament. Now for the Old.

A. T. J.

**July 23, 1885**

**"Can the Old Testament Be Trusted?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 28 ,  
p. 436.**

IT is a historical fact that *two hundred and eighty-two* years before Christ, the Old Testament was translated from Hebrew into Greek, at Alexandria in Egypt,

and it there consisted of the same books that compose the Old Testament of today. "Whence it is evident that we still have those identical books which the most ancient Jews attested to be genuine."

We shall not take up separately each book of the Old Testament, as that would extend this article further than would be proper, but only some of the leading ones, and as the writings of the whole Old Testament are so intimately connected, if we establish a portion of it, we confirm the validity of the whole.

First we will notice the book of Daniel, and, as an introduction, offer a few lines from an editorial in the New York *Independent*:—

"A few years ago the critics with one voice refused to see anything in it [the book of Daniel] more than an apocalyptic composition of the date of Antiochus Epiphanes. Eichorn, Bertholdt, Gesenius, De Wette, Lengerke, Ewald, and Hitzig, with the more moderate as well as the rationalistic critics, agreed in its late date, some being so precise as to fix it at 167 B.C. 'There never was any Belshazzar,' they exclaimed, and we could bring nothing to corroborate our written record. The replies made to them were feeble and unsatisfactory. But the monuments of the kings of Babylon began to be read a few years ago."

The critics could assert with a great deal of assurance, that "there never was any Belshazzar," because, aside from the Bible, in none of the authorities on the subject, was there any Belshazzar named. Therefore, as the historians failed to mention him, "there never was any" such king. But the Babylonian inscriptions make all plain, and *exactly* confirm the Bible account. They declare that Nabu-Nahid (Nabonadius) with an army took the field against Cyrus, and *left Belshazzar, his eldest son*, in command of the city. Nabu-Nahid, being defeated by Cyrus, was compelled to take refuge in Borsippa, and Cyrus went on against Babylon and Belshazzar, and the city, with Belshazzar, was taken, as recorded in Daniel 5.

And this condition of affairs in Babylon is the only one that will agree with the record in Daniel; for Daniel was certainly made prime minister of the kingdom, the chain of gold being the insignia of that office. Yet for all his being prime minister, he is spoken of as the *third* ruler in the kingdom. Dan. 5:7, 16, 29. How can this be? Thus: Nabu-Nahid, the *first* ruler, Belshazzar his son, yet the *third* ruler. And in no other possible way can the records of Daniel be met; for his office was really the *second* in the kingdom. But how fully this illustrates the perfect accuracy of the Scriptures. Here is an important point in the history of Babylon, wholly passed over by the historians; yet Daniel records it exactly as it is, and after more than two thousand years the inscriptions of that king of Babylon declare that Daniel is correct.

This also fixes the date of the book of Daniel to the time that has been claimed for it, because there is no other time in the world's history when these points in Daniel could have been written. For shortly after, Babylon fell into decay and these inscriptions were buried out of sight, and the historians made no mention of any of them; consequently they never could have been learned afterward; therefore they were learned in Babylon at the time when they

occurred, and thus the claims of the book of Daniel are correctly placed, and absolutely fixed, at the date 538 B.C. (For proofs as to Belshazzar, see "Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth edition, article "Babylonia;" Rawlinson's "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. 8, par. 50.) The list of instruments mentioned in Daniel 3:5, 7. 15, is another proof; for this "very list is true to the time of Daniel, and would never have been thought of three centuries later." In short, "every historical or social allusion in Daniel is borne out by the facts discovered."

The book of Ezekiel gives another instance of the exactness of the Bible writers, and of being true to the times in which it was written. In chap. 23:14, 15, we read: "For when she saw men portrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans *portrayed with vermilion, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea.*" Of this also we may say that is it true to the time of Ezekiel in the captivity in Babylon; and would never have been thought of later, nor in any other country. In Egypt, in Assyria, in Persia, and in Greece, their art was displayed in sculpture. From the gems upon which the carving was so minute as to suggest the employment of a magnifying-glass, to the colossal bulls that guarded the palace of Nineveh from the entrance of evil spirits, all, all was sculpture. But in Babylonia it was far different.

"While the Assyrians had stone in abundance, the Babylonians were obliged to import it from a distance. Brick-clay, on the contrary, lay ready at hand. Where the Assyrians employed sculptured alabaster to ornament their buildings, the Babylonians contented themselves with enameled bricks, and *painted plaster.* Sculpture was naturally developed by the one; just as *painting* was by the other; and ornamentation, which could be lavished on the *exterior* in Assyria, had to be confined to the *interior* in Babylon." (Compare Eze. 8:8-10 with the text quoted above.) "The few bas-reliefs of Babylon that exist are small and inferior in execution; but *brilliant coloring* and a lavish use of the metals, made up for this want. The walls were covered with the most costly materials, and '*images portrayed with vermilion*' excited the admiration of the stranger. The love of bright colors, in contrast with the sober hues of the Assyrian palaces, led also to the cultivation of gardens; and the hanging gardens of Babylon, raised upon tiers of arches, were one of the wonders of the world."—*Enc. Brit., art. Babylonia.*

At no time in the world's history later than this, could such a thing as Ezekiel describes be said of the Babylonians. For only a little while afterward the kingdom of Babylon was overthrown by the Medes and Persians, who took possession of it, and these Babylonish peculiarities were lost to the world. But how plainly these words of Ezekiel bring before us the Babylon of his day, when Nebuchadnezzar reigned, whose utmost endeavors were put forth in the building, and decoration of his capital city, when all the skill of his splendid artists was employed in blending the brilliant colors that ornamented the walls of his pleasant palaces, and Babylon sat as mistress of the world in that pitch of pride and grandeur, "the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency! And by

all this we know of surety that the book of Ezekiel is exactly placed at B.C. 604-561.

Now we turn to the books of Kings and Isaiah. In Isaiah 36:1 and 2 Kings 18:13, we read: "Now in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah did Sennacherib, king of Assyria, come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them." This is placed in our Bibles at the date 713 B.C., which does not *exactly* correspond with the Assyrian inscriptions, but is only twelve years out of the way, being that much too early. The native monuments state that Sennacherib ascended the throne the 12th of Ab (part of July and August), 705 B.C., and placed his invasion of Judah in 701 B.C.

In verse 14 of this same chapter in 2 Kings, we read:—

"And Hezekiah, king of Judah, sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish, saying, *I have offended*; return from me; that which thou puttest on me will I bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah, king of Judah, three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold."

This is the only record that the Bible makes of this point, and so far as the Bible goes we do not know wherein he had "offended," nor why he should confess so readily, and offer to bear whatever Sennacherib should put upon him. Sennacherib, however, tells the whole story. The trouble arose as follows:—

The Philistine city of Ekron revolted from Assyrian rule, but Padi, their king, still retained his friendship for the king of Assyria, and so opposed the rebellion. Thereupon the Ekronites entered into negotiations with Ethiopia and Egypt and obtained promise of their help, and also seized Padi, made him prisoner, and sent him to Hezekiah for safe keeping. By thus accepting this charge, Hezekiah made himself a partner in the Ekronite rebellion. So after Sennacherib had defeated the Egyptians, recovered Ekron, and punished the leaders in the rebellion, he went up against Hezekiah, not only to compel him to release Padi, but to punish him for his offense. Then it was, and this is why it was, that Hezekiah confessed to Sennacherib, "I have offended." A number of points could be given from Sennacherib's narrative, every one confirming that in the Bible, but this one will confirm that in the Bible, but this one will suffice to show the perfect veracity of the Scripture account. For the full account see "Rawlinson's Seven Great Monarchies," Second Monarchy, chap. 9, par. 164-168; Geikie's "Hours with the Bible," vol. 4, chap. 17, par. 4-21.

Again, in Isaiah 37:37, 38 and 2 Kings 19:36, 37, it is said: "So Sennacherib, king of Assyria, departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. And it came to pass, as he was worshiping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezar his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia. And Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead." The inscriptions declare that Sennacherib was "building a palace for himself at Nineveh on a grander scale than had ever been attempted before. His works were interrupted by his murder, in 681, by his two sons, who, however, soon found themselves confronted by the veteran army of Esarhaddon, their fathers youngest and favorite son, who, in January, 680, defeated them at Khanirabbat,

and was proclaimed king."—*Enc. Brit., art. Babylonia; Seven Great Monarchies, Second Monarchy, chap. 9, par. 193; Ancient Empires of the East, chap. 2, par. 36.*

Here, then, is the confirmation of every point in these Scriptures, and in this single instance the slight difference in the dates will bear nothing against the truthfulness of the narrative, nor against the general correctness of the time in which the books were written. Indeed, the Scripture narrative would seem to demand more time than is there given for these occurrences. The invasion, return, and dwelling, of Sennacherib, are all placed by the dates, within 710-9 B.C., which is hardly time enough, especially as it is said that he "returned and dwelt at Nineveh;" and this short period would hardly justify the statement that he dwelt there. But the native monuments remove all difficulty, by showing that he did actually dwell at Nineveh after his return, being employed in building a palace in honor of his god. In this, therefore, is proof that Isaiah and this part of Kings were written as far back as the former half of the seventh century B.C.

A. T. J.

*(To be concluded next week.)*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 17:1-16. Elijah the Tishbite" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 28 , pp. 438, 439.**

**JULY 26–1 KINGS 17:1-16**

THE life of Elijah, up to the time of his translation, is the subject of the greater part of the lessons during the remaining part of the present quarter. It is well; for Elijah and his times form one of the most interesting subjects that can be studied by the people of the present day.

The very last words of the Old Testament are a prophecy concerning Elijah: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord; and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Mal. 4:5, 6.

As they came down from the Mount of Transfiguration the disciples asked Jesus about this prophecy, as follows: "And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, That *Elias is come already*, and they knew him not, *but have done unto him whatsoever they listed*. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of *John the Baptist*." Matt. 17:9-13.

According to these words of Christ, therefore, this prophecy referred to John the Baptist, and Luke gives a fuller view of its application to him. "But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth

shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him *in the spirit and power of Elias*, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; *to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.*" Luke 1:13-17.

But this is not all that Elijah has to do with the work of the Lord Jesus. As this prophecy, fulfilled by John the Baptist referred to the times just preceding the first advent of the Saviour, so the times of Elijah, and Elijah himself, bear an important part in relation to the times just preceding the second advent of the Saviour and in connection with that advent itself.

In Matt. 17:1-5, Luke 9:28-35, and Mark 9:2-7, we have the account of the Saviour's transfiguration, and all three agree in recording the

439

fact that Elias (Elijah) and Moses were there talking with him. Nor were they simply the spirits of these two men. Luke says plainly, "There talked with him two *men*, which were Moses and Elias [Elijah]; who appeared in glory," etc. They were two glorified *men* therefore.

Now if we can learn what the transfiguration meant, then we can learn also what was the meaning of the appearance there of these two men. We turn to 2 Peter 1:16-18, and read: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount."

Here the apostle is writing of the coming of the Lord in his everlasting kingdom (verse 11), and says, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables" when they made known "the power and coming" of the Lord. Why have they not followed fables, that is, "made-up stories"? Because they "were eye-witnesses of his majesty," as he shall then appear. When were they eyewitnesses of his majesty? Answer, "When we were with him in the holy mount." When the voice came from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." What did they see there? Jesus "was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Matt. 17:2. "And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them." Mark 9:3. "Behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them." Matt. 17:5.

Is this the way Jesus will appear when he comes? "Behold he *cometh with clouds*; and every eye shall see him." Rev. 1:7. "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the *clouds of Heaven* with power and *great glory*." Matt. 24:30. "He shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." Luke 9:26. How great will be that glory? "Then the *moon shall be confounded*, and the *sun ashamed*, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Isa. 24:23. Therefore according to

Peter's words, these things are proof positive that when they saw the Lord Jesus transfigured—when they saw him standing on the mount with the glittering glory of God about him—they were then "eyewitnesses of his majesty" as he shall appear in his second advent to this world.

But what will occur when Jesus comes in his glory? "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and *the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*" 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. It is plain, then, that when Jesus saw him on the holy mount, the righteous living will be "changed," "caught up," translated, as was Elijah, and therefore when Elijah stood in glory, with his glorified Lord, in the picture of the coming of the Lord, which Peter, James, and John saw, he stood there as the representative of those who shall be translated at the coming of the Lord, as *he* was in the days of old.

But this is not all, the experience through which Elijah passed just before his translation was also representative. His experience then is, in many points, an exact representation of that through which those will have to pass who shall be translated as he was. This experience will be the subject of several of the following lessons, and therein we shall endeavor to make the subject plain. Again we say the life of Elijah is one of the most important studies in which the people of the present day can be engaged.

The question may arise, Why was Moses there? It is foreign from the lesson, yet so intimately connected with the line of Scripture which we have pursued, that it might be well to explain this point. The answer to the question is that Moses was there as the representative of the righteous dead, as Elijah was the representative of the righteous living. For we have seen that when Jesus comes *the righteous dead are raised*, as well as the righteous living translated. Now as the Scriptures make absolutely no provision for reaching life beyond this world, except by a resurrection from the dead, or a translation, as were Enoch and Elijah; and as Moses had died, it follows that as he, *a man*, stood in glory, on the Mount of Transfiguration, he was there by virtue of a resurrection from the dead. There is Scripture that shows this. Jude, in the ninth verse, says: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about *the body of Moses.*" Now Paul says that the devil had the power of death. Heb. 2:14. He says, also, as we have quoted above, that it is at the voice of the archangel that the dead arise (1 Thess. 4:16); and we read in John 5:25 that it is the voice of the Son of God that will raise the dead; therefore the archangel of Jude 9 is the Son of God; as it is he alone who raises the dead; and as when one dies he goes into the power of the devil who has the power of death; when the Son of God went to raise Moses, the devil disputed his right. Mark, this is a dispute between the devil and the Son of God, about the "*body of Moses.*" And as the body of Moses stood in glory on the Mount with the Son of God, we know that when he said to the devil, "The Lord rebuke thee," he took the body of Moses, in spite of the devil's dispute. And thus Moses stood on the Mount of Transfiguration, the representative of the righteous dead; as Elijah stood there the representative of the righteous living; and the Lord Jesus above all, as the one whose voice shall

call both dead and living from this world to himself in glory, when he comes in his glory.

A. T. J.

**"Was Not Dr. Whedon a Spiritualist?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 28 , pp. 441, 442.**

D. D. WHEDON, D.D., was one of the foremost men of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. He was an authoritative commentator, and an editor of leading Methodist periodicals. He died lately, and left to the world a heritage of which we think the Methodist Church can by no means be proud. We refer to his theory of the soul—the specter as he called it—which is as bald Spiritualism as anything that we have ever seen outside of the ranks of downright Spiritualism itself. In fact it is recognized, and has been taken up, by Spiritualists, as embodying the very views which they have all along maintained, on the nature of spirits. We propose to lay before our readers some of Dr. Whedon's expressions. We have no expectation that anybody can understand them, any more than they can understand the frog-like mutterings of the spirits, but we give them, all the same, for in this peculiarity is one of the most striking likenesses to Spiritualism. Yet we shall do our best to explain.

Some time ago he contributed to the New York *Independent* an article on "The Specter in the Brain," and now since his death another article from him, entitled "The Vanishing Specter," appeared in the *Independent* of June 25, which he introduces thus:—

"In our late article, entitled "The Specter in the Brain," we inferred from analysis of the combined properties of the brute body and soul, compared with those of the human body and spirit, that the former were a united temporality, derived immediately from the earthly, and the latter a perpetuity derived immediately from God."

So the brute "body and soul" are a "united temporality," and the human body and spirit are "a perpetuity." But he does not tell us whether the latter are a united perpetuity or a divided perpetuity, and that is the very thing about which we are anxiously concerned.

Next he tells us what death is, both in the brute and in man—both in the "temporality" and in the "perpetuity:"—

"With the brute, death is a vanishing of the specter, an evaporation of the terrene soul, and its return to the world-soul whence it originated."

"With man it is the emergence of the human spirit from the body into the region of spirits."

That is, in plain words, the death of a man is an *emergence of the perpetuity*.

We have no doubt that it is absolutely essential that this distinction between the death of brutes and men should always be kept clearly defined. For, now that Dr. Whedon has experienced an emergence of the perpetuity, who should ever be able to tell us what dire disaster might follow if this distinction should become

confused in the minds of men, and they should speak of the death of a man as, The evaporation of the perpetuity, or, The emergence of the temporality?

Next he tells us how the emergence of the perpetuity is performed. He says:—

"The process of death with the redeemed man is a struggle of the spirit with the body to make its divine ascent. As it recedes, the formation-conservative power loses its grasp upon the organism, and leaves it to disintegration."

And that is exactly how it is done!

Now he goes on to tell us what becomes of the "perpetuity" after its emergence—what becomes of the "formative-conservative power" after it has left the "organism" to "disintegration." He says:—

"Emerging from the body, the spirit awakes into the pure ether of the region of bodiless spirits. This blessed atmosphere, we conceive, is, as it were, within the atmosphere of our outside troublous worlds. For there are worlds within worlds, enfolding and pervading each other without impeding, just as light can, without obstruction, pervade our earthly atmosphere. This paradissic ether is an effluence from the divine essence, and the emancipated spirit bathes and swims and lives therein as his own native and genial element. Paradise may

442

thus pervades our air above and around us, and, at death, the spirit enters thereinto as through a veil. Within that veil is the true world, of which our outside world is the coarse, hard shell, the crude repulsive bark."

If that is anything else than sheep Spiritualism, we should like for some one to point it out.

Again:—

"Within the turbulence of our earthly atmosphere this celestial ether is a pure tranquility. . . No pestilence infect, no darkness obscures, no Arctic icebergs can freeze, no volcanic fires can consume, even if the spirit nature were susceptible of such evils. But so transcendent is his substance that he can swim in the glacier without chill, and repose in the lava bed and suffer no heat. . . . By a blessed concord of the infinite and finite wills is this ethereal loveliness created."

Swimming in a sea of solid ice, reposing in a bed of living lava, and *that* is "ethereal loveliness"! ! O-h-h-h !!!

Another name that he gives this "specter," this "perpetuity," is as follows:—

"Among the angels they are *angeloids*."

And—

"The angels wait upon the *angeloids*."

As to whether this "specter" has a form, we are treated to the following sublime piece of "ethereal" wisdom:—

"Of all definite existences, there must be limitations. There certainly is a localization within us of the mental essence. It has a

presence where it is; and it has an absence where it is not. And between the two, its being and not being, there must be a boundary line or separating margin, and so an approach to *form*. . . . Our human bodies are bounded or, as we may say, *surfaced*, by a *skin*. But the spirit is surfaced, and its individuality and continuity of self-hood are secured, by its own volitions."

There, with that, we shall stop; there is plenty more of the same kind, but this is certainly enough. We do not wonder that he died—that there was an emergence of his perpetuity—shortly after writing that article. Such "absolute sweetness," such "ethereal loveliness," is too utterly transcendent for this world.

That the perfect likeness between this and outright Spiritualism may be clearly seen we here subjoin three extracts from the Spiritualistic record of creation:—

"And God said, Let Mechanical Procedure be! and movement, rhythmical, harmonical, melodial, unfolded from the firmament. And the movement thereof in the moving creation was time."

"And God said, Let there be space! and the firmament was separated from the emanation, and the firmament, unmoved, appeared, and the emanation unfolded within the procedure. And the firmament is manifest Infinitude, and the emanation, separated, is encompassed space."

"And God said, Let there be light! and the Divine Procedure unfolded a luminary unto the ethereal which divided the emanation from the firmament. And the intelligence was light."

Now if there is anybody that can detect any difference between Dr. Whedon's "divine volitional effluence," and the Spiritualist's "divine procedure;" between Dr. Whedon's "evaporation of the terrene soul," and the Spiritualist's "emanation unfolded within the procedure;" or between Dr. Whedon's spirit whose "individuality and continuity of self-hood are secured by its own volitions," and the Spiritualist's "movement, rhythmical, harmonical, melodial" which "unfolded from the firmament," we should like to have them do it.

We repeat, it is nothing but downright Spiritualism. And this is the last heritage that this eminent "door of divinity" has left to the world. And Spiritualism, its natural heir, has not delayed to claim it. Every Spiritualist paper that we have seen since Dr. Whedon's article was published, has welcomed it, and the New York *Dispatch* says that,—

"It has been promptly seized upon by several of the professional mediums, and in some of this weeks' [the first week in July] seances, forms, in semblance comporting with the conditions of his angeloids, have been shown to astounded disciples."

Just here another question arises. The Spiritualists seize upon this as the embodiment of their views of the death of all men. Dr. Whedon, it seems, uses it in reference only to "redeemed men," yet even this is a question. On the supposition, however, that it has reference solely to the "emergence of the perpetuity" of *redeemed* men, what is the process in the case of an *unredeemed* man. If the spirit of a redeemed man, "emerging from the body, awakes into the

pure ether of the region of bodiless spirits," "into this paradisaic ether which is an effluence of the divine essence;" then into what does the spirit of an *unredeemed* man awake, when it emerges from the body." Dr. Whedon says nothing about this side of the question.

Therefore if the Spiritualists are not justified in applying Dr. Whedon's theory in the death of all men, will some of Dr. Whedon's associates show where and how the line should be drawn between the "emergence of the perpetuity" of a redeemed man, and that of an unredeemed man? And if such line cannot be drawn, then does not Dr. Whedon, does not this representative man of the Methodist Church, in his very latest testimony to the world, stand committed to the veritable support of Spiritualism? But will the Methodist Church allow that, in this, Dr. Whedon is a representative man? If it will not, it surely is strictly in order for it to say so, and that with no faltering voice. But if the Methodist Church does allow that in this Dr. Whedon is a representative man, then does not this church stand fully committed to the support of Spiritualism?

And yet all this scheme of Dr. Whedon's is simply the logical outcome of the immortal soul theory. And the wave which he has raised—to borrow DeQuincey's figure—is only "one of those ambitious fellows which sometimes run far ahead of their fellows in a tide steadily gaining ground. . . . marking only the strength of that tendency which sooner or later is destined to fill the whole capacity of the shore."

As for us we take the Bible and its great doctrine of immortality through Christ alone; and this, not by the vanishing of a specter, but by the resurrection of the dead.

A. T. J.

**July 30, 1885**

**"Can the Old Testament Be Trusted? (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 29 , p. 452.**

THE next point in the book of Second Kings is on the invasion of Samaria, by Shalmaneser (chap. 18:9, 10): "Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, came up against Samaria, and besieged it. And at the end of three years they took it; even in the sixth year of Hezekiah, that is the ninth year of Hosea, king of Israel, Samaria was taken." The Bible chronology places this event "*about* 723 B.C." And the tablets of Shalmaneser, from the ruins of Nineveh, assert that his reign was B.C. 727-722, and that the "chief event of his reign was the campaign against Samaria. The capture of that city, however, was reserved for his successor, Sargon, in 720." This corresponds with the Scripture date exactly, as the attack was made about 723, and the siege continued three years, which gives the very date of the tablets of Shalmaneser.

Besides extending this article to an immoderate length, it would be too tedious a task to give in full all the accounts confirming the Scripture record; in fact it would be only to rewrite that record. Therefore we shall mention the

names, and give references to the passages of Scripture with which they correspond. The inscriptions declare that, in 710 B.C., Sargon, king of Assyria, overran Judea, and razed Ashdod to the ground (Isa. 20:1); that a year after the Judean war by Sennacherib, Merodach-Baladan was in command at Babylon (Isa. 39:1; 2 Kings 20:12); that in 740 B.C., Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, overthrew the ancient kingdom of Damascus (2 Kings 16:9), and in his "inscriptions Ahaz of Judah appears among the names of those who acknowledged his sovereignty and paid tribute" (2 Kings 16:7-18; *Enc. Brit., art. Ahaz; Rawlinson, Third Monarchy, chap. 9, par. 129*); that in 730 B.C. he placed his vassal Hoshea on the throne of Samaria in the room of Pekah (2 Kings 15:30; 17:1); that Ben-hadad reigned in Damascus, while Ahab reign in Israel, and that Hazael succeeded Ben-hadad (2 Kings 8:7-15).

No less accurate and circumstantial is the testimony of the "Moabite Stone," discovered in August, 1868, and now familiar to many, which reads as follows:—

"I am Mesha, king of Moab [2 Kings 3:4]; the Dibonite, my father, reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. Omri was king of Israel [1 Kings 16:16]; and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh [1 Kings 11:7; Jer. 48:7, 13, 46]; was angry with his land, and his son succeeded him [1 Kings 16:28]; and he also said, I will afflict Moab. In my days he spake thus: And I looked on him and on his house. [2 Kings 1:1; 3:4, 5.] And Israel kept constantly perishing. And Omri held possession of the land of Medeba, and there dwelt in it Omri and his son and his grandson, forty years. [1 Kings 16:23, 29; 2 Kings 3:1.] But Chemosh restored it in my days. And the king of Israel built for him Kiriathaim, and I fought against the city and took it, and brought from thence the altar of Jehovah, and put it before Chemosh in Keriath. And Chemosh said to me, 'Go and take Nebo from Israel.' And I went in the night, and fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon, and took it, and I utterly destroyed it, and I slew all of it, seven thousand, for to Ashtor-Chemosh had I devoted them. And I took from thence the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. And the king of Israel built Jahaz, and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me, and Chemosh drove him from before me; and I took from Moab two hundred men, all told, and I attacked Jahaz and took it, joining it to Dibon. Chemosh said to me, 'Go fight against Horonaim.'"

Here, then, are the facts, strictly in accordance with the Scripture account of Omri, his son Ahab, and his grandson Jehoram; and of Mesha, king of Moab, and his father's servitude, and his own rebellion. Now it is utterly inconceivable how these statements of the Scripture could have been gathered from any other source than the actual events themselves. For there is absolutely no history of the Moabites, from which they could have been taken in later times. Therefore the perfect agreement between the occurrences as recorded in the Bible, and as recorded by Mesha, king of Moab, upon the enduring stone, proves, to a demonstration, that the records were made at the same time. This, then, carries

us back 929 years B.C., as the date of this portion of the sacred word. However, we are not obliged to stop at this date for want of proofs of any earlier, for the decipherment of the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments and tombs fully corroborates the record in the Pentateuch concerning Joseph and the exodus; so much so, in fact, that it is now considered as a most valuable auxiliary to the full understanding of the Egyptian history, and "Brugsch and Lepsius and Chabas and Mariette treat the Pentateuch as of prime historical importance."

"It seemed, a few years ago, an almost incredible story told in Genesis of the campaign of the four kings of Elam and Babylonia—Chedorlaomer, Arioch, Amraphel, and Tidal—against the five kings of Sodom and the plain. The monuments confirm the story wonderfully. They tell us that at just this time [about 1900 or 2000 B.C.] there had been an Elamite (or Median) conquest of Babylonia; they tell us that Laomer was the name of an Elamite god, and that Chedorlaomer means worshiper of Laomer; and we find an account of this very Arioch mentioned on the monuments as king of Elassar, and we learn that his father's name was Chedormabug, and his grandfather's name was Simtihilhak; and we further learn that even earlier than this there had been Babylonian expeditions to the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Every difficulty is completely removed, and confirmation supplied.

"Abraham, we are told, came from Ur of the Chaldees. Such a town had become utterly lost, except in this Biblical mention of it, and a pious tradition had put it in an impossible place. The present generation has rediscovered it, and read its record on the monuments. We find it was the second capital of Babylonia, and was distinguished for its worship of the moon-god. The names could be mentioned of half a dozen of its kings, one of whom was Cheformabug, father of the Arioch of the Bible. Two seals, worn by gentlemen of Ur before the time of Abraham, and bearing the names of the first two kings, are in the British Museum. The Bible geography is proved no fiction."—*Wm. Hayes Ward, D. D., in Sunday School Times, vol. 25, no. 42, article, "The Bible and the Monuments."*

We shall add no more. These evidences, wholly from outside of the Bible, prove beyond any possibility of reasonable doubt, that the Scriptures are authentic records of the things of which they treat, and all the researches in archeology only serve to heap evidence upon evidence of their absolute truthfulness.

It is a law of evidence that—

"Probable proofs, by being added, not only increase the evidence but *multiply* it."—*Butler's Analogy, Part 2, chap. 7, par. 41.*

"When two independent writers witness to the same event, the probability of that event is increased, not in an arithmetical, but in a *geometrical* ratio," *i.e.*, "Let it be ten to one that a certain fact is true upon the testimony of one witness, and likewise ten to one that the same fact is true upon the evidence of another, then it is not *twenty* to one, but *one hundred and thirty* to one, that the fact is true on the

evidence of both. And the evidence to the same point, of a third independent witness of equal credibility with the others, would raise the probability [of its truth] to *one thousand three hundred and thirty* to one. 'By the mouth of two or three witnesses,' the word, to which such witness is borne, is '*established*.'

"And the agreement is the more valuable, if it be (so to speak) incidental and casual—if the two writers are contemporary, and their writings not known to one another; if one only alludes to what the other narrates, if one appears to have been an actor, and the other merely a looker-on; if one gives events, and the other the feelings which naturally arise out of them; in these cases the conviction which springs up in every candid and unprejudiced mind, is absolute; the elements of doubt which hangs about all matters of mere *belief* being reduced to such infinitesimal proportions as to be inappreciable, and so, practically speaking, to disappear altogether."—*Rawlinson's Historical Evidences, lecture 1, par. 22, note 52.*

It is upon precisely such evidence as this that the Bible rests. Therefore, even though it be looked upon as merely a history of the times in which it was written, these evidences prove that the Bible is worthy of all acceptance as a faithful record of absolute facts as they actually occurred. So that it is verily true that he who, in these days, presumes to cast doubt upon the Scripture record, only thereby exposes his ignorance or his willfulness.

But this is not all. In the Bible are recorded not only the things that had occurred in the times when its respective books were written, but also things which should occur for ages to follow, even to the end of the world. And when we read that which was written in these books away in ancient times, concerning what should come in ages to follow; and then take up the history of these ages and find events occurring exactly as written hundreds and even thousands of years before; this again, not only confirms the absolute faithfulness of the Scripture but carries it *beyond the human* for the spring of the knowledge of the facts, the record of which is therein given.

Nor yet is this all—nay, it is merely the beginning. For there is a "*scheme of doctrine* bound up with these facts"—absolutely dependent upon them, inseparably connected with them, and "null and void without them"—which stands fully established, just as soon as the record of the facts is shown to be worthy of acceptance; that doctrine is the doctrine of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Therefore it stands proven to a demonstration that, "*All Scripture*," whether doctrinal, prophetic, or historical, "IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD."

Having by these evidences, which might be greatly multiplied, demonstrated the absolute trustworthiness of the Bible record, we now propose to take our stand upon this "sure foundation," and from it, as our point of observation, to trace, by the outline therein given, the course of the history of this world from the Babylonian ascendancy to our own day.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 18:1-18. The Famine in the Land" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 29 , pp. 454, 455.**

AUGUST 2–1 KINGS 18:1-18

HAVING learned in last week's lesson that Elijah stood on the Mount of Transfiguration as the representative of those who shall be translated at the coming of the Lord, we turn now to a study of the times of Elijah just before his translation, and we shall find in them a representation of the times in the days just before the coming of the Lord and the translation of the righteous who shall then be alive.

THAT there will be a company of people alive on the earth, when the Lord comes, who will hail him with joy and meet him with gladness, is abundantly shown in the Scriptures. Paul says plainly, "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that *we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord* shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep [the dead] . . . the dead in Christ shall rise first; *then we which are alive and remain* shall be caught up together with them . . . and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:15-17. Again he says, "*We shall not* all sleep [not all die], but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; . . . Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. 15:51-54. Where is that "saying" written? Read Isa. 25:8, 9. "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away

455

from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said *in that day*, Lo, this is our God; *we have waited for him*, and he will save us; this is the Lord; *we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice* in his salvation."

IT is plain, therefore, that there will be some righteous on the earth when the Lord comes, but compared with the wicked they will be but few. When the Lord comes, he will take vengeance on the wicked as well as save the righteous. "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. And in Rev. 6:15, 17, we read, "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and every bond man, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matt. 24:12, 13. Thus we see that the two classes, the righteous and the wicked, will be upon the earth when the Lord comes. The wheat and the tares "both grow together until the harvest"—"the harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:30, 39.

WE see by the words of the present lesson that, through the drought, the streams of water and the vegetation had so dried up that the beasts were likely to perish. "And Ahab said unto Obadiah, Go into the land, unto all fountains of water, and unto all brooks; peradventure we may find grass to save the horses and mules alive, that we lose not all the beasts. So they divided the land between them to pass throughout it; Ahab went one way by them to pass throughout it; Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by himself."

NOW READ what Joel says of the time that just precedes the day of the Lord: "Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come. Is not the meat cut off before our eyes, [yea], joy and gladness from the house of our God? The seed is rotten under their clods, the garners are laid desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. O Lord, to thee will I cry: for the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, and the flame hath burned all the trees of the field. The beasts of the field cry also unto thee: for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." Joel 1:15-20.

AND in view of it he says: "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:1.

ZEPHANIAH says of that time: "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord; the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord." Zeph. 1:14-16.

ZEPHANIAH tells exactly why the terrors of this great day come so upon men. It is "because they have *sinned against the Lord*." This is what brought all the trouble in the days of Elijah. For when Ahab cried out to Elijah, "Art thou he that troubled Israel?" Elijah replied, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that *thou has forsaken the commandments of the Lord*, and thou hast followed Baalim." And it was because Elijah had held up before the people the commandments of God, and had insisted on obedience to them that he was now accused of troubling Israel; and it was Israel's persistent violation of the commandments that brought upon them all the trouble. Here then, in the days of Elijah, was a controversy over the commandments of God. On one side was Jezebel wielding all the power of the state in behalf of the violation of the commandments; on the other side was Elijah and a few others maintaining the honor of God by strict adherence to the precepts of his law.

NOW it is the truth that just before the Lord comes there is to be just such another controversy in regard to the commandments of God. The last message to men, that the Bible contains, is one that warns them against the transgression of the commandments, and calls them to "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." This message is found in Rev. 14:9-12, and reads as follows:—

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

THAT this is the very last message to men is shown by the fact that, following in direct connection with this, the prophet says, "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; *for the harvest of the earth is ripe* [the end of the world is come]. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; *and the earth was reaped.*" Verses 14-16.

THESE scriptures show that when the Lord comes in the clouds of heaven, it is to reap the harvest of the earth; that which will fit a people to be gathered as wheat into the garner of God, is the *keeping of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus*; and that by which men make themselves only to be accounted chaff to be burned in the fire, is *the worship of the beast and his image*. This shows also, that to worship the beast and his image is to violate the commandments of God, and so incur his wrath; and that to keep the commandments of God is to excite to oppressiveness the power of the beast and his image. Rev. 13:15.

WE are here making no argument as to what is the beast, nor what is his image, nor what it will be to worship them. We simply draw a parallel between the events of the times of Elijah and those which immediately precede the coming of the Lord. Now do we here present any argument to show that the coming of the Lord is near; we simply show by the Scriptures that, whenever his coming shall be near, *then*, as in the days of Elijah, the commandments of God will be the one subject of controversy between those who will serve the Lord, and those who will not.

A. T. J.

**August 6, 1885**

**"The Assyrian Empire" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 30 , pp. 468, 469.**

By its lines of prophecy, the Bible does certainly give a complete system of historical views. And for any one entering upon the study of history, who wishes to obtain a ready grasp of all of its important points, from which any part of the great field can be entered at any time, and in any direction, there is no better way than to take up and follow the course laid down in the prophetic scriptures. We

believe this to be the true method of studying the history of the world. In the Bible, God has just as surely opened to us the book of human history, as he has the book of human destiny. And we believe that we may study the one as well as the other, with the sanction of Him who ruleth over all.

The great field of prophecy opens with Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon at the close of the seventh century before Christ. But that we may enter this field understandingly it will be necessary to briefly sketch the history that preceded his accession and the establishment of the empire of Babylon.

In Genesis 10:8-12 we read:—

"And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord. *And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city.*"

Thus we are introduced to the founders, and to the history, of the two, afterward, rival kingdoms of Babylonia and Assyria.

With only occasional and slight variations, Babylonia or Chaldea, down to the time of Nebuchadnezzar, was bounded on the south by the Persian Gulf, on the west by the Arabian Desert, on the east by the River Tigris, and reached northward to the thirty-fourth parallel of latitude. It contained about 23,000 square miles of territory, being almost exactly the size of the State of West Virginia, or the present kingdom of Denmark. At the time when we enter upon its history the border of the Persian Gulf was about 120 or 130 miles farther inland than it now is.

As we have seen, Asshur went forth from Babylon and founded the Assyrian nation. Being thus a colony of Babylonia, it was governed for some time by Babylonian rulers appointed by the Chaldean king. It was not very long, however, till the Babylonian authority was renounced, and the Assyrians established a separate and independent monarchy in the north, while the Chaldean monarchy still flourished in the souther part of the great Mesopotamian plain. Thus Assyria reached from the thirty-fourth parallel of latitude at the south, to the thirty-eighth parallel at the north, and was bounded on the east by the Zagros Mountains, and by the River Euphrates on the west. Its territory consisted of about 75,000 square miles, being just about the size of the State of Nebraska, and a little smaller than Great Britain.

The two kingdoms seem to have passed along very peaceably together, Assyria soon rising to an entire equality with the Babylonian.

"Not only does she treat as an equal with the great Southern Empire—not only is her royal house deemed worthy of furnishing wives to its princes—but when dynastic troubles arise there, she exercises a predominant influence over the fortunes of the contending parties, and secures victory to the side whose cause she espouses."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Second Monarchy, chapt. 9, par. 20.*

These amicable relations continued down to the accession of the Assyrian king, Tiglath-Nin, B.C.1300, who aspired to transfer to Assyria the supremacy, which had been hitherto at least *claimed* by Babylonia. Accordingly he made war on the Southern Kingdom, and with such success that he was enable "to inscribe upon his signet-seal the proud title of 'Conqueror of Babylon.'" He reigned for some time at the southern capital, and, it appears, established an Assyrian dynasty there. But in the course of about a century Babylonia succeeded in throwing off the Assyrian yoke and again establishing her independence.

The next Assyrian monarch of more than common important was Tiglath-Pileser I., whose accession dates about 1130 B.C. He tells us:—

"There fell into my hands altogether, between the commencement of my reign and my fifth year, forty-two countries with their kings, from the banks of the River Zab to the banks of the River Euphrates, the country of the Khatti, and the upper ocean of the setting sun. I brought them under one government; I took hostages from them, and I imposed on them tribute and offerings."—*Id., par. 41.*

All this is in first five years. He afterward marched his army into Babylonia, where he remained two years wasting with fire and sword the northern provinces, and, although he actually capture Babylon, he did not hold it long, and, in his retreat, if his Babylonian opponent, Merodach-iddin-akhi, did not actually defeat him, he did succeed in capturing his idols, and carried them back with him to Babylon, where they remained 418 years, that is, until the tenth year of Sennacherib, B.C. 694, when they were recovered by him and carried back to the Assyrian capital.

The next of the most notable of the kings of Assyria, was Asshur-izir-pal, who ascended the throne B.C. 883.

"During the twenty-five years of his active and laborious reign, Assyria enlarged her bounds and increased her influence in almost every direction, while at the same time she advanced rapidly in wealth and the arts; in the latte respect leaping suddenly to an eminence which, so far as we know, had not previously been reached by human genius. The size and magnificence of Asshur-izir-pal's buildings, the artistic excellence of their ornamentation, the pomp and splendor which they set before us as familiar to the king who raised them, the skill in various useful arts which they display or imply, have excited the admiration of Europe, which has seen with astonishment that many of its inventions were anticipated, and that its luxury was almost equaled by an Asiatic people nine centuries before the Christian era."—*Id., par. 66.*

In the first six years of his reign Asshur-izir-pal successfully conducted ten military campaigns, and styles himself "the conqueror from the upper passage of the Tigris to Lebanon and the Great Sea, who has reduced under his authority all countries from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same."

He was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser, the second of that name, who reigned thirty-five years. during the first twenty-seven years, he successfully led,

in person, twenty-three military expeditions. Among the countries invaded, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Chaldea on the sea coast which was not independent of Babylon, and Syria (Damascus) are the principal ones. He led two expeditions into Babylonia, in the second of which he defeated and slew the pretender to the Babylonian crown, marched into Babylon itself, and then on to Chaldea on the coast, and so, as he says, the power of his army "struck terror as far as the sea." Five times he invaded the kingdom of Damascus or Syria—three times against Ben-hadad, and twice against Hazael—and, after finally subduing Hazael and plundering his principal towns, the terror of his arms struck as far as to the Mediterranean Sea; and Tyre, and Sidon, and the kingdom of Israel under Jehu, hastened to make their submission, and to pay tribute, to the mighty Shalmaneser, king of Assyria.

Shalmaneser died and was succeeded by his son Shamas-Vul, in the year 823 B.C. Shamas-Vul conducted several military campaigns, the most important of which was the one against Babylon. The Babylonians, alarmed at his approach, occupied a strongly fortified city on his line of march, which he besieged and captured, slew 18,000 men, and took 3,000 prisoners, plundered and burnt the city, and pressed on against the retreating enemy. The Babylonian monarch, Merodach-belatzu-ikbi, gathered together again his own troops, and those of his allies, "a vast host," and met Shamas-Vul at the River Daban, a branch of the Euphrates. The Babylonians were again defeated, with the loss of 5,000 killed, 2,000 prisoners, 100 chariots, 200 tents, and the royal standard and pavilion, and "Babylonia, which has so long been an independent kingdom is reduced to the condition of a tributary of Assyria."

Shamas-Vul was succeeded by his son Vul-lush III., in 810 B.C. Vul-lush was a warlike as any of his predecessors, and extended the Assyrian dominion to still larger limits. He exercised the power of a sovereign over Babylonia, and speaks of himself as "the king to whose son, Asshur, the chief of the gods, has granted the kingdom of Babylon." From which it would appear that he made his son viceroy over the country.

"It thus appears that by the time of Vul-lush III., or early in the eighth century B.C., Assyria had with one hand grasped Babylonia, while with the other she had laid hold of Philistia and Edom. She thus touched the Persian Gulf on the one side, while on the other she was brought into contact with Egypt. At the same time she had received the submission of at least some portion of the great nation of the Medes. . . . She held Southern Armenia, from Lake Van to the sources of the Tigris; she possessed all Upper Syria, including Commagene and Amanus; she had tributaries even on the further side of that mountain range; she bore sway over the whole Syrian coast from Issus to Gaza; her authority was acknowledged by the Phœnicians, the Hamathites, the Patena, the Hittites, the Syrians of Damascus, the people of Israel, and the Idumeans or people of Edom. On the east she had reduced almost all the valleys of Zagros, and had tributaries in the great upland on the eastern side of the [Zagros] Range."—*Id.*, par. 112.

At the death of Val-lush, there was a pause for a period of thirty-six years (B.C. 781-745) in the "magnificent course of Assyrian conquests" which had hardly known a check for more than a hundred years. The kings that occupied this interval were Shalmaneser III., Asshur-dayan III., Asshur-lush, and Pul (2 Kings 15:19; 1 Chron. 5:26). And after Pul, in B.C. 745 there arose another mighty conqueror, Tiglath-Pileser II. (2 Kings 15:29; 16:7, 10; 1 Chron. 5:6, 26; 2 Chron. 28:20). Such an one was needed if the empire was to be preserved, for in the interval aforementioned, during the reigns of the three ease-loving, effeminate kings who preceded Pul, there was insurrection after insurrection, and revolt after revolt, and there was not enough military spirit in these kings to quell any of them. Pul seems to have had some enterprise, for he invaded Israel and took tribute from Menahem. But when Tiglath-Pileser arose, all the vigor of the old empire is again asserted.

During this season of weakness and revolt, the old Babylonian kingdom was all broken up by upstart kings. Nabonassar established himself at the head of affairs in Babylon itself; a certain Yakin, or Baladan, the father of Merodach-Baladan, became master of the tract upon the sea coast; and towards the north various princes, Nadina, Zakiru, and others, at the same time obtained petty governments which they administered in their own names. Nabonassar was the most determined and energetic one among the number, and he took a step by

469

which he expected to be remembered at least—he destroyed all the records that he could get hold of, of kings who had preceded him in Babylon, and began to number the years from the date of his own accession B.C. 747, and thus came the "era of Nabonassar." He held the throne of Babylon fourteen years. He was succeeded in 733 by Nadius, who reigned two years, to 731, and after him came three weak kings, Chinzinus, Porus, and Eluleus, by name, when Merodach-Baladan, who had succeeded his father as king of the coast territory, extended his authority over the upper country, and became king of Babylon in fact. Isa. 39:1; 2 Kings 20:12, 13. See Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 5-9.

Tiglath-Pileser was no sooner settled on the Assyrian throne than he set about the restoration of the empire. He says himself that he immediately levied an army and marched against Southern Mesopotamia (Babylonia). He attacked and defeated several of the petty princes above mentioned, taking the towns of Kur-Galzu. Sippara, or Sepharvaim, together with many other places of less consequence in the lower part of the country, and received the submission of Merodach-Baladan, who acknowledged him as suzerain, and consented to pay tribute. But there seems to have been friendly relations between Tiglath-Pileser and Nabonassar, and as Tiglath-Pileser in his third year (743 B.C.) began his Syrian, Palestinian, and Phúnecian wars, which continued with but short intermission down to about 732 or 731 B.C., it thus happened that Nabonassar reigned in peace in Babylon all his days, so far at least as the king of Assyria was concerned.

A. T. J.

*(To be concluded next week.)*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 18:19-29. 'If the Lord Be God, Follow Him; but if Baal, Then Follow Him'" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 30 , pp. 470, 471.**

AUGUST 9–1 KINGS 18:19-29

BAAL was the chief god of the Phenician and Canaanitish nations. He was the sun-god, and in him the people worshiped the sun. His worship to some extent had found a place among the people of God before the time of Samuel (Judges 2:10-13; 10:10) but under the guidance of Samuel his worship was wholly forsaken by Israel, and they followed and "served the Lord only" (1 Sam. 7:3, 4). Two hundred years pass by, to the accession of Ahab, before Israel turns again to the worship of Baal.

AHAB is introduced thus: "And in the thirty and eighth year of Asa king of Judah began Ahab the son of Omri to reign over Israel: and Ahab the son of Omri reigned over Israel in Samaria twenty and two years. And Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him. And it came to pass, as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, that he took to wife Jezebel the daughter of Ethbaal king of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal, and worshiped him. And he reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made a grove; and Ahab did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him." 1 Kings 16:29-33.

THIS very supremacy of wickedness reached by Ahab was through the alliance formed with Jezebel. Taking her to wife was considered by the Lord as worse than walking in the wicked ways of all before him. As stated above, "as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam . . . he took to wife Jezebel." And when he had taken Jezebel for his wife, his queen, and put himself thus in her power, then he had literally sold himself to work evil. And thus the matter is summed up by the graphic writer of the Kings: "But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, *whom Jezebel his wife stirred up.*" 1 Kings 21:25.

JEZEBEL was the daughter of Ethbaal (Baal with him) priest of Baal and Astarte, and king of Tyre and Zidon. Tyre was the chief seat of the Baal-worship, and there was a magnificent temple devoted to his worship, and when Jezebel became the wife of Ahab she deliberately set herself to establish his licentious worship amongst all Israel. The most of the people were idolaters already; but the calf-worship, established by Jeroboam, was in the name of the Lord. With him the calf-worship was more a political measure than anything else. He set up the calves to keep the people from going to Jerusalem to worship the Lord, through fear that if they should go there to worship, the kingdom would turn again to Rehoboam. So to prevent this apparent danger to his kingdom, he set up the calves, saying, "Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." This worship, idolatrous as it was, and bad as it was, had yet this

merit, that it was at least in the *name* of Jehovah, and the people in their worship, mistaken though it was, still at least pretended to worship the Lord.

BUT this was not enough for Jezebel. It was not enough that idolatry should abound; Baal must be the idol. Nor was it enough that one god should be worshiped; Baal—the sun—must be that one. It was not enough that some, or even most, of the people should worship the sun; they must *all* do it. So she set on foot a systematic attempt to absolutely suppress the true worship of the Lord, and by Baal to supplant the true God. Nor was it enough for her that all should, if possible, be *persuaded* to adopt the service of Jezebel and Baal, they must be *compelled*, under penalty of death to do it. Accordingly she began to cut off all who clung to the worship of Jehovah. By these energetic measures she brought the condition of affairs to the point where there were only 7,000 out of all Israel that had not bowed the knee to Baal; and these only escaped by taking refuge in dens and caves of the earth, and were so widely scattered that Elijah thought that he was the only one left alive.

THUS matters stood when the voice of the Lord came to Elijah saying, "Go show thyself unto Ahab." Elijah went and said to Ahab, "Now therefore send, and gather to me all Israel unto Mount Carmel, and the prophets of Baal four hundred and fifty, and the prophets of the groves four hundred, which eat at Jezebel's table." Ahab did so, "And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him." The question was not, whether they should worship God. The question was, Who is the true God? The question was not whether they should worship or not worship; all were ready and willing to worship. But the question was, Whom shall we worship? Would they have another god before Jehovah? or would they have him and him alone, according to his own commandments.

THE first commandment was the one that was involved in the controversy in the days of Elijah. Should God be worshiped? or should Baal? In last week's lesson we learned that that people who shall be alive on the earth, and who when the Lord comes, shall be translated as Elijah was, will be brought to a like test as to whom they will worship. They will have to decide whether they will worship the beast and his image or whether they will worship God. The word of God says, "If any man worship the beast and his image. . . . the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God. . . . Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12. And in Rev. 15:2, we learn that those who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus, get "the victory over the beast and over his image," and "stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God."

471

ANY one who fairly studies the subject cannot fail to see that the following is the truth. The "beast" is the papal power. The "image to the beast" will be the United States Government when the National Reform party shall have succeeded in forming here the union of Church and State for the purpose of *compelling* everybody to keep Sunday (the *day* of the sun) as Jezebel in the days of Elijah compelled the people to worship the *image* of the sun. And as the Sunday institution was established by the papacy—the beast—and is set forth as

the sign of her authority; so when, after the similitude of the papal church, the National Reform party unites, in this country, Church and State, for the express purpose of compelling all the people to keep Sunday—an institution of the beast, the papal church—*then* to keep that day will be to worship the beast and his image.

WE say that *then* to keep Sunday will be to worship the beast and his image. Because absolutely the only authority for Sunday keeping is the Church of Rome, and when we yield obedience to any power that enforces that authority, we then become servants to that power, for, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?" Rom. 6:16. What then shall we do? The Bible tells. When the beast and his image are enforcing their own worship, the Lord says, "Here are they that *keep the commandments* of God, and the faith of Jesus."

TRUE the National Reform party pretends that it is the ten commandments to which they are going to compel obedience. But not one of the ten commandments says a word about keeping Sunday. Oh, but the fourth commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy;" and they will have it that Sunday is the Sabbath. But that is not true; that same commandment which says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," says also, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The National Reform party and everybody else knows that Sunday is *not* the seventh day. Therefore when they seek to compel people to keep Sunday, that is *not* obedience to the commandment of God. And in opposition to that very thing the Lord sends his own word, "*Here are they that keep the commandments of God,*" etc.

THE time is coming, and now is, when the people shall hear the message of God, "Saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." In obedience to that message from God, the test will be as strict as was that in the day of Elijah; and the question for decision will be, "If the Lord be God, follow him;" but if the Church of Rome, then follow her. If the authority of God be binding, obey him; but if the authority of the papal church be binding, then obey her. If the commandment of God should be kept, which says, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath," then keep it; but if the commandment of the Romish Church should be kept, which says we must observe Sunday "*instead of the Sabbath,*" then keep it. And thus it must be decided whether we will "worship Him that made the Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters;" or whether we will "worship the beast and his image."

THUS we find another parallel in the experience of Elijah and of those who must be translated as was he. In the next lesson we shall see another.

A. T. J.

**August 13, 1885**

**"The Assyrian Empire. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 31 ,  
pp. 484, 485.**

IN the years 731 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser again overran Babylonia, and in 729 B.C. offered sacrifices to the Babylonian gods in Babylon and all the principal cities. He was succeeded B.C. 727 by Shalmaneser IV., having re-established the power of Assyria throughout Syria, Palestine, and Phúnicia, to the borders of Egypt.

Shalmaneser reigned six years. his most important act was his invasion of Israel and siege of Samaria. 2 Kings 17:3-6; 18:9-12. He was succeeded by 722 B.C., by Sargon.

Sargon warred successively in Susiana (Elam), in Syria, in Armenia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kurdistan, Media, and Babylonia. About 711 B.C., he took Ashdod (Isa. 20:1), and went on from there and invaded Egypt and subdued Ethiopia. Isa. 20:3-5. Having completely reduced Syria, humiliated Egypt, and struck terror into the tribes of the north and east, he determined on a great expedition against Babylon. About the same year that Sargon took his seat on the Assyrian throne, Merodach-Baladan took possession of Babylon and established his authority there as king. While Sargon was engaged in his Syrian and Egyptian wars, Merodach-Baladan held undisputed sway in Babylon, but in his twelfth year, which was Sargon's twelfth year also, Sargon, as stated above, made his great expedition into that country. Merodach-Baladan, however, did not even await the invader, but left Babylon and fled to his own former city, Beth-Yakin, on the coast of the Persian Gulf, near the mouth of the Euphrates. There Sargon attacked him, defeated his army, and drove the troops into their own dyke, in which many of them were drowned. Merodach-Baladan took refuge within the walls of the city, which Sargon besieged, took, plundered, and burnt, and took Merodach-Baladan prisoner, and carried him captive into Assyria.

"The power of Babylon was broken. Henceforth the Assyrian rule is maintained over the whole of Chaldea and Babylonia, with few and brief interruptions, to the close of the [Assyrian] empire. The reluctant victim struggles in his captor's grasp, and now and then for a short space shakes it off, but it is only to be seized again with the firmer gripe, until at length his struggles cease, and he resigns himself to a fate which he has come to regard as inevitable."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Second Monarchy, chap. 9, par. 149.*

"Indeed, it may be said that from the invasion of Tiglath-Pileser to the revolt of Nabopolassar, Babylonia ceased to have any separate existence. It was governed by Assyrian kings, or the viceroys they appointed, and the only attempts to recover independence were made under the leadership of the Chaldean chiefs. It becomes nothing more than an important province of Assyria."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Babylonia and Assyria, par. 9.*

In B.C. 705, Sargon was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, "the greatest of all the Assyrian monarchs." This was the Sennacherib of whom so much is said

in the Bible. He reigned twenty-four years. About the time of his accession, Merodach-Baladan escaped from his Assyrian prison, and fled to Babylon, and again assumed the title of king, but Sennacherib soon followed, and overran the country, and Merodach-Baladan escaped into Susiana. About B.C. 700 Merodach-Baladan returned to Babylon, and, in conjunction with a certain Susub, again organized a revolt. Sennacherib again proceeded to Babylon, and again Merodach-Baladan fled, this time to an island in the Persian Gulf, and abandoned to Sennacherib's mercy his brothers and all of his partisans. After this he is never heard of more. Babylon was captured, burnt, and ruined by Sennacherib, and its inhabitants sold into slavery.

Sennacherib was succeeded in B.C. 681 to 680, by his son Esar-haddon (Isa. 37:38). To prevent the revolts that were so frequent in Babylonia, Esar-haddon determined to rebuild Babylon and make it the second capital of his empire. Accordingly he restored many of the people who had been carried away, brought back the captured gods, rebuilt the walls and temples, built a house for his son, and a palace for himself. And this is why it was that when the "captains of the host of the king of Assyria" had taken Manasseh of Judah captive, they "carried him to *Babylon*." The king of Assyria was at Babylon, and the "captains of the host must carry that captive king to the king of Assyria, who was at Babylon, and Esar-haddon was this "king of Assyria" to whom Manasseh was carried (2 Chron. 32:11). In the reign of no other king of Assyria, except *perhaps* Esar-haddon's son, would a captive have been carried to *Babylon*.

Esar-haddon was succeeded by his son Asshur-bani-pal, in the year 668 B.C. Asshur-bani-pal was the "grand monarch" of the grand empire of Assyria. "In his reign and Assyrian dominions reached their greatest extent," and Assyrian art reached its highest development. Then it was that the Assyrian stood in the grandeur and glory, afterward described by the prophet of God:—

"Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs. The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth. All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations. Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches; for his root was by great waters. The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him; the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chestnut trees were not like his branches; nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty. I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches: so that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." Eze. 31:3-9.

"In the middle part of this prince's reign, Assyria was paramount over the portion of western Asia included between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Halys on the one hand, and the Caspian Sea and the great Persian Desert on the other.

Southwards the boundary was formed by Arabia and the Persian Gulf; northwards . . . it did not extend so far as the northern frontier of Armenia. Besides her Asiatic dominions, Assyria possessed also at this time a portion of Africa, her authority being acknowledged as far as the latitude of Thebes. The countries included within the limits thus indicated, and subject, during the period in question, to Assyrian influence, were chiefly the following, Susiana, Chaldea, Babylonia, Media, Matiene or the Zagros Range, Mesopotamia; parts of Armenia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia; Syria, Phenicia, Palestine, Idumea, a portion of Arabia, and almost the whole of Egypt."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Second Monarchy, chap. 9, par. 252*, (ninth from the end). See also *Labberton's Historical Atlas, Map 3*.

Asshur-bani-pal reigned forty-two years, till about 636 B.C. He was succeeded by his son Bel-zakir-iskun, who soon found his empire threatened on three sides—Media, Babylonia, and Egypt. Media was now organized into a powerful monarchy under Phraortes, and advanced upon Assyria from the east; Babylonia threw off the Assyrian yoke; and Psammeticus of Egypt invaded the Assyrian dominions on the west and laid siege to Ashdod. This danger to his empire was promptly met by Bel-zakir-iskun. He immediately raised two armies, one of which he placed under the command of Nabopolassar (Nabu-pal-usur), and sent it to subdue the revolted Babylonia; the other he, in person, led to meet the coming forces of Media. Nabopolassar so effectually performed his appointed service as to merit and receive from his sovereign the honorable title of "King of Babylon." Bel-zakir-iskun met the Medes, . . . them back, and pursued them into their own country, where he finally brought them to bay in the plain of Rhages, and inflicted upon them a crushing defeat, in which the Median king was slain.

Phraortes, however, was immediately succeeded by his son Cyaxeres, who continued the war and finally succeeded in driving the king of Assyria out of Media, and in his turn invaded Assyria, and threatened a siege of Nineveh, but was just then recalled to his own country by the ravages of barbarians from the north. As the barbarians of Germany afterward poured down upon the Roman Empire, so now the barbarous Scythian hordes poured into Media. "On they came . . . like a flight of locusts, countless, irresistible—swarming into Iberia and Upper Media—finding before them a garden, and leaving it behind them a howling wilderness." Cyaxeres met them, was defeated, and was compelled to make terms with the invaders, and to pay an annual tribute.

But the Scythians did not confine themselves to Media. They swept down through the passes of the Zagros Mountains into Assyria. "The tide swept on. Wandering from district to district, plundering everywhere, settling nowhere, the clouds of horse passed over Mesopotamia, the force of the invasion becoming weaker as it spread itself, until in Syria it reached its term through the policy of the Egyptian king, Psammeticus." "Psammeticus went out and met those barbarians, and by rich presents tempted them to turn aside and not invade Egypt." The power of the Scythians continued about fourteen years, when finally

Cyaxeres invited all the chiefs to a banquet, got them all drunk, put them all to death, and then succeeded in driving their hordes back into Scythia.

During these years Bel-zakir-iskun died, and was succeeded by Asshur-emid-ilin, the Saracus of the Greek writers. Assyria had been greatly weakened by the invasion of the Scyths; more so, indeed, than had Media; and immediately enemies rose up on all sides. Nabopolassar, who had now for about fifteen years been consolidating and strengthening his power at Babylon, determined to possess that province, in his own right. To make success certain, he entered into an alliance with Necho, king of Egypt, who in 612 B.C. had succeeded Psammeticus, then, by virtue of this alliance, sent an embassy to Cyaxeres of Media, asking him to join in a triple alliance, and all together attack the Assyrian Empire.

The king of Media was only too glad of such a golden opportunity to complete the enterprise from which he had been turned by the Schthic invasion, and, without a moment's delay, accepted the proposition. And to more closely bind the alliance, the king of Media gave, in marriage, his daughter Amyitis to Nebbuchadnezzar the son of Nabopolassar. In the year 610 B.C., these united powers invaded Assyria. Necho came out of Egypt, hurrying on to join the other powers (2 Kings 23:29; 2 Chron. 35:20, 21), when Josiah king of Judah went out to stop him. Josiah was slain, his army defeated, and Necho pushed on to the Euphrates, laid siege to Carchemish (2 Chron. 35:20), an Assyrian fortress, the center of a province, and the link that connected Assyria and Syria. He captured Carchemish, and occupied it with his army, thus at one stroke severing all the Assyrian territory west of the Euphrates. Necho fixed his headquarters "at Ribin in the land of Hamath," and exercised his power as suzerain

485

ever the kingdom of Judah and the provinces round about. 2 Kings 23:33-35.

Nabopolassar and Cyaxeres both went up against the king of Assyria himself, and besieged Nineveh. Saracus, after exhausting every means of resistance, burned himself in his palace, and Nineveh was destroyed.

Thus perished forever, the Assyrian Empire, after an independency of more than a thousand years, and an ascendancy of about six hundred and ninety years.

There followed a division of the territories that had formed the Assyrian Empire. West of the Euphrates fell to Necho; the northern mountainous region was annexed to Media; and all the rest was held by Nabopolassar as king of Babylon. And so arose the kingdom of Babylon of the Bible.

A. T. J.

NOTE.—The authority which we have mainly followed in this sketch of the Assyrian Empire, is, "The Seven Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World," by Canon Rawlinson. In connection with this, we have consulted the "Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth edition; "The Ancient Empires of the East," by Prof. A. H. Sayce; "Ancient History of the East," by Lenormant and Chevallier; and "Ancient History from the Monuments, Assyria," by Mr. George Smith, of the British Museum; especially have we followed Mr. Smith in the *order* of events from the

death of Asshur-bani-pal to the division of the empire among the allied conquerors.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 18:30-46. 'The Lord, He Is the God'" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 31 , pp. 486, 487.**

AUGUST 16–1 KINGS 18:30-46

IT will be remembered that the lesson for last week was upon the scene of Elijah's calling all Israel to the point of decision between the Lord and Baal; how that all Israel, and the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, came to him at Mount Carmel, and there the test was to be made, by which the people should decide as to whom they would follow. The prophets of Baal prophesied from morning till noon, "But there was no voice nor any that answered." Then they cried louder and "cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets till the blood gushed out upon them" till the time of the evening sacrifice (about three o'clock), but still "there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded."

THEN "Elijah said unto all the people, Come near unto me. And all the people came near." Then he repaired the altar of the Lord, that had been broken down, and took "twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob;" with these he built the altar of the Lord; then prepared his sacrifice and commanded water to be brought and poured upon the sacrifice and the altar until it ran over and down and round about the altar and filled the trench that he had caused to be digged.

"AND it came to pass at the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that Elijah the prophet came near, and said, Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again. Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench. And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces; and they said, The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God."

IN last week's lesson we also showed that just before the Lord comes the people will be brought to just such a test upon their obedience to the Lord, in keeping the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, against the decree of Church and State in favor of Sunday, as was Israel against the decree of the ancient Jezebel in favor of Baal; that every man must decide whether he will "worship the beast and his image," or whether he will "worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." We called attention to the fact that there is now a party working for a union of Church and State, for the express purpose of compelling the people to keep Sunday; and that against this the Lord sends a message of warning, and also calls upon all men to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

WHEN the people all gathered before Elijah, they seemed to be wavering. It seems that they could not make up their minds what they should do. Although the narrative is very brief, it is plain that the attention of all the people had been called to the conflict that was going on between Jezebel and the prophets of the Lord, between Baal and Jehovah.

For (1) Jezebel had cut off all the prophets

487

of the Lord that she could find, and those who escaped were obliged to take refuge in caves, and there were 7,000 persons scattered throughout Israel who had not worshiped Baal. It is impossible that all this could have been carried on without the attention of all Israel being called to this great subject.

(2) Ahab had made such a diligent search for Elijah that it was impossible that the subject of controversy could have been hidden, for when Obadiah finally met Elijah, he said: "There is *no nation or kingdom*, whither my lord [Ahab] hath not sent to seek thee; and when they said, He is not here; *he took an oath of the kingdom* and nation, that they found thee not." 1 Kings 18:10.

(3) The prophets of Baal were working in the interest of Baal, throughout the nation of Israel; for when Elijah did show himself to Ahab and gave the challenge and told him to gather Israel and the prophets together, we read: "So Ahab sent unto all the children of Israel, and gathered the prophets together unto Mount Carmel." Of these there were four hundred and fifty, and of the prophets of Ashera, the female companion of Baal, there were four hundred. From all these things it is plain that this thing "was not done in a corner;" and we may safely conclude that the subject had been thoroughly discussed by all Israel.

This is further shown by the very first words that Elijah spake to the people, when they had assembled. Said he, "How long halt ye *between two opinions!*" It is plain therefore that the people were acquainted with the two views of the subject, although there was hesitancy in decidedly adopting either.

ON the one side was Jehovah, who had brought their fathers out of Egypt; who had planted them in Canaan, who had been with Samuel, and Gideon, and Barak, and Jephtha; who had led the host of Israel round Jericho, and had thrown down its walls; who had caused the waters of Jordan to stand still while Israel passed over; who had led them through the wilderness, and had fed them with bread from heaven, even with angels' food (Ps. 78:25); the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel; the Creator of heaven and earth; the lover of a world of sinners. On the other side was Baal, the embodiment of shame, with the wicked, licentious, cruel, shameful Jezebel as his grand patron, and the promoter of his worship.

OH! how were it *possible* for there to be "two opinions"? How *could* it be that they would not only recognize "two opinions," but actually "halt"—hesitate—between them? Was it because they were worse than any other people that have ever been? Not at all. It was simply because they were human. Let us see for a moment what there was to draw them toward Baal.

FIRST of all. Baal worship was *fashionable*, it was popular. Remember that Baal-worship was sun-worship. It was just as fashionable, just as popular, then to worship Baal as it now is to keep Sunday. The king, the queen, the court, the

rich, the powerful, the mighty, all worshiped Baal; and after these all the middle classes, and all the common people, all, all were for Baal—except only seven thousand out of all the multitudes of Israel. There were a few scattered here and there throughout the nation who refused to accept anything as worthy of an opinion but that the Lord was God, and that his commandments were yea and amen and must be obeyed, and these were held as fanatics.

THEN, too, a person could not prosper at all, unless he worshiped Baal. All the patronage and all the power of the kingdom with the queen at the head, was exerted in favor of Baal. So much so indeed was this, that it was even dangerous *not* to follow the way of Jezebel and Baal. It was at the risk of life itself that the faithful seven thousand served the Lord. More than this, when by all these considerations they were induced to forsake their duty to God and their respect for his commandments, the restraints of conscience and the law of God were loosed, for Baal demanded nothing of this kind. No self-denial was ever asked of the worshipers of Baal; no pleasure, be it what it would, was ever denied to the followers of Baal.

THEN, it was just as fashionable to go to a feast in the house of Baal, as it now is to go to a festival in the house of the Lord. Then it was just as honorable to bow the knee to Baal in the house of Baal, as it now is to gamble in the house of the Lord. Then it was just as entirely proper to offer the young women to the highest bidder, in the temple of Baal, as it now is to put them up and sell them at auction, or sell their kisses, to the highest bidder, in the house of the Lord. And then, for the servant of the Lord to reprove those, was to make himself as unpopular, and as much of a troubler of Israel, as it now is to reprove these. Then, it was counted just as stubborn fanaticism to acknowledge Jehovah in the first commandment, as it now is to acknowledge Jehovah in the fourth commandment.

AND this fashionableness, and popularity, and worldly honor, and worldly advantage, and abundance of pleasures, were what caused the people then to halt between two opinions as to whether they would follow the Lord or follow Baal, just as it now causes people to halt between two opinions as to whether they will keep the Sabbath of the Lord, or keep the Sunday of the papal church.

"HOW LONG halt ye between two opinions?" If the Bible says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," keep it, but if the Bible says that the first day of is the Sabbath of the Lord, then keep that. What matters it though four hundred and fifty prophets, with the second Jezebel (Rev. 2:20) at their head, all say that Sunday—the first day—is the Sabbath; until they point to a verse in the word of God that says plainly, The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord—until then their word on that subject is no more to be taken as the truth than was the word of the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal that Baal was God.

THERE is no disguising the fact that this Sabbath question is fast gaining the lead of all public questions. The great multitude, as governments, and as nations, are rapidly wheeling into line in support of the claim that Sunday is the Sabbath and must be so kept under penalty of law. There are a few, a little company, who, in opposition to this, maintain that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and must be so observed. And this question, as to which day is the Sabbath, is

not left for our decision, any more than the question as to who was the true God was left to theirs in the day of Elijah. The Lord himself has decided this question as well as that. And after the manner of Elijah we say to all. Write these two questions, 1. Is the seventh day the Sabbath? 2. Is the first day the Sabbath? Then which ever one that the word of God in the Bible says is the Sabbath, let that day be the Sabbath. And that holy word answers, with no uncertain sound, to every man in the wide world, "*The seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy day*; and call the Sabbath a *delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable*; and shalt *honor him*, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; *for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.*" Isa. 58:13, 14.

A. T. J.

**August 20, 1885**

**"The Babylonian Empire" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 32 , pp. 500, 501.**

WE have seen how the destruction of the Assyrian Empire was accomplished, and how that empire was divided among the three allied powers,—Media, Babylonia, and Egypt, and their kings, Cyaxeres, Nabopolassar, and Necho. The marriage of Nebuchadnezzar, the son of the king of Babylon, to Amyitis, the daughter of the king of Media, firmly bound and faithfully maintained the alliance between these two powers.

But there was nothing of this kind to favor the king of Egypt. Necho was not left very long to enjoy the portion that pertained to him in the partition of the empire. As we have related, this triple alliance was formed and the invasion of Assyria was begun about the year 610 B.C. The march to Nineveh, the siege, and the settlement of the division of the empire, seem to have occupied about two years. Thus for three full years, to B.C. 607, Necho was left undisturbed in his possessions from the Euphrates, westward. In the year 607 B.C., Nabopolassar associated Nebuchadnezzar with himself, as king, on the Babylonian throne. Then it was decided to add the possessions of Necho to the Babylonian dominions. Accordingly, the same year Nebuchadnezzar marched out of Babylon against Necho. At the crossing of the Euphrates at Carchemish, he found the Egyptian army drawn up to meet him. A great battle was fought, which was utterly disastrous to the Egyptians, who "fled away" in confusion.

"Nebuchadnezzar closely pursued his adversary as far as the frontier of Egypt; but having learned, whilst before Pelusium, that his father was dead (604), he retraced his steps to take possession of a throne that, so recently established, might be shaken by a change of things. Under these circumstances, says Berosus, the

Babylonian historian, he put the affairs of Egypt, Syria, and the adjacent countries, in order; and leaving in charge of his trusted generals the numerous prisoners he had taken, as well as the command of the garrisons left in the conquered provinces, he departed with a small escort, crossed the desert by forced marches, and thus arrived speedily at Babylon, where the chief of the caste of the Chaldeans resigned into his hands the government he had administered since the death of Nabopolassar."—*Ancient History of the East, book 4, chap. 5, sec. 2, last par.*

Then says the graphic writer of the Kings:—

"The king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the River Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt." 2 Kings 24:7.

With reference to the Babylonian Empire, as an *empire*, it may fairly be said that Nebuchadnezzar was its real founder, for all the conquests that were ever made by the Babylonians after the establishment of their independence upon the destruction of the Assyrian Empire, were made by Nebuchadnezzar, even while his father lived. Yet, because of the establishment of that independence by Nabopolassar, the history of that kingdom which grew into the Babylonian Empire, properly enough begins with him. However, when the Assyrian Empire fell, and the allied kings made the division of its territory, Nabopolassar did not date the beginning of his reign from the year of that division, 610 B.C.; but he dated it from the year that Bel-zakir-iskun, king of Assyria, bestowed upon him the title of "King of Babylon," as his reward for bringing again into subjection that revolted province. So that the beginning of the history of the kingdom of Babylon of the Bible and of Nebuchadnezzar is in the year 625 before Christ.—See "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Monarchy, chap. 8, par. 1; "Ancient History of the East," book 4, chap. 3, sec. 5; "Ancient Empires of the East," chap. 2, par. 43.

And thus we are brought to the establishment of the kingdom of Babylon of the Bible, and to the accession of Nebuchadnezzar as ruler of that kingdom.

Just here another most important personage comes into notice. In that same expedition against Necho, which we have already sketched, Nebuchadnezzar besieged, at Jerusalem, Jehoiakim, whom Necho had made king of Judah. 2 Kings 23:34; 24:1; Dan. 1:1. Nebuchadnezzar took the city, and "Jehoiakim became his servant." Nebuchadnezzar also took "part of the vessels of the house of God," and "certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes," and had them carried to Babylon in 607 B.C. Among the captives that were carried to Babylon from this expedition was DANIEL, who was soon raised by the Lord to the dignity of a prophet of God; and by the king to that of ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon; and upon the illustration of whose sublime prophecies we are now to enter.

Of the prophecies of Daniel, the Son of God said, "*Whoso readeth, let him understand.*" Matt. 24:15.

In the very first verse of the book of Daniel, is introduced Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. Then it is related how he took Jerusalem and carried some of

the people captive to Babylon, and how that certain ones of these who were "well favored" were chosen, whom they might teach the learning of the Chaldeans. In the first verse of the second chapter it is said that "Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him;" and in verse twenty-eight, same chapter, we find Daniel declaring to the king that "There is a God in Heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the King Nebuchadnezzar *what shall be in the latter days.*"

That which troubled the king, in connection with his dream, was that he could not recall what he had seen. And of all the real or reputed "wise men" of Babylon, none but Daniel, and he only by being shown it in a night vision, could bring it again to his mind. But when Daniel related the dream, the description was so accurate that Nebuchadnezzar immediately recognized it to the full. Daniel said:—

"Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Dan. 2:31-35.

As we have seen, Daniel had told the king that, in this, God was making known to this king what shall be "in the latter days." He therefore immediately proceeded to tell the king the meaning of all this. He said:—

"This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." Verses 36-38.

There is a passage in Jeremiah that corresponds with this and explains it somewhat more fully:—

"In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah came this word unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus saith the Lord to me; Make thee bonds and yokes, and put them upon thy neck, and send them to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which come to Jerusalem unto Zedekiah king of Judah; and command them to say unto their masters, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Thus shall ye say unto your masters; I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him." Jer. 27:1-6.

When Nebuchadnezzar first took Jerusalem, in his expedition against Necho, Jehoiakim served him three years and then he turned and rebelled against him. Nebuchadnezzar returned and again besieged the city, took it, and bound Jehoiakim in fetters and carried him to Babylon, and made Jehoiachin king in his stead. Jehoiachin soon rebelled, and Nebuchadnezzar was compelled to again come against Jerusalem. This time he stripped the temple of the Lord of all its gold and all its treasures, and carried away to Babylon Jehoiachin and all his court, and 10,000 of the people, leaving only "the poorest sort of the people of the land," and made Zedekiah king in Jerusalem. Zedekiah served the king of Babylon eight years and then rebelled. In the ninth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar again laid siege of Jerusalem. After a siege of a year and a half the city was taken, and the temple and all the great men's houses were burned with fire, the walls of Jerusalem were broken down "round about," and Zedekiah, with many more of the people, was carried to Babylon, and Gedaliah was made governor over the very few poor people that were left in the land. In about two months came Ishmael, and ten men with him, and murdered Gedaliah, "And all the people, both small and great, and the captains of the armies, arose, and came to Egypt; for they were afraid of the Chaldees." See 2 Kings 24 and 25; 2 Chron. 36; Jer. 52.

Uphrabet, the Pharaoh-hophra of Jer. 44:30, was at this time king of Egypt. He received ambassadors from Zedekiah, and sent an army to help him in his rebellion against Nebuchadnezzar (Eze. 17:15, 17; Jer. 37:1-10; 39:1-10). Uphrabet was defeated, however, but he had done enough to incur the severe displeasure of the king of Babylon, and then when he received and harbored the murderers of Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had made governor, his insolence could be borne no longer, and Nebuchadnezzar desolated Egypt.

"The haughty king of Babylon was not yet satisfied; he aspired to the conquest of Phúnecia, coveting its immense riches. For a long time, too, the grand utterances of the prophets had announced to the people of Tyre, now in the sixth century of their supremacy over other cities, the misfortunes impending over them. 'Behold,' said Ezekiel, 'I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people. He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field; and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee. And he shall set engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers.' Eze. 26:7-9.

"The Tyrians resisted for a long time, with the constancy and obstinacy they had already

shown against Sargon, and the siege of their city lasted thirteen years. But at last Tyre was carried by assault, by the king of Babylon in person (574), who treated the Tyrians as he had the Jews, and carried in Chaldea the most distinguished families of the country. The colonies Tyre than possessed on the northern coast of Africa and in Spain, such as Carthage, not yet independent, and Gades (now Cadiz), recognized the suzerainty of the conqueror of the mother country. . . . Tyre once taken, Nebuchadnezzar, before returning to Babylon, attacked the

people of Idumea, Moab, and Ammon, who had associated themselves with the last Jewish attempt at revolt, and compelled them to submission. He made also a campaign in Arabia, passed victoriously through Hedjaz, and Nedjid, and penetrated as far as the Sabean kingdom of Yemen. These wars, predicted by the prophets, terminated the series of Chaldean conquests in Western Asia."—*Ancient History of the East, book 4, chap. 5, sec. 3, par. 5, 6.* A. T. J.

(To be concluded next week.)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 19:1-18. 'What Doest Thou Here?'" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 32 , pp. 502, 503.**

AUGUST 23—1 KINGS 19:1-18

AFTER the scene on Mount Carmel, which was the subject of last week's lesson, Ahab went and told Jezebel all that had been done, and how that the prophets of Baal had been slain. "The Jezebel sent a messenger unto Elijah, saying, So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to-morrow about this time. And when he saw that, he arose, and went for his life, and came to Beersheba, which belongeth to Judah, and left his servant there."

"BUT he himself went a day's journey into the wilderness, and came and sat down under a juniper tree; and he requested for himself that he might die; and said, It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life; for I am not better than my fathers. And as he lay and slept under a juniper tree, behold, then an angel touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat. And he looked, and, behold, there was a cake baken on the coals, and a cruse of water at his head. And he did eat and drink, and laid him down again. And the angel of the Lord came again the second time, and touched him, and said, Arise and eat; because the journey is too great for thee. And he arose, and did eat and drink, and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights unto Horeb the mount of God."

THUS Elijah was compelled to flee for his life because of his faithfulness to the Lord and in the defense of his commandments. Remember, that with the exception of the rain of that same day, there had been no rain for three years and a half, and all the vegetation had dried up, as was shown in the lesson of August 2. And into this waste, desolate wilderness Elijah was compelled to flee for his life, and when he had gone a whole day's journey, "he came and sat down under a juniper tree, and requested for himself that he might die."

BUT what a singular reason it was that he gave for wanting the Lord to take away his life, "O Lord, take away my life; *for I am not better than my fathers.*" Nowadays, in a great many, indeed in most, instances it seems

503

to be considered the very pink of perfection to be no better than our fathers were. Just as soon as the duty of keeping the Sabbath of the Lord is urged upon the people, then the plea arises, "Our fathers, for generations back, all kept Sunday, and they were good people and accepted of the Lord, and if we are as good as

they were we shall be all right; if they are saved we shall be; if I can be as good as they were that is all I want."

ELIJAH reasoned not so. He had a better idea of the principles of righteousness, of duty, and of allegiance to God, than to offer any such beg-off as that. So has everybody a better idea of consistency than to reason so upon any subject of minor, or even common, importance. No person refuses to ride in a palace car because our fathers had nothing better than a lumbering stage-coach. No person refuses to ride on a steamer because our fathers never saw one. So likewise it is with all advancement in science, art, and human knowledge. Instead of refusing it men take every advantage of it, and try by all means to profit by it. And the man who makes a new discovery in the field of science, of philosophy, or of exploration of a continent, it matters not though his discovery of a continent, it matters not though his discovery upsets all the accepted theories of men, if his discovery bears the test of the truth in the field to which it belongs, men readily accept it, and the discoverer is honored, and rightly so, as a benefactor of his race in that he has enlarged the view, and added to the sum, of human knowledge.

THIS when the matter relates to things of this world. But when the subject is one that concerns the eternal destiny of men; when it is discovered by some one that in matters of faith and morals, men are wrong; then when the way of truth is pointed out, even though it bear every test of truth known to the Bible, that man is held up as a heretic, a propagandist, a troubler of Israel, an exciter of divisions among the people; then, a question upon which hang eternal interests, is calmly put aside with the observations that "Our fathers knew nothing of this, therefore it is of no interest to us; our fathers did not find it out, therefore it cannot be the truth; what matters it, though the Bible does say it is the truth, as it was not obeyed by our fathers, we need not obey it; if we are only as good as they, we shall be safe."

BUT let all such know that our fathers, who were good, did all that they knew, and were accepted of the Lord, in it. "For *if there be first a willing mind*, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." 2 Cor. 8:12. And unless we do all that we know, or all that we may know, we are *not* as good as they were. Therefore it is plain that we cannot be as good as our godly fathers were by simply doing what they did. To be accepted of the Lord they had to do all that they knew; to be accepted of the Lord, we likewise must do all that we know. And if in the advancing work of God in the world, points of truth, of which our fathers knew nothing, shine forth from the word of God, we must accept them, walk in the light of them, and live according to them, to be accepted of the Lord in this our day as our fathers were in theirs. "While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light." John 12:36. "And the law [of God] is light." Prov. 6:23.

AS Elijah, away in the wilderness alone, lay and slept under that juniper tree, "Behold, then an angel touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat. And he looked, and, behold there was a cake baken on the coals, and a cruse of water at his head." Although the bitter Jezebel was seeking for his life, and though to escape her wrath, he has fled into the wilderness where he has neither food nor

water, yet an angel visits him, and he has the blessed privilege of eating food from an angel's hand. Blessed privilege, even though it be only bread and water. Bread and water, in the desolation of the desert, from the hand of an angel, is infinitely better than the richest dainties, in the luxury of kings' palaces, from the hand of a Jezebel.

ELIJAH laid him down again and slept, "And the angel of the Lord came again the second time, and touched him, and said, Arise and eat; because the journey is too great for thee." He did eat and drink and "went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights unto Horeb the mount of God." There the word of the Lord came to him, and he said unto him, What doest thou here, Elijah? "And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away."

WE have shown, in previous lessons, the contest that there is to be between the beast and his image and those who keep the commandments of God, just before the coming of the Lord. We have referred to the National Reform Party, and its work of forming a union of Church and State in the Government of the United States, for the sole purpose of compelling all people to keep Sunday, in violation of the commandment of God. We have shown that, in opposition to this, God sends a message calling upon all to "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." And when this union of Church and State is accomplished, that will be an image to the beast—the papal church. And from this history of all such unions, we may know what will be the evitable result—*persecution* of dissenters.

WE are not left, however, to infer from what has been, what will be; the word of God tells us plainly what will be the result of such an action. The word says: "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. . . . And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Rev. 13:15-17. Then it will be with these who keep the commandments of God, as it was with Elijah, the representative of these. The new Jezebel then swaying the power of the Government, will seek their lives, to take them away. Then these will have to flee, as Elijah did, and they, as he did, will find drought in all the land, and "the rivers of water dried up," and all the pastures of the wilderness dried up. Joel 1:14-20:2.

YES, and these too will find, amidst the desolation, as Elijah did, that "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways." Ps. 91:11. These too, as Elijah did, will find even in the desolate wilderness that their "place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks," that bread shall be given them, and their waters shall be sure; that their eyes too, as his did, "shall see the King in his beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off." Isa. 33:16, 17. And when found thus fleeing for their lives, if asked as was Elijah, "What doest thou here?" they can reply as he did. "I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant. . . . and they seek my life, to take it away." But even though the new Jezebel shall seek to take away the lives

of those who keep the commandments of God, yet the holy prophet says, "I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and *them that had gotten the victory* over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, *stand on the sea of glass*, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2.

THE Lord calls, now, for those who will be "very jealous for the Lord God of hosts." He calls for those who will jealously regard his commandments, even at the expense of every earthly thing. He seeks now for those who will "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," against all earthly powers. What doest thou here? Are you very jealous for the Lord God of hosts?

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 1 Kings 21:4-19. The Story of Naboth" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 32 , pp. 503, 510.**

**INTERNATIONAL AUG. 30-1 KINGS 21:4-19**

AT Jezreel, about twenty-five miles from Samaria, Ahab had a palace. Hard by this palace was a vineyard belonging to Naboth. And Ahab said to Naboth, "Give me thy vineyard, that I may have it for a garden of herbs, because it is near unto my house; and I will give thee for it a better vineyard than it; or, if it seem good to thee, I will give thee the worth of it in money. And Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee."

THE Lord had given commandment that the land should not be sold forever. "And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land." Lev. 25:25. "So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe; for every one of the children of Israel shall keep himself to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers." Num. 36:7. Naboth simply proposed to obey the word of the Lord, and so told Ahab that he could not have his land. But even though the Lord had given no directions on the subject, it was clearly the right of Naboth to refuse to sell his land for the private purposes of the king. For if he had no right to refuse to sell, he had no rights at all in the matter, and was thus placed subject to the mere whim of the king. And if he was obliged to so yield to the wish of Ahab, even though Ahab had given him a better vineyard, what assurance was there that he would not shortly have to give up that vineyard at the wish of the king, as he had given this at the first. Not only by the word of God, but by every principle of justice and right, Naboth was in the right and Ahab in the wrong.

FREDERICK THE GREAT once wanted, for a part of his garden, an adjoining piece of ground upon which a wind-mill stood. He sent an agent to buy the ground and the mill. The miller sturdily refused to sell it. At last the agent said, "Not at any price? Could not the king take it from you for nothing if he chose?" The miller replied, "Have we not the Kammergericht [the Imperial Chamber of Justice] at Berlin?" That was as much as to say that, though Frederick wanted the grounds for his own private use, yet if he attempted to take them by force, the miller would appeal to him as king, and that, in justice to his subject, Frederick as king would not allow Frederick as a private person, to take the land against the

wish of the owner. Frederick was wonderfully pleased at the answer of the lowly miller, and "Have we not the Kammergericht at Berlin," became a popular saying in Germany.

BUT Ahab was not a Frederick. "Ahab came into his house heavy and displeased because of the word which Naboth the Jezreelite had spoken to him. . . . And he laid him down upon his bed, and turned away his face, and would eat no bread." Throughout Ahab's whole career he appears as capricious as a spoiled child, with yet this shortcoming that he had no force of character even in his caprices, but was always ready to be ruled by whatever

*(Continued on page 510.)*

*(Continued from page 503.)*

influence affected him at the moment. First he took to wife Jezebel, the very embodiment of imperious infamy; then he allowed her to stir him up to commit more iniquity than all the kings of Israel before him; then, when because of his wickedness Elijah pronounced to him the judgment of the Lord, in drought upon the land for three years and a half, there was not nation or kingdom round about that he did not send to in search of Elijah; and when Elijah finally came to meet him and denounced him to his face, all he did was to simply go, in obedience to Elijah's command, to gather together all Israel and the prophets of Baal to Mount Carmel. Then, when the contest had been decided at Mount Carmel, instead of firmly taking a stand on the side of the Lord, he simply went and told Jezebel all that had happened, and let her exert herself anew in behalf of Baal. And now in this instance with Naboth, because he can't have that vineyard he must go to bed and refuse to eat anything!

JEZEBEL, however, had enough self-assertion for ten men, and a regiment of women. She can tell in a minute what to do—she will murder Naboth and his family so that there shall be no heirs, and take everything that he has. All this will she do and be merry about it. "I will give thee the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite." And she did. And then, as might be expected, just as soon as she came telling him that Naboth was dead, this weak, wicked, and wickedly weak king "rose up to go down to the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite to take possession of it."

"AND the word of the Lord came to Elijah the Tishbite, saying, Arise, go down to meet Ahab . . . behold, he is in the vineyard of Naboth wither he is gone down to possess it." And there as Ahab stands with satisfaction contemplating his new possession, suddenly there strikes upon his ear a voice, as thunder out of clear sky, exclaiming, "Hast thou killed, and also taken possession?" Ahab cries out, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" The stern reply is, "I *have* found thee; because thou hast sold thyself to work evil in the sight of the Lord." "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." "The dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel. Him that dieth of Ahab in the city the dogs shall eat; and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat."

IT is very natural for those who have sold themselves to do evil to count as their enemies those who reprove them and point out their sins. But there is no escape. It may long be delayed, but, sooner or later, "Be sure your sin will find you out." And it is vastly better for us to find out our sins, and put them away, than at last to have them find us out, when it is too late to put them away.

AHAB'S covetousness ended in murder and robbery. "Take heed, and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Luke 12:15. "Thou shalt not covet." Covetousness is the leading sin in the transgression of any commandment of the decalogue. Not one of the commandments can be broken but that covetousness leads in the transgression. Covetousness itself is idolatry (Eph. 5:5; Col. 3:5), and covetousness in all its forms is summed up in one word—*selfishness*. May we all remember the Saviour's warning, "Take heed, and beware of covetousness." And may we, with David, ever pray, "Incline my heart unto thy testimonies, and not to covetousness." Ps. 119:36.

A. T. J.

**August 27, 1885**

**"The Babylonian Empire. (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 33 , p. 516.**

WE have seen that Nebuchadnezzar's conquests comprised all the countries westward to Asia Minor and the Mediterranean, with Egypt and Arabia. Eastward his dominion extended over all of Susiana (Elam); a part, at least, of Persia; and by the marriage of Nebuchadnezzar to the daughter of Cyaxares, and procuring a marriage between Astyages, the son of Cyaxares, and Aryenis, the daughter of the king of Lydia, Nabopolassar had succeeded in binding by blood relationship these three kingdoms—Media, Lydia, and Babylonia—into one, in which his influence, and that of Nebuchadnezzar after him was always paramount.

"By this peace the three great monarchies of the time—the Median, the Lydian, and the Babylonian—were placed on terms not only of amity, but of intimacy, and (if the word may be used) of blood relationship. The crown princes of the three kingdoms had become brothers. From the shores of the Egean to those of the Persian Gulf, Western Asia was not ruled by inter-connected dynasties, bound by treaties to respect each others' rights, and perhaps to lend each other aid in important conjunctures, and animated, it would seem, by a real spirit of mutual friendship and mutual attachment. . . . From the date of the peace between Alyattes and Cyaxares . . . for nearly half a century, the three kingdoms of Media, Lydia, and Babylonia remained fast friends, pursuing their separate courses without quarrel or collision, and thus giving to the nations within their borders a rest and a refreshment which they

must have greatly needed and desired".—*Seven Great Monarchies, Third Man, chap. 6, par. 43.*

As this inter-relationship was brought about altogether, from first to last, by Nabopolassar, so, from first to last, the ascendancy of the Babylonian power was felt in the alliance. And as by the conquest of Tyre the power of Nebuchadnezzar was recognized in all the Tyrian colonies of the Mediterranean as far as to Carthage and even to Cadiz; and as by the conquest of Egypt, Arabia, Moab, Ammon, and all the Phenecian countries, his power was spread from the northern borders of Syria to Ethiopia and the Arabian Desert, and as his rule extended over all of Susiana and a part of Persia; and when it is remembered that this was nearly, if not quite, six hundred years before Christ; it is evident that the Babylonian influence was recognized as far as civilization extended.

As the greatness of the kingdom was all owing to the abilities of Nebuchadnezzar, and as the empire began to decline immediately upon his death, it may properly be said that he was the empire. This will most forcibly appear in the quotations which immediately follow. It is therefore peculiarly appropriate, and expresses the very essence of all the history on the subject, when, in further explanation, Daniel exclaimed:—

"Thou art this head of gold." Dan. 2:32, 38.

"Nebuchadnezzar is the familiar form, transcribed from the Hebrews, of the name of the great Babylonian king who carried the Jews captive, and whose reign marks the highest point of the Chaldean Empire."—*Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Nebuchadnezzar.*

"Nabopolassar was followed in 604 by his son Nebuchadnezzar, whose long reign of forty-three years made Babylon the mistress of the world. *The whole East was overrun by the armies of Chaldea.* Egypt was invaded, and the city of the Euphrates was left without a rival."—*Id., art. Babylonia, eth. And Hist., par. 11.*

"Nebuchadnezzar, Nabopolassar's eldest son, was the *real founder* of the Babylonian Empire. The attempt of Pharaoh Necho to win for Egypt the inheritance of Syria, was overthrown at the battle of Carchemish, and when Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father in B.C. 604, he found himself *the undisputed lord of Western Asia.* . . . Babylon was now enriched with the spoils of foreign conquest. It owed as much to Nebuchadnezzar as Rome owed to Augustus. The buildings and walls with which it was adorned were worthy of the metropolis of the world."—*Sayce's Ancient Empires of the East, chap. 2, par. 44, 45.*

"Nebuchadnezzar rendered himself no less famous by his internal administration than by his foreign conquests. The fortune of war had placed at his disposal immense riches and innumerable captives; he employed both in the works of embellishment and of public utility, which made Babylon the most celebrated city in the world."—*Ancient History of the East, book 4, chap. 5, sec. 3, par. 7.*

"Crowds of captives—the produce of his various wars—Jews, Egyptians, Phenicians, Syrians, Ammonites, Moabites, were settled

in various parts of Mesopotamia, more especially about Babylon. From these unfortunates forced labor was as a matter of course required; and it seems to have been chiefly, if not solely, by these exertions that the magnificent series of great works was accomplished, which formed the special glory of the Fourth Monarchy."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 30.*

"Throughout the empire, at Borsippa, Sippara, Cutha, Chilmad, Duraba, Teredon, and a multitude of other places, he built or rebuilt cities, repaired temples, constructed quays, reservoirs, canals, and aqueducts, on a scale of grandeur and magnificence surpassing everything of the kind recorded in history, unless it be the constructions of one or two of the greatest Egyptian monarchs." "The genius and grandeur which characterized Nebuchadnezzar, and which have handed down his name among the few ancient personages known generally throughout the East, are very apparent in Scripture, and indeed in all accounts of his reign and actions."—*McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, art. Nebuchadnezzar, par. 6, 15.*

"It is enough to note in this place that he was great both in peace and in war, but greater in the former. . . . It was as the adorer and beautifier of his native land—as the builder and restorer or almost all her cities and temples—that this monarch obtained that greatest reputation which has handed down his name traditionally in the East on a par with those of Nimrod, Solomon, and Alexander, and made it still a familiar term in the mouths of the people. Probably no single man ever left behind him as his memorial upon the earth one-half the amount of building that was erected by this king."—*Ib., art., Babylonia History, par. 6.*

"Nebuchadnezzar is the great monarch of the Babylonian Empire, which lasting only eighty-eight years—from B.C. 625 to B.C. 538—was for nearly half the time under his sway. Its military glory is due chiefly to him, while the constructive energy, which constitutes its especial characteristic, belongs to it still more markedly through his character and genius. It is scarcely too much to say that, but for Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonians *would have had no place in history*. At any rate, their actual place is owing *almost entirely to this prince*, who to the military talents of an able general added a grandeur of artistic conception and skill in construction which place him on a par with the greatest builders of antiquity."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth, chap. 8, par. 23.*

"His last days were as brilliant as his first; his sun set in an unclouded glory, shorn of none of the rays that had given splendor to its noonday. Nebuchadnezzar expired at Babylon in the forty-fourth years of his reign, B.C. 561, after an illness of no long

duration. He was probably little short of eight years old at his death."—*Ib.*, par. 38.

Of the propriety of Babylon's being represented in its place in the vision, by the "gold" of the image, the following is an illustration:—

"Babylonia seems to have been the source from which Assyria drew her learning; such as it was, her architecture, the main ideas of her mimetic art, her religious notions, her legal forms, and a vast number of her customs and usages. *But Babylonia herself*, so far as we know, *drew her stores from no foreign country*. Hers was apparently the genius which excogitated an alphabet—worked out the simplest problems of arithmetic—worked out the simplest problems of arithmetic—invented implements for measuring the lapse of time—conceived the idea of raising enormous structures with the poorest of all materials, clay—discovered the art of polishing, boring, and engraving gems—reproduced with truthfulness the outlines of human and animal forms—attained to high perfection in textile fabrics—studied with success the motions of the heavenly bodies—conceived of grammar as a science—elaborated a system of law—saw the value of an exact chronology—in almost every branch of science made a beginning, thus rendering it comparatively easy for other nations to proceed with the superstructure. To Babylonia far more than to Egypt, we owe the art and learning of the Greeks. It was from the East, not from Egypt, that Greece derived her architecture, her sculpture, her science, her philosophy, her mathematical knowledge—in a word, her intellectual life. And Babylon was the source to which the entire stream of Eastern civilization may be traced."—*Ib.*, chap. 8, last par.

"Here was the center and starting-point of the civilization which afterwards spread throughout Western Asia."—*Ancient Empires*, chap. 2, par. 3.

With these views of Babylon and her greatness and glory, we can see the property of the expressions used by Isaiah in regard to her, when he speaks of her as "Babylon the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," chap. 13:19; and as "the lady of kingdoms," chap. 47:5. But for all this the time should come when her glory was to depart; her empire should perish; and Babylon should fall to rise no more at all. This Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, should be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. 13:19); the time should come when she should be called *no more* "the lady of kingdoms."

In Jeremiah 27:7 we read of the extent of the kingdom of Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar, and in whose reign it should fall, as follows:—

"And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him."

Thus we find that in the days of Nebuchadnezzar's grandson the kingdom of Babylon should pass away, and other nations and other kings should establish

themselves, and serve themselves of this kingdom. And in the direct record of the fall of Babylon, given in Daniel 5, Nebuchadnezzar is repeatedly spoken of as the grandfather of Belshazzar, the king who was reigning in Babylon at the time of its fall. See verses 2, 11, 13 (margin); also "Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 43, notes 179, 185; and par. 50. A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 2:1-15. Elijah Translated"**  
***The Signs of the Times 11, 33 , pp. 518, 519.***

**SEPT. 6. 2 KINGS 2:1-15**

FROM Horeb, Elijah was directed to go by Damascus on his return to the land of Israel, and to anoint Hazael to be king of Syria, and Jehu to be king of Israel, and Elisha to be prophet in his room, and then it was, and not till then, that the Lord told him of the 7,000 in Israel who had not bowed to Baal. Then it was the Elijah knew that he was not alone in honoring God in the nation of Israel. Elisha was found in the field plowing with twelve yoke of oxen. He asked permission to go and kiss his father and his mother; this was given, and he did so. Then he killed two of the oxen and made a feast for the people, "Then he arose, and went after Elijah, and ministered unto him."

THAT Elijah was to be translated was known not only to himself, but to Elisha, and also to the schools of the prophets. When Elijah said to Elisha, "Tarry here, I pray thee; for the Lord hath sent me to Bethel," Elisha said, "As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee;" and this determination not to leave Elijah was because he knew that Elijah was to be taken away. When they were come to Bethel, the sons of the prophets said to Elisha, "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day? And he said, Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace." And when Elijah and Elisha had passed on and had come down to Jericho, there likewise the sons of the prophets said to Elisha, "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" And again he answered, "Yea, I know it; hold ye your peace." And when they two had gone on down to Jordan, fifty of the sons of the prophets went and stood "to view afar off."

IT is useless to speculate upon the question of *how* they all knew it. We know that they *did* know it. And the fact of Elisha's knowing it is a sufficient reason for his determination not to leave Elijah. Nor need we suppose that this determination was the result of curiosity; but rather of a desire to be a partaker of the rich experience, and the immense held to his faith, that would be afforded by his walking by Elijah's side, even to his entering into Heaven, and by seeing, himself, as it were, the rending of the veil that separates us from the other world. We know that this was so, because several years afterward, when the king of Syria had with "horses, and chariots, and a great host," compassed about the city where Elisha was, Elisha's servant cried out, "Alas, my master! how shall we do?" The prophet replied, "Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw; and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about

Elisha." 2 Kings 6:13-18. Elisha did not pray that his own eyes might be opened, but that the eyes of the *young man* might be opened, that *he* might see what Elisha already knew was there. As for himself, he had seen the heavenly horses and chariots take away Elijah, and he knew that they were ever ready to protect the servant of God. He did well to go with Elijah to the furthest possible step.

AS these two men went onward from Jericho, they presently "stod by Jordan. And Elijah took his mantle, and wrapped it together and smote the waters, and they were divided hither and thither, so that they two went over on dry ground. And it came to pass, when they were gone over, that Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee, before I be taken

519

away from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. And he said, Thou hast asked a hard thing; nevertheless, if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so. And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. And Elisha saw it, and he cried, My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof! And he saw him no more."

THUS Elijah went bodily into Heaven without seeing death. His natural body was "changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" into a spiritual body. His mortal body was made immortal. The same body that walked by Elisha's side, and the same hands upon which Elisha had poured water, were changed from the natural to the spiritual, from mortal to immortal. That same body went to Heaven; that same body stood on the mount of transfiguration; and to-day that same body stands in the presence of God in Heaven. Those same lips that denounced sin and called the people to obedience to the commandments of God, are to-day singing the songs of Zion, in Zion the beautiful city of God.

PAUL says, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." 1 Cor. 15:44. In this, however, he does not speak of *two bodies*, but he speaks of two conditions of the *same body*. Man has a natural body now; and if he ever reaches another world, it will be by the change of this natural body into a spiritual body either by translation or by a resurrection. It is all a hoax about there being a spiritual body inside of the natural body, and that the natural body is cast off and the spiritual body flies away. It is all a hoax that at death the spirit leaves the natural body and goes into a spiritual body. Elijah did not leave his body in this world when he went to Heaven; nor did Jesus leave his body when he went to Heaven. Elijah did not obtain a spiritual body by dying, but by translation. Neither do those who die obtain a spiritual body by dying, but by a resurrection from the dead. And these two ways—by translation and by resurrection—are the only ways that God has appointed by which men may ever reach another world.

IT was in writing of the resurrection of the righteous dead, that Paul referred to the spiritual body. He says, "So also is *the resurrection of the dead*. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body; *it is raised a spiritual* body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is

*written*, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit *that was not* first which is *spiritual*, but that which is *natural*; and afterward that which is spiritual. *The first man is of the earth*, earthy; *the second man is the Lord from Heaven*. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." 1 Cor. 15:42-48.

WE have shown that Elijah stood on the mount of transfiguration as the representative of those who shall be translated at the coming of the Lord. We have shown that in their leading points, the times and the experience of Elijah just before his translation were representative of the times and the experiences of those in the last days who shall be translated at the coming of Christ. We have seen that as there was great drought in the land then, so there is to be just before the Lord comes. We have seen that as there was a controversy over the commandments of God in the time of Elijah, so there is to be in the last days. We have seen that as there was persecution of those who kept the commandments then, so there is to be, just before the coming of the Lord, persecution of those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We have seen that as the test was then whether they would worship the Lord or Baal, so in the last days it will be whether men will worship the beast and his image, or whether they will worship Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. We have seen that as then the test of obedience to God was involved in keeping the first commandment, so now it turns upon showing allegiance to God by keep the fourth commandment.

AND now as Elijah's experience in this world ends with his translation, and his being carried up into Heaven by the heavenly chariots, so also ends the experience, in this world, of those who in the last days keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus must be kept against the most determined opposition of all the powers of earth. And of those who will do this, it is said, "I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2. Of this same company it is said in another place, "These were redeemed from among men." Elijah was redeemed from among men.

IT cannot be said of those who shall be raised from the dead, that they were redeemed from among men; they will be redeemed from death (Hos. 13:14); they will be redeemed from among the dead. But this company of those who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus, who get the victory over the beast and his image, who stand on the sea of glass, in the presence of the great white throne (Rev. 4:6), who have the harps of God, these being redeemed from among men as was Elijah, himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. "For, behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire." Isa. 66:15.

"Oh, joy! oh, delight! should we go without dying.  
No sickness, no sorrow, no dread, and no crying.  
Caught up through the air with our Lord into glory,  
When Jesus receives his own."

And now as we, for the present, take our leave of Elijah, we pray that each one who has read these sketches of his experience, may be as faithful and uncompromising in his allegiance to God and his commandments, in this our day, as was Elijah in his; that each one may be as jealous for the Lord God of hosts as was he; and then there is no shadow of question but that when the Lord and his holy angels shall come with fire and with his chariots, all such shall be not only where Elijah is, but where the Lord Jesus himself is. They shall see the King in his beauty, they shall behold the King of glory.

"TAKE heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons. . . . Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and [that] they may teach their children."

**September 3, 1885**

**"The Medo-Persian Empire" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 34 , pp. 532, 533.**

THE passing away of the Babylonian Empire was shown to King Nebuchadnezzar in the interpretation of his vision of the great image. Daniel declared to him:—

"And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." Dan. 2:39.

We know whence this other kingdom should arise; we know what nations should come against Babylon; we know who would lead the armies; and we know how the city should be taken; for God mustered the forces, and directed the siege, and his plans were all revealed to his prophets from sixty to one hundred and seventy-five years before the city and the kingdom of Babylon fell. The way is all clear before us in this—the prophecy is plain, so also is the history.

Of the nations that should overthrow the kingdom of Babylon, we read:—

"Make bright the arrows; gather the shields; the Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes; for his device is against Babylon, to destroy it; because it is the vengeance of the Lord, the vengeance of his temple." "Prepare against her the nations with the kings of the Medes, the captains thereof, and all the rulers thereof, and all the land of his dominion." Jer. 51:11, 28.

But the Medes were not to be alone. Isaiah cries, "Go up, *O Elam*; besiege, *O Media*." Isa. 21:2. "And *Elam* bare the quiver with chariots of men and horsemen." Isa. 22:6.

Elam, the Susiana of ancient geography and history, was a province of the Babylonian Empire as late as the third year of Belshazzar (Dan. 8:1, 2); but on

the rise of the Persian power, it threw off the yoke of Babylon, joined itself to Persia, became the chief province of the Persian Kingdom, and its capital, Susa (the Shushan of Scripture), became finally the capital of the whole Medo-Persian Empire. See "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," "McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia," "Young's Analytical Concordance," etc.

The sequel of the revolt of Elam and of its mention in this prophecy lies in this, that Cyrus was of Elamite origin, and the recognized chief of the Susianans (Sayce, "Ancient Empire," chap. 2, par. 46); and when he became king of Persia and began to spread his conquests, the Susianians (Elamites) only waited for the opportune moment, to revolt from Babylon and join the standard of Cyrus. But this time never came till Cyrus started to the conquest of Babylon in B.C. 539; because Cyrus and his forces, for nearly twenty years, until this time, were away to the northwest, the north, and the east, far away from the borders of Elam. (Rawlinson, Fifth Monarchy, chap. 7, par. 9, 15, 21, 25.) But when he started from Ecbatana (Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 47, 57, note 232), his Median capital, to the conquest of Babylon, he had to cross the province of Elam; then came the time when they could join their chosen chief, then Elam could "go up," Media could "besiege," and Cyrus, of Persia, could lead the forces.

God had not only long beforehand named the nations that should destroy Babylon, he had also called by name the general that should lead them:—

"Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight; I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron; and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name; I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." Isa. 45:1-4.

The analysis of this scripture will give us the fall of Babylon better than any other way that we could get at it.

1. "I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." This was written about B.C. 712. Cyrus started against Babylon B.C. 539, and took it B.C. 538, when he was about sixty-one years old. ("Seven Great Monarchies," Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 47, 49; Fifth Mon. chap. 8, par. 25, 26.) Thus we see that the Lord called him "by name" 113 years before he was born, and told what he should do, 174 years before he did it.

2. "To open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." "I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron." That this may be properly understood we shall have to give a brief description of the city of Babylon. And as an introduction we will give an extract from Nebuchadnezzar, and one from Herodotus.

Of the building of the walls and fortresses of the city, and the length of the wall, Nebuchadnezzar himself wrote an inscription as follows:—

"Imgur-bel and Nivit-bel, the great walls of Babylon, I built them square. . . . I repaired, with bitumen and bricks, the sides of the

ditches that had been dug. I caused to be put in order the double doors of bronze, and the railings and the gratings, in the great gateways. I enlarged the streets of Babylon so as to make them wonderful. I applied myself to the protection of Babylon and Vale Saggatu (the pyramid), and on the most elevated lands, close to the great gate of Ishtar, I constructed strong fortresses of bitumen and bricks, from the banks of the Euphrates down to the great gate, the whole extent of the streets. I established their foundations below the level of the waters. I fortified these walls with art. I caused Imgur-bel, the great all of Babylon, the impregnable, such as no kind before me had made, to be measured, 4,000 mahargagar."

"This measurement," says Lenormant, "corresponds exactly with the 480 stades [sixty miles] given by Herodotus as the circuit.—*Ancient History of the East, book 5, chap. 5, sec. 3, par. 16.*

"'The city stands on a broad plain,' says Herodotus, who visited it in the fifth century before the Christian era, 'and is an exact square, 120 furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is 480 furlongs. While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other city that approaches to it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall 50 royal cubits in width, and 200 in height. The royal cubit is longer by three fingers' breadth than the common cubit.'—*Ancient History of the East, book 4, chap. 5, sec. 3, par. 7.*

The city, as stated above, lay in the form of a square, 15 miles on each side, making 60 miles around it. It was surrounded by a wall 350 feet high and about 85 feet thick at the top. On the top of the wall at irregular intervals were built towers to guard the most accessible parts. Of these towers there were 250. The open space on the wall, within the line of these towers, was of sufficient breadth to allow a four-horse chariot to turn with safety. Twenty-five gates pierced the wall on each side, making 100 gates in all in the outer wall. These were double gates of solid brass, with brazen lintels and posts, and fastened with bars of iron. Around the wall on the outside ran a moat, that had been formed by taking from it the earth with which the bricks were made to build the wall. Under the wall and diagonally through the city, from corner to corner so as to obtain the greatest length of water, ran the River Euphrates. On each side of the river, inside of the city, was built a strong wall, each wall being pierced with twenty-five gates opening into the streets that ran from the outer gates. These were also brazen gates like those in the outer wall. The banks of the river were lined throughout with brick laid in bitumen, with sloping landing-places at the gates. Boats were always ready at these landing-places by which to pass from side to side of the river. Over the river about the middle of the city was a drawbridge thirty feet wide supported on stone piers. At the two ends of the bridge were the two grand palaces of the city. Of course this vast area within the city was not built up solidly with houses as is a modern city. These were gardens, orchards, and fields interspersed among the houses, and about the palaces and temples. It was

expected that if ever the city should be besieged, they could grow sufficient provisions within the walls to support the population, so that they might shut their gates, man the towers, and dwell securely with no fears of ever being overcome by any besieging force. Such, briefly outlined, was the Babylon against which Cyrus went to lay siege.

In describing the fall of Babylon, we shall give bodily the historical view as drawn by Rawlinson from Herodotus, Xenophon, Polyhistor, Berosus, Abydenus, and the inscriptions; and as we go along insert in the record, within brackets, the prophecies that are therein fulfilled, and also the state of affairs in the city that night, as described by Daniel. This we think the best, because in this way we can present the two views almost in the form of a parallel. We would simply remark that Nabonadius was king of Babylon, and quote the history.

"When at last it was rumored that the Persian king had quitted Ecbatana (B.C. 539) and commenced his march to the southwest, Nabonadius received the tidings with indifference. His defenses were completed; his city was amply provisioned; if the enemy should defeat him in the open field, he might retire behind his walls, and laugh to scorn all attempts to reduce his capital either by blockade or storm."

"If we may trust Herodotus, the invader having made all his preparations and commenced his march, came to a sudden pause midway between Ecbatana and Babylon. One of the sacred white horses, which drew the chariot of Ormazd, had been drowned in crossing a river; and Cyrus had thereupon desisted from his march, and, declaiming that he would revenge himself on the insolent stream, had set his soldiers to disperse its waters into 360 channels. [Cyrus swore that he would so break the strength of the river, that, in the future, women should pass it without wetting their knees.—See Grote's "Greece," chap. 33, par. 3.—A.T.J.] This work employed him during the whole summer and autumn; nor was it till another spring had come that he resumed his expedition. To the Babylonians such a pause must have appeared like irresolution. They must have suspected that the invader had changed his mind and would not venture across the Tigris. If the particulars of the story reached them, they probably laughed at the monarch who vented his rage on inanimate nature, while he let his enemies go scot free." "Cyrus, however, had a motive for his proceedings, which will appear in the sequel."

[But whatever motive Cyrus may have had in stopping here from one spring to another, there was yet a higher motive in, and over, it all. God's people were in Babylon and they must know when its fall would be, that they might save themselves. Sixty years before He had said: "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." And then, too, he gave them the sign by which they should know when her destruction was at hand. He said: "And lest your heart faint, and ye fear for the rumor that shall be heard in the land; a rumor shall both come one year, and after

that in another year shall come a rumor, and violence in the land, ruler against ruler." Jer. 51:45, 46

533

Thus when Cyrus stared out, Babylon heard the "rumor" and made all ready, but Cyrus stopped and stayed all summer, through the fall, and all winter, then when spring came again, again he started, and again a "rumor" was heard in Babylon, followed swiftly by "violence" and "ruler against ruler." And *that* is why he stayed there at the river so long. God was over it all. He had said that two rumors, a year apart, should reach Babylon, then his people should go out of the midst of her, and deliver "every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord."]

"Having wintered on the banks of the Gyndes in a mild climate, where tents would have been quite a sufficient protection for his army, he put his troops in motion at the commencement of spring, crossed the Tigris apparently unopposed, and soon came in sight of the capital. Here he found the Babylonian army drawn out to meet him under the command of Nabonadius himself, who had resolved to try the chance of battle. An engagement ensued, of which we possess no details; our informants simply tell us that the Babylonian monarch was completely defeated, and that, while most of his army sought safety within the walls of the capital, he himself with a small body of troops threw himself into Borsippa, an important town lying at a short distance from Babylon toward the southwest."

"It might have been supposed that his absence would have produced anarchy and confusion in the capital, but a step which he had recently taken with the object of giving stability to his throne, rendered the preservation of order tolerably easy. At the earliest possible moment had had associated with him in the government, his son, Belshazzar, or Bel-shar-uzur,—probably when he was about fourteen—the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar. [See Jer. 27:6, 7; Dan. 5:2, 11, 13, margin before notice.] This step, taken most likely with a view to none but internal dangers, was not found exceedingly convenient for the purposes of the war. In his father's absence Belshazzar took the direction of affairs within the city, and met and foiled for a considerable time all the assaults of the Persians. He was young and inexperienced, but he had the counsels of the queen-mother [Dan. 5:10-12] to guide and support him, as well as those of the various lords and officers of the court. So well did he manage the defense that after a while Cyrus despaired, and as a last resource ventured on a stratagem in which it was clear that he must either succeed or perish."

A. T. J.

*(To be concluded next week.)*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 4:18-37. The Shunammite's Son" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 34 , pp. 534, 535.**

**SEPT. 13. 2 KINGS 4:18-37**

AS soon as Elijah had been taken away from him, Elisha took up the mantle that had fallen from the translated prophet, and went back and stood by Jordan, and, as Elijah had done as they two went over, he smote the water with the mantle, and the waters separated, and Elisha passed over. He then came back to Jericho, and the men of the city called his attention to its pleasant situation, but the water was bitter and the ground barren. Elisha took salt and cast it into the spring, and said, "Thus saith the Lord, I have healed these waters; there shall not be from thence any more death or barren land. So the waters were healed unto this day, according to the saying of Elisha." 2 Kings 2:9-22.

SHORTLY afterward, the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel, and the kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom, went against him, and came out into the wilderness where there was no water; and according to the word of Elisha, "there came water by the way of Edom, and the country was filled with water," and this with "neither wind nor rain." Next there came to him a woman whose husband had died in debt, and the creditor had come to take her two sons for bondmen to pay the debt, and all they had was a single pot of oil. Elisha told her to go and borrow empty vessels from all her neighbors, and then pour into these from her one pot of oil till they were all full, then go and sell the oil, pay the debt, and she and her sons live of the rest.

THEN the next account of him is that given in our lesson. "It fell on a day that Elisha passed to Shunem." Shunem was a city of the tribe of Issachar (Josh. 19:18), about five miles south of Mount Tabor, about three miles from Jezreel, and in full view of the point on Mount Carmel where Elijah stood when the great decision was made between the Lord and Baal. It was at Shunem where the Philistines had pitched, when Saul saw them from Mount Gilboa, and his heart failed him, and he went and had a spiritualist medium at Endor hold a seance for him. 1 Sam. 28:4.

AT Shunem Elisha found "a great woman," a good woman too, as events proved; "and she constrained him to eat bread. And so it was,

535

that as oft as he passed by, he turned in thither to eat bread. And she said unto her husband, Behold now, I perceive that this is an holy man of God, which passeth by us continually. Let us make a little chamber, I pray thee, on the wall; and let us set for him there a bed, and a table, and a stool, and a candlestick; and it shall be, when he cometh to us, that he shall turn in thither."

AND this kindness to Elisha was not forgotten by him, nor by the Lord. "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister." Heb. 6:10. "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall

give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." Matt. 10:41, 42. The Lord wants people to use hospitality. It is one of the qualifications demanded in one who shall be chosen to be elder of the church. 1 Tim. 3:2.

THE Lord wants it to be genuine hospitality too. He says, "Use hospitality one to another *without grudging*." 1 Peter 4:9. When we see people coming to our house, we say, "I should like to know what they are coming here for. I just wish they would stay away;" and then, when they reach the house, say, "How *do* you do? I am so glad to see you! Sit right down. Why I haven't see [*sic.*] you so long. Oh! you *must* stay to dinner. I can't *think* of your going before dinner," &c., &c. Then we rustle around and get a big dinner, and have a grand time gossiping about everybody in the neighborhood, and finally the visitors go away, and *then* we say, "There, I am glad they are gone, and now I hope they will stay away," &c., &c. And we call *that* hospitality! But it is no such thing. Hospitality, to be *real* hospitality, must be "without grudging," must be from the heart, before people come, while they are with us, and after they are gone. Nor is it forgetful to entertain strangers.

THIS Shunammite was genuinely hospitable. She thought, and planned, and executed, to make her guest comfortable, and specially because he was a "man of God." And she was richly rewarded for it. First, by being blessed with that boon that was, as the whole history of the nation shows, the highest aspiration of every wife among the children of Israel—the boon of embracing a son in hope of the coming Messiah. And second, the wonderful blessing of having him restored to her even from the dead. Thus the Lord, in his loving-kindness, remembered and blessed the acts of kindness that had been shown to his servant.

BUT the Lord's mercy and goodness is not limited to our acts. Once David sat in his house thinking. Presently he spoke, and said to Nathan the prophet, "See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." That same night the word of the Lord came to Nathan to go and tell David that "The Lord telleth thee that he will make thee and house. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7. David was not allowed to build an house for the Lord. But because he *thought* of it, because his mind had a care for the work and worship of God, God took note of the *thought* and blessed it with a reward that embraces eternity. Oh that there were more men like David! Oh that there were more women like this Shunammite, to take thought and care for the work, the worship, and the service of God! What blessings would be upon such! What grace would be to the children of men! "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth." Col. 3:2.

"AND when the child was grown, it fell on a day, that he went out to his father to the reapers. And he said unto his father, My head, my head. And he said to a lad, Carry him to his mother. And when he had taken him, and brought him to his mother, he sat on her knees till noon, and then died." It is supposed that the child's disease was sunstroke, followed by brain fever.

"And she went up, and laid him on the bed of the man of God, and shut the door upon him, and went out. And she called unto her husband, and said, Send

me, I pray thee, one of the young men, and one of the asses, that I may run to the man of God, and come again. And he said, Wherefore wilt thou go to him to day? it is neither new moon, nor Sabbath. And she said, It shall be well." The new moon, the beginning of the month, was a solemn feast, day (Ps. 81:3), and the Sabbath was the day of weekly convocation. It would be natural for her to wish to go to the man of God on these days, but as it was neither, her husband is surprised, and yet she has such faith that the child shall be restored, that she will not allow her husband to suffer the grief of knowing that his only child is dead. And when Elisha asks her if it is well with herself, with her husband, and with her child, her answer is, "It is well." Thus may say everyone who believes in God. Has death taken away your child? God has said, "Thy children shall come again to their own border." "They shall come again from the land of the enemy." Jer. 31:16, 17. Death is the enemy, and God has promised to destroy it, and bring back those who are held in its strong grasp. There is One who has all power in Heaven and in earth. He lives, and was dead; and is alive forevermore, and has the keys of hell (the grave) and of death. Rev. 1:18. And trusting in Him, even though the child be dead, we can truly say, "It is well." For when He shall call, the child shall live, never to die any more.

"THEN she saddled an ass, and said to her servant, Drive, and go forward; slack not thy riding for me, except I bid thee." It seems strange that people would use an animal for riding that has to be followed by a person on foot to whip it up all the time. But in the East, to this day, the people do just that thing. A late traveler thus tells of the donkey boys in Damascus: "These persecutors run after the animals, shouting and goading them for hours together; they keep the donkey in a gallop always, yet never get tired themselves nor fall behind."

A. T. J.

**September 10, 1885**

**"The Medo-Persian Empire. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 35 , pp. 548, 549.**

*(Concluded).*

"WITHDRAWING the greater part of his army from the vicinity of the city, and leaving behind him only certain corps of observation, Cyrus marched away up the course of the Euphrates for a certain distance, and there proceeded to make a vigorous use of the spade. His soldiers could now appreciate use of the spade. His soldiers could now appropriate the value of the experience which they had gained by dispersing the Gyndes, and perceive that the summer and autumn of the preceding year had not been wasted. They dug a channel or channels from the Euphrates, by means of which a great portion of its water would be drawn off, and hoped in this way to render the natural course of the river fordable. ["A

drought is upon her waters; and they shall be dried up." "And I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry." Jer. 50:38; 51:36.]

"When all was prepared, Cyrus determined to wait for the arrival of a certain festival during which the whole population were wont to engage in drinking and reveling ["Prepare the table, watch in the watchtower, eat, drink." Isa. 21:5], and then silently in the dead of night to turn the water of the river and make his attack. ["Arise, ye princes, and anoint the shield." Isa. 21:5.] All fell out as hoped and wished. The festival was held with even greater pomp and splendor than usual; for Belshazzar, with the natural insolence of youth, to mark his contempt of the besieging army, abandoned himself wholly to the delights of the season, and himself entertained a thousand lords in his palace.

["Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. Belshazzar, while he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father [grandfather, margin] Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king and his princes, his wives and his concubines, might drink therein. . . . They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone." Dan. 5:1-4. "For it is the land of graven images . . . and they are made upon their idols." Jer. 50:38. But, "The night of my pleasure hath he turned into fear unto me." Isa. 21:4. "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote." Dan. 5:5. "My heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me; therefore are my loins filled with pain; pangs have taken hold upon me. . . . I was bowed down at the hearing of it; I was dismayed at the seeing of it." Isa. 21:4, 3. "Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." Dan. 5:6.

"Let now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee . . . none shall save thee." Isa. 47:13, 15. "The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers . . . but they could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof. Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonished. Now the queen by reason of the words of the king and his lords came into the banquet house; and the queen spake and said, . . . There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods; . . . now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation. Then was Daniel brought in before the king. . . . Then Daniel answered and said before the king, Thou . . . hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they

have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and thy lords, thy wives, and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know; and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified; then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." Dan. 5:7-28.]

"Elsewhere the rest of the population was occupied in feasting and dancing. Drunken riot and mad excitement held possession of the town; the siege was forgotten; ordinary precautions were neglected. Following the example of their king, the Babylonians gave themselves up for the night to orgies in which religious frenzy and drunken excess formed a strange and revolting medley." ["And I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men; and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the King, whose name is the Lord of Hosts." "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:57, 39.]—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 47-51.*

"We are told in Daniel that Babylon was captured on the night of a great feast to the idol gods, at which the wives and concubines joined in a wild revelry. But the women were not in the habit of feasting with men—how is this? An account, by Cyrus himself, of his capture of Babylon, was dug up only three or four years ago. In it he declares that Babylon was captured 'without fighting,' on the fourteenth day of the month Tammuz. Now the month Tammuz was named in honor of the god Tammuz, the Babylonian Adonis, who married their Venus or Ishtar; and the fourteenth of Tammuz was the regular time to celebrate their union, with lascivious orgies. On this day of all others, the women took part in the horrible rites, and it was in this feast of king, princes, wives, and concubines that Babylon was taken and Belshazzar slain. The Bible is here fully and wonderfully corroborated."—*Wm. Hayes Ward, D. D., in Sunday-School Times, Vol. 25, No. 42, pp. 659, 660.*

"Meanwhile, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. ["Set up the watchmen, prepare the liers in wait." Jer. 51:12, margin.] Anxiously they noted the gradual sinking of the water in the river-bed; still more anxiously they watched to see if those within the walls would observe to see if those within the walls

would observe the suspicious circumstance and sound an alarm through the town. Should such an alarm be given, all their labors would be lost. If when they entered the river-bed, they found the river-walls manned and the river-gates fast-locked, they would be indeed 'caught in a trap.' Enfiladed on both sides by the enemy whom they could neither see nor reach, they would be overwhelmed and destroyed by his missiles before they could succeed in making their escape. But, as they watched, no sounds of alarm reached them—only a confused noise of revel and riot, which showed that the unhappy townsmen were quite unconscious of the approach of danger. ["Therefore shall evil come upon thee; thou shalt not know from whence it riseth; and mischief shall fall upon thee; thou shalt not be able to put it off; and desolation shall come upon thee suddenly, which thou shalt not know." Isa. 47:11.]

"At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the deep river-bed, and on the landing-places opposite the river-gates clusters of men grew into solid columns. ["The Lord of hosts hath sworn by himself, crying, Surely I will fill thee with men, as with caterpillars; and they shall lift up a shout against thee." Jer. 51:14.] The undefended gateways were seized; a war-shout was raised; the alarm was spread, and swift runners started off to 'show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end.' ["One post shall run to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end, and that the passages are stopped, and the reeds they have burned with fire, and the men of war are affrighted." Jer. 51:31, 32.]

"In the darkness and confusion of the night a terrible massacre ensued. ["Against him that bendeth let the archer bend his bow, and against him that lifteth himself up in his brigandine [coat of mail]; and spare not her young men; destroy ye utterly all her host. Thus the slain shall fall in the land of the Chaldeans, and they that are thrust through in the streets." "Therefore shall her young men fall in the streets, and all her men of war shall be cut off in that day, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:3, 4; 50:30.] The drunken revelers could make no resistance. ["The mighty men of Babylon have forborne to fight, they have remained in their holds; their might hath failed; they became as women; they have burned her dwelling places; her bars are broken." Jer. 51:30.]

"The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful hand-writing upon the wall, which too late had warned him of his peril, could do nothing even to check the progress of the assailants who carried all before them everywhere. Bursting into the palace, a band of Persians made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry. ["In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain." Dan. 5:30.] Other bands carried fire and sword through the town. ["A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith

the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon her mighty men; and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon their horses, and upon their chariots, and upon all the mingled people that are in the midst of her; and they shall become as women." "Thus saith the Lord of hosts; The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken, and her high gates shall be burned with fire; and the people shall labor in vain, and the folk in the fire, and they shall be weary." Jer. 50:35-37; 51:58.] When the morning came, Cyrus found himself undisputed master of the city, when if it had not despised his efforts might with the greatest ease have baffled them." ["Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." Isa. 45:1.]

"Thus perished the Babylonian Empire." ["And it shall be, when thou hast made an end of reading this book, that thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates; and thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her; and they shall be weary. Thus far are the words of Jeremiah." Jer. 51:63, 64.]-*Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth Mon., chap. 8, par. 52-55.*

"The fall of Babylon was also the fall of an ancient, widely spread, and deeply venerated religious system. Not, of course, that the religion suddenly disappeared or ceased to have votaries, but that, from a dominant system, supported by all the resources of the State, and enforced by the civil power over a wide extent of territory, it became simply one of the many of the tolerated beliefs, exposed to frequent rebuffs and insults, and at all times overshadowed by a new and rival system—the comparatively

549

pure creed of Zoroastrianism. The conquest of Babylon by Persia was, practically, if not the death-blow, at least a severe wound, to the sensuous idol-worship which had for more than twenty centuries been the almost universal religion in the countries between the Mediterranean and the Zagros Mountain Range. The religion never recovered itself—was never reinstated. It survived a longer or a shorter time, in places. To a slight extent it corrupted Zoroastrianism; but on the whole, from the date of the fall of Babylon it declined. Bel bowed down; Nebo stooped [Isa. 46:1]; Merodach was broken in pieces [Jer. 50:2]. Judgment was done upon the Babylonian graven images; and the system, of which they formed a necessary part, having once fallen from its proud pre-eminence, gradually decayed and vanished." ["Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods hath he broken unto the ground. O my threshing, and the corn of my floor; that which I

have heard of the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, have I declared unto you." Isa. 21:9, 10.]—*Id.*, *Fifth Mon.*, *chap. 7, par. 27.*

"So long as Babylon, 'the glory of kingdoms,' 'the praise of the earth,' retained her independence, with her vast buildings, her prestige of antiquity, her wealth, her learning, her ancient and grand religious system, she could scarcely fail to be in the eyes of her neighbors the first power in the world, if not in mere strength, yet in honor, dignity, and reputation. Haughty and contemptuous herself to the very last, she naturally imposed on men's minds, alike by her past history and her present pretensions; nor was it possible for the Persian monarch to feel that he stood before his subjects as indisputably the foremost man upon the earth until he had humbled in the dust the pride and arrogance of Babylon. But, with the fall of the great city, the whole fabric of Semetic greatness was shattered. Babylon became 'an astonishment and a hissing'—all her prestige vanished—and Persia stepped manifestly into the place, which Assyria had occupied for so many centuries, of absolute and unrivaled mistress of Western Asia."—*Id.*, *par. 26.*

The geographical extent of the Fifth Monarchy [the Medo-Persian Empire] was far great than that of any one of the four [Chaldea, Assyria, Babylon, and Media alone] which had preceded it. . . . The dominions of the Persian kings covered a space fifty-six degrees [about 3,878 miles] long, and in places more than twenty [about 1,400 miles] wide. The boundaries of their empire were the desert of Thibet, the Sutej and the Indus [rivers], on the east; the Indian Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Arabian and Nubian Deserts, on the south; on the west, the Greater Syrtis, the Mediterranean [and] the Egean [seas], and the Strymon River [the Kara-Soo, of European Turkey]; on the north the [river] Danube, the Black Sea, the Caucasus [mountains], the Caspian [sea], and the Jaxartes [the present Syr Daria River]. Within these limits lay a territory, the extent of which from east to west was little less than 3,000 (?) [4,000] miles, while its width varied between 500 and 1,500 miles. Its entire area was probably not less than two millions of square miles, or more than half that of modern Europe. It was thus at least eight times as large as the Babylonian Empire at its greatest extent.—*Id.*, *chap. 1, par. 1.*

The Persian Empire continued to the defeat of Darius Codomannus by Alexandria the Great, near Arbela, B.C. 331, October.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 5:1-16. Naaman the Syrian" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 35 , p. 551.**

**SEPT. 20. 2 KINGS 5:1-16**

SYRIA lay to the north of Palestine. It was bounded on the east by the Euphrates and the Desert of Palmyrene; on the west by the Mediterranean Sea, Phúnicia, and Cilicia; and on the north by Cappadocia. It was about the size of Scotland. Haran, the place where Abraham stopped on his way to Canaan, was in Syria. Haran was the city of Nahor; Nahor was Bethuel's father; "Bethuel the Syrian" was Rebecca's and Laban's father, Isaac married Rebecca, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, the sister to Laban the Syrian; and when Jacob, Rebecca's son, fled from the fury of Esau, his mother told him "Flee thou to Laban my brother to Haran." "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria." Gen. 11:31; 22:20-23; 27:43; 2-5; Hos. 12:12.

AFTER Israel had come into the land of Canaan, among the idols that they served, were the gods of Syria. Judges 10:6. David defeated the Syrians of Damascus, slaying 22,000 of them, and put garrisons in Syria of Damascus, and the Syrians became servants to David. 2 Sam. 8:5, 6. When Absalom had killed his brother Amnon, he fled to Geshur in Syria and stayed there three years. 2 Sam. 13:38; 15:8. Solomon brought horses and chariots out of Egypt for the kings of Syria. 1 Kings 10:29. Asa, of Judah, sent a present of silver and gold by which he induced a king of Syria to break his league with Baasha of Israel, and to help Asa. 1 Kings 15:16-22. Elijah was directed to anoint Hazael king over Syria. 1 Kings 19:15. Benhadad, king of Syria, came up with thirty-two kings and besieged Samaria. But two hundred and thirty-two princes of the provinces led a *sortie* out of Samaria, and the Syrians fled, and Benhadad escaped on a horse. The next year he came again, and the children of Israel went against the Syrians, and pitched before them "like two little flocks of kids; but the Syrians filled the country." The battle was joined and of the Syrians 100,000 footmen fell in the battle. Benhadad first fled to Aphek, and then surrendered to the king of isarel. 1 Kings 20. Three years afterward there was war again with Syria in which Ahab, of Israel, was killed. 1 Kings 22. The next mention of Syria is, two years afterward, in our lesson. Naaman was captain of the host of the king of Syria, "a great man with his master, and honorable. . . also a mighty man in valor; but he was a leper." 2 Kings 5:1.

"AND the Syrians had gone out by companies, and had brought away captive out of the land of Israel a little maid; and she waited on Naaman's wife. And she said unto her mistress, Would God my lord were with the prophet that is in Samaria! for he would recover him of his leprosy. And one went in, and told his lord, saying, Thus and thus said the maid that is of the land of Israel. And the king of Syria said, Go to, go, and I will send a letter unto the king of Israel. And he departed, and took with him ten talents of silver, and six thousand pieces of gold, and ten changes of raiment. And he brought the letter to the king of Israel, saying, Now when this letter is come unto thee, behold, I have therewith sent Naaman my servant to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy."

"SO NAAMAN came with his horses and with his chariot, and stood at the door of the house of Elisha. And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean. But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the

Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place, and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? may I not wash in them, and be clean? So he turned and went away in a rage."

NAAMAN had his own ideas of how things should be done, and if he could not have it that way, he would not have it done at all. He was not the last person of that kind. Many people present their petition to the Lord, and they have their minds all made up about how it will be answered, and then if they do not receive it that way, they do not recognize that the Lord has answered their prayer at all. And there is often actual harm done by would-be revivalists in giving instruction, especially in regard to conversion. Many are brought to see their great need of salvation, of conversion, and honestly and earnestly inquire the way; and then the revivalist will perhaps undertake to tell them how they may know when they are converted, when they are accepted of God. They are told that they will feel a certain way, that they must obtain a certain kind of feeling, etc., etc., and the poor souls are left to look long and wait for that particular feeling, so they are set to follow a will-o'-the-wisp instead of the word of God.

THIS is all wrong. No man can tell another how that other will feel when he is converted. More: no converted person can make an unconverted person to understand how he himself felt when he was converted. The conversion of a soul is by the power of God through his Holy Spirit, and it "passeth all understanding." The converted soul understands it, in a measure, but he cannot make another to understand it in any measure, and for any one to undertake it tell the seeker for salvation just *how* he will feel, or just *what* to expect, is only to mislead, and perhaps plunge into despair a soul for whom Christ died.

WHAT then shall we tell the seeker to do? Tell him what Christ tells to all. Tell him "Ask, and it *shall* be given you; seek, and ye *shall* find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh *it shall be opened*. . . . If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; *how much more* shall your heavenly Father *give the Holy Spirit* to them that ask him." Luke 11:9-13. Tell the people that, and it will be all right, because it is the word of Him who saves sinners. We may tell also that we *know* that it is true, because we asked of him the Holy Spirit and he gave it; we sought the Lord, and we *did* find him; we knocked and he *did* open unto us; and we *know it*. Tell this, and when they seek him they will find him; and then they will know it, and not till then *can* they know it. Oh, never set a human example before a soul seeking salvation. Point him to Christ. There he is. He waits to be gracious. Seek, and ye *shall find* him, and then, oh the peace, the joy in the Holy Ghost, none can know but him who receives it. "When thou sadist, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek." Thank Heaven for the religion of Christ—a religion that converts the soul.

NAAMAN "turned and went away in a rage. And his servants came near, and spake unto him, and said, My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it? how much rather than, when he saith to thee, Wash, and be clean." How reasonable! And Naaman was won by it. Would that all men were as ready to act upon the suggestion as was Naaman the

Syrian. If men were bidden do some great thing by which the terrible leprosy of sin might be taken away, when a Fountain is open to all for sin and uncleanness, free to all, and He says, "Wash, and be clean."

"THEN went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." But until he had dipped himself the seventh time, he was not clean. If he had gone away after the sixth time, he would still have been a leper as before. This is the very lesson that is taught by the Saviour in that place where he tells us to seek and we shall find. Luke 11:5-9. It is earnestness, importunity. Not that he would teach that the Lord is hard to be entreated, but that we should be importunate, even as Jacob of old, "I *will not* let thee go, except thou bless me." How much more when there is no place else to go. There was no water but that of Jordan to cleanse Naaman. There is no fountain but that of Calvary to cleanse the sinner. We "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23; and we all must be cleansed by the precious blood of Christ.

"What can wash away my stain?

*Nothing* but the blood of Jesus.

What can make me whole again?

Nothing but the blood of Jesus."

A. T. J.

### **"Did Elijah Die?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 35 , pp. 553, 554.**

WE have long been perfectly assured, and it has been often shown in these columns, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul turns into utter confusion and nonsense the whole scheme of divine revelation as contained in the Bible. If, however, there had been in our minds the least doubt that such is the truth, such lingering doubt would have been entirely and effectually removed by what has lately come under our notice.

Our readers will recollect that the International Sunday-school Lesson for September 6, 1885, was on the translation of Elijah. During the past week, the religious papers containing notes on this lesson have reached us from different parts of the country, and it is in these "notes," and "observations," and "practical suggestions," etc., etc., that we find most aptly and fully illustrated, the havoc that is made with Scripture, reason, and common sense, by the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. We propose to lay before our readers some of the effusions that have actually been set forth as worthy of being taught in the Sunday-schools of our country.

The Bible record is:—

"And it came to pass, as they [Elijah and Elisha] still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven."

There is a narrative so simple that a child can understand it, and an event transcendently sublime. And yet upon such a subject the writer of the "notes" in the *Pacific* gets off the following:—

"A sudden departure from this world is often considered a misfortune, and a *stroke of lightning* a token of divine displeasure. But, if we are ready, as Elijah was, we may accept it as a token of divine love that the manner of our removal is quick and painless."

Does this writer mean to convey the idea that Elijah was struck with lightning? If not, does he mean to say that, if a man were struck with lightning, it would be the same to him as was translation to Elijah? Again, is a "sudden departure from this world" by death, whether it be by a stroke of lightning or otherwise, equivalent to the departure of Elijah from this world? If so, why should it be considered "a misfortune"? Was it "a misfortune" to Elijah that he should make the "sudden departure" that he did? Well, if he was struck with lightning, doubtless it was; but if as the word of God says, *Elijah went up* by a whirlwind *into Heaven*, then it was certainly everything but a misfortune.

But the writer of the *Pacific* is not by any means alone. Here is one in the *Christian Union* writing "Home Talks about the Word," on this same subject:—

"Paul says Elijah was a man of like passions with ourselves.

Every child of God goes to Heaven *just as much alive as Elijah did*.

The *body is not you*; you live in it, and *you keep on living without it*."

We would suggest that if this writer would study the word of God more and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul less, she would not have quoted *Paul* as saying that Elijah was a man of like passions with ourselves. This simply in passing. But now to our subject.

If it be true that, "Every child of God goes to Heaven *just as much alive as Elijah did*," how is it that nobody does it, nor ever has done it since Elijah did it? If, "Every child of God goes to Heaven just as much *alive* as Elijah did," then how is it that every child of God, as well as everybody else, *dies*? Is it the same thing to *die* that it is to be *translated*? Here we set together two passages of Scripture:—

1. "And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven." 2 Kings 2:11.

2. "And Elisha died, and they buried him." 2 Kings 13:20.

Now we ask: Do these two passages mean the same thing? Did Elisha go to Heaven just as much alive, as Elijah did? If language is of any use at all; if the power of reason, or of comprehension, be of any worthy whatever; then it is impossible to hold both these scriptures as meaning the same thing—one just as much as the other. It is equally impossible to believe that these words of the Lord, and those quoted from the *Christian Union*, can both be the truth. And as the word of God *is the truth*, we know by that, that this from the *Union* is *not* the truth.

There is another statement in the same paper to which we would call attention, this by Dr. Lyman Abbott, in which it is implied, if not definitely stated, that this narrative is not a part of the Bible. He says:—

"If any one doubts or denies the truth of the story, it is not worth while to argue with him. The translation of Elijah was a sign to Elisha. The sight was vouchsafed to him. He learned its lesson. That is enough. . . . It is not right to treat as a rejecter of Christian truth one whose philosophic tendencies make him skeptical

respecting such an event as this. The translation of Elijah is a flower embroidered on the edge of the garment; *it is no part of the woof.*"

We can but wonder how Dr. Abbott knows that the "translation of Elijah is no part of the woof" of the garment of Christian truth. Is it not a part of the word of God? Was it not written for our learning? Is it not profitable? By what right does Dr. Abbott take upon himself to decide how much of the word of God is a part of the "woof," and how much is not? And if "it is *not* right to treat as a rejecter of Christian truth one whose philosophic tendencies make him skeptical respecting such an event as this," then is it right "to treat as a rejecter of Christian truth one whose philosophic tendencies make him skeptical respecting such an event as" the resurrection of Christ. If "philosophic tendencies" will justify skepticism respecting this event or this part of the word of God, why will they not justify it respecting any or all other events or any other part, or even all of that word?

Next we have the New York *Observer*. One of the practical suggestions drawn from Elijah's translation is this:—

"The dead do not slumber in the grave. God's own go straight to the heavenly place. Elijah went up thither, not to sleep, but to live and serve and rejoice. So do dying saints now pass at once to glory 'in paradise.'"

Let us give a scriptural analysis of this.

1. "The dead do not slumber in the grave."

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. 12:2. "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep." "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." "Jesus . . . cometh to the grave," and "cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." John 11:11, 14, 38, 43.

2. "God's own go straight to the heavenly place."

"I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart." "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. . . . For David is not ascended into the Heavens." Acts 13:22; 2:29, 34.

3. "Elijah went up thither, not to sleep, but *to live and serve and rejoice*. So do *dying saints* now pass at once to glory 'in paradise.'"

"*The dead praise not the Lord*, neither any that go down into silence." "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. 115:17; 6:5. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, *Whither I go, ye cannot come*; so now I say to you." "I go unto my Father." John 13:33; 14:12.

Reader, which will you believe? the word of God, or the word of man? Will you believe a doctrine to be the truth that directly contradicts the word of God?

The *Sunday-School Times* says:—

"The miraculous translation of Elijah only sets before us in a visible appearance what takes place when every true child of God departs."

And the New York *Independent*:—

"Elijah's translation only slightly differs from that of every Christian. The important part is not that the body is taken up to Heaven, but that the soul is. And that is what we can all hope for."

These quotations might be multiplied but we have not the space, nor, indeed, do we think it necessary. But from these no one can fail to see that there is an utter confusion of ideas, in regard to death and translation. From these extracts from the Sunday-school teaching, it is impossible to tell whether Elijah died, or whether all men are translated. Yes, more, from these it is impossible to tell whether Elijah himself died or whether he was translated. We have often wondered what that man could have been thinking about, who wrote in the margin of 2 Chron. 21:12, of a certain writing of Elijah's that it, "was writ before is death"! But since seeing the above extracts from these leading, evangelical (?) papers, we cannot see but that he was just as clear in his estimate as are these eminent theologians of our own day.

And such confusion of ideas, and of plain Scriptures, in short, such unmitigated nonsense, is taught in the Sunday-schools throughout our land, as being the veritable truth of God. And all this that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul may have free course to run and be glorified. That doctrine cannot be held in harmony with the Scripture; and, that it cannot, needs no better proof than is found in the extracts which we have given. It is a doctrine entirely foreign to the word, the work, and the purpose of God.

We will present just one more extract—another

554

from Dr. Abbott—and if anything could show a worse confusion of ideas, than the foregoing extracts display, this must be the thing that does it. It is as follows:—

"What light, if any, does this incident throw on the question respecting the resurrection of the body?"

Well, we should like to know. We wish the Doctor had answered his own question. We should exceedingly like to know what light could be thrown upon the resurrection of a dead man, by the fact that a living man went to Heaven! True, the Doctor [*sic.*] says, "if any." Well, *is* there any?

We believe the Bible. We believe that Elijah went up into Heaven; this too, with no hint of death. We believe also, according to the Bible, that when a man dies and *goes to the grave* (Eccl. 9:10; 2 Kings 22:20; 2 Chron. 34:26), it is just as far removed from any similarity to that which happened to Elijah, as anything can possibly be. One is life, and the other is death; Elijah went into Heaven, the person who dies goes into the grave. But if death and translation mean the same thing, if the experience of the man who dies is the same as that of the man who never dies, then language becomes useless, reason is made impotent, and the Bible a mass of meaningless phrases.

A. T. J.

Note.—These extracts can be found in the issue of August 27, 1885, of each of the respective papers, except the *S.S. Times*—in that the date is August 22.

**September 17, 1885**

**"The Empire of Grecia. The Reign of Philip" *The Signs of the Times*  
11, 36 , p. 564.**

**THE REIGN OF PHILIP**

"And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth."  
Dan. 2:39, last part.

In Dan. 10:20 the angel said, "And now I return to fight with the prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come." Therefore we know that Grecia was the power that should succeed that of Media and Persia—that Grecia was the "third kingdom of brass" which should "bear rule over all the earth."

B.C. 359, Philip II. succeeded to the kingdom of Macedon. "Macedonia is a part of Greece."—*Strabo, Fragments 10; book 8, chap. 1, sec. 1, par. 1, sec. 3, par. 1*. See also "Encyc. Brit.," article "Greece," par. 1. "Greece was, at the moment, completely disorganized." Apart from Macedonia, Greece at that time consisted of nineteen distinct States,—Epirus and Thessaly composed North Greece; Acarnania, Etolia, Locris, Doris, Phocis, Megaris, Búotia, and Attica, composed Central Greece; and Corinthia, Sicyonia, Achaia, Elis, Messenia, Lagonia, Argolis, and Arcadia, composed the Peloponnesus or Southern Greece; the island of Eubúá, which lay along the eastern coast, formed the nineteenth State,—but taken all together the whole nineteen were only a little larger than the State of West Virginia, they having 25,811 square miles while West Virginia has 23,000. Imagine West Virginia with a coast line as great as that of Greece, divided into nineteen independent States, two of which comprise fully half of the whole area, each one of the nineteen being jealous of all the others, besides being itself separated by factions jealous of each other, with all public spirit gone—imagine such a condition of affairs as this, and you have a picture of Greece at the time that Philip became king of Macedon. See "Encyc. Brit.," articles "Macedonia Empire" and "Greece;" Rollin, "History of Philip," sections 1, 2.

It is evident that before Greece could do anything at all, of any worth, she must be united. To accomplish this, was the task that Philip had set for himself. As soon, therefore, as Philip had settled the affairs of his own kingdom he set about to bring the States of Greece into subjection to himself.

"And now, as a politician and conqueror, he resolves how he may best extend his frontiers, reduce his neighbors, and weaken those whom he is not able to conquer at present; how he may introduce himself into the affairs of Greece, take part in her intestine feuds, make himself its arbiter, join with one side to destroy the other, in order to obtain the empire over all. In the execution of this great design, he spares neither artifices, open force, presents, nor promises. He employs for this purpose negotiations, treaties, and alliances, and each of them singly in such a manner of his design, expediency solely determining him in the choice of measures. We shall always see him acting under this character, which is,

preparing to attack the great king of Persia, and endeavoring to become the avenger of Greece, by subverting an empire which before had attempted to subject it, and which had always continued its irreconcilable enemy, either by open invasions or secret intrigues."—*Rollin, Hist. of Philip, sec. 1, par. 21, 22.*

In 355 B.C., the Sacred War broke out among the States of Greece, and lasted ten years, which gave Philip his desired opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of Greece. The Sacred War was caused by the Phoceans, who dwelt near Delphi, plowing up certain grounds that had been consecrated to Apollo. When this was done, it was reported to the States-general of Greece as sacrilege. The Phoceans were summoned before the Amphictyonic Council, and after an examination of the whole affair, they were declared guilty of sacrilege, and sentenced to pay a heavy fine. They refused to submit, and took up arms. The Council met again and declared war on the Phoceans, and then the trouble began. Nearly all Greece took part in the quarrel, some of the States taking sides in favor of the god, others joining the Phoceans.

"In this general movement of the Greeks. . . Philip thought it most consistent with his interest to remain neuter. . . . He was also well pleased to see both parties weaken and consume each other, as he should thereby be enabled to fall upon them afterwards with greater ease and advantage."—*Id., sec. 2, par. 7.*

However, in 353 B.C. Philip interfered so far as to join Thessaly to his kingdom, and the Thessalions to his standard, and started to invade Phocis, but the Athenians seized Thermopylae, and he was obliged to return to Macedonia for a season. At last the Thebans grew tired of the Sacred War and sought the alliance of Philip. This was just what Philip was waiting for, and he therefore "declared at once in their favor."

"There was nothing Philip had more at heart than to possess himself of Thermopylae, as it opened to him a passage into Greece; to appropriate to himself all the honor of the Sacred War, as if he had been the principal in that affair; and to preside in the Pythian games. He was desirous of aiding the Thebans, and by their means to possess himself of Phocis; but then, in order to put this doubtful design into execution, it was necessary for him to keep it secret from the Athenians, who had actually declared war against Thebes, and who for many years had been in alliance with the Phocians. His business, therefore, was to place other objects in their view; and on this occasion the politics of Philip succeeded to a wonder."—*Id., sec. 4, par. 2.*

Just at this juncture, the Athenians also grew tired of the war, and sent two commissioners to Philip to sound him in regard to his helping to bring about a peace. He of course answered very favorably. Thereupon Athens sent ten ambassadors to inquire fully about all points in regard to the important question. The ten returned with a very favorable report indeed. Then these ten ambassadors were immediately sent back to Philip, "with full powers to conclude a peace and ratify it by oaths." After considerable delay on the part of the

ambassadors, and more on the part of Philip, with his troops advancing all the time, peace was ratified, but Philip refused to include the Phoeans. When the embassy returned to Athens a controversy arose there whether Philip was to be trusted or not, and while they were contending over that question, Philip decided it by taking possession of Thermopylae, "which opened to him the gates, and put into his hands the keys of Greece," invaded Phocis, the Phoeans sued for peace, and yielded themselves to Philip's mercy, and so ended the Sacred War, with Philip in possession of the key of Greece.

Philip immediately assembled the Amphictyonic Council to pass judgment on the Phoeans. The council decreed that all the cities of Phocis should be destroyed; that they should have no towns of more than sixty houses each; that such towns should be a certain distance apart; that none should enjoy any possessions except upon the payment of an annual tribute; and that the Phoean seat in the council was forfeited. Then Philip demanded that the council give him the vacant seat, which as a matter of course was done, and so Philip of Macedon became a member of the general council of the States of Greece. Next the obsequious council gave him, in conjunction with the Búatians and Thessalions, the superintendence of the Pythian games. Thus he had obtained all his wish, after, which he returned to Macedon, but still holding possession of Thermopylae.

The next seven years Philip spent in wars in Illyria, Thrace, and Scythia, and in an unsuccessful siege of Byzantium (Constantinople). In 338 B.C., another trouble, similar to that which caused the Sacred War, arose among the Locrians. The question came before the Amphictyonic Council. Philip had bribed the crators of the Council, and they persuaded the deputies that it were much better to elect Philip generalissimo of all Greece, than to assess their respective States for the means by which to hire soldiers.

Accordingly, "By a public decree, 'ambassadors were sent to Philip of Macedon, who, in the name of Apollo and the Amphictyons, implore his assistance, beseech him not to neglect the cause of that god which the impious Amphissians make their sport; and notify him, that for this purpose all the Greeks, associated in the council of the Amphictyons, *elect him for their general, with full power to act as he shall think proper.*' This was the honor to which Philip had long aspired, the aim of all his views, and the end of all the engines he had set at work till that time. He therefore did not lose a moment but immediately assembled his forces . . . and possessed himself of Elatea, the greatest city in Phocis."—*Id.*, sec. 6, par. 5, 6.

Athens arose in arms, and Demosthenes, in an oratorical contest with Python, overwhelmed him, and carried the Thebans with him to an alliance with Athens against Philip. The battle of Cheronea followed quickly. Philip was victorious, and Greece was his. The battle of Cheronea was the first in which Alexander ever fought as a commander. He was only eighteen, yet he fully displayed the intrepid valor that characterized him in after years. He broke and entirely routed the veteran "sacred battalion," the flower of the Theban army.

"Philip used his victory moderately, for he wished to leave Greece quiet behind him when he crossed into Asia to assail the great king [of Persia]."—*Encyc. Brit., article Macedonia Empire, par. 3.* "Macedon at that time [the battle of Cheronea], with no more than 30,000 soldiers, gained a point which Persia, with millions of men, had attempted unsuccessfully at Platea, at Salamis, and at Marathon. Philip, in the first years of his reign, had repulsed, divided, and disarmed his enemies. In the succeeding ones, he had subjected, by artifice or force, the most powerful States of Greece, and had made himself its arbiter; but now he prepares to revenge the injuries which Greece had received from the Barbarians, and meditates no less a design than the destruction of their empire [the Persian Empire]. The greatest advantage he gained by his last victory (and this was the object he long had in view, and never lost sight of) was to get himself appointed, in the assembly of the Greeks, their generalissimo against the Persians. In this quality he made preparations to invade that mighty empire. He nominated, as leaders of part of his forces, Attalus and Parmenio, two of his captains, on whose valor and wisdom he chiefly relied, and made them set out for Asia Minor."—*Rollin, Hist. of Philip, sec. 7, par. 1.*

A. T. J.

*(To be continued.)*

**October 1, 1885**

**"The Empire of Grecia. (*Continued.*) The Reign of Alexander" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 37 , pp. 580, 581.**

#### **THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER**

BUT it was not for Philip to carry the war against Persia. He could unite Greece under one head; he could shape the forces so that they could be wielded by one mighty arm; and then his work was done. It was reserved for a mightier than he to hurl the rugged forces of Macedon and Greece against the multitudes of the Persian king. B.C. 336, Philip was assassinated at the marriage feast of his daughter. Thus he died at the age of forty-seven years, after a reign of twenty-four years. Ochus, king of Persia, died the same year—poisoned by the eunuch Bagoas, one of his chief ministers. Alexander the Great, at twenty years of age, succeeded Philip as king of Macedon, and Darius Codomanus succeeded Odhus in the rule of the Persian Empire. Thus the last king of Persia and his conqueror, that was to be, began to reign in the same year—B.C. 336. See Rollin, "Hist. of Philip," sec. 7, par. 1; and "Hist. of Alexander," sec. 2, par. 1; "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 188.

"The prospects of Alexander were full of uncertainty and peril, up to the very day of Philip's assassination. . . . Cleopatra [Philip's second wife] was at this time in the ascendant; Olympia [Philip's divorced wife, mother of Alexander] was violent and mischievous; and Philip only forty-seven years of age. Hence the future

threatened nothing but aggravated dissension and difficulties for Alexander. . . . From such formidable perils, visible in the distance, if not immediately impending, the sword of Pausanias [Philip's assassin] guaranteed both Alexander and the Macedonian kingdom. But at the moment when the blow was struck, and when the Lynkestian Alexander, one of those privy to it, ran to forestall resistance, and place the crown on the head of Alexander the Great, no one knew what to expect from the young prince thus suddenly exalted, at the age of twenty years. . . . It remained to be proved whether the youthful son of Philip was capable of putting down opposition and upholding the powerful organization created by his father.

"But Alexander, present and proclaimed at once by his friends, showed himself, both in word and deed, perfectly competent to the emergency. He mustered, caressed, and conciliated, the divisions of the Macedonian army and the chief officers. His addresses were judicious and energetic, engaging that the dignity of the kingdom should be maintained unimpaired, and that even the Alatic projects already proclaimed should be prosecuted with as much vigor as if Philip still lived.

"By unequivocal manifestations of energy and address, and by dispatching rivals or dangerous malcontents, Alexander thus speedily fortified his position on the throne at home. But from the foreign dependents of Macedon—Greeks, Thracians, and Illyrians—the like acknowledgment was not so easily obtained. Most of them were disposed to throw off the yoke; yet none dared to take the initiative of moving, and the suddenness of Philip's death found them altogether unprepared for combination. By that event the Greeks were discharged from all engagement, since the vote of the confederacy had elected him personally as imperator. They were not at full liberty, in so far as there was any liberty at all in the proceeding, to elect any one else, or to abstain from re-electing at all, and to even let the confederacy expire.

"Now it was only under constraint and intimidation, as was well known both in Greece and Macedonia, that they had conferred this dignity on Philip, who had earned it by splendid exploits, and had proved himself the ablest captain and politician of the age. They were by no means inclined to transfer it to a youth like Alexander, until he had shown himself capable of bringing the like coercion to bear, and extorting the same submission. The wish to break loose from Macedonia, widely spread throughout the Grecian cities, found open expression from Demosthenes and others in the assembly at Athens.

"Apprised of these impulses prevalent throughout the Grecian world, Alexander felt the necessity of checking them by a demonstration immediate, as well as intimidating. The energy and

rapidity of his proceedings speedily overawed all those who had speculated on his youth, or had adopted the epithets applied to him by Demosthenes. Having surmounted, in a shorter time than was supposed possible, the difficulties of his newly-acquired position at home, he marched into Greece at the head of a formidable army, seemingly about two months after the death of Philip. He was favorably received by the Thessalians, who passed a vote constituting Alexander head of Greece in place of Philip; which vote was speedily confirmed by the Amphictyonic assembly, convoked at Thermopylae.

"Alexander next advanced to Thebes, and from thence over the isthmus of Corinth into Peloponnesus. . . . His great force probably not inferior to that which had conquered at Cheroneia, spread terror everywhere, silencing all except his partisans. Nowhere was the alarm greater than at Athens. The Athenians, recollecting both the speeches of their orators, and the votes of their assembly . . . trembled lest the march of Alexander should be directed against their city, and accordingly made preparation for a siege. . . . At the same time, the assembly adopted . . . a resolution of apology and full submission to Alexander; they not only recognized him as chief of Greece, but conferred upon him divine honors in terms even more emphatic than those bestowed on Philip. The mover, with other legates, carried the resolution to Alexander, whom they found at Thebes, and who accepted the submission.

"After displaying his force in various portions of Peloponnesus, Alexander returned to Corinth, where he convened deputies from the Grecian cities generally. . . . Alexander asked from the assembled deputies the same appointment which the victorious Philip had required and obtained two years before—the hegemony or headship of the Greeks collectively for the purpose of prosecuting war against Persia. To the conquest of a prince at the head of an irresistible army, one answer only was admissible. He was nominated imperator with full powers by land and sea.

"The convention sanctioned by Alexander was probably the same as that settled by and with his father Philip. *Its grand and significant feature was, that it recognized Hellas [Greece] as a confederacy under the Macedonian prince as imperator, president, or executive head and arm. It crowned him with a legal sanction as keeper of the peace within Greece, and conqueror abroad in the name of Greece.*"—Grote's *History of Greece*, chap. 91, par. 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18.

Alexander "summoned, at Corinth, the assembly of the several States and free cities of Greece, to obtain from them the same supreme command against the Persians as had been granted to his father a little before his death. No diet ever debated on a more important subject. It was the Western world deliberating on the ruin of the East, and the methods for executing a revenge that had been

suspended more than an age. The assembly held at this time will give rise to events, the relation of which will appear astonishing and almost incredible; and to revolutions which will change the appearance of things nearly throughout the world.

"To form such a design required a prince, . . . but above all, a monarch who had *supreme authority over all the States of Greece*, none of which singly was powerful enough to make so arduous an attempt; and which required, in order to their acting in concert, to be subject to one chief, who might give motion to the several parts of that great body, by making them all concur to the same end. Such a prince was Alexander. It was not difficult for him to rekindle in the minds of the people their ancient hatred of the Persians, their perpetual and irreconcilable enemies whose destruction they had more than once sworn, and whom they had determined to extirpate, in case an opportunity should ever present itself for that purpose. . . . The deliberations of the assembly were therefore very short, and that prince was unanimously\*<sup>5</sup> 1 appointed generalissimo against Persia."—*Rollin, Hist. Alexander, sec. 2, par. 15, 16.*

While Alexander left "Macedonian officers in the exercise of their new imperial authority throughout Greece and the islands," he himself "returned home to push the preparations for his Persian campaign. He did not however think it prudent to transport his main force into Asia, until he had made his personal ascendancy felt by the Macedonian dependencies, westward, northward, and northeastward of Pella—Illyrians, Peonians, and Thracians. Under these general names were comprised a number of distinct tribes, or nations, warlike and for the most part predatory. Having remained unconquered until the victories of Philip, they were not kept in subjection even by him without difficulty; nor were they at all likely to obey his youthful successor, until they had seen some sensible evidence of his personal energy."—*Grote, chap. 91, par. 26.*

But they were soon effectually treated to a "sensible evidence of his personal energy"—in just about five months he had swept the country from the borders of Macedonia through the midst of Thracia and Músia to and across the Danube at about the twenty-sixth degree of longitude; then up the Danube about 150 miles; then southeastward to the southern point of Lake Lychnidus (the present Ochrida Lake) in the southern part of Illyria (the present Albania); and in less than three weeks afterward he stood with his army in Búotia, to the south of Thebes, ready to chastise that city for her rebellion during his absence. Thebes was razed to the ground; and Alexander marched on to Corinth, where he received deputations from various Grecian cities, and presided at a meeting of the assembled deputies of the Grecian States, where he levied the quota of troops that each State should supply in the intended expedition, the following spring, against Persia. This being settled, "Alexander left Greece for Pella in the autumn of 335 B.C., and never saw it again."—*Grote, chap. 91, last paragraph but one.* For the full account of this

expedition beyond the Danube and back to Thebes and to Corinth, see Grote, chap. 91, par. 27 and to the end of the chapter. For the line of march, not only here but in all his campaigns, see "Ginn & Heath's Classical Atlas," map No. 19.

"The ensuing winter was employed in completing his preparations; so that early in the spring of 334 B.C., his army, destined for the conquest of Asia, was mustered between Pella and Amphipolis, while his fleet was at hand to lend support."—Grote, chap. 92, par. 1.

"The army intended for Asia, having been assembled at Pella was conducted by Alexander himself first to Amphipolis, where it crossed the Strymon; next along the road near the coast, to the river Nestus and to the towns of Abdera and Maroncia; then through Thrace across the rivers Hebrus and Melas; lastly, through the Thracian Chersonese to Sestos. Here it was met by his fleet, consisting of 160 triremes, with a number of trading vessels besides; made up in large proportions from contingents

581

furnished by Athens and Grecian cities. The passage of the whole army—infantry, cavalry, and machines—on ships, across the strait from Sestos in Europe to Abydos in Asia, was superintended by Parmenio, and accomplished without either difficulty or resistance.

"The army when reviewed on the Asiatic shore after its crossing, presented a total of 30,000 infantry, and 4,500 cavalry. . . . Besides these troops, there must have been an effective train of projectile machines and engines, for battles and sieges, which we shall soon find in operation. As to money, the military chest of Alexander, exhausted in part by profuse donatives to Macedonian officers," contained only seventh talents—\$78,085—no more than enough to maintain his army for thirty days; besides this he had, in bringing together and fitting out his army, incurred a debt of about \$1,450,150.—Grote, chap. 92, par. 24, 27, 28.

Thus, in the spring of 334 B.C., on the soil of the Persian Empire, stood Alexander the Great, "as the chief of united Greece," and "the conqueror abroad in the name of Greece," carrying to all the nations of the East the Greek power, Greek art, the Greek language, and Greek civilization. And so, according to the word of the Lord, spoken two hundred years before, "*The Prince of Grecia*" HAD "come." Dan. 10:20.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 7:1-17. The Famine in Samaria" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 37 , pp. 582, 583.**

**OCTOBER 11. 2 KINGS 7:1-17**

BEN-HADAD had gathered together a great host and had besieged Samaria till the famine had become terrible. So scarce had grown the food that an ass'

head sold for eighty pieces of silver (about \$44), and at last women were found who had eaten a child. When the king heard of this, he determined to kill Elisha, but when he came to where Elisha was, then Elisha said: "Then Elisha said, Hear ye the word of the Lord; Thus saith the Lord, To-morrow about this time shall a measure of fine flour be sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of Samaria. Then a lord on whose hand the king leaned answered the man of God, and said, Behold, if the Lord would make windows in heaven, might this thing be? And he said, Behold, thou shalt see it with thine eyes, but shalt not eat thereof."

"AND there were four leprous men at the entering in of the gate: and they said one to another, Why sit we here until we die? If we say, We will enter into the city, then the famine is in the city, and we shall die there; and if we sit still here, we die also. Now therefore come,

583

and let us fall unto the host of the Syrians: if they save us alive, we shall live; and if they kill us, we shall but die." When men were found to be lepers the law was that "the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; he is unclean; he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be." Lev. 13:45, 46.

THE famine being so great in the city, these men of course could obtain no food from there, and as they were about to perish any way, they concluded that nothing greater than that could befall them even though the Syrians should get them; but if the Syrians should happen to favor them, and give them food, their lives would be saved. So they determined to go.

"AND they rose up in the twilight, to go unto the camp of the Syrians; and when they were come to the uttermost part of the camp of Syria, behold, there was no man there. For the Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians, to come upon us. Wherefore they arose and fled in the twilight, and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life."

IT is easy for the Lord to spread terror amongst men. Several such instances are given in the Bible. Gideon will be remembered, with his three hundred men with their pitchers and torches, and how that, all of a sudden, the breaking of the pitchers and the glare of the torches put the 135,000 Midianites to flight in terror. Judges 7. And "the children of Ammon and Moab and Mount Seir" came up against Judah when Jehoshaphat was king. The children of Judah were all gathered together in the wilderness Tekoah, and Jehoshaphat "appointed singers unto the Lord, and that should praise the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army, and to say, Praise the Lord; for his mercy endureth for ever. "And when they began to sing and to praise, the Lord set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and mount Seir, which were come against Judah; and they were smitten. For the children of Ammon and Moab stood up against

the inhabitants of mount Seir, utterly to slay and destroy them; and when they had made an end of the inhabitants of Seir, every one helped to destroy another."

IT is not alone in the Bible, nor alone in Bible times that such things have occurred. The Lord has done just as remarkable things for his people in later ages as he did in those ancient times. After the Papacy had put to death John Huss and Jerome of Prague, it set about to extirpate all the heretics of Bohemia. For this purpose crusade after crusade was set afoot, only to be defeated in disgrace. At last in A.D. 1427, the pope had succeeded in gathering together an army of nearly 200,000 men. "Led by three electors of the Empire, by many princes and counts, and the *legate-a-latere* of the pope," this great host invaded Bohemia, entering it in June. "The Bohemians marched to meet their invaders. They were now within sight of them and the two armies were separated only by the river that flows past Meiss. The crusaders were in greatly superior force, but instead of dashing across the stream, and closing in battle with the Hussites, whom they had come so far to meet, they stood gazing in silence at those warriors hardened by constant exposure, and begrimed with the smoke and dust of battle, and seemed to realize the pictures of terror which report had made familiar to their imaginations long before they came in contact with the reality. It was only for a few moments that the invaders contemplated the Hussite ranks. A sudden panic fell upon them; they turned and fled in the utmost confusion."

FOUR years afterward another army was raised for the invasion of Bohemia, to destroy the followers of the doctrines preached by Huss, and for which he had been cruelly and treacherously burned at the stake. This time—the fifth of these crusades—130,000 men swept into Bohemia. "On the first of August, 1431, the crusaders crossed the Bohemian frontier, penetrating through the great forest which covered the country on the Bavarian side. They were brilliantly led, as concerned rank, for at their head marched quite a host of princes, spiritual and temporal. . . . The feelings of the Hussites as day by day they received tidings of the numbers, equipments, and near approach of the host, we can well imagine. Clouds as terrible had ere this darkened their sky, but they had seen an omnipotent Hand suddenly disperse them. . . . They reflected, however, that victory did not always declare on the side of the largest battalion, and, lifting their eyes to heaven, they calmly awaited the approach of the foe. The invading host advanced, 'chanting triumph before victory,' says Lenfant, and arriving at Tochan, it halted there a week . . . Forming in three columns, the invaders moved forward. Procopius fell back on their approach. . . . His design was to lure the enemy father into the country, and fall upon him on all sides. On the morning of the 14th of August, the Bohemians marched to meet the foe. . . .

"The enemy were encamped near the town of Reisenberg. The Hussites were not yet in sight, but the sound of their approach struck upon the ear of the Germans. The rumble of their wagons, and the war-hymn chanted by the whole army as it marched bravely forward to battle, were distinctly heard. Cardinal Cesarini had a companion climbed a little hill to view the impending conflict. . . . The cardinal and his friend had gazed only a few minutes when they were startled by a strange and sudden

movement in the host. As if smitten by some invisible power, it appeared all at once to break up and scatter. The soldiers threw away their armor and fled, on this way, another that; and the wagoners, emptying their vehicles of their load, set off across the plain at full gallop. . . . The army had been seized with a mysterious panic. That panic extended to the officers equally with the soldiers. The duke of Bavaria was one of the first to flee. He left behind his carriage, in the hope that its spoil might tempt the enemy and delay their pursuit. Behind him, also in inglorious flight, came the elector of Brandenburg; and following close on the elector were others of less note, chased from the field by this unseen terror. The army followed, if that could be styled an army which so lately had been a marshaled and bannered host, but was not only a rabble rout, fleeing when no man pursued."

THE cardinal succeeded in rallying a few of the flying soldiers. "They stood then ground only till the Bohemians were within a short distance of them, and that strange terror fell upon them, and the stampede became so perfectly uncontrollable, that the legate himself was borne away in the current of bewildered and hurrying men. He left behind him his hat, his cross, his bell, and the pope's bull proclaiming the crusade—that same crusade which had come to so ridiculous a termination.

"This was now the second time the strange phenomenon of panic had been repeated in the Hussite wars. The Germans are naturally brave; they have proved their valor on a hundred fields. . . . There is here the touch of a divine finger—the infusion of a preternatural terror. So great was the stupefaction with which the crusaders were smitten, that many of them instead of continuing their fight into their own country, wandered back into Bohemia; while others of them, who reached their homes in Nuremburg, *did not know their native city* when they entered it, and began to beg for lodgings as if they were among strangers."—*Wylie's History of Protestantism, book 3, chap. 17.*

IT is impossible to read this narrative and not see in it a perfect likeness to the panic of the Syrians in this lesson. Rome and the Emperor Sigismund had treacherously burnt the saintly Huss, and the scholarly Jerome, and now sought to destroy their innocent brethren, and God wrought for his people here as veritably as ever he did in the world. God's wondrous workings for his children are not all confined to the times in which the Bible was written. He is the same Mighty One still. There is still a God in Israel.

YES, and still there are men as unbelieving as that "lord" upon whose hand the king of Israel leaned when Elisha said that "to-morrow about this time" there should be such plenty in the gates of starving Samaria. Still there are such ready to say, "If the Lord should make windows in heaven might this thing be." But yet for all the unbelief of men, the *fact* remains that God leads, and works for, his people. And yet for all the unbelief of men, every part of the word of God will be fulfilled as literally as was the word of Elisha that day. The four lepers went and

called to the watchman of Samaria, and told the city, by him, that the Syrians had fled and left everything; then a company was sent out to learn whether it were really true, and they returned and confirmed the word; then the whole city poured out and spoiled the tents of the Syrians. So a measure of fine flour was sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, according to the word of the Lord. "Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper." 2 Chron. 20:20.

A. T. J.

**"Comfort Ye, Comfort Ye My People" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 37 , pp. 585, 586.**

"COMFORT ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." This is the word of the Lord by the prophet Isaiah. The Lord knows our trials, our afflictions, our troubles, and in his great pity sends comfort. "Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." Job 5:6, 7. Trouble is the common lot of all men. Who in this world is free from it? None. And the Lord, knowing our frame, remembering that we are dust, says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people."

Paul, in contemplating this, exclaims, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of *all comfort*; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God." 2 Cor. 1:3, 4. The Bible is a perfect storehouse of all the needs of human experience, and trouble is as universal as is the human race. "Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." Job 5:6, 7. Solomon, in considering the oppressions that are done under the sun, said: "Behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter." Eccl. 4:1. It is had enough to be oppressed, but to be oppressed and have no comforter is terrible. It is true that there are many such, but it is equally true that there *need* not be any such; for all that are oppressed, all that are afflicted, all that are troubled, may do as one of old, "I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause," and he, "the God of all comfort," will "comfort all that mourn." His tender mercies are over all his works.

It is a fact that the Lord has not, in his word, told us to do anything without telling us how to do that thing. It is so in this. He has not only told us, "Comfort ye my people," but he tells us how to comfort them. We will notice an example or two.

In John 13 to 18 we have Jesus's last talk to his disciples before his crucifixion. He was about to leave them to go again to his Father, and in John 13:33 he said: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so not I say to you." This is a very important statement, "Whither I go ye cannot come." But not only

that, the Lord refers us to something else, "As I said unto the Jews, . . . so now I say to you." Therefore to obtain the full meaning of this word, whither I go ye cannot come, we must find what it was he had said to the Jews. The only place in which he spoke these words to the Jews is John 8:21: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; *whither I go, ye cannot come.*" This it is to which he referred in John 13:33. "As I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you." Therefore, so far as going to the Lord is concerned, it is positive by his own words, that his disciples have no pre-eminence above men who die in their sins.

When Jesus said this to his disciples, they were troubled. Could it be possible that they who had left all and had followed him; that these whom he had chosen out of the world; that these whom he had loved unto the end; could it be possible that they, after all their experience with him and his love for them, should now be left on the level of those who die in their sins? Why should they not be troubled? He had asked them once, "Will ye also go away?" and Peter had replied, "Lord, to whom shall we go" thou hast the words of eternal life;" and now after having trusted in him for eternal life, to be told that when he should go away, they could not go where he went, that was enough to trouble them.

But Jesus did not allow them to be long troubled thus. He comforts them. He said: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. *And if I go* and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you* unto myself; *that* where I am, there ye may be also." John 14:1-3. This relieved them of all their trouble on that point, this was comfort indeed. And, mark you, it is the Lord's own word. It is Christ's own message of comfort to his disciples. And that message of comfort is, although it be that "whither I go, *ye cannot come,*" any more than can men who die in their sins, yet, "*I will come again* and receive you unto myself; *that* where I am there ye may be also." And this word "that" shows that it is only by his coming again that his children can ever be where he is.

Now why should the Saviour, who loved his disciples so tenderly, stir up this trouble in their hearts? They were with him when he told the Jews, "Ye shall die in your sins, and whither I go ye cannot come." They understood the full force of that fearful sentence. Now why should he plunge them into fear and trouble, by saying the same thing to them, and this too, by the phrase, "As I said unto the Jews," so emphatically that they could not possibly misunderstand him? Why was this done? The sequel shows plainly that it was for the purpose of making such an impression upon them as they never could forget; and so to fix ineffaceably upon their minds the truth that without his coming again, there is absolutely no hope of ever being where he is; and thus to set them in view of one event as the consummation of all their hopes, and that event the *coming again* of the Lord. That is the comfort of Christ himself.

Another instance: The Thessalonian brethren were sorrowing because some of their number had died. And now the Lord, by Paul's pen, sends them comfort. And what is his comfort? The same Jesus gave to his disciples, for it is Jesus who sends this. Here is it: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with

a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort one another with these words.*" 1 Thess. 4:16-18. That is the comfort the Lord gives to the sorrowing. And any other under such circumstances is false comfort. It is not only his comfort to us, but it is *his command* that we comfort one another *with these words.*

Once more: In 2 Thess. 1:6-10 Paul speaks to those "who are troubled," and his comfort is that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven . . . when he shall come to be glorified in his

486

saints, and to be admired in all them that believe . . . in that day." This is the comfort of God: The Lord is coming. "I will come again." "The Lord himself shall descend from Heaven." "The Lord shall be revealed from Heaven." "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God."

A. T. J.

**October 8, 1885**

**"The Empire of Grecia. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 38 ,  
p. 596.**

(Continued.)

### **THE BATTLE OF GRANICUS, ISSUS, AND ARBELA**

ABOUT seventy-five or eighty miles from the place where Alexander landed in Asia Minor, the river Granicus pours into the Sea of Marmora. There, early in his fourth day's march (May 22, B.C. 334, *Haydn's Dictionary of Dates.*), he found the Persian army drawn up in battle array, on the eastern bank of the river. "On approaching the river he made his preparations for immediately attack." Alexander's forces having arrived at the brink of the river, the two armies stood for some time "watching each other in anxious silence." Then Alexander gave the word of command, and with wild war-shouts, and sound of trumpets, his troops rushed into the river and across, and in a little while had gained the opposite bank. The Persian army was annihilated. Of the Persian troops about 20,000 were killed, and about 2,000 were taken prisoners; while of Alexander's soldiers there were only 115 killed, and about 1150 wounded. "No victory could be more decisive or terror-striking than that of Alexander" at the Granicus. "There remained no force in the field to oppose him. . . . Such exploits, impressive even when we read of them now, must at the moment when they occurred have acted most powerfully upon the imagination of contemporaries."—

*Grote, chap. 92, par. 39-50; Rollin, Hist. Alexander, sec. 3, par. 10-15.*

"The battle of Granicus threw open to Alexander the whole of Asia Minor. There was no force left in the entire country that could venture to resist him, unless protected by walls. Accordingly, the Macedonian operations for the next twelve months, or nearly the whole space that intervened between the battles of the Granicus and of Issus, consisted of little more than a series of marches and sieges."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 195. Encyc. Brit., art. Macedonian Empire.*

Alexander gave his army a few months' rest at Gordium, the capital of Phrygia, in the latter part of the winter and early spring of 333 B.C. Having received re-enforcements to the amount of 3,650 troops, he set out, the latter part of May, to the southeastward through Phrygia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia.

In the year that had passed since the battle of the Granicus, Darius had succeeded in gathering together a vast host, numbering at the very lowest estimate 311,200, and at the highest 600,000; the weight of authority favors placing the real number at about 500,000. Accompanied by his mother, his wife, his concubines, his children, and all the personal attendants of every description that pertain to the palace and the harem, Darius in person led his army out of Babylon just about the time that Alexander with his little band of less than 40,000, left Gordium. In the camp, all the luxury of the palace was maintained by the king and his Persian grandees.

"The baggage was enormous; of gold and silver alone, we are told that there was enough to furnish load for 600 mules and 300 camels. A temporary bridge being thrown over the Euphrates, five days were required to enable the whole army to cross. . . . At the head of such an overwhelming host, Darius was eager to bring on at once a general battle."—*Grote, chap. 93, chap. 18, 19.*

Alexander, being by a fever delayed at Tarsus ("no mean city," by the way), the two armies did not meet till November, and then at Issus, where was fought the second battle between Grecia and Persia. The city of Issus, near which the battle was fought, lay at the extreme northeastern point of the Mediterranean Sea. Here, between the base of the mountains and the sea, on the borders of the Gulf of Issus, was a tract of flat land, nowhere more than a mile and a half wide. In this narrow space, on the north bank of the River Pinarus, Darius wedged 200,000 men. Of course this made his ranks so deep that the rest of his army had no room to act, and so they remained, to the number of about 250,000, useless and unformed in the rear.

On the south side of the River Pinarus, Alexander formed his forces, so in this position the Pinarus flowed between the two armies as did the Granicus at the battle that was fought there. The battle began by the advance of Alexander. Leaving 300 of his cavalry to hold in check 20,000 Persians that threatened his right flank, he moved onward his whole line at a slow pace till it came within bow-shot of the Persian front, and then gave the command to charge. Alexander with the right of his line charged Darius's left, which "instantly broke and fled."

Alexander's left was not so successful, however,—their part of the bank of the river was steep, and defended by stakes, and besides this, the Persian right showed a stubborn resistance; nor was it until Alexander had returned from the rout of Darius's left, and attacked in flank the remaining forces, that his own left gained any headway; then, however, that part of the Persian line was driven back, and the rout became general.

Then the vast multitude confined in so narrow a space, horses, and chariots, and men, rushing headlong hither and thither in their frantic efforts to escape, only made the slaughter more dreadful. One hundred and ten thousand of the Persian army were slain, and 40,000 were made prisoners. Among the prisoners was Darius's whole family. He himself managed to gather up 4,000 of the flying troops, and made no tarrying until he put the Euphrates between himself and Alexander. Besides these, 8,000 hired Greeks held together in one body, and made their way to Tripolis on the coast of Phenicia, where they found the vessels that had brought them over; these they seized and escaped to Cyprus, and then to Egypt. And that was all that was left of the immense host that Darius brought to the battle of Issus. No attempt was made to rally or re-form the flying fugitives, and so the second time a Persian army was annihilated by Alexander; this time with a loss to himself of only 450 killed, and 504 wounded. "No victory recorded in history was ever more complete in itself, or more far-stretching in its consequences, than that of Issus." As the battle of Granicus gave to Alexander all Asia Minor, so the battle of the Issus laid at his feet Egypt and all of Asia west of the Euphrates. Grote, chap. 93, par. 1-33; "Seven Great Monarchies," Fifth Mon. chap. 7, par 196-202; Rollin, "Hist. Alexander," sec. 5.

But Darius was yet alive and free, and one more blow must be struck, and only one, before the proud Persian ascendancy is destroyed. It was "twenty months" after the battle of Issus before Alexander set his forces in motion toward the interior of the Persian Empire. By this time—about June 331—Darius had succeeded in gathering together at Arbela, an army of more than a million of men.

"The forces which he had collected for the final struggle comprised—besides Persians, Babylonians, Medes, and Susianians from the center of the empire—Syrians from the banks of the Orontes, Armenians from the neighborhood of Ararat, Cappadocians and Albanians from the regions bordering on the Euzine, Cadusians from the Caspian, Bactrians from the Upper Oxus, Sogdians from the Jaxartes, Arachosians from Cabul, Arians from Heart, Indians from Punjab, and even Sace from the country about Kashgar and Yarkand, on the borders of the Great Desert of Gobi. Twenty-five nations followed the standard of the great king, and swelled his vast army, which amounted (according to the best authorities) to above a million of men. Every available resource that the empire possessed was brought into play, Besides the three arms of cavalry, infantry, and chariots, elephants were, for perhaps the first time in the history of military science, marshalled in the battle-field, to which they added an unwonted element of

grotesqueness and savagery."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 207* (11th from the end).

Alexander crossed the Euphrates at Thasacus (the modern Deir); marched northeastward and crossed the Tigris about thirty-five miles above the site of Nineveh; turned to the right and marched for four days down the Tigris. The fourth day he met a body of Persian cavalry, which he scattered, taking some prisoners from whom he learned that Darius with his whole army was only a few miles away. At this he halted and gave his army a rest of four days. While it was yet dark, the morning of the fifth day he advanced with the intention of attacking Darius at break of day. However, when he reached the plain immediately in the Persian front, he saw that some of the ground was freshly broken, and fearing that pitfalls had been prepared for his army, he delayed the attack, and spent the day in carefully surveying the field.

"The spot predetermined for a pitched battle, was the neighborhood of Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about thirty miles west of Arbela, towards the Tigris, and about as much southeast of Mosul, a spacious and level plain, with nothing more than a few undulating slopes, and without any trees. It was by nature well adapted for drawing up a numerous army, especially for the free manúuvres of cavalry, and the rush of scythed chariots; moreover the Persian officers had been careful beforehand to level artificially such of the slopes as they thought inconvenient. [This was what caused Alexander to suspect pitfalls.] In the ground, there seemed everything to favor the operation both of the vast total, and the special forces, of Darius; who fancied that his defeat at Issus had been occasioned altogether by his having adventured himself in the narrow defiles of Cilicia, and that on open and level ground, his superior numbers must be triumphant. For those who looked only to numbers, the host assembled . . . might well inspire confidence, for it is said to have consisted of 1,000,000 of infantry, 40,000 cavalry, 200 scythed chariots, and fifteen elephants."—*Grote, chap. 93, par. 72, 73.*

The next morning Alexander marshaled his army, consisting of 40,000 infantry, and 7,000 cavalry. As at Issus, Alexander led the right and Parmenio the left. In fact the whole conflict was hardly more than a repetition of the battle of Issus. Alexander defeated the Persian left, and got near enough to hurl a spear at Darius which killed his charioteer. At this the cry was raised that Darius had fallen, the Persian ranks at once grew unsteady, and presently began to break and fly. Darius, seeing this, and being in imminent danger from Alexander, yielded to the general alarm and fled, and with him, fleeing in every direction, went the whole of the left and center of his army. The Persian right, however, stoutly withstood Parmenio until Alexander had routed the rest of the army, and was recalled to attack these in flank, then, seeing that all hope of success was gone, they too quitted the field. Then the terror began. The Persians hurrying to cross the river Zab, were pursued by the conquerors, who slew the unresisting fugitives, till they were weary of slaughter.

"The prodigious army of Darius was all either killed, taken, or dispersed, at the battle of Arbela. . . . The miscellaneous contingents of this once empire, such at least, among them, as survived, dispersed to their respective homes, and could never be again mustered in mass. The defeat of Arbela was in fact the death-blow of the Persian Empire. It converted Alexander into the great king, and Darius into nothing better than a fugitive pretender."—*Grote, chap. 93, par. 88.*

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 12:1-15. The Temple Repaired" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 38 , p. 598.**

**OCTOBER 25. 2 KINGS 12:1-15**

THE subject of this lesson is, "The Temple Repaired," but before we notice that, we shall have to inquire how it became necessary that the temple should be repaired. Jehoram, the son of Johosphaphat, married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and this carried into the kingdom of Judah all the corruptions of the house of Israel; for, says the record, "He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, like as did the house of Ahab; for he had the daughter of Ahab to wife." The Arabians came and slew all of Jehoram's sons except Ahaziah, the youngest; Jehoram died; and Ahaziah went down to see Joram of Israel just at the time when Jehu was executing judgment on the house of Ahab, and Jehu slew him with the princes of the house of Ahab. And even while he lived "his mother was his counselor to do wickedly."

WHEN Athaliah learned that Ahaziah was dead, "she arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah." But Jehoshabeath, the sister of Ahaziah, was the wife of Jehoiada the priest, and she secured Joash, who was about a year old, and fled with him to the temple, where she hid him and his nurse, and there he was kept under the care of Jehoiada the priest, six years. This left Athaliah, the daughter of Jezebel, in authority in the kingdom of Judah. She, being the true daughter of her mother, forced the worship of Baal upon the people of Judah as her mother had forced it upon Israel. She built a house for Baal, and robbed the house of the Lord of its ornaments and decorations and wealth, to furnish the house of Baal. When Joash was seven years old, Jehoiada laid plans to proclaim him king. "And he set all the people, every man having his weapon in his hand, from the right side of the temple to the left side of the temple, along by the altar and the temple, by the king round about. Then they brought out the king's son, and put upon him the crown, and gave him the testimony, and made him king. And Jehoiada and his sons anointed him, and said, God save the king."

"NOW when Athaliah heard the noise of the people running and praising the king, she came to the people into the house of the Lord; and she looked, and, behold, the king stood at his pillar at the entering in, and the princes and the trumpets by the king; and all the people of the land rejoiced, and sounded with

trumpets, also the singers with instruments of music, and such as taught to sing praise. Then Athaliah rent her clothes, and said, Treason, Treason." Then Athaliah was slain, "and Jehoiada made a covenant between him, and between all the people, and between the king, that they should be the Lord's people. Then all the people went to the house of Baal, and brake it down, and brake his altars and his images in pieces, and slew Mattan the priest of Baal before the altars." Thus Baal was destroyed out of Judah also.

THEN under the guidance and wise counsel of Jehoiada, Joash carried forward the good work of reformation, and gave orders that the temple that had been rifled by Athaliah should be repaired. But, although the people were willing and gave of their means for the purpose, it seems that the priests, to whom was given the charge, were unfaithful; for the donations continued twenty-three years, yet nothing was done for the house of the Lord. It appears that the priests who had charge of the matter had gone so far as to even keep for themselves the means dedicated to the house of the Lord. "Then king Jehoash called for Jehoiada the priest, and the other priests, and said unto them, Why repair ye not the breaches of the house? now therefore receive no more money of your acquaintance, but deliver it for the breaches of the house. And the priests consented to receive no more money of the people, neither to repair the breaches of the house."

THEN "Jehoiada the priest took a chest, and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar, on the right side as one cometh into the house of the Lord; and the priests that kept the door put therein all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord. And it was so, when they saw that there was much money in the chest, that the king's scribe and the high priest came up, and they put up in bags, and told the money that was found in the house of the Lord. And they gave the money, being told, into the hands of them that did the work, that had the oversight of the house of the Lord; and they laid it out to the carpenters and builders, that wrought upon the house of the Lord. And to masons, and hewers of stone, and to buy timber and hewed stone to repair the breaches of the house of the Lord, and for all that was laid out for the house to repair it."

THIS time they found honest men to do the business—so strictly honest, indeed, that it was not necessary to reckon with them, for we read, "They reckoned not with the men, into whose hand they delivered the money to be bestowed on workmen: for they dealt faithfully."

WE cannot be any too careful with the house of the Lord. The Lord himself has great care for the place of his worship, and we are doing his will when we have a care for it. Once as David sat in his house, Nathan was sitting by, and David spoke to him, saying, "See now, I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." That very night the Lord appeared to Nathan, and told him to go and tell David that he should not build the house himself, but that his son should build it, and also to say to David, "Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an house. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7:1-16. Thus we see that a *thought* of David's, concerning the house of the Lord, is rewarded with eternal glory. There is a *thought* that bears fruit to all eternity.

AT another time the house of the Lord was desolate, and the people regarded it carelessly, although they themselves dwelt in good houses. And at the same time they made excuses that they could not build the house because they were not doing well financially. Their crops failed; their money seemed to slip away unawares; and their clothing did not wear as well as it ought. But the very thing which they made an excuse for not building the house was the result of their not building it. Then the Lord said, "Consider your ways. Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the Lord. Ye looked for much, and, lo, it came to little; and when ye brought it home, I did blow upon it. Why? saith the Lord of hosts. *Because of mine house that is waste, and ye run every man unto his own house.*" Haggai 1:7-9.

AGAIN we say, The Lord has a care for the place of his worship, and he not only wants his people to have a care for it, but he richly rewards such care. But such a care as he regards is not that kind in which the place of his worship is fitted up for theatricals, operatic airs, feasts, and festivals.

A. T. J.

**October 15, 1885**

**"The Empire of Grecia. (*Concluded.*) Extent of Alexander's Rule" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 39 , p. 612.**

"A FEW days after the battle, Alexander entered Babylon, 'the oldest seat of earthly empire' then in existence, as its acknowledged lord and master. There were yet some campaigns of his brief and bright career, to be accomplished. Central Asia was yet to witness the march of his phalanx. He was yet to effect that conquest of Afghanistan in which England since has failed. His generalship, as well as his valor, was yet to be signalized on the banks of the Hydaspes and the field of Chillian-wallah; and he was yet to precede the queen of England in annexing the Punjaub to the dominions of a European sovereign. But the crisis of his career was reached; the great object of his mission was accomplished; and the ancient Persian Empire, which once menaced all the nations of the earth with subjection, was irreparably crushed when Alexander had won his crowning victory of Arbela."—*Creasy's Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World, Arbela, last paragraph.*

As the battle of the Granicus gave Alexander all Asia Minor, and as the battle of the Issus laid at his feet Egypt, and all of Asia west of the Euphrates, so the battle of Arbela bestowed upon him all of eastern Asia, from the Euphrates to the Indus and the Jaxartes. In tracing the fulfillment of another prophecy, we shall have occasion to follow in detail, Alexander's course from the Hellespont to the utmost limits of his conquests, even as sketched by Mr. Creasy's eloquent pen. But for the present it must suffice for us simply to observe that, from about the

middle of November, 331 B.C., to the month of August, 325 B.C., Alexander had accomplished all that is suggested in the above quotation, and about the month of November, 324 B.C., was once more within the gates of the city of Babylon. And in view of these facts which we have given, there can be no shadow of a doubt that the power of Grecia, as carried by Alexander the Great, was the "third kingdom of brass," of which Daniel spoke to Nebuchadnezzar.

Its being the "third kingdom" was not all that Daniel spoke of it however. He declared to Nebuchadnezzar that it should "*bear rule over all the earth.*" We have outlined the scope of his personal conquest, from the Adriatic Sea on the west, to the river Indus on the east; from the river Danube, the Black and the Caspian Seas, and the river Jaxartes on the north, to the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and lower Egypt on the south. This of itself was the greatest part of the then known earth. But the prophecy does not say that it should bear rule over the *greater part* of the known earth, but it does say, "over all," and nothing less than "over all" as then known, will meet the demands of the prophecy. Was it so? and can it be shown? It was so; and it can be shown. Alexander's influence was not confined to the limits described by his personal presence. As quoted by Creasy, Arrian says boldly:—

"I believe that there was in his time no nation of men, no city, nay, no single individual, with whom Alexander's name had not become a familiar word. I therefore hold that such a man, who was like no ordinary mortal, was not born into the world without some special providence."—*Fifteen Decisive Battles, Arbela, par. 4.*

This statement is probably extravagant, so far as it relates to the "single individual," but with this exception, we verily believe it to be a justifiable statement. But now to the proofs:—

"Alexander being arrived within a league and a half [four and a half miles] of Babylon, the Chaldeans, who pretended to know futurity by the stars, deputed to him some of their old men to warn him that he would be in danger of his life in case he entered that city, and were very urgent that he should pass by it. . . . The Greek philosophers being told the foundation of his fear and scruples waited upon him; . . . and made him have so great a contempt for divination in general, and for that of the Chaldeans in particular, that he immediately marched toward Babylon with his whole army. He knew that there were arrived in that city *ambassadors from all parts of the world*, who waited for his coming; *the whole earth echoing so much with the terror of his name* that the several nations came with inexpressible ardor, *to pray homage to Alexander, as to him who was to be their sovereign.* . . . So that he set forward with all possible diligence towards that great city, *there to hold, as it were, the states-general of the world.* After making a most magnificent entry, he gave audience to all the ambassadors, with the grandeur and dignity suitable to a great monarch, and at the same time with the affability and politeness of a prince who is desirous of winning the affections of all."—*Rollin, Hist. Alexander, sec. 18, par. 1.*

"So widely had the terror of his name and achievement been spread, that several of these envoys came from the most distant regions. There were some from the various tribes of Lybia [west of Egypt]—from Carthage [west of Lybia]—from Sicily and Sardinia— from the Illyrians and Thracians— from the Lucanians, Bruttians, and Tuscans, in Italy— nay (even some affirmed), *from the Romans*, as yet a people of moderate power. But there were other names yet more surprising—Ethiopians from the extreme south, beyond Egypt— Scythians from the north, beyond the Danube—Iberians [from Spain] and Gauls [from France], from the far west, beyond the Mediterranean Sea. Legates also arrived from various Grecian cities, partly to tender congratulations and compliments upon his matchless successes, partly to remonstrate against his sweeping mandate for the general restoration of the Grecian exiles. It was remarked that these Grecian legates approached him with wreaths on their heads, tendering golden wreaths to him, as if they were coming into the presence of a god. *The proofs which Alexander received even from distant tribes*, with names and costumes unknown to him, *of fear for his enmity and anxiety for his favor*, were such as had never been shown to any historical person, and such as entirely to explain his superhuman arrogance."—*Grote, chap. 94, par. 79* (23 from the end of the chapter).

"His march to Babylon steeped him still more in the intoxication of success. As he advanced on his road he was met by ambassadors not only from Illyrians and Thracians, from Sicily and Sardinia, and Lybia, and Carthage, but from Lucanians and Etruscans, and, as some said, *from Rome itself*. *The lord of all the earth could scarcely look for wider acknowledgment or more devout submission.*"—*Encyc. Brit., article, Alexander the Great, par. 14.*

"In the tenth year after he had crossed the Hellespont, Alexander, having won his vast dominion, entered Babylon; and, resting from his career, in that oldest seat of earthly empire, he steadily surveyed the mass of various nations which owned his sovereignty, and revolved in his mind the great work of breathing into this huge but inert body the living spirit of Greek civilization. In the bloom of youthful manhood, at the age of thirty-two, he paused from the fiery speed of his earlier course; and for the first time gave the nations an opportunity of offering their homage before his throne. *They came from all the extremities of the earth*, to propitiate his anger, to celebrate his greatness, or to solicit his protection. *African tribes came* to congratulate and bring presents to him as the sovereign of Asia. Not only would *the people bordering on Egypt upon the west* look with respect on the founder of Alexandria and the son of Jupiter Ammon, but *those who dwelt on the east of the Nile*, and on *the shores of the Arabian Gulf*, would hasten to pay court to the great king whose fleets had navigated the Erythrean

Sea, and whose power was likely to affect so largely their traffic with India.

"Already the bravest of *the barbarians of Europe* were eager to offer him their aid; and the *Kelts and Iberians*, who had become acquainted with Grecian service when they fought under Dionysius and Agesilaus, *sent embassies to the great conqueror at Babylon*, allured alike by the fame of his boundless treasures and his unrivaled valor. It was no wonder that *the Carthaginians*, who had dreaded, a century earlier, the far inferior power of the Athenians, and on whose minds Timoleon's recent victories had left a deep impression of the military genius of Greece, dispatched their ambassadors to secure, if possible, the friendship of Alexander. . . . *The Lucanians and the Bruttians* are especially mentioned as having *sent embassies to Alexander at Babylon*. . . . 'The Tyrrhenians also,' said Aristobulus and Ptolemeus, 'sent an embassy to the king to congratulate him upon his conquests.' The ports of the western coasts of Italy swarmed at this time with piratical vessels, which constantly annoyed the Greek traders in those seas. These piracies had been reported to Alexander, *and he sent remonstrances to the Romans* on the subject. . . . There is every reason to believe that among the Tyrrhenian ambassadors mentioned by Alexander's historians *there were included ambassadors from Rome*.

"History may allow us to think that *Alexander and a Roman ambassador did meet at Babylon*; that *the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a citizen of that great nation* which was destined to succeed him in his appointed work and to found a wider and still more enduring empire. They met, too, in Babylon, almost beneath the shadow of Bel, perhaps the earliest monument ever raised by human pride and power, in a city stricken, as it were, by the word of God's heaviest judgment, as the symbol of greatness apart from and opposed to goodness. . . . During the period of Alexander's conquests, no other events of importance happened in any part of the civilized world, as if *a career so brilliant had claimed the undivided attention of mankind*."—Arnold, *History of Rome*, chap. 30, par. 1-3.

Here are two scenes:—

Scene first: In the year 603 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar, king of the mighty kingdom, and builder of the wonderful city of Babylon, sits in his pleasant palace. Before him, and speaking earnestly, stands a young Jew. To the intently listening king, the young man is interpreting a remarkable dream that the great king had dreamed; he says that God is thus making known to the king what should come to pass afterward; and that one among these things would be the rise of a "third kingdom," and that this third kingdom should "bear rule over all the earth."

Scene second: Two hundred and seventy years afterward, in that same great city of Babylon, perhaps in the same palace where

Nebuchadnezzar had sat there sits Alexander the Great, king of the third kingdom from Nebuchadnezzar. As there he sit upon his throne, before him stand ambassadors "from all the extremities of the earth," who are come "to propitiate his anger, to celebrate his greatness, or to solicit his protection."

Now look on this picture, then on that; and no man can say that the scene represented in the second, is not the perfect consummation of that which was spoken in the first. The dream was certain, the interpretation was sure; and the fulfillment absolute.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 10:15-31. Jehu's Zeal"**  
***The Signs of the Times* 11, 39 , p. 614.**

**OCTOBER 18. 2 KINGS 10:15-31**

THE real title of the subject of this lesson, as given in the "International Lessons," is "Jehu's *False Zeal*." But we know not by what right the lesson committee insert the word "false." And we think it is contrary to the intention of the inspired record. For we read distinctly in verse 30: "And the Lord said unto Jehu, Because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel." This was said to Jehu by the Lord, after Jehu had done what is recorded in the lesson. And when the Lord says to Jehu, "*Thou hast done well* in executing *that which is right* in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab *according to all* that was in mine heart;" and when *because* of this the Lord pronounces a reward upon Jehu and upon his house for four generation, upon the throne of Israel; in view of all this we think it a very questionable piece of wisdom for the lesson committee to brand it as "Jehu's *false zeal*." When the Lord says that Jehu did "well;" that he did "right;" that he did according to what was in His heart concerning Ahab; then for the lesson committee to charge it up as "*false zeal*," is certainly, to say the least, not very far removed from charging the Lord himself with a "false zeal." We think when *the Lord* pronounces so plainly as this upon the merit of an action, it is best for *men* to confine themselves to the record.

THE time had fully come when judgment must be executed upon the bloody house of Ahab. When that "still small voice" came to Elijah as he stood at the mouth of the cave in Horeb, the Lord said unto him, "Go, return on thy way to the wilderness of Damascus: and when thou comest, anoint Hazael to be king over Syria; and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel; and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. And it shall come to pass, that him that escapeth the sword of Hazael shall Jehu slay; and him that escapeth from the sword of Jehu shall Elisha slay." 1 Kings 19:15-17. And again Elisha sent a young man of the children of the prophets directly to Jehu with this message: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I have anointed thee king over the people of the Lord, even over Israel. And thou

shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets; and the blood of all the servants of the Lord, at the hand of Jezebel. For the whole house of Ahab shall perish;" etc. 2 Kings 9:1-10.

ACCORDING to this word, Hazael was now king of Syria, and Joram, the son of Ahab, had made war against Hazael and "the Syrians wounded Joram. And king Joram went back to be healed in Jezreel of the wounds which the Syrians had given him at Ramah, when he fought against Hazael king of Syria." Chap. 8:28, 29. Then it was that Elisha sent the young men to anoint Jehu king, that he might, according to the word of Elijah, slay him that had escaped from the sword of Hazael. And if he had escaped the sword of Jehu, then it would have remained for Elisha to slay him. The house of Ahab was devoted, and their judgment could no longer be delayed. And as Jehu came, driving "furiously," "Joram said, Make ready. And his chariot was made ready. And Joram king of Israel and Ahaziah king of Judah went out, each in his chariot, and they went out against Jehu, and met him in the portion of Naboth the Jezreelite."

THERE was that fatal field of Naboth—the monument of the united iniquities of Ahab and Jezebel. And when, on that fatal day, after the innocent blood of Naboth and his sons had been poured out, Ahab went down to take possession of the portion of Naboth, Jehu followed him in a chariot, and was there when Elijah pronounced the fearful doom of Ahab and Jezebel with all their house, and now Jehu comes to execute the judgment that day pronounced. "And it came to pass, when Joram saw Jehu, that he said, Is it peace, Jehu? And he answered, What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many? And Joram turned his hands, and fled, and said to Ahaziah, There is treachery, O Ahaziah.

"AND Jehu drew a bow with his full strength, and smote Jehoram between his arms, and the arrow went out at his heart, and he sunk down in his chariot. Then said Jehu to Bidkar his captain, Take up, and cast him in the portion of the field of Naboth the Jezreelite; for remember how that, when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, the Lord laid this burden upon him; surely I have seen yesterday the blood of Naboth, and the blood of his sons, saith the Lord; and I will requite thee in this plat, saith the Lord."

WHEN Jehu came to Jezreel, "Jezebel heard of it; and she painted her face, and tired her head, and looked out at a window." She must once more assert herself, and as Jehu entered in at the gate she cried out, "Had Zimri peace, who slew his master?" But it was her last effort. The chamberlains of her palace pitched her out through the window, and so perished Jezebel.

BUT Jehu's work was not done yet. The house and the prophets, and the priests, and the worship of Baal, which Jezebel had introduced, still remained. "And Jehu gathered all the people together, and said unto them, Ahab served Baal a little; but Jehu shall serve him much." So he proclaimed all Israel, and all the worshipers of Baal came, so that there was not a man left that came not. . . . And the house of Baal was full from one end to another." They were all destroyed. "And they brought forth the images out of the house of Baal, and burned them. And they brake down the image of Baal, and brake down the house of Baal, and made it a draught house unto this day. Thus Jehu destroyed Baal

out of Israel." Thus sin brings its fearful penalty. Warning after warning, reproof after reproof, entreaty after entreaty, had come to the house of Ahab, but all to no avail. And "He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy." Prov. 29:1. "Turn you at my reproof; behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you." Prov. 1:23.

THERE is another point in this lesson worthy of consideration. It is the part taken by Jehonadab, the son of Rechab. As Jehu was on his way from Jezreel to Samaria, he came upon Jehonadab and sainted him. In the midst of all the corruption and iniquity of Israel, Jehonadab had taken special precaution to keep his family pure. He had pledged them particularly that they should drink no wine, neither they nor their sons forever, etc. Jer. 35. Jehu said to him, "Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? And Jehonadab answered, It is." Said Jehu, "If it be, give me thine hand. And he gave him his hand; and he took him up to him into the chariot. And he said, Come with me, and see my zeal for the Lord. So they made him ride in his chariot." And it appears that Jehonadab acted in concert with Jehu in all that followed. For he went with Jehu through the crowd of Baal-worships in the house of Baal, to search and see that there were no worshipers of the Lord there. This again is against the idea of Jehu's zeal being a "false zeal."

IN this narrative of Jehu in his chariot, riding in his zeal to perform the righteous judgment of the Lord upon the adversaries of Jehovah in the land of Israel, we are reminded of a Greater than Jehu, who at the last is to visit the judgments of the Lord upon all of the ungodly. "Behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many." Isa. 66:15, 16. "For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak. According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies; to the islands he will repay recompense." Isa. 59:17, 18. And when thus He comes in His glory, then to every one whose heart is right as His heart is with the right, he will say, Give me thine hand, and all such will he take up in his chariot, and make them ride in his chariot.

GOD is righteous. He loves righteousness and hates iniquity, and to "the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;* therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Heb. 1:8, 9. And to all of the children of men who love righteousness and hate iniquity, the Son of God saith, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3:21.

A. T. J.

**"How Readest Thou?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 39 , p. 615.**

SOME ONE, presumably its editor, has sent us a number of papers bearing the title, *The Spirit of the Word*, and in the first number we have an explanation of the title, as follows:—

"By the *Spirit* of the word I mean its *real* and intended meaning, in contradistinction to its apparent and surface meaning, or the 'letter.' It is a common mistake among Christians to suppose the Bible is written in very plain and simple language, and that the correct meaning is that which lies upon the surface—the most obvious and apparent sense. If I err not, the truth is just the opposite of this. The Bible often means something very different from what it says. . . . It may sound strange and erroneous, to some, to hear any one say that the Bible does not mean what it says. But if you will read this paper month after month, I think I can show you that I do not make the statement unwarrantably."

From what we have read of the paper, we think the last statement to be correct. We believe that the person who should read that paper "month after month" would not only believe that the Bible does not mean what it says, but would also believe that there is nothing that means what it says.

But we can prove, by sound logic, and upon his own principles, that the Bible *does* mean what it says. See: *He* says that the Bible means "just the opposite" of what it says. So *he* must mean "just the opposite" of what *he* says. Therefore, by his own principles, the Bible means just what it says. Because when *he* says that the Bible means just the opposite of what it says, *he means* just the opposite of what he says; and the opposite of what he says is, that the Bible means just what it says.

We suppose, however, that this editor will hardly admit our deduction; yet we cannot see how he can reasonably object to it, for surely we have just as much right to hold that his words mean the opposite of what they say, as he has to say that the Bible means just the opposite of what it says. And if he, or any other, objects, then we should like him to explain to us by what right it is that he applies to the word of God a false rule that may not be applied to his own words.

But this person is not the only one who holds to this system of interpreting the word of God. True, all such do not state the case so boldly, but they act firmly upon the principles which this writer has plainly stated. When the Lord says, "The soul that sinneth it shall die" (Eze. 18:4), he is made to mean that it shall live to all eternity. When the Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God" (Ex. 20:10), he is made to mean that that is the Jewish Sabbath; that it is the first day of the week; that it is the seventh part of time; etc., etc., in fact he is made to mean just anything at all but what he says. When the Lord says, "The gift of God is eternal life *through Jesus Christ* our Lord" (Rom. 6:23), he is made to mean that eternal life is the common lot of all men. When the Lord says, "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life" (1 John 5:12), he is made to mean that every man has life whether he has the Son of God or not.

This is nowadays the prevalent mode of reading the word of God. It is read in the reverse of what it really says, and so every man is left "to do that which is

right in his own eyes." The Saviour once asked a lawyer these two questions: "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" Luke 10:26. These questions are as appropriate to-day as they were the day they were first uttered. "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" If the Lord wanted to tell the people of this world that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, how would it be possible for him to do it more plainly than he has done it? If he wanted to tell the people that the soul that sinneth it shall die, how could he do it in any other words than those in which he has told them? If he wanted to tell men that his own

618

*gift* to men is eternal life through Jesus Christ; and that those who have Christ have life, and those who have not Christ have no life; how would it be possible for him to tell them that in words more plain than those in which he has told just that thing?

"How readest thou?" Do you read the word as it is, or do you read it the reverse of what it is? And if you read it, and seek to obey it, in the reverse of what it says, why should not the Lord reward you in the reverse of the hopes which you build upon your reverse reading? "What is written in the law? how readest thou?"

A. T. J.

### **"A New Sunday Champion" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 39 , p. 624.**

THE Sunday institution has found a new champion. Of course he hails from Ohio. And of all men, who should it be? Why, John W. Rockefeller, of Standard Oil notoriety. A few Sundays ago, the noted bully, John L. Sullivan, was hired to pitch in a game of base-ball at Cleveland. When the sport had gone on all day without any disturbance, and 4,000 spectators had fully enjoyed themselves, and the game had closed, then the valiant Rockefeller bestirred himself. The daughty Sullivan was arrested and was fined \$10 and costs, and the wounded honor of Sunday, and of John W. Rockefeller, was vindicated. The following from the *Chronicle* (S. F. ) hits the things exactly:—

"It seems like a paradox to learn that the head of the great Standard Oil monopoly, who has done more than any other man to corrupt the politics of Ohio and neighboring States, is posing as the apostle of Sabbatarianism in Cleveland. At least it was at his instance that slogger Sullivan was arrested for pitching ball on Sunday, although a nice sense of the commercial value of the game was shown by not disturbing it until the 4,000 spectators had enjoyed the day's sport. This crusade may be prompted by a genuine desire to keep the Sabbath from desecration, but the people who are engaged in the work ought to select another leader than the corrupter of legislatures."

But what do the Sunday crusaders care who are their leaders, so long as they will show their zeal for Sunday? That is the one all-essential qualification, and it covers every other shortcoming. And this instance is simply an indication of the characters who will champion the Sunday cause as it grows in popularity. We

commend to the National Reform Party this newly-fledged champion of reform(?).  
A. T. J.

**October 22, 1885**

**"The Roman Empire" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 40 , p. 628.**

"AND the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron; forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." Dan. 2:40.

It is certain that of those four kingdoms of the prophecy, each is universal in its time and place, and so in the very nature of the case must be successive. Of the kingdoms of Nebuchadnezzar it is said, "Wheresoever the children of men dwell. . . . hath He given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all." Of the next kingdom it was said: "And after thee shall arise another kingdom." The preceding one extending over all civilized countries, when another should arise it must establish its authority and ascendancy, or it could not be recognized as "*another* kingdom;" and the only way in which it could possibly so establish itself would be by overturning the power which then exerted the universal rule, which, of necessity, would plant itself as the successor in the supremacy. This view is made positive by the words which introduce the next, the "third kingdom of brass, which" should "bear rule over all the death." By the terms which describe the place of each of these three kingdoms it is literally impossible that more than one of them could be in existence at the same time.

Having seen the extent of the "third kingdom"—that of the Grecian—it is plain that when the "fourth kingdom" shall arise it must be universal, as was each of the three which preceded it in the description given by the prophet. Especially must this be so, in view of the words in which it is set forth as being "strong as iron," and as iron that breaketh all things, "so shall it break in pieces and bruise." This shows that, as iron is the strongest of metals, so the fourth kingdom should be the strongest of these kingdoms. Therefore the fourth kingdom must be stronger than the Grecian under Alexander the Great; and as that bore rule over all the *then* known earth, this can do no less; and for the fourth kingdom we must look for one that ruled the more widely known world more absolutely than it was ruled by Alexander the Great.

This fourth kingdom is fairly, and nicely, introduced in the last historical quotation which we gave on the extent of the kingdom of Alexander the Great. We will here reproduce that part of the quotation:—

"History may allow us to think that Alexander and a *Roman* ambassador did meet at Babylon; that the greatest man of the ancient world saw and spoke with a *citizen of that great nation, which was destined to succeed him* in his appointed work, and to found a wider and still more enduring empire."—*Arnold's History of Rome, chap. 30, par. 2.*

And every school-boy who has ever read in McGuffey's old Fifth Reader, knows of

"Rome, That sat on her seven hills, and from her throne Of beauty *ruled the world!*"

And how that

"in that elder day, to be a *Roman*, Was *greater than a king.*"

The Scripture, too, speaks of the widespread power of Rome, saying:—

"And in those days there went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." Luke 2:1.

Cesar Augustus was the first emperor of Rome. His name was originally Caius Octavius; but as he was grand-nephew to the great Julius Cesar, and as that great man adopted him into his own family titles and honors, and made him his heir, with the name of Caius Octavius was incorporated that of Julius Cesar, and then his name stood, Caius Julius Cesar Octavianus. Then when he became the sole head of the mighty empire of Rome, as he already bore the name of the "greatest man of the Roman, or perhaps of all the ancient world," in casting about for a title most befitting his majesty:—

"At last he fixed upon the epithet *Augustus*, a name which no man had borne before, and which, on the contrary, had been applied to things the most noble, most venerable, and most sacred. The rites of the gods were called *august*; their temples were *august*. The word itself was derived from the holy auguries; it was connected in meaning with the abstract term *authority*, and with all that increases and flourishes upon earth. The use of this glorious title could not fail to smooth the way to the general acceptance of the divine character of the mortal who was deemed worthy to bear it."—*Encyc. Brit., art. Augustus and the Augustan Age.*

And as thus he bore the greatest *name*,—Cesar,—and the most sacred and authoritative *title* known to the Roman world, his own name now assumed the form *Cesar Augustus*. He it was who issued the decree "that all the world should be taxed." Not taxed in the form of levying and collecting money, as we now understand the word, but rather an enrollment, or, as we would not express it, he ordered a *census* of the empire to be taken.

To see how fitly Luke's words describe the extent of the power of Cesar Augustus and of Rome, and to show how perfectly Rome fulfills the prophecy of the fourth kingdom, we shall now present the testimony of the most authoritative writers. We can introduce this no better than with the following words of Gibbon:—

"The empire of the Romans filled the world, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. The slave of imperial despotism, whether he was condemned to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Scriphus, or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly. On every side he was encompassed with a vast extent of sea and land, which he could never hope to traverse without being

discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers, his anxious view could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable deserts, hostile tribes of barbarians, of fierce manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the emperor's protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. 'Wherever you are,' said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, 'remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror.'"—*Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 3, par. 37.*

In illustration of the absolute power exerted by the emperor, Gibbon subjoins the following two notes:—

"Seriphus was a small and rocky island in the Egean Sea, the inhabitants of which were despised for their ignorance and obscurity. The place of Ovid's exile is well known, by his just, but unmanly lamentations. It should seem, that he only received an order to leave Rome in so many days, and to transport himself to Tomi. Gaards and gaolers were unnecessary.

"Under Tiberius, a Roman knight attempted to fly to the Parthians. He was stopped in the straits of Sicily; but so little danger did there appear in the example, that the most jealous of tyrants disdained to punish it."—*Id.*

Ovid was banished by Cesar Augustus. Tomi was a "semi-Greek semi-barbaric town," on the coast of the Black Sea, about ninety miles south of the mouth of the Danube. There, to "the very outskirts of civilization," he was ordered to go; there he went, and there he remained about eight years, even to the day of his death; and all that was required to either take or keep him there, was the *word* of the emperor of Rome. Thus far-reaching, and so absolute, was the power of Rome.

"That imperial dignity . . . was undoubtedly the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which upon this planet has been suffered to appear."—*De Quincey's Essays, The Cesars, chap. 6, last paragraph, last sentence.*

"But the same omnipresence of imperial anger and retribution which withered the hopes of the poor humble prisoner, met and confounded the emperor himself, when buried from his giddy height by some fortunate rival. All the kingdoms of the earth, to one in that situation, became but so many wards of the same infinite prison. Flight, if it were not successful for the moment, did but little toward his inevitable doom. And so evident was this, that hardly in once instance did the fallen prince *attempt* to fly, but passively met the death which was inevitable, in the very spot where ruin had overtaken him."—*Id., The Cesars, introduction, par. 12.*

"Rome, therefore, which came last in the succession, and swallowed up the three great powers that had *seriatim* cast the human race into one mould, and had brought them under the unity of a single will, entered by inheritance upon all that its predecessors in that career had appropriated, but in a condition of far ampler development. Estimated merely by longitude and latitude, the territory of the Roman Empire was the finest, by much, that has ever fallen under a single

scepter. . . . Rome laid a belt about the Mediterranean of a thousand miles in breadth; and within that zone she comprehended not only all the great cities of the ancient world, but so perfectly did she lay the garden of the world in every climate, and for every mode of natural wealth, within her own ring-fence, that, since that era, no land, no part and parcel of the Roman Empire, has ever risen into strength and opulence, except where unusual artificial industry has availed to counteract the tendencies of nature. So entirely had Rome engrossed whatsoever was rich by the mere bounty of native endowment. Vast, therefore unexampled, immeasurable, was the basis of natural power upon which the Roman throne reposed."—*Id.*, *paragraph 8*.

"Its range, the compass of its extent, was appalling to the imagination. Coming last among what are called the great monarchies of prophecy, it was the only one which realized in perfection the idea of a *monarchia*, being (except for Parthia and the great fable of India beyond it) strictly coincident with the civilized world. Civilization and this empire were commensurate; they were interchangeable ideas and co-extensive. . . . The vast power and dominion of the Roman Empire, for the three centuries which followed the battle of Actium, have dazzled the historic eye. . . . The battle of Actium was followed by the final conquest of Egypt. That conquest rounded and integrated the glorious empire; it was now circular as a shield. . . . From that day forward for three hundred years, there was silence in the world; no muttering was heard; no eye winked beneath the wing. Winds of hostility might still rave at intervals; yet it was on the outside of the mighty empire; it was at a dream-like distance; ;and, like the storms that beat against some monumental castle, 'and at the doors and windows seem to call,' they rather irritated and vivified the sense of security, than at all disturbed its luxurious lull."—*Id.*, *Philosophy of Roman History, par. 1, 2*.

A. T. J.

(*To be Continued.*)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 13:14-25. The Death of Elisha" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 40 , p. 631.**

**NOVEMBER 1. 2 KINGS 13:14-25**

AFTER the anointing of Jehu as king of Israel, nothing more is said of Elisha till this record of his last sickness and death—a period of about forty-five years; this covered the whole of the reign of Jehu and his son Jehoahaz, and part of the reign of Joash, the grandson of Jehu. Hazael reigned in Syria all this time, and continued to commit depredations in all the coasts of Israel (2 Kings 10:32; 13:22). He even made an incursion into the kingdom of Judah, took Gather, and "set his face to go up to Jerusalem." Then Joash of Judah "took all the hallowed things that Jehoshaphat, and Jehoram, and Ahaziah, his fathers, kings of Judah, had dedicated, and his own hallowed things, and all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house, and sent it to Hazael, king of Syria; and he went away from Jerusalem." 2 Kings 12:17, 18.

Hazael had so persistently oppressed Israel that finally there was left "of the people to Jehoahaz but fifty horsemen; for the king of Syria had destroyed them, and had made them like the dust by threshing."

THIS was the condition of affairs at the time of our lesson. "Now Elisha was fallen sick of his sickness whereof he died. And Joash the king of Israel came down unto him, and wept over his face, and said, O my father, my father! the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." Now that Joash is about to lose Elisha from his kingdom forever, he comes to weep over him, and to remember the day when Elisha alone was more than a match for all the armed hosts of Syria. He now begins to realize what a protection Elisha was, and what a power the kingdom is now about to lose. If he had remembered this sooner, he would not have been brought so low. If he had never forgotten it, Israel would have flourished instead of being oppressed. It is ever so. We appreciate our blessings when they are gone. Then, too we act without them as we should have acted when they were with us. But if we would only learn to appreciate our blessings while we have them, then we should not have to do without them; for by the advantage of these, we should but be advanced to other and greater ones.

BUT for even this parting token of regard, Elisha, in kindness, shows the king a token of good from the Lord. "And Elisha said unto him, Take bow and arrows. And he took unto him bow and arrows. And he said to the king of Israel, Put thine hand upon the bow. And he put his hand upon it; and Elisha put his hands upon the king's hands. And he said, Open the window eastward. And he opened it. Then Elisha said, Shoot. And he shot. And he said, The arrow of the Lord's deliverance, and the arrow of deliverance from Syria; for thou shalt smite the Syrians in Aphek, till thou have consumed them. And he said, Take the arrows. And he took them. And he said unto the king of Israel, Smite upon the ground. And he smote thrice, and stayed. And the man of God was wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times; then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it; whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice."

HAZAEEL was succeeded by his son Ben-hadad. "And Jehoash the son of Jehoahaz took again out of the hand of Benhadad the son of Hazael the cities, which he had taken out of the hand of Jehoahaz his father by war. Three times did Joash beat him, and recovered the cities of Israel." And Syria never invaded Israel any more.

"AND Elisha died, and they buried him." And that is the obituary of Elisha, the "man of God." The Bible writers are remarkable for the brevity of the obituaries. It would be well if their way were followed more fully at the present day.

"AND the bands of the Moabites invaded the land at the coming in of the year." The Moabites were the descendants of Moab, the son of one of the daughters of Lot, by her father, after the destruction of Sodom. Their country lay to the east of the Dead Sea.

"AND it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold, they spied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulcher of Elisha; and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet." It is idle to conjecture upon *why* the Lord wrought this miracle. He has

not told us why it was. He has recorded the fact, and that is all we can say about it.

WITH the death of Elisha closes the lessons in the Kings, for this year. But the kingdom of Israel continued only about a hundred years longer, until even the Lord could no longer bear with them, and then he cast them out of his presence. In to-day's lesson, verse 23, we read that for all the sins of the successive kings, yet "the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, and had respect unto them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast he them from his presence as yet." Finally, however, they had so literally "sold themselves to do evil" that the Lord removed them out of his sight, and rejected all the seed of Israel, and they were carried captive into Assyria, and never returned to their own land.

A. T. J.

**October 29, 1885**

**"The Empire of Rome. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 41 ,  
pp. 644, 645.**

(Continued.)

"THE Cesar of Western Rome—he only of all earthly potentates, past or to come, could be said to reign as a *monarch*, that is, as solitary king. He was not the greatest of princes, simply because there was no other but himself. There were doubtless, a few outlying rulers, of unknown names and titles, upon the margins of his empire; there were tributary lieutenants and barbarous *reguli*, the obscure vassals of his scepter, whose homage was offered on the lowest step of his throne, and scarcely known to him but as objects of disdain. But these feudatorics could no more break the unity of his empire, which embraced the whole civilized world,—the total habitable world as then known to geography or recognized by the muse of history,—than at this day the British Empire on the sea can be brought into question or made conditional, because some chief of Owyhee or Tongatabook should proclaim a momentary independence of the British trident, or should even offer a transient outrage to her sovereign flag.

"Parthia, it is true, might pretend to the dignity of an empire. But her sovereign, though sitting in the seat of the great king, were no longer the rulers of a vast and polished nation. They were regarded as barbarians, potent only by their standing army, not upon the larger basis of civic strength; and even under this limitation, they were supposed to owe more to the circumstances of their position—their climate, their remoteness, and their inaccessibility except through arid and sultry deserts—than to intrinsic resources, such as

could be permanently relied on in a serious trial of strength between the two powers. The kings of Parthia, therefore, were far enough from being regarded in the light of antagonistic forces to the majesty of Rome. And, these withdrawn from the comparison, what else was there—what prince, what king, what potentate of any denomination—to break the universal calm that through centuries continued to lave, as with the quiet undulations of summer lakes, the sacred footsteps of the Cesarian throne."—*DeQuincey's Essays, The Cesar's, introduction, par. 3.*

"As respected the hand of man, Rome slept for ages in absolute security. . . . The Roman power, in its centuries of grandeur, involved every mode of strength, with absolute immunity from all kinds and degrees of weakness. It ought not, therefore, to surprise us that the emperor, as the depositary of this charmed power, should have been looked upon as a *sacred* person, and the imperial family considered as a '*divina domus*.' . . . Much more may this be supposed of him to whose care was confided the weightier part of the human race; who had it in his power to promote or suspend the progress of human improvement; and of whom, and the motions of whose will, the very prophets of Judea took cognizance.

"No nation and no king was utterly divorced from the counsels of God. Palestine, as a central chamber of God's administration, stood in the same relation to all. It has been remarked, as a mysterious and significant fact, that the founders of the great empires all had some connection, more or less, with the temple at Jerusalem. . . . And we may be sure that, amongst them, the Roman emperor, as the great accountant for the happiness of more men, and men more cultivated, than ever before were intrusted to the motions of a single will, had a special, singular, and mysterious relation to the secret councils of Heaven."—*Id., par. 9, 10.*

"All the self-governing powers that had previously filled the world are seen to bend one after the other, and finally disappear. How suddenly did the earth become desolated of her free nations! . . . However deeply we may sympathize with the fall of so many free States, we cannot fail to perceive that a new life sprang immediately from their ruins. With the overthrow of independence, fell the barriers of the exclusive nationalities; the nations were conquered—they were overwhelmed together; but by that very act were they blended and united; for, as the limits of the empire were held to comprise the whole earth, so did its subjects learn to consider themselves as one people."—*Von Ranke, History of the Popes, Book 1, chap. 1, sec. 1, par. 2, 5.*

"Although it would be difficult to affirm, and still more so to prove, that this people [the Romans under the republic] had, from their first rise, formed a plan in order to conquer and subject all

nations, it cannot be denied but that, if we examine their whole conduct attentively, it will appear that they acted as if they had a foreknowledge of this; and that a kind of instinct had determined them to conform to it in all things. . . . Enemies to the liberty of all nations; having the utmost contempt for kings and monarchy; looking upon the whole universe as their prey, they grasped, with insatiable ambition, the conquest of the whole world; they seized indiscriminately all provinces and kingdoms, and extended their empire over all nations; in a word, they prescribed no other limits to their vast projects than those which deserts and seas made it impossible to pass."—*Rollin's Ancient History, Sequel to Alexander's Successors, chap. 1, sec. 7, last two paragraphs.*

The Roman conquests were almost entirely accomplished by the arms of the nation as a republic, and when Augustus succeeded in merging into himself all the authority of the empire, then, as shown by the quotations already given, he became the master of the world, and the remote peoples that had not yet felt the terror of the actual presence of the Roman arms, hastened, as in the day of Alexander the Great, to send their ambassadors, with presents, to crave his friendship.

"The name of Augustus growing famous all over the world, the remotest nations of the North and East, that is, the Scythians, the Samaritans [Sarmatians\*<sup>6</sup> 1], the Indians, and the Seres, sent ambassadors, with presents to him, to pray his friendship, the last of which, Florus tells us, were four years on their journey, which is to be supposed coming and going. The seres were the farthest people of the East, the same whom we now call the Chinese. They being anciently famous for the making of silk, and silken manufactures; hence *serica* became the name of silk, and *sericum* of a silken garment, both among the Greeks and Latins."—*Prideaux's Connection, part 2, book 8, last par. But one, An. 25, Herod 13.*

In the year 21 B.C., Augustus started on an official journey into the East. After spending some time in Sicily, he sailed into Greece, and wintered at Samos.

"While Augustus lay at this place, there came thither to him ambassadors from Candace, queen of Ethiopia, . . . who, finding him at Samos, there obtained from him the peace which they desired, and then returned again into Ethiopia. . . . Early the next spring Augustus passed from Samos into Lesser Asia, and, having settled all matters there, continued his progress through that country into Syria, and came to Antioch.

"Phraates, king of Parthia, on Augustus's coming in Syria, sent ambassadors to him to pray his friendship. For being then upon ill terms with his people, whom he had much alienated from him by his tyranny and cruelty, he dreaded a foreign war, and he had reason at that time to fear it from Augustus. For whereas Augustus had three years before released to him one of his sons (whom he

had in captivity at Rome), upon promise that he would send back to him all the prisoners and ensigns which the Parthians had taken from the Romans in their wars with the Crassus and Antony, he had not yet discharged himself of that obligation. That, therefore, this might not be a cause of war against him, he now not only sent back all those captives and ensigns, but also yielded to all other terms of peace which were then required of him, and gave four of his sons, with their wives and children, in hostage for the performance of them."

"At the same time that Augustus made peace with Parthia, he settled also the affairs of Armenia. . . . Augustus, toward the end of summer, returning out of Syria, was attended by Herod to the sea-shore, where he embarked; and from thence sailed back; Samos, and there resided all the ensuing winter in the same manner as he had the former. . . . While Augustus lay at Samos, there came thither to him a second embassy, from the king of India, to desire the establishment of a league of friendship with him, to which purpose he wrote to him a letter in the Greek language, telling him therein, that though he reigned over six hundred kings, yet he had such value for the friendship of Augustus, by reason of the great fame which he had heard of him, that he sent this embassy on so long a journey on purpose to desire it of him; to which letter he subscribed by the name of Porus, king of India. . . . Of the ambassadors that first set out from India on this embassy, three, only, reached the presence of Augustus; the others that were in commission, died on the way. . . . Among the presents which they brought were several tigers, and these were the first of this sort of wild beasts that had been seen either by Greeks or Romans."—*Id.*, *Book 9, An. 21, Herod 17; An. 19, Herod 19.*

When it is remembered that at this time the Parthian hordes held dominion from the Tigris to the borders of China; that the hordes of the Scythians and the Sarmatians were spread over all the north country above the Sea of Aral, the Caspian, and the Black Sea, and westward to the River Vistula and the Baltic Sea (the Baltic was then called the Sarmatian Ocean); and that from the Vistula, the Upper Danube, and the Rhine, to the German Sea, was covered with the German tribes, as wild and savage as were the American Indians when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock, and that even these had been chastised by Germanicus; then when it is seen, as above, that the Sarmatians, the Scythians, the Parthians, the Chinese, and the Indians, came to the throne of Augustus, bringing presents, asking his friendship, and praying for promises of peace—bearing all this in mind, it stands as the literal truth that, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; from the Arctic regions to the Indian Ocean; and from the German Sea and the Friths of Forth to Ethiopia; there was not a single organized people in the world that did not either feel or fear the power of Rome. See "Labberton's Historical Atlas [*sic.*]," map 15; "Ginn and Heath's Classical Atlas [*sic.*]," map 12.

The boundaries of the actual conquests of the Roman armies—the limits to which the Roman soldiers actually marched and conquered—were marked by the Tigris, the Danube, the Rhine, the Friths of Forth, the Atlantic Ocean, the Desert of Sahara, the Desert of Arabia, and the Persian Gulf.

To quote Gibbon's elegant lines:—

"The arms of the Republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively *broken by the iron monarch of Rome.*"—*Decline and Fall, chap. 38, par. 43*, the first paragraph under "General Observations," etc., at the close of the chapter.

"In the second century of the Christian era, the Empire of Rome comprehended the fairest part of the earth, and the most civilized portion

649

of mankind. The frontiers of that extensive monarchy were guarded by ancient renown and disciplined valor. The gentle but powerful influence of laws and manners had gradually cemented the union of the provinces. Their peaceful inhabitants enjoyed and abused the advantages of wealth and luxury. The image of a free constitution was preserved with decent reverence; the Roman senate appeared to possess the sovereign authority, and devolved upon the emperors all the executive powers of government. . . .

"The principal conquests of the Romans were achieved under the republic; and the emperors, for the most part, were satisfied with preserving those dominions which had been acquired by the policy of the senate, the active emulation of the consuls, and the martial enthusiasm of the people. The seven first centuries were filled with a rapid succession of triumphs; but it was reserved for Augustus to relinquish the ambitious design of subduing the whole earth, and to introduce a spirit of moderation into the public councils. . . .

"His generals in the early part of his reign attempted the reduction of Ethiopia and Arabia Felix. They marched near a thousand miles to the south of the tropic; but the heat of the climate soon repelled the invaders, and protected the unwarlike natives of those sequestered regions. The northern countries of Europe scarcely deserved the expense and labor of conquest. The forests and morasses of Germany were filled with a hardy race of barbarians, who despised life when it was separated from freedom; and though, on the first attack, they seemed to yield to the weight of the Roman power, they soon, by a signal act of despair, regained their independence, and reminded Augustus of the vicissitude of fortune. On the death of that emperor, his testament was publicly read in the senate. He bequeathed, as a valuable legacy to his successors, the advice of confining the empire within those limits which nature seemed to have placed as its permanent bulwarks and boundaries; on the west the Atlantic Ocean; the Rhine and the Danube on the north; the Euphrates on the east; and, towards the

south, the sandy deserts of Arabia and Africa.—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 1, par. 1-3.* A. T. J.

*(To be continued.)*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jonah 1:1-17. The Story of Jonah" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 41 , p. 647.**

**NOVEMBER 8. JONAH 1:1-17**

JONAH lived during the reign of Jeroboam II.; for we read in the account of what Jeroboam did that "he restored the coast of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain, according to the word of the Lord God of Israel, *which he spake by the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher.*" 2 Kings 14:25. As was related in our last lesson, "Hazeal, king of Syria, oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz;" and Elisha, just before his death, had prophesied to Joash, Israel's deliverance from Syria. But as Joash, in obeying the prophet's word to smite with the arrows upon the ground, had shown his lack of persistence in smiting only three times, whereas he should have smitten till directed to hold, the prophet said to him, "Thou shouldst have smitten five or six times; *then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it; whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice.*" Accordingly Joash smote Syria three times, and no more; and then it fell to Jeroboam II. to complete the deliverance of Israel from the oppressions of Syria.

"FOR the Lord saw the affliction of Israel, that it was very bitter: for there was not any shut up, nor any left, nor any helper for Israel. And the Lord said not that he would blot out the name of Israel from under heaven; but he saved them by the hand of Jeroboam the son of Joash." 2 Kings 14:26, 27. And it was the prophet Jonah that directed, encouraged, and strengthened Jeroboam in his appointed work, because the Lord was gracious to Israel and had compassion on them, "because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Jeroboam, the son of Joash, reigned from B.C. 827 to 786, and it was in the former part of his reign that Jonah prophesied. (1) Because, as we have seen, it was at the word of Jonah that victory was given to Jeroboam, and that Israel recovered his possessions; and (2) Because of these successes Israel became exalted, and then *Amos* prophesied Israel's captivity and destruction. And *Amos* says he prophesied "in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel, *two years before the earthquake.*" Amos 1:1; 7:7-17. Uzziah began to reign in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam, which would be in the year 800 B.C.; and this would leave only fourteen years of the reign of Jeroboam, so that *Amos* prophesied between the years 800 and 786 B.C. Therefore Jonah's prophesying in the early years of Jeroboam's reign, must have been from B.C. 827 down to about 810 B.C.

NINEVEH, to which Jonah was commanded to go, was the capital of the Assyrian Empire. It was situated on the River Tigris, 36° 20' north latitude, 43° 10' east longitude, and was 600 miles from Jonah's home. Vul-lush III. was king

of the city of Nineveh and the empire of Assyria from 810 to 781 B.C., and it is most likely that it was in his reign that Jonah was sent on this mission to Nineveh. It may have been in the reign of Vul-lush's predecessor, Shamas-Vul, who reigned from 823-810. We cannot tell yet exactly in which it was; but we may be almost certain that it was in the reign of one of these two kings that Jonah was sent to Nineveh. Vul-lush had great success in all his expeditions; he extended his dominions in almost every direction, and it is most likely that the wealth acquired from the tribute of all the nations round about had induced that state of luxury and dissipation which called for destruction unless immediate repentance was shown.

THEREFORE the Lord said to Jonah, "Arise go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before me." The Lord has left no nation to itself without full opportunity to know and serve him. Here his prophet is sent to the capital of Assyria, whose empire then ruled from Egypt and the Great Sea to Central Asia, and from the Persian Gulf to the mountains of Armenia. Before this his prophets had spoken directly to, and had even anointed, a king of Syria. Afterward he spoke in a dream, and then by his prophet, to the great Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon; and Nebuchadnezzar published a letter to all people, nations, and languages that he "thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward" him. Dan. 4:2. From Jeremiah the Lord sent messages to Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Tyre, and Sidon. Jer. 27:3-7. He spoke to Cyrus and to Alexander the Great. We repeat, God has left no nation without a knowledge of himself, and no nation has ever been left to itself without warning.

BUT Jonah was not willing to carry the Lord's message to this perishing city. "Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord." Nineveh lay about six hundred miles to the east, and Jonah started to go about three thousand miles to the westward; for Tarshish was on the southwest coast of Spain. But Jonah was open-hearted about it; he did not pretend, as many people now do, to be obeying the Lord by going directly opposite to what the Lord told him. He was disobedient, and he intended it to be considered so. But now, thousands of people, in effect, do just as Jonah did, and then try to convince themselves that they are obeying the Lord. The Lord says to all people, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Thousands of people will work all day the seventh day, and then do no work on the first day, and pretend that in this they are obeying the commandment of God. But to rest on the first day of the week is no more obedience to the commandment of God to keep the Sabbath than it was obedience for Jonah to go to Tarshish when the Lord told him to go to Nineveh. If you are going to obey the Lord, do it; and if you are determined to disobey, do that; but don't try to pass off disobedience for obedience, and so deceive yourself. "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. 6:25.

JONAH "went to Joppa; and he found a ship going to Tarshish; so he paid the fare thereof, and went down into it, to go with them unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. But the Lord sent out a great wind." This was a eurocydon,

such as struck the ship on which Paul was being taken a prisoner to Rome. "And there was a mighty tempest in the sea." "Then the mariners were afraid, and cried every man unto his god, and cast forth the wares that were in the ship into the sea, to light it of them. But Jonah was gone down into the sides of the ship; and he lay, and was fast asleep." Jonah seems to have felt perfectly safe, although he knew he was disobeying God. So do many people. And, as then, innocent persons are thrown into trial and distress because of their careless disobedience.

"SO the shipmaster came to him, and said unto him, What meanest thou, O sleeper? arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not." Then they cast lots to find whose was the fault that the storm was upon them, and the lot fell upon Jonah. "Then said they unto him, Tell us, we pray thee, for whose cause this evil is upon us. What is thine occupation? and whence comest thou? what is thy country? and of what people art thou? And he said unto them, I am an Hebrew; and I fear the Lord, the God of Heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land. Then were the men exceedingly afraid." They knew that the God who made the sea and the dry land must be above all gods, and so when they heard of him, they were "exceedingly afraid."

THEN, knowing that Jonah was the cause of all their trouble, "they said unto him, What shall we do unto thee, that the sea may be calm unto us? for the sea grew more and more tempestuous [margin]. And he said unto them, Take me up, and cast me forth into the sea; . . . for I know that for my sake this great tempest is upon you. Nevertheless the men rowed hard to bring it to the land; but they could not." Even against the evidence of the lot, and the convincing word of Jonah, the men labored hard to deliver themselves rather than pitch him into the sea; but it was all no use; overboard he had to go. So the men "cried unto the Lord. . . . Lay not upon us innocent blood." "So they took up Jonah, and cast him forth into the sea; and the sea ceased from her raging. Then the men feared the Lord exceedingly, and offered a sacrifice unto the Lord, and made vows." So the Lord turned Jonah's rebellion into good for those who knew not the Lord, and taught them of himself.

"NOW the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah. And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights." This part of the story is just as true as is any other. Jesus makes mention of this very verse of Jonah, in his preaching. And, having the indorsement of Christ, we know that it is as true as any other of his words, and they are all absolutely true; although the translation in the New Testament, which gives the word "*whale*," is not justifiable. The original says, The Lord had prepared a *great fish*. And a great fish was what it was. But because a whale is a great fish, it does not follow at all that this was a whale. There are great fish in the Mediterranean that can swallow not only a man, but a horse or a buffalo. In one such was found the whole body of a man in complete armor. In one was found a whole horse. In one was found the skin of a whole buffalo, which had been thrown overboard from the very ship which caught the fish. See Smith's Dictionary, Art. *Whale*. It was nothing strange or wonderful at all that such a great fish should swallow Jonah; and that the Lord should preserve him unhurt, and was no more wonderful than to preserve the three

Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, or Daniel in the den of hungry lions.  
A. T. J.

**November 5, 1885**

**"The Roman Empire. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42 , p.  
660.**

"THE only accession which the Roman Empire received during the first century of the Christian era, was the province of Britain. In this single instance the successors of Cesar and Augustus were persuaded to follow the example of the former, rather than the precept of the latter. The proximity of its situation to the coast of Gaul seemed to invite their arms; the pleasing, though doubtful intelligence of a pearl fishery attracted their avarice; and as Britain was viewed in the light of a distinct and insulated world, the conquest scarcely formed any exception to the general system of continental measures. After a war of about forty years [A.D. 41-81], undertaken by the most stupid [Claudius], maintained by the most dissolute [Nero], and terminated by the most timid [Domitian] of all the emperors, the far greater part of the island submitted to the Roman yoke. . . At the very time when Domitian, confined to his palace, felt the terrors which he inspired, his legions, under the command of the virtuous Agricola, defeated the collected force of the Caledonians at the foot of the Grampian hills; and his fleets, venturing to explore an unknown and dangerous navigation, displayed the Roman arms round every part of the island. . .

"But the superior merit of Agricola soon occasioned his removal from the Government of Britain. . . . Before his departure, the prudent general had provided for security as well as for dominion. He had observed that the island is almost divided into two unequal parts by the opposite gulfs, or, as they are now called, the Friths of Scotland. Across the narrow interval of about forty miles, he had drawn a line of military stations, which was afterwards fortified in the reign of Antoninus Pius, by a turf rampart erected on foundations of stone. This wall of Antoninus, at a small distance beyond the modern cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, was fixed as the limit of the Roman province. The native Caledonians preserved in the northern extremity of the island their wild independence, for which they were not less indebted to their poverty than to their valor. . . . The masters of the fairest and most wealthy climates of the globe, turned with contempt from gloomy hills assailed by the winter tempest, from lakes concealed in a blue mist, and from cold and lonely heaths, over which the deer of the forest were chased by a troop of naked barbarians.

"Such was the state of the Roman frontiers, and such the maxims of Imperial policy, from the death of Augustus to the accession of Trajan [A. D. 98]. That virtuous and active prince had received the education of a soldier, and possessed the talents of a general. The peaceful system of his predecessors was interrupted by scenes of war and conquest; and the legions, after a long interval, beheld a military emperor at their head. The first exploits of Trajan were against the Dacians, the most warlike of men, who dwelt beyond the Danube, and who, during the reign of Domitian, had insulted with impunity the majesty of Rome. . . .

"Decebalus, the Dacian king, approved himself a rival not unworthy of Trajan; nor did he despair of his own and the public fortune, till, by the confession of his enemies, he had exhausted every resource, both of valor and policy. This memorable war, with a very short suspension of hostilities, lasted five years; and as the emperor could exert, without control, the whole force of the State, it was terminated by the absolute submission of the barbarians. The new province of Dacia, which formed a second exception to the precept of Augustus, was about thirteen hundred miles in circumference. Its natural boundaries were the Niester, the Teys or Tibiscus [Temes], the Lower Danube, and the Euxine [Black] Sea. . . .

"Trajan was ambitious of fame; and as long as mankind shall continue to bestow more liberal applause upon their destroyers than on their benefactors, the thirst for military glory will ever be the vice of the most exalted characters. The praises of Alexander, transmitted by a succession of poets and historians, had kindled a dangerous emulation in the mind of Trajan. Like him, the Roman emperor undertook an expedition against the nations of the East; but he lamented, with a sigh, that his advanced age scarcely left him any hopes of equaling the renown of the son of Philip. Yet the success of Trajan, however transient, was rapid and specious. The degenerate Parthians, broken by intestine discord, fled before his arms. He descended the River Tigris in triumph, from the mountains of Armenia to the Persian Gulf. He enjoyed the honor of being the first, as he was the last, of the Roman generals who ever navigated that remote sea. His fleets ravaged the coasts of Arabia; and Trajan vainly flattered himself that he was approaching towards the confines of India.

"Every day the astonished senate received the intelligence of new names and new nations that acknowledged his sway. They were informed that the kings of Bosphorus, Colchis, Iberia, Albania [countries above Armenia between the Black and the Caspian Seas], Osroene [a province of Mesopotamia in the bend of the Euphrates], and even the Parthian monarch himself, had accepted their diadems from the hands of the emperor; that the independent

tribes of the Median and Carduchian hills had implored his protection, and that the rich countries of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria, were reduced into the state of provinces. But the death of Trajan soon clouded the splendid prospect; and it was justly to be dreaded that so many distinct nations would throw off the unaccustomed yoke when they were no longer restrained by the powerful hand which had imposed it."

In A. D. 117, Trajan died, and was succeeded by Hadrian, and:—

"The resignation of all the Eastern conquests of Trajan was the first measure of his reign. He restored to the Parthians the election of an independent sovereign, withdrew the Roman garrisons from the provinces of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria, and, in compliance with the precept of Augustus, once more established the Euphrates as the frontier of the empire."

"The marital and ambitious spirit of Trajan formed a very singular contrast with the moderation of his successor. The restless activity of Hadrian was not less remarkable, when compared with the gentle repose of Antoninus Pius. The life of the former was almost a perpetual journey; and as he possessed the various talents of the soldier, the statesman, and the scholar, he gratified his curiosity in the discharge of his duty. Careless of the difference of the seasons and of climates, he marched, on foot and bareheaded, over the snow of Caledonia and the sultry plains of the Upper Egypt; nor was there a province of the empire, which, in the course of his reign, was not honored with the presence of the monarch. But the tranquil life of Antoninus Pius was spent in the bosom of Italy; and during the twenty-three years that he directed the public administration, the longest journeys of that amiable prince extended no farther than from his palace in Rome to the retirement of his Lanuvian Villa.

"Notwithstanding this difference in their personal conduct, the general system of Augustus was equally adopted, and uniformly pursued, by Hadrian and the two Antonines. They persisted in the design of maintaining the dignity of the empire, without attempting to enlarge its limits. By every honorable expedient they invited the friendship of the barbarians; and endeavored to convince mankind that the Roman power, raised above the temptation of conquest, was actuated only by the love of order and justice. During a long period of forty-three years [A.D. 117-161], their virtuous labors were crowned with success; and if we may except a few slight hostilities that served to exercise the legions of the frontier, the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius offered the fair prospect of universal peace. The Roman name was revered among the most remote nations of the earth. The fiercest barbarians frequently submitted their differences to the arbitration of the emperor; and we are informed by a contemporary historian that he had seen

ambassadors who were refused the honor which they came to solicit, of being admitted into the rank of subjects.

"The terror of the Roman arms added weight and dignity to the moderation of the emperors. They preserved peace by a constant preparation for war; and while justice regulated their conduct, they announced to the nations on their confines that they were as little disposed to endure as to offer an injury. The military strength which it had been sufficient for Hadrian and the elder Antonius to display, was exerted against the Parthians and the Germans by the Emperor Marcus [Aurelius, A.D. 161-180]. The hostilities of the barbarians provoked the resentment of that philosophic monarch, and, in the prosecution of a just defense, Marcus and his generals obtained many signal victories both on the Euphrates and on the Danube."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 1, par. 4-12.*

After a sketch of the provinces, which we shall have occasion hereafter to notice, Gibbon gives the area and population of the empire, as follows:—

"This long enumeration of provinces whose broken fragments have formed so many powerful kingdoms, might almost induce us to forgive the vanity or ignorance of the ancients. Dazzled with the extensive sway, the irresistible strength, and the real or affected moderation of the emperors, they permitted themselves to despise, and sometimes to forget, the outlying countries which had been left in the enjoyment of a barbarous independence; and they gradually usurped the license of confounding the Roman monarchy with the globe of the earth. But the temper as well as the knowledge of a modern historian, requires a more sober and accurate language. He may impress a juster image of the greatness of Rome, by observing that the empire was above *two thousand miles in breadth*, from the wall of Antoninus and the northern limites of Dacia to Mount Atlas and the tropic of Cancer; that it extended, in length, *more than three thousand miles*, from the Western Ocean to the Euphrates; that it was situated in the finest part of the temperate zone—between the twenty-fourth and fifty-sixth degrees of northern latitude; and that it was supposed to contain above sixteen hundred thousand square miles, for the most part of fertile and well-cultivated land."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 1, last par.*

"The number of subjects who acknowledged the laws of Rome,—of citizens, of provincials, and of slaves,—cannot now be fixed with such a degree of accuracy as the importance of the object would deserve. We are informed that when the Emperor Claudius exercised the office of censor, he took an account of six million nine hundred and forty-five thousand Roman citizens, who, with the proportion of women and children, must have amounted to about twenty millions of souls. The multitude of subjects of an inferior rank was uncertain and fluctuating. But after weighing with attention every circumstance which could influence the balance, it seems probable that there existed, in the time of Claudius, about twice as many provincials as there were citizens, of either sex and of every age; and that the slaves were at least equal in number to the free

inhabitants of the Roman world. The total amount of this imperfect calculation would rise to about *one hundred and twenty* millions of persons, a degree of population which possibly exceeds that of modern Europe, and forms the most numer-

661

ous society that has ever been united under the same system of government."—*Id.*, chap. 2, par. 17.

It should be borne in mind that when Gibbon states that this degree of population "possibly exceeds that of modern Europe," it was the Europe of more than a million years ago. This was written about A.D. 1773, and, according to the printed estimates, at that date Europe contained a population of about 107,000,000. Its population, June, 1882, was 327,743,400.

In the reign of Marcus Aurelius we reach the summit of the greatness of the Roman Empire. In the reign of Commodus, his son and successor, A.D. 180, this mighty "fabric of human greatness" began to decline and totter toward its fearful fall. At this point, therefore, we shall close our view of the greatness and power of Rome, only pausing to remarks that, in view of the indubitable evidences which we have presented, we cannot see how any one can doubt that the prophet spoke directly of the Roman Empire when he said:—

"The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron; forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise."

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Jonah 3:1-10, Nineveh's Repentance" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42 , pp. 663, 664.**

**NOVEMBER 15. JONAH 3:1-10**

LAST week's lesson ended with Jonah in the fish's belly. Then he began to pray. In fact, he began to pray as soon as he was cast into the sea; for he says: "For thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about; all thy billows and thy waves passed over me. *Then* I said, I am cast out of thy sight; yet I will look again toward thy holy temple." "When my soul fainted within me I remembered the Lord; and my prayer came in unto thee, into thy holy temple." Chap. 2:3, 4, 7. It often happens that some such upsetting as this is necessary to bring men to see themselves. David said, "Before I was afflict I went astray; but now have I kept thy word." Ps. 119:67. Then he says: "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes." Verse 71. The whole of psalm 107 is made up of instances of men being brought by dangers, afflictions, etc., to acknowledge God, and of calls upon men to "praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men."

YET it is to be feared that, in most cases, after the Lord at such times has heard their cries and delivered them, they remember him, at best, for only a little

while, and turn again to folly. But Jonah well says: "They that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy." "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness *unto them which are exercise thereby.*" Heb. 12:11. Jonah's repentance was genuine. He was ready to obey God, and he said, "I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that that I have vowed. Salvation is of the Lord. And the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land."

"AND the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the second time, saying, Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee." "Preach the preaching that I bid thee," is the Lord's command to every preacher. "Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thy heart, and hear with thy ears." "And tell them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." Eze. 3:10, 11. "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2. That which the Lord says is the only thing that is right. It may not always be the most pleasant thing to speak, nor the most pleasant thing for men to hear, but it is the *best* thing to speak, and it is the *best* thing for men to hear.

"NOW NINEVEH was an exceeding great city of three days' journey." Nineveh was built by Asshur, a grandson of Noah (Gen. 10:11), and at this time was the greatest city in the world, containing about 600,000 people. It was the capital of the Assyrian Empire, which had spread its rule from the Tigris to the Mediterranean Sea, and from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf. "And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried, and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them."

THE message reached the king, and he too joined the general fear. He not only joined in it, but issued a decree that the good work should go on. "For word came unto the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles, saying, Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste any thing; let them not feed, nor drink water; but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands."

THIS was genuine repentance. The Saviour declared it to be so, and that these men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment and condemn the generation to whom he preached. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." We have, therefore, the testimony of Jesus that the men of Nineveh repented. The word which John the Baptist, and Jesus, and Peter, and all the apostles preached, was, "Repent." And by the action of the Ninevites, it is shown that repentance is not only in word, not only in fasting and prayer, but this with *turning* every one *from his evil way*, and

from the violence that is in his hands. "Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well." Isa. 1:16. Anything short of turning from evil and of *wanting* to do better, it is of no avail until they really *do* better. And all who do so God will receive and forgive as really as he did the

(Continued on page 670.)

(Continued from page 263.)

men of Nineveh. "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not."

"BUT it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry." Jonah thought all his credit as a prophet, or even as a man, was forfeited. He had told the people that the city should be destroyed, and now the Lord was not going to do it, and he was therefore "very angry." It seems that he had told the Lord as much before he left his own country; for now he says: "O Lord, was not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I fled before unto Tarshish." From this it appears that when the Lord first told Jonah to arise and go to Nineveh and cry against it, Jonah had said to him, in substance, If I go up Nineveh and tell them the city shall be overthrown, they will stop sinning and turn to the Lord, and then thou wilt not overthrow it; and so if the city is not to be overthrown anyhow, I might as well stay in my own country, or anywhere else; therefore I will flee to Tarshish. He did not think that if the city was to be destroyed anyway it was indeed useless for him to go. Jonah apparently cared more for his reputation than he did for all the souls in Nineveh, and thought that the Lord should turn a deaf ear to all the cries of the people, so that Jonah's word might be performed in spite of all.

"SO Jonah went out of the city, and sat on the east side of the city, and there made him a booth, and sat under it in the shadow, till he might see what would become of the city." Then the Lord prepared a gourd "that it might be a shadow over his head" from the heat; and the next day the gourd withered, and a vehement east wind "and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted," and he wished that he might die, and said, "It is better for me to die than to live." "Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night; and should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"

THERE the record closes. Jonah made no further answer. It is queer that he could not see and rejoice in the mercy of God, in the first place; that the wicked people would not turn without warning; that unless they did turn they must perish; and that the warning alone could save them. But the Lord was patient and gentle with him, and kindly taught him the lesson which he was slow to discern. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of

the remnant of his heritage? he delighteth in mercy." Micah 7:18.  
A. T. J.

**"Psalms 146:4" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42 , p. 665.**

IN Psalms 146:3, 4, we read: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day *his thoughts perish*." This is in harmony with the Scriptures throughout. As stated elsewhere, "the dead know not anything;" "their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." Eccl. 9:5, 6. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down *into silence*." Ps. 115:17.

To evade the force of the words of Psalms 146:4,—*"In that very day his thoughts perish,"*—it has been, for a long while, a favorite scheme of those who hold to the immortality of the soul to change the words of the text by substituting the word "*purposes*" for "*thoughts*," claiming that the man still thinks when he is dead, but that the purposes which he had formed while living have perished, that they cannot be accomplished. And now comes the Revised Version, and, with a marginal reading, bolsters up this theory. The *text* of Psalms 146:4 reads in the Revised Version just as it does in the Old Version, but "*purposes*" is put into the margin as an alternate reading. Thus this version is made to favor the idea that "*thoughts*" in the text is at least equivalent in meaning to "*purposes*;" and that when a man dies, in that very day his purposes perish, but his thoughts go on.

Such an interpretation of the text is, as we have seen, to make the scripture contradict itself. But that is not all, it is to make the scripture contradict every principle of fact and evidence as seen in human experience. Let us cite a few instances of men's purposes that did not perish "in that very day," in which their breath went forth and they returned to earth. Nebuchadnezzar formed the purpose of confining the River Tigris within certain limits, and built an extensive embankment at a place near where Bagdad now stands; and the bricks with which he faced and strengthened the embankment, and which have upon the his name, lie to-day exactly as he placed them. We know, therefore, that that purpose of his did not perish in the very day in which his breath went forth, nor for ages afterward, if indeed it has yet perished.

Stephen Girard purposed that the poor white orphans of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., should have the benefits of education, and should be supported till they had acquired an education. That purpose did not perish; not has it yet perished, nor will it ever while the world lasts.

Peter Cooper purposed that mechanics and artisans should have opportunity to acquire "the most skillful practice of their several trades; to that they could not only apply their labor to the best possible advantages, but enjoy the happiness of acquiring useful knowledge—the purest and most innocent of all sources of enjoyment." His purpose did not perish when he died.

James Lick purposed that the State of California should have an observatory, and in it a telescope having a larger object-glass than any that had ever yet been made. He died. But so far from his purpose perishing the "very day" in which his

breath went forth, Europe and America have been engaged ever since in fulfilling that purpose, now soon to be accomplished.

Multitudes of such instances might be given from all ages of human history in illustration of the fact that to read *purposes* for *thoughts* in psalm 146:4, is to put darkness for light, and falsehood for truth. The fact of the matter is, men's purposes perish while they live as well as when they die. It is not necessary to wait till their "breath goeth forth," and they return to earth, to realize that fact. To-day I may form a purpose concerning to-morrow, or next week, or next month, or next year, and that purpose may, and indeed does as often as otherwise, perish. Yet *I continue to live and to think*. To-day I may purpose a thing in regard to even the things of this very day, and that purpose is just as likely as not to perish; but that affects neither the fact of my living, nor of my thinking. Again we say, and the experience of every human being proves the truth, that men's purposes perish in the days that they live, as well as in the day that they die.

It is not so with men's thoughts. When a man dies, it is the truth that "in that very day his thoughts perish"—he ceases to think, the mind ceases to act. As long as there is consciousness, there is thought; but when a man dies, all power of thought is destroyed. That a man can think when he is dead is certainly one of the most perverse ideas that ever entered men's brains. A man may be struck a slight blow on the head, and he ceases to think; but let him be struck a crushing, killing blow, and lo! he thinks more and better than ever! In other words; knock him senseless and he cannot think at all; kill him, and he can think better than ever before!! Was there ever such nonsense? Does any one suppose that Adam, before he lived, had any powers of thought? Assuredly not. Then upon what principles can it be supposed that he had any such powers after he died—when he had returned to the condition in which he was before he lived? Did he, by sinning, acquire the power to think after he was dead? Did he, by sinning, acquire the power to retain *in death* one of the very chiefest of the attributes of *life*—the power of thought?

It is the absolute truth that "the wages of sin is death;" and when, because of sin, death passed upon all mankind, it is equally the truth that when "his breath goeth forth," and "he returned to his earth, *in that very day his thoughts perish*."

A. T. J.

**"Rice" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42 , p. 671.**

RICE.—Died, Oct. 14, 1885, of inflammation of the bowels, Laura, youngest child of S. C. and Anna Rice, of Healdsburg, Cal., aged 17 months and 14 days. Services by the writer.

A. T. J.

**November 12, 1885**

**"The Roman Empire. (Continued.) The Roman Provinces" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 43 , p. 676.**

**THE ROMAN PROVINCES**

ALTHOUGH the "iron monarchy of Rome," in the greatness of its strength, broke in pieces all kingdoms, yet the time was to come when it itself should be broken. At the same time that Daniel spoke of the fourth kingdom breaking in pieces and bruising all, he also said:—

"And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, *the kingdom shall be divided*; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And *as the toes of the feet* were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken." Dan. 2:41, 42.

We must now inquire, Of what should this division consist? Into how many parts should Rome be divided? We think there can be but one answer possible. Because, as it is the "*feet and toes*," and particularly the "*toes*," of the image that are spoken of in connection with the division, it is certain that that division is shown by the toes of the image; and as this was the image of a man, there were certainly *ten* toes. Therefore the only reasonable or possible conclusion is that Rome should be divided into *ten parts*. However, we are not left to draw our own conclusions, logical and necessary though they be. In the seventh chapter of Daniel, this same series of kingdoms is gone over again under the symbols of "four great beasts," the fourth one of which was declared by the angel to be the fourth kingdom, which shows it to be identical with the iron—the fourth kingdom—of the great image. This fourth beast had also *ten horns*, which exactly correspond to the ten toes of the image. Further, the angel said plainly of these ten horns that they were *ten kings* that should arise (Dan. 2:24), which proves to a demonstration that the toes of the image are spoken of in connection with the division, with direct reference to the number of parts into which Rome should be divided. Therefore we know that ten kingdoms were to arise upon the ruins of the Roman power.

Now we may ask, *Where* should these ten kingdoms arise? In other words, Are there any clearly defined limits within which the ten kingdoms should establish themselves? We believe there are. And that we may make the subject as plain and as easily understood as possible, we shall now define those limits.

From the ascension of Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the world, these four kingdoms are the only ones that should ever bear universal sway. And each of these in its turn occupied territory peculiar to itself, from which it spread its power over the others. Although the four kingdoms were successive, and although each one in succession spread its power over all the territory of those that had preceded it, yet each one retained its own peculiar distinctions from all the others. And this distinction is kept up throughout the book of Daniel, and is even recognized in the book of Revelation, which was written in the time of the supremacy of the fourth kingdom, in a prophecy that was not to be fulfilled till after the establishment of the ten kingdoms.

The fact of the matter is, these are not only the four universal empires, but they also represent the four divisions of the then known civilized world, each one of which occupies territory peculiar to itself, and is never confounded with any of the others. Thus, Babylonia was first, and when it was overturned it was by the united power of Media and Persia, which occupied entirely distinct territory from that of Babylonia proper. Then when the Medo-Persian power was destroyed, it was by the power of Grecia, which arose from a territory entirely distinct from that of either Babylon or Medo-Persia. So, likewise, when the Grecian ascendancy was destroyed it was by a power that arose still further to the west, entirely beyond the territory of Grecia, in a territory entirely its own, and distinct from all the others. This is all expressed in a single verse in the seventh chapter of Daniel. After the description of the four great beasts which represent these four kingdoms, he says of the fourth beast, that he beheld till he was slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flames; then he says of the others:—

"As concerning *the rest of the beasts*, they had their dominion taken away; yet *their lives were prolonged* for a season and time." (Margin, Chaldee, "A prolonging in life was given them.") Dan. 7:12.

This passage, with the point which we here make, is aptly and well illustrated by a passage from Rawlinson, speaking of the Babylonian monarchy, he says:—

"Even when this monarchy met its death at the hands of Cyrus the Great, the nationality of the Chaldeans was not swept away. We find them recognized under the Persians, and even under the Parthians, as a distinct people."—*Seven Great Monarchies, First Mon., chap. 8, last year.*

Thus it was with each and with all,—the dominion was taken away, but the nationality remained; the *ruling power* was transferred, but the *national life* continued. It follows, therefore, that, as it was Rome that was to be divided, the division must pertain to the territory that was peculiar to the fourth kingdom, and which had not belonged to any of the three that preceded it. Where was that? We can easily learn. (1) Media and Persia occupied the territory east of the Tigris and the Persian Gulf; (2) Babylonian, the territory from the Tigris to the Arabian Desert; (3) Grecia, from the Hellespont to and even beyond the Danube, and to the Adriatic Sea, northward to about the forty-fifth parallel of latitude; (4) The territory of Rome proper occupied all the rest west of the Danube and the Rhine to the Atlantic and the Frith of Forth, and all of the northern coast of Africa, to nearly as far east as the twentieth degree of longitude.

Within the boundaries thus marked lay the territory of Rome proper. It was this territory that was peculiar to the fourth kingdom. And it was within the limits drawn under "(4)" above that we are to look for the ten divisions of the fourth kingdom and the establishment of the ten kingdoms.

We propose to trace the history of these ten kingdoms from their tribe as nations as savages in the dismal forests of Germany, through their devastating incursions into the rich and civilized provinces of Rome, and down to their own establishment within these provinces, and their development into civilized and influential kingdoms there. Rome, once so powerful, once so great, now, through luxury and indulgence, grown corrupt, effeminate, and weak, we shall see waste

away and perish. We shall see the movements of the nations coming in to fill up with a new and vigorous people the place that Rome was no longer worthy, it will be best, and in fact really necessary to a proper understanding of the subject, that we briefly sketch the boundaries of the provinces of the Roman Empire, both of Rome proper, and as far east as the Hellespont and the Black Sea. This task, however, has been so admirably performed by Gibbon that all that we shall need to do will be to quote his words. He says:—

"We have attempted to explain the spirit which moderated, and the strength which supported, the power of Hadrian and the Antonines. We shall now endeavor, with clearness and precision, to describe the provinces once united under their sway, but at present divided into so many independent and hostile States.

"Spain, the western extremity of the empire, of Europe, and of the ancient world, has in every age invariably preserved the same natural limits,—the Pyrenean Mountains, the Mediterranean, and the Atlantic Ocean. That great peninsula, at present so unequally divided between two sovereigns, was distributed by Augustus into three provinces,—Lusitania, Betica, and Tarraconensis. The kingdom of Portugal now fills the place of the warlike country of the Lusitanians; and the loss sustained by the former on the side of the east, is compensated by an accession of territory towards the north. The confines of Grenada and Andalusia correspond with those of ancient Betica. The remainder of Spain,—Gallicia, and the Asturias, Biscay and Navarre, Leon and the two Castiles, Murcia, Valencia, Catalonia, and Arragon,—all contributed to form the third and most considerable of the Roman governments, which, from the name of its capital, was styled the province of Tarragona."

"Ancient Gaul, as it contained the whole country between the Pyrenees, the Alps, the Rhine, and the Ocean, was of greater extent than modern France. To the dominions of that powerful monarchy [a republic now], with its recent acquisitions of Alsace and Lorraine [lost again in 1870], we must add the duchy of Savoy, the cantons of Switzerland, the four electorates of the Rhine, and the territories of Liege, Luxemburg, Hainault, Flanders, and Brabant. . . . The sea-coast of the Mediterranean, Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphine, received their provincial appellation from the colony of Narbonne. The government of Aquitaine was extended from the Pyrenees to the Loire. The country between the Loire and the Seine was styled the Celtic Gaul, and soon borrowed a new denomination from the celebrated colony of Lugdunum, or Lyons. The Belgic lay beyond the Seine, and in more ancient times had been bounded only by the Rhine; but a little before the age of Cesar, the Germans, abusing their superiority of valor, had occupied a considerable portion of the Belgic territory. The Roman conquerors very eagerly embraced so flattering a circumstance, and the Gallic frontier of the Rhine, from Basel to Leyden, received the pompous names of the Upper and the Lower Germany. Such, under the reign of the Antonines, were the six provinces of Gaul,—the Narbonnese, Aquitaine, the Celtic, or Lyonnese, the Belgic, and the two Germanies.

"We have already had occasion to mention the conquest of Britain, and to fix the boundary of the Roman province in this island. It comprehended all England, Wales, and the Lowlands of Scotland as far as the Friths of the Clyde and the Forth."—*Dec. and Hall, chap. 1, par. 23-26.*  
A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 18:1-12. Hezekiah's Good Reign" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 43 , p. 679.**

**NOVEMBER 22. 2 KINGS 18:1-12**

"AND he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father did." Hezekiah was one of the best kings that ever reigned in Judah, while Ahaz, his father, was one of the worst. There was a conspiracy formed by Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah king of Israel, against Ahaz king of Judah. They proposed to destroy Ahaz and set up Ashariah the son of Tabael as king of Judah. The Lord sent Isaiah to Ahaz to say, "Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass." Isa. 7:1-10. Then Ahaz, instead of trusting the Lord, "sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son; come up, and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him; for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin."

"AND king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, and saw an altar that was at Damascus; and king Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar, and the pattern of it, according to all the workmanship therefore. And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that king Ahaz had sent from Damascus; so Urijah the priest made it against king Ahaz came from Damascus. And when the king was come from Damascus, the king saw the altar; and the king approached to the altar, and offered thereon." "For he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him; and he said, Because the gods of the kings of Syria help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me. But they were the ruin of him, and of all Israel." 2 Kings 16:7-12; 2 Chron. 28:23. In the following this worship of the gods of Syria, he shut up the house of the Lord, and in all the cities of Judah "he made high places to burn incense unto other gods." Then too after he had put himself into the hands of the king of Assyria, he had to rob the house of the Lord to satisfy his demands. He "cut off the borders of the bases, and removed the laver from off them; and took down the sea from off the brazen oxen that were under it, and put it upon a pavement of stones. And the covert for the Sabbath that they had built in the house, and the

king's entry without, turned he from the house of the Lord for the king of Assyria." "And Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria came unto him, and distressed him, but strengthened him not."

THUS it was that when Hezekiah came to the throne there was urgent necessity for a reformation. He accordingly immediately set about it. "He, in the first year of his reign, in the first month, opened the doors of the house of the Lord, and repaired them." Then he brought in the priests and the Levites, and had them sanctify themselves, and sanctify and cleanse the house of the Lord. It took eight days to clean out all the rubbish and uncleanness that they found in the temple. Then Hezekiah gathered the rams, lambs, and bullocks for the burnt offering, and all the different orders of musicians to sing in the worship of the Lord. "And Hezekiah rejoiced, and all the people, that God had prepared the people; for the thing was done suddenly." 2 Chron. 29:36.

NEXT, "Hezekiah sent to all Israel and Judah, and wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh, that they should come to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, to keep the passover unto the Lord God of Israel." "So the posts passed from city to city, through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even unto Zebulun; but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them. Nevertheless, divers of Asher and Manasseh and Zebulun humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem, . . . even many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulun." 2 Chron. 30. This was the Lord's last call to the people of the ten tribes. Those who thus humbled themselves and joined with Judah in the worship of God were delivered from the captivity inflicted by Sargon shortly afterward. The Lord knew the iniquities that were multiplying in Israel. He knew that their destruction could not long be delayed. As a nation, they were even now beyond recovery. But in his mercy and pity he sends one more gracious invitation to whosoever would return to his service and his worship. Still he longs for Ephraim to return. Still he pleads with Israel to repent. And then when they have gone with a perpetual backsliding, he cries out, "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I set thee as Zebulun? mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together." Hos. 11:8. But Ephraim was "like a silly dove." "Ephraim provoked him to anger most bitterly," till even mercy compelled to cast them out of his sight. "So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day."

WHEN Hezekiah had brought back the people to the worship of God ("so that there was great joy in Jerusalem; for since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there was not the like in Jerusalem"); then "all Israel that were present went out to the cities of Judah, and brake the images in pieces, and cut down the groves, and threw down the high places and the altars out of all Judah, and Benjamin, in Ephraim also and Manasseh, until they had utterly destroyed them all. Then all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession, into their own cities." 2 Chron. 31:1. Then it was that Hezekiah broke "in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it a piece of brass." 2 Kings 18:4 (margin).

"AND he rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not." His rebellion, however, did not, in the end, amount to much in his favor. Perhaps he would have fared better if he had maintained his rebellion upon its own merits,

and trusted in the Lord to help him. But he not only rebelled, but he meddled with that which did not concern him at all, and so vitiated the righteousness of his own rebellion, and brought upon him a reverse, and the oppression of the king of Assyria. In short, the story is as follows: The people of Ekron rebelled against the king of Assyria also. But their king—Padi—"was inspired by friendship and zeal for Assyria" (so says Sennacherib himself), and resisted their rebellion. Then they took Padi, and gave him up, "bound in chains of iron, to Hezekiah of Judah." They then joined with Egypt against Assyria. Sennacherib defeated the allied forces, and then went to Ekron. What he did there we will let him tell in his own words:—

"I deposed the rulers and dignitaries who had revolted, and killed them; I hung their bodies on crosses on the walls of the city. I sold for slaves all the men of the city who had committed violence and crimes. As for those who had not committed crimes or faults, and had not despised their masters, I pardoned them. I brought Padi, their king, out of Jerusalem and restored him to the throne of his royalty."

THEN, as Hezekiah, by keeping Padi a prisoner for them, was made partaker in their rebellion, Sennacherib went up to punish him. Of this Sennacherib says:—

"But Hezekiah king of Judah did not submit. There were forty-four walled towns, and an infinite number of villages, that I fought against, humbling their pride and braving their anger. By means of fire, massacre, battles, and siege operations, I took them; I occupied them; I brought out 200,150 persons, great and small, men and women; horses, asses, mules, camels, oxen, and sheep, without number; and carried them off as booty. As for himself, I shut him up in Jerusalem, the city of his power, like a bird in its cage. I invested and blockaded the fortresses round it; those who came out of the great gate of the city, were seized and made prisoners. I separated the cities I had plundered from his country; and gave them to Mitenti king of Ashdod, to Padi king of Ekron, to Ishmabaa king of Gaza. Then the fear of my majesty terrified this Hezekiah of Judah. He sent away the watchmen and guards whom he had assembled for the defense of Jerusalem."

THEN it was that Hezekiah did as the Bible says: "And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish, saying, *I have offended; return from me; that which thou puttest on me will I bear.* And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold." 2 Kings 18:14-16. Of this Sennacherib says:—

"He sent messengers to me at Nineveh, the seat of my sovereignty, with thirty talents of gold, and eight hundred talents of silver, metals, rubies, pearls, great carbuncles, seats covered with skins, thrones ornamented with leather, amber, seal skins, sandal wood, and ebony, the contents of his treasury. . . . He sent an ambassador to present this tribute and to make his submission."—*Le Normant's Ancient History of the East, Book 4, chap. 3, sec. 3,*

*par. 9-11. Rawlinson's Seven Great Monarchies, Second Mon., chap. 9, par. 166, 167.*

THAT was a dear piece of business for poor Hezekiah. He had far better have let the Ekronites conduct their own rebellion, and send their king somewhere else. It would have been much better if he had attended to his own business, and let this business of these others alone. By doing as he did, he not only brought upon himself this evil, but he debarred himself from the help of the Lord. He could not ask the Lord to help him. All that he could do, in his distress, was to confess to the king of Assyria, "I have offended; return from me; that which thou puttest on me will I bear." It is far different from this the next time this same king of Assyria comes into the land, and sends an insulting letter, demanding a further surrender. Then in his innocency he could go and spread the letter before the Lord, and ask him to look upon it and see, and bow down his ear and hear all that Sennacherib had spoken. Then, too, the Lord answered; and the king of Assyria's army was smitten by the angel, and he returned with shame of face to his own country. Let every one remember that injunction of the Scriptures, "Let none of you suffer . . . as a busybody in other men's matters." 1 Pet. 4:15. Keep yourself clear of such things, and then if distress comes, in innocency you can present your petition to the Lord, and can trust in him to help, and he will hear, and deliver.

A. T. J.

**"Healdsburg College Notes" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 43 , pp. 681, 682.**

WE have been at the College a full month, and we count it indeed a privilege. One hundred and twelve students are now in attendance. Forty-three of these dwell at the Students' Home; to this number may be added the managers of the Home, and several teachers, making in all fifty-six in the Home "family," which may properly enough be termed "the happy family." Almost, if not quite, all seem to enter heartily into the endeavor to conform to the rules of the institution, and to accomplish, as far as may be on their own part, the purpose of their presence here. All appear to go about the mechanical, and other forms of physical labor, as cheerfully as they do about the mental. And what is better than all—that which, indeed, is the complement of all else—with the majority of those at the Home there is an honest and hearty strife "to enter in at the strait gate"—an earnest effort to form genuinely Christian characters. Of those students who do not live at the Home, of course I cannot speak from personal association, but from what I can gather there seems to be a good, healthy influence, religious as well as otherwise, pervading the whole school.

We are sure that our people on the Pacific Coast do not realize as they should the value of Healdsburg College. They do not realize what a blessing God has placed, as it were, at their very doors. He has established this institution, has proved its success, and has shown its efficiency, not only in fitting laborers for the cause, but in the training of youth to be successful men and women in the management of the every-day affairs of life. The management of this institution is

composed of those who have spent years in the education and management of children and youth; they take anxious thought for those who are committed to their charge; they are watchful and diligent to see that correct habits and right principles are inculcated and observed; and the advantages, the influence, and the care that are to be enjoyed by those who are sent to the Students' Home, are not second to those of the best homes in the land. We wish our people would visit the College and the Home; that they would study into its principles, its advantages, and its workings, more—yes, very much more—than they do; for we are sure that if this were done, the good that is already being done by the school would be increased many fold. Brethren, think of these things, and ask yourselves, before God, what you should do toward sending your own children and inducing others to send theirs.

There are now twenty-eight students in the history class. They are well under way, and appear to be deeply interested, and willing to study hard, to accomplish as much as possible, and do it well, in the term allotted to this branch of Bible work. Fields of new and deep interest in the understanding of illustration of the sublime truths of the Bible, are opened to their minds, and they are trying to show a just appreciation of them in a higher honor, and a deeper love, for the word of God.

We call it the history class, but we would have no one get the idea that it is in the study of history apart from the Bible. It is the study of the history of those nations and kings which are directly referred to in the Bible, especially in the prophecies. So it is simply the study of the Bible in history—the study of the word of God as spoken of nations and kings, and fulfilled by them. It is the study and development of these things in such a way that those who go out into the field to labor may have not simply a vague idea, or, perhaps, at the best, a mere outline of the nations pointed out in prophecy; but that they may have a good understanding, a *positive knowledge*, of them; and also that in and by this they may have an acquaintance with the historical sources, the acknowledged authorities, whence are drawn the facts of history which mark the fulfillment of the prophecies of the word of God. It lends a new interest to the word of God, and a greater importance to history, when it is seen that through all history, from Abraham and Chedorlaomer to our own day, there runs the golden thread of God's providence and word, with which the principle events of history are so inextricably blended that they are seen to be but parts of one another. It strengthens and increases faith in God and in his word, and shows the Bible to be the sublimest production that ever has been, or ever shall be, seen in this world. This gives strength and confidence to those who are called, as ministers of Christ, to use the sword of the Spirit.

We have said that there are twenty-eight students in the history class; but there should be more than twice that number here receiving the benefits of the school in fitting them for efficient labor in the cause of the Third Angel's Message. There could be more than twice that number, and there would be too, if the example were followed which has brought two of those who are here. Two young men are here by the direct effort of certain brethren individually. One brother, who works for wages himself, bears entirely the expenses of a young man for the full

Bible course of six months; and without such help this young man could not be here at all.

Another brother supports entirely, for six months, the wife and three children of a man who has labored some in the cause, while this man spends these six months at the College. In this latter instance, this good brother made considerable of a journey on foot, through mud and rain, to see the one now at College, and persuade him to come to the school. He pleaded with him, and urged him to come. He begged to be allowed to furnish the means for the support of his family, so that he might come with the assurance that his family would be

682

well cared for. Finally, when after earnest prayer and consultation together and with the Conference Committee, the man decided to come, this brother went at once and deposited, for the benefit of the family, the whole six months' supply of money, and this brother has a family of his own to support; nor is he rich.

We say that these instances show sincere love for Christ and for the souls for whom he died. These men, denying themselves that men may be fitted in the shortest time to carry the last message of mercy to the perishing, manifest the spirit of Christ, who, though he was rich, yet became poor for our sakes. Why is it that there cannot be scores of such men on the Pacific Coast? Why is it that our College cannot thus be filled with men who are sent forth into the fields already white unto the harvest? Does any one suppose that these brethren will have no part in the reward that shall be given for the labor that is done by these men whom they thus virtually send into the field? Nay, verily, "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man *according to his ways*, and *according to the fruit* of his doings." Jer. 17. These brethren are thus sowing seed that shall bear fruit, thirty, sixty, or a hundred fold; and their reward shall be according to the *fruit* of their doings, saith the Lord.

More than this, these brethren are doing double work for the Master. Each, in his own place, is on his own part working for him; and in addition to this, each one sends a man into the field to work for him. Thus there are four men, instead of two, at work for the Master.

Again we say, Why can there not be scores of such men as these? You who can do this, and are not doing it, what account will you render to the Master when he comes? Will it be sufficient justification for you to say that you could not preach, while in your hands were means sufficient to have fitted one to go forth who could preach? Oh, that our brethren would all realize how great is the haste that the "King's business" requires; and how excellent are the facilities with which he has supplied the cause on this coast, in the establishment of this institution!

A. T. J.

**November 19, 1885**

**"The Roman Empire. (Concluded.) The Roman Provinces" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44 , p. 692.**

*(Concluded).*

## THE ROMAN PROVINCES

THE boundaries of Italy were the same as they now are, and were divided by Augustus into eleven regions.

"The European provinces of Rome were protected by the course of the Rhine and the Danube. The latter of those mighty streams, which arises at the distance of only thirty miles from the former, flows about thirteen hundred miles, for the most part to the southeast, collects the tribute of sixty navigable rivers, and is, at length, through six months, received into the Euxine [Black Sea], which appears scarcely equal to such an accession of waters. The provinces of the Danube soon acquired the general appellation of Illyricum, or the Illyrian frontier, and were esteemed the most warlike of the empire; but they deserve to be more particularly considered under the names of Rhetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia, Dacia, Mesia, Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece.

"The province of Rhetia, which soon extinguished the name of the Vindelicians, extended from the summit of the Alps to the banks of the Danube, from its source, as far as its conflux with the Inn. . . .

"The wide extent of territory which is included between the Inn, the Danube, and the Save,—Austria Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, the Lower Hungary, and Sclavonia,—was known to the ancients under the names of Noricum and Pannonia. In their original state of independence, their fierce inhabitants were intimately connected. Under the Roman Government they were frequently united, and they still remain the patrimony of a single family. . . . It may not be improper to observe, that if we except Bohemia, Moravia, the northern skirts of Austria, and a part of Hungary, between the Teyss and the Danube, all the other dominions of the House of Austria were comprised within the limits of the Roman Empire.

"Dalmatia, to which the name of Illyricum more properly belonged, was a long, but narrow tract, between the Save and the Adriatic. . . .

"After the Danube had received the waters of the Teyss and the Save, it acquired, at least among the Greeks, the name of Ister. It formerly divided Mesia and Dacia, the latter of which, as we have already seen, was a conquest of Trajan, and the only province beyond the river. If we inquire into the present state of those countries, we shall find that, on the left hand of the Danube, Temeswar and Transylvania have been annexed, after many revolutions, to the crown of Hungary; whilst the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia acknowledge the supremacy of the Ottoman Porte. On the right bank of the Danube. Mesia, which during the Middle Ages, was broken into the barbarian kingdoms of Servia and Bulgaria, is again united in Turkish slavery.

"The appellation of Rommelia, which is still bestowed by the Turks on the extensive countries of Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece, preserves the memory of their ancient state under the Roman Empire. In the time of the Antonines, the martial regions of Thrace, from the mountains of Hemus and Rhodope to the Bosphorus and the Hellespont had assumed the form of a province. . . . The

kingdom of Macedonia, which, under the reign of Alexander, gave laws to Asia, derived more solid advantages from the policy of the two Philips; and with its dependencies of Epirus and Thessaly, extended from the Egean to the Ionian Sea. When we reflect on the fame of Thebes and Argos, of Sparta and Athens, we can scarcely persuade ourselves that so many immortal republics of ancient Greece were lost in a single province of the Roman Empire, which, from the superior influence of the Achean league, was usually denominated the province of Achaia.

"Such was the state of Europe under the Roman emperors. . . . From Cyrene [the twentieth degree east longitude] to the ocean, the coast of Africa extends above fifteen hundred miles; yet so closely is it pressed between the Mediterranean and the Sahara, or sandy desert, that its breadth seldom exceeds fourscore or a hundred miles. The eastern division was considered by the Romans as the more peculiar and proper province of Africa. Till the arrival of the Phunician colonies, that fertile country was inhabited by the Libyans, the most savage of mankind. Under the immediate jurisdiction of Carthage, it became the center of commerce and empire; but the republic of Carthage is now degenerated into the feeble and disorderly States of Tripoli and Tunis.

"The military government of Algiers oppresses the wide extent of Numidia, as it was once united under Mussinissa and Jugurtha; but in the time of Augustus, the limits of Numidia were contracted; and at least two-thirds of the country acquiesced in the name of Mauritania, with the epithet of Ceariensis. The genuine Mauritania, or country of the Moors, which, from the ancient city of Tingi, or Tangier, was distinguished by the appellation of Tingitana, is represented by the modern kingdom of Fez. Salle, on the ocean, long infamous for its piratical depredations, was noticed by the Romans as the extreme object of their power, and almost of their geography. A city of their foundation may still be discovered near Mequinez, the residence of the barbarian whom we condescend to style the emperor of Morocco; but it does not appear that his more southern dominions, Morocco itself and Segelmessa, were ever comprehended within the Roman province. . . .

"We may observe, that Africa is divided from Spain by a narrow strait of about twelve miles, through which the Atlantic flows into the Mediterranean. The columns of Hercules, so famous among the ancients, were two mountains which seemed to have been torn asunder by some convulsion of the elements; and at the foot of the European mountain the fortress of Gibraltar is now seated. The whole extent of the Mediterranean Sea, its coasts, and its islands, were comprised within the Roman dominion."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 1, par. 28-33, 37, 38.* See also Ginn and Heath's Classical Atlas, Map 12.

Of these provinces, Pannonia and all westward, and those named on the African coast, formed the territory proper of the fourth kingdom,—Rome. These, with the northwestern part of Illyricum, formed what is known in history as the Latin or Western Empire of Rome. And it is within the boundaries of the Western

Empire that the ten kingdoms should be established.  
A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 20:1-17. Hezekiah's Prayer Answered" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44 , p. 695.**

**NOVEMBER 29. 2 KINGS 20:1-17**

AFTER Hezekiah's punishment, and his confession and submission to Sennacherib, as related in last week's lesson, he fell sick of the malady which forms the subject of this lesson. "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amos came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord. Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." This message is somewhat different from that which would be given in the majority of cases nowadays to as good a man as Hezekiah. Now, the word of comfort would be, in most instances, in substance about this: "You are now to leave this world and go to Heaven. We speak of it as death, but in reality there is no death. 'Death is but the gate to endless joy,' and you will soon be happy in Heaven; and by this you will know what true life is; it is then you will really begin to live," etc., etc.

BUT such is not the message of God to any dying person. "Thou shalt die, *and not live*," is the word of God. And therefore when a person dies, and he does not live. A person cannot be dead and alive at the same time. If he is dead, he is dead, and not alive; and he will not be alive until the resurrection—if righteous, till the resurrection of the just; if unrighteous, till the resurrection of the unjust. And so Hezekiah understood it. He seems to have had no idea that he was going to Heaven when he died; if he had, he certainly showed very little appreciation of the blessedness of it, by weeping, as he did, "with a great weeping." But we have his own word on this subject: "The writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness: *I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave; I am deprived of the residue of my years. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living. . . . Like a crane or a swallow, so did I chatter; I did mourn as a dove. For the grave cannot praise thee, death can not celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth.*" Isa. 38:9-19.

THUS spake Hezekiah. And it was because, if he should die, he would go to the grave—to a place and condition in which he could neither see nor praise the Lord. It was because of this that he "wept sore." It was because of this that he desired not yet to die. Then came the word of the Lord to him by Isaiah: "I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; . . . and I will add unto thy days fifteen years. . . . And Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs. And they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered." 2 Kings 20:5-7. It is right to pray for the sick, indeed the Lord has given specific directions to do so; but he has not directed us to disregard appliances. On the contrary, in this place he gives just as specific directions to use appliances as he does in the other place to pray for the sick. Notice, too, that it was *after* his distinct promise to heal Hezekiah and to add unto

his days fifteen years, that he ordered them to take a bunch of figs and lay on the boil; but it was not till *after* they had applied the figs that he recovered. Prayer and faith and works, or, in other words, *common sense*, go together in the intelligent service of the Lord; while that kind of faith-cure, that is now becoming too prevalent, that proposes to cure all manner of diseases without either appliances or common sense, is nothing but spiritual quackery, and is strikingly akin to presumption. It certainly is not intelligent faith.

"AND Isaiah said, This sign shalt thou have of the Lord, that the Lord will do the thing that he hath spoken; shall the shadow go forward ten degrees, or go back ten degrees? And Hezekiah answered, It is a light thing for the shadow to go down ten degrees; nay, but let the shadow return backward ten degrees. And Isaiah the prophet cried unto the Lord; and he brought the shadow ten degrees backward, by which it had gone down in the dial of Ahaz." Verses 9-11. It is hard to understand how Hezekiah should think it any more of "a light thing" for the shadow to go down than for it to go back. To us it would seem to be just as easy to do the one as to do the other; for certainly no power but that of God could do either, and it is just as easy for Almighty power to do one thing as it is to do another. Whatever Hezekiah may have thought about this, we can find excuse for him; but we can find literally no excuse for those modern would-be wise "divines" who attempt to tell just how this thing was done. They attempt to explain by natural causes, not only this miracle, but other such recorded events, especially in the Old Testament. If these were the result of what we know as natural causes; if these things were in accordance with what is termed and known as natural law, then there was no miracle about them. And to talk, as some do, of these things as being too "violent interferences with the order of nature," is simply to talk nonsense. What is the order of nature? Who established the order of nature? Is not God above nature? Is not the order of nature simply the ordinances which God established? Assuredly so. Then is he bound, as we are, to act strictly according to these laws? If so, then there is no such thing as a miracle. And every attempt to explain by natural causes any of the miracles recorded in the Bible, is just so much of an effort to reduce them to the level of the natural, and to rob them of their sublime dignity as miracles, and is therefore simply *unbelief*, however much faith may be professed.

SHORTLY after Hezekiah's recovery, Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, sent messengers with letters and a present unto Hezekiah, because he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick and had recovered; and he also sent these messengers "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land." 2 Chron. 32:31. Merodach-baladan was at first king of a small country at the head of the Persian Gulf; but he spread his authority northward, and took Babylon and began to reign there about 721 B.C.—the same year in which Sargon became king of Assyria. Sargon went down to recover Babylon. He did so; and took Merodach-baladan prisoner, and carried him into Assyria; but he escaped from prison, returned to Babylon, re-established his authority there, and maintained it a few years, until Sennacherib once more recovered Babylon to Assyria. Merodach-baladan then fled to an island in the Persian Gulf, where he died; and Sennacherib, to prevent further revolt of the rebellious city, determined, as he says himself, "to overthrow

it even more than was done by the deluge," and so left it a heap of ruins, with the Euphrates running over it.

IT was during Merodach-baladan's second reign in Babylon, and between Sennacherib's first and second invasions of Judea, that this embassy came from Babylon to Hezekiah. We saw in last week's lesson how Hezekiah, by receiving the king of Ekron, had brought Sennacherib upon him; and how that, by his submission and the payment of a large tribute, Sennacherib had turned back. The matter of the second invasion appears to be about as follows: Ambassadors were sent, either by Hezekiah or by an influential faction, to solicit the alliance of Egypt against Assyria. Isa. 30:1-7; 31:1-5. Sennacherib learned of it (2 Kings 18:19-21), and came out to Lachish, and so placed himself between Hezekiah and his forces, and the king of Egypt and his forces. From Lachish he sent Rabshakeh and Rabsaria and Tartan up to Jerusalem to demand the submission of Hezekiah, upon the condition that he should remain in his own land until Sennacherib got ready to come and carry all away captive. 2 Kings 18:31-35. Hezekiah refused to hear him, and forbade any of the people to answer him, and sent a company to Isaiah to ask whether the Lord would not hear the words of Rabshakeh. 2 Kings 18:36, 37; 19:1-5.

THEN Rabshakeh returned to Sennacherib at Libnah, "for he had heard that he was departed from Lachish." Then Sennacherib heard that Tirhakah king of Ethiopia had come out to fight against him. *Then he sent messengers with a letter* to Hezekiah. Hezekiah took this letter up into the temple and spread it before the Lord, and prayed him to see and hear all the words of Sennacherib. 2 Kings 19:6-16. "And it came to pass *that night*, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand." 2 Kings 19:35. So it is a mistake to suppose that Sennacherib's army was encamped against Jerusalem when it was smitten by the angel. And this is exactly what Isaiah had said: "Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, *nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield, nor cast a bank against it.*" 2 Kings 19:32. Accordingly, we find that the whole narrative goes to show that Sennacherib was away below Libnah, going to fight with Tirhakah, when his army was smitten. And Sennacherib returned "with shame of face" into his own land.

THUS once more Jehovah showed himself to his people and to the heathen as above all gods. And showed himself ready and willing to deliver his people from the oppressor, when they put their trust implicitly in him. He is the same mighty God, the same tender Father, to his people to-day as he was of old. With him is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning;" but men's sins have parted between them and him, and when they shall return, as he in mercy is now calling upon them to do, to faithful obedience to all his law, once more he will show himself valiant in the behalf of those whose hearts are perfect toward him. "Blessed are the people who know the joyful sound." Yea, "Blessed is that people whose God is Jehovah." A. T. J.

**November 26, 1885**

**"Ancient Germany" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 45 , pp. 708, 709.**

HAVING defined and briefly sketched the country that is to be divided, it will now be necessary to describe ancient Germany, the country whence are to come the nations that shall make the division. Having found that ten kingdoms are to be established here, it will be proper to study for a little while the primitive condition of the people that is to form these kingdoms. Here, again, we shall need to simply transcribe portions of Gibbon's history:—

"We shall occasionally mention the Scythian or Sarmatian tribes, which, with their arms and horses, their flocks and herds, their wives and families, wandered over the immense plains which spread themselves from the Caspian Sea to the Vistula, from the confines of Persia to those of Germany. But the warlike Germans, who first resisted, then invaded, *and at length overturned* the Western monarchy of Rome, will occupy a much more important place in this history, and possess a stronger, and, if we may use the expression, a more domestic, claim to our attention and regard. The most civilized nations of modern Europe issued from the woods of Germany; and in the rude institutions of those barbarians we may still distinguish the original principles of our present laws and manners."

"Ancient Germany, excluding from its independent limits the province westward of the Rhine, which had submitted to the Roman yoke, extended itself over a third part of Europe. Almost the whole of modern Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Livonia, Prussia, and the greater part of Poland, were peopled by the various tribes of one great nation, whose complexion, manners, and language denoted a common origin, and preserved a striking resemblance. On the west, ancient Germany was divided by the Rhine from the Gallic, and on the south, by the Danube, from the Illyrian, provinces of the empire. A ridge of hills, rising from the Danube, and called the Carpathian Mountains, covered Germany on the side of Dacia or Hungary. The eastern frontier was faintly marked by the mutual fears of the Germans and the Sarmatians, and was often confounded by the mixture of warring and confederating tribes of the two nations. In the remote darkness of the north, the ancients imperfectly descried a frozen ocean that lay beyond the Baltic Sea, and beyond the Peninsula, or islands of Scandinavia."

"Some ingenious writers have suspected that Europe was much colder formerly than it is at present; and the most ancient descriptions of the climate of Germany tend exceedingly to confirm their theory. The general complaints of intense frost and eternal winter, are perhaps little to be regarded, since we have no method of reducing to the accurate standard of the thermometer, the feelings, or the expressions, of an orator born

in the happier regions of Greece or Asia. But I shall select two remarkable circumstances of a less equivocal nature.

"1. The great rivers which covered the Roman provinces, the Rhine and the Danube, were frequently frozen over, and capable of supporting the most enormous weights. The barbarians, who often chose that severe season for their inroads, transported, without apprehension or danger, their numerous armies, their cavalry, and their heavy wagons, over a vast and solid bridge of ice. Modern ages have not presented an instance of a like phenomenon.

"2. The reindeer, that useful animal, from whom the savage of the North derives the best comforts of his dreary life, is of a constitution that supports, and even requires, the most intense cold. He is found on the rock of Spitzbergen, within ten degrees of the Pole; he seems to delight in the snows of Lapland and Siberia; but at present he cannot subsist, much less multiply, in any country to the south of the Baltic. In the time of Cesar the reindeer, as well as the elk and the wild bull, was a native of the Hercynian forest, which then overshadowed a great part of Germany and Poland.

The modern improvements sufficiently explain the causes of the diminution of the cold. These immense woods have been gradually cleared, which intercepted from the earth the rays of the sun. The morasses have been drained, and, in proportion as the soil has been cultivated, the air has become more temperate. Canada, at this day [1775 A.D.], is an exact picture of ancient Germany. Although situated in the same parallel with the finest provinces of France and England, that country experiences the most rigorous cold. The reindeer are very numerous, the ground is covered with deep and lasting snow, and the great river of St. Lawrence is regularly frozen, in a season when the waters of the Seine and the Thames are usually free from ice."

"When Tacitus considered the purity of the German blood, and the forbidding aspect of the country, he was disposed to pronounce those barbarians *Indigenú*, or natives of the soil. We may allow with safety, and perhaps with truth, that ancient Germany was not originally peopled by any foreign colonies already formed into a political society; but that the name and nation received their existence from the gradual union of some wandering savages of the Hercynian woods. To assert those savages to have been the spontaneous production of the earth which they inhabited would be a rash inference, condemned by religion, and unwarranted by reason."

"Modern Germany is said to contain about two thousand three hundred walled towns. In a much wider extent of country, the

geographer Ptolemy could discover no more than ninety places which he decorates with the name of cities; though, according to our ideas, they would but ill deserve that splendid title. We can only suppose them to have been rude fortifications, constructed in the centre of the

woods, and designed to secure the women, children, and cattle, whilst the warriors of the tribe marched out to repel a sudden invasion. But Tacitus asserts, as a well-known fact, that the Germans, in his time [A.D. 56-135], had *no* cities; and that they affected to despise the works of Roman industry, as places of confinement rather than of security. Their edifices were not even contiguous, or formed into regular villas; each barbarian fixed his independent dwelling on the spot to which a plain, a wood, or a stream of fresh water, had induced him to give the preference. Neither stone, nor brick, nor tiles, were employed in these slight habitations. They were indeed no more than low huts, of a circular figure, built of rough timber, thatched with straw, and pierced at the top to leave a free passage for the smoke.

"In the most inclement winter, the hardy German was satisfied with a scanty garment made of the skin of some animal. The nations who dwelt towards the north clothed themselves in furs; and the women manufactured for their own use a coarse kind of linen. The game of various sorts, with which the forests of Germany were plentifully stocked, supplied its inhabitants with food and exercise. Their monstrous herds of cattle, less remarkable indeed for their beauty than for their utility, formed the principal object of their wealth. A small quantity of corn was the only produce exacted from the earth; the use of orchards or artificial meadows was unknown to the Germans; nor can we expect any improvements in agriculture from a people, whose prosperity every year experienced a general change by a new division of the arable lands, and who, in that strange operation, avoided disputes, by suffering a great part of their territory to lie waste and without tillage."

"The sound that summoned the German to arms was grateful to his ear. It roused him from his uncomfortable lethargy, gave him an active pursuit, and, by strong exercise of the body, and violent emotions of the mind, restored him to a more lively sense of his existence. In the dull intervals of peace, these barbarians were immoderately addicted to deep gaming and excessive drinking; both

of which, by different means, the one by inflaming their passions, the other by extinguishing their reason, alike relieved them from the pain of thinking. They gloried in passing whole

days and nights at table; and the blood of friends and relations often stained their numerous and drunken assemblies. Their debts of honor (for in that light they have transmitted to us those of play) they discharged with the most romantic fidelity. The desperate gamester, who had staked his person and liberty on a last throw of the dice, patiently submitted to the decision of fortune, and suffered himself to be bound, chastised, and sold into remote slavery, by his weaker but more lucky antagonist.

"Strong beer, a liquor extracted with very little art from wheat or barley, and *corrupted* (as it is strongly expressed by Tacitus) into a certain semblance of wine, was sufficient for the gross purposes of German debauchery. But those who had tasted the rich wines of Italy, and afterwards of Gaul, sighed for that more delicious species of intoxication. They attempted not, however, (as has since been executed with so much success,) to naturalize the vine on the banks of the Rhine and Danube; nor did they endeavor to procure by industry the materials of an advantageous commerce. To solicit by labor what might be ravished by arms, was esteemed unworthy of the German spirit. The intemperate thirst of strong liquors often urged

the barbarians to invade the provinces on which art or nature had bestowed those much envied presents."

"A general of the tribe was elected on occasions of danger; and, if the danger was pressing and extensive, several tribes concurred in the choice of the same general. The bravest warrior was named to lead his countrymen into the field, by his example rather than by his commands. But this power, however limited, was still invidious. It expired with the war, and in time of peace the German tribes acknowledged not any supreme chief. *Princes* were, however, appointed, in the general assembly, to administer justice, or rather to compose differences, in their respective districts."

"In the hour of danger it was shameful for the chief to be surpassed in valor by his companions; shameful for the companions not to equal the valor of their chief. To survive his fall in battle, was

indelible infamy. To protect his person, and to adorn his glory with the trophies of their own exploits, were the most sacred of their duties. The chiefs combated for victory, the companions for the chief."

"The Germans treated their women with esteem and confidence, consulted them on every occasion of importance, and fondly believed, that in their breasts resided a sanctity and wisdom more than human. Some of the interpreters of fate, such as Velleda, in the Batavian war, governed, in the name of the deity, the fiercest nations of Germany. The rest of the sex, without being

adored as goddesses, were respected as the free and equal companions of soldiers; associated even by the marriage ceremony to a life of toil, of danger, and of glory. In their great invasions, the camps of the barbarians were filled with a multitude of women, who remained firm and undaunted amidst the sound of arms, the various forms of destruction, and the honorable wounds of their sons and husbands.

"Fainting armies of Germans have, more than once, been driven back upon the enemy, by the generous despair of the women, who dreaded death much less than servitude. If the day was irrecoverably lost, they well knew how to deliver themselves and their children, with their own hands, from an insulting victor.

709

Heroines of such a cast may claim our admiration; but they were most assuredly neither lovely, nor very susceptible of love. Whilst they affected to emulate the stern virtues of man, they must have resigned that attractive softness, in which principally consist the charm and weakness of woman. Conscious pride taught the German females to suppress every tender emotion that stood in competition with honor, and the first honor of the sex has ever been that of

chastity. The sentiments and conduct of these high-spirited matrons may, at once, be considered as a cause, as an effect, and as a proof of the general character of the nation."

"The religious system of the Germans (if the wild opinions of savages can deserve that name) was dictated by their wants, their fears, and their ignorance. They adored the great visible objects and agents of nature—the Sun and the Moon, the Fire and the earth—together with those imaginary deities, who were supposed to preside over the most important occupations of human life. They were persuaded, that, by some ridiculous arts of divination, they could discover the will of the superior beings, and that human sacrifices were the most precious and acceptable offering to their altars."

"Germany was divided into more than forty independent states; and, even in each state, the union of the several tribes was extremely

loose and precarious. The barbarians were easily provoked; they knew not how to forgive an injury, much less an insult; their resentments were bloody and implacable. The casual disputes that so frequently happened in their tumultuous parties of hunting or drinking, were sufficient to inflame the minds of whole nations; the private feuds of any considerable chieftains diffused itself among their followers and allies. To chastise the insolent, or to plunder the defenseless, were alike causes of war. The most formidable states of Germany affected to encompass their

territories with a wide frontier of solitude and devastation. The awful distance preserved by their neighbors attested the terror of their arms, and in some measure defended them from the danger of unexpected incursions."

"Such was the situation, and such were the manners of the ancient Germans. Their climate, their want of learning, of arts, and of laws, their notions of honor, of gallantry, and of religion, their sense of freedom, impatience of peace, and thirst of enterprise, all contributed to form a people of military heroes. And yet we find, that during more than two hundred and fifty years that elapsed from the defeat of Varus [September, A.D. 9] to the reign of Decius [249 A.D.], these formidable barbarians made few considerable attempts, and not any material impression on the luxurious and enslaved provinces of the empire. Their progress was checked by their want of arms and discipline, and their fury was diverted by the intestine divisions of ancient Germany."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 9, par. 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 26, 24.*

But when we reach the time of the reign of Decius, it seems almost as though the very elements were employed in hurling the barbarous nations in multitudes upon the already rapidly failing empire.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Isaiah 1:1-18. The Sinful Nation"  
*The Signs of the Times* 11, 45 , pp. 711, 718.**

**DECEMBER 6. ISAIAH 1:1-18**

ISAIAH means "Salvation of Jehovah," and he has been called the "evangelical prophet." He wrote more about Christ and the Christian dispensation than did any other prophet. He prophesied in "the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah." If he began to prophesy in the last year of Uzziah, about 758, and continued to the end of Hezekiah's reign, about 698, this would give sixty years of service as a prophet. We do not certainly know that he lived *throughout* the reign of Hezekiah, but we know that he lived through the most of it, so that he prophesied, at the very least, nearly sixty years. It would thus appear that he was quite young when he was chosen of God to prophesy.

IT would seem from Isa. 6:7 that it was in the year that Uzziah died that he began to prophesy; for there he records a vision of "the Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up," and he exclaims, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts." Then one of the seraphim flew unto him, "having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar; and he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and *thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.* Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me." This must have been Isaiah's first vision, and

the time when he was chosen to the prophetic work; for it was at this time that his sins were forgiven. And when he first sees the Lord, he exclaims, as we have read, "Woe is me! for I am undone." But when the seraph has touched his lips with the hallowed fire, and told him his sin is cleansed, his iniquity taken away, then he is ready to be a messenger of the Lord; and as soon as he hears the voice asking who shall be sent, he cries, "Here am I; send me. And he said, Go." Thus the Lord would have no one go to speak for him, nor in his name, till his iniquity has been taken away and his sin purged. Then, and not till then, can we bear the message of the Lord.

IN this very first vision he spoke of Christ, and of the people in the day when Christ was upon the earth. John tells us so. In recording the words and works of the Saviour, he says, "But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him." And these very ones who did not believe on Christ, in them was fulfilled the very saying of Isaiah as recorded in Isa. 6:9, 10. Compare John 12:38-41 and Isa. 6:1-13. Then says John, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him." We see also by this that in the year that King Uzziah died, Isaiah not only spake of this people, but he also spoke of Christ, and *he then saw Christ*. That majestic one whom Isaiah saw sitting upon that throne high and lifted up; that one whose train filled the temple in Heaven; that one in the presence of whose glory the bright seraphim shaded their faces; that one of whom these seraphim said, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory,"—*that* was Christ our Lord and Saviour. That was He who speaks in righteousness, He who is indeed "mighty to save."

WE have no prophecy which Isaiah refers definitely to the reign of Jotham, nor any message sent directly to Jotham as there is to Ahaz and Hezekiah. In chapters 7, 8, and 9 are prophecies in the reign of Ahaz. Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, had formed a confederacy to take Jerusalem and Judah, and kill Ahaz and make the son of Tabeal, a creature of their own, king in Jerusalem. But the Lord sent a word to Ahaz and his people, "Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass." And in that message to Ahaz and his people Isaiah uttered his prophecy of Immanuel, "which is, being interpreted, God with us." See Isa. 7:14 and Matt. 1:23. At the same time he prophesied of that child which should be called, "Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, the everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. 9:6, 7; Luke 1:32, 33; and at the same time he prophesied of the second coming of the Saviour, the reform on the law of God, and the working of Spiritualism just before Christ comes in his glory. Isa. 8:16-21; 2 Thess. 2:9. And in the lesson for to-day, his word is a prophecy which Paul applied to the people in his day. See Isa. 1:9, with Rom. 9:29; 11:5.

THESE are but a few instances in illustration of Peter's word about the prophets: "Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." 1 Peter 1:12. In reading the prophets, we are always to bear in mind that they have written many things to us, as well as some things to those of their own day. And when, in to-day's lesson, we read,

"Ah, sinful nation," he means the people of to-day—not the people who make no profession of his name, but the people upon whom his name is called. To those of to-day, he says, "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." To what purpose are sacrifices, and offerings, and the calling of assemblies, when the law of God is despised and rejected? So in another place this same prophet says: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins. Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know my ways, *as a nation that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinance* of their God." Isa. 58:1-14. To what purpose are fastings and prayers, when the ordinance of God is forsaken? "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9.

THEREFORE, to-day he says to the people of to-day: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fa-

718

(Continued on page 718.)

(Continued from page 711.)

therless, plead for the widow." "Turn yourselves and live ye." Harken to the word of God and obey. Jesus said to his disciples, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." John 15:3. Paul says that, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water *by the word*, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. 5:25-27. Peter says: "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit." 1 Pet. 1:22. The only way in which to "learn to do well," is by strict obedience to the word of God, through the Spirit.

And the only way to obtain the Holy Spirit is by confession, and the forsaking of sin. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso *confesseth* and *forsaketh* them shall find mercy." Prov. 28:13. "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." "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." Rom. 3:24, 25.

"If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Christ is "the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Sam. 15:22.

A. T. J.

**December 3, 1885**

**"The First Migrations of the Goths" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 46 , p. 724.**

THE night of January 1, A.D. 193, the Emperor Commodus, after having reached "the summit of vice and infamy," was poisoned by Marcia, his favorite concubine, and, at the instance of her accomplices, who were impatient of the poison, was strangled by a wrestler. From that night till the reign of Constantine as sole emperor, A.D. 323, of more than sixty who assume the "bloody purple" none lived in peace; only four—Severus, Claudius, Constantine, and Galerius—died in quietness, and only one—Decius—fell in battle with the barbarians; and one—Valerian—died in captivity in Persia. All the others were either assassinated, or else took their own lives to prevent being massacred, or else fell in battle with their successful rivals. De Quincey, however, lengthens the period and lessens the number. Of the office of emperor he says, it was "always a post of danger, and so regularly closed by assassination, that in the course of *two centuries* there are hardly to be found three or four cases of exception."—*Essay, Ancient History, the Cesars, chap. 6, par. 6.*

A few strokes of Gibbon's vigorous pen will illustrate for us the terrible history of this dreary period of the empire. He says:—

"From the great secular games celebrated by Philip, to the death of the Emperor Gallienus, there elapsed [A.D. 248-268] twenty years of shame and misfortune. During that calamitous period, every instant of time was marked, every province of the Roman world was afflicted, by barbarous invaders and military tyrants, and the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its dissolution."—*Chap. 10, par. 1.*

In this twenty years there were seven emperors,—Philip, Decius, Hostilianus, Gallus, Emilianus, Valerian, and Gallienus. Of the reigns of the last two—father and son—Gibbon says:—

"The joint government of the father and the son subsisted about seven, and the sole administration of Gallienus continued about eight years [A.D. 253-268]. But the whole period was one uninterrupted series of confusion and calamity. The Roman Empire was at the same time, and on every side, attacked by the blind fury of foreign invaders, and the wild ambition of domestic usurpers."—*Id., par. 21.*

Of Gallienus and his reign we are told that,—

"In every art that he attempted, his lively genius enabled him to succeed; and as his genius was destitute of judgment, he attempted every art, except the important ones of war and government. He was a master of several curious but useless sciences, a ready orator, an elegant poet, a skillful gardener, an

excellent cook, and most contemptible prince. When the great emergencies of the State engaged his presence and attention, he was engaged in conversation with the philosopher Plotinus, wasting his time in trifling or licentious pleasures, preparing his initiation to the Grecian mysteries, or soliciting a place in the Areopagus of Athens. . . . At a time when the reins of government were held with so loose a band, it is not surprising that a crowd of usurpers should start up in every province of the empire against the son of Valerian. . . . To illustrate the obscure monuments of the life and death of each individual, would prove a laborious task, alike barren of instruction and amusement. . . . *Of the nineteen tyrants who started up under the reign of Gallienus there was not one who enjoyed a life of peace or a natural death.*"—*Id.*, par. 46, 47, 50.

Except in the number of the usurpers, the reign of Gallienus may be taken as a fair picture of the whole period from Commodus to Constantine. In concluding his observations upon these "rapid and perpetual transitions from the cottage to the throne, and from the throne to the grave," the historian adds:—

"Such were the barbarians [which we shall introduce presently], and such the tyrants, who, under the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, the dismembered the provinces, and reduced the empire to the lowest pitch of disgrace and ruin, from whence it seemed impossible that it should ever emerge."—*Id.*, par. 52.

We have now reached the time when we can enter intelligently upon the study of the course of the flood of barbarians which comes pouring down from the North upon the already torn and distracted empire. And we now propose to trace the ten kingdoms from their origin among the savage tribes of ancient Germany to their establishment within the Western Empire, and to the present condition of such of them as remain, among the civilized nations of modern Europe. Of all these, to the GOTHS belongs the first place. Although the GOTHS were not absolutely the first to invade the empire, nor yet actually the first to fix their final settlement within its limits; yet as they did more than any other nation to break the power of Rome, and so to prepare the way for the other nations to enter, to them rightly belongs the foremost place among all the nations that had any share in the breaking up of the once so mighty empire of Rome.

"The Emperor Decius had employed a few months in the works of peace and administration of justice, when [A.D. 250] he was summoned to the banks of the Danube by the invasion of the Goths. This is the first considerable occasion in which history mentions that great people, who afterwards broke the Roman power, sacked the capital, and reigned in Gaul, Spain, and Italy. So memorable was the part which they acted in the subversion of the Western Empire, that the name of Goths is frequently, but improperly, used as a general appellation of rude and warlike barbarism."

"Many vestiges, which cannot be ascribed to the arts of the Goths in the countries beyond the Baltic. From the time of the geographer Ptolemy, the southern part of Sweden seems to have continued in the possession of the less enterprising remnant of the nation, and a large territory is even at present divided

into East and West Gothland. During the Middle Ages (from the ninth to the twelfth century), whilst Christianity was advancing with a slow progress into the North, the Goths and the Swedes composed two distinct, and sometimes hostile, members of the same monarchy. The latter of these two names has prevailed without extinguishing the former. The Swedes, who mightily well be satisfied with their own fame in arms, have in every age claimed the kindred glory of the Goths."

"If so many successive generations of Goths were capable of preserving a faint tradition of their Scandinavian origin, we must not expect from such unlettered barbarians any distinct account of the time and circumstances of their emigration. To cross the Baltic was an easy and natural attempt. The inhabitants of Sweden were masters of a prominent number of large vessels with oars, and the distance is little more than one hundred miles from Carlsrona to the nearest ports of Pomerania and Prussia. Here, at length, we land on firm and historic ground. At least as early as the Christian era, and as late as the age of the Antonines [A.D. 138-180], the Goths were established towards the mouth of the Vistula, and in that fertile province where the commercial cities of Thorn, Elbing, Konigsberg, and Dantzic were long afterwards founded."

"In the age of the Antonines the Goths were still seated in Prussia. About the reign of Alexander Severus [A.D. 222-235], the Roman province of Dacia had already experienced their proximity by frequent and destructive inroads. In this interval, therefore, of about seventy years, we must place the second migration of the Goths from the Baltic to the Euxine; but the cause that produced it lies concealed among the various motives which actuate the conduct of unsettled barbarians. Either a pestilence or a famine, a victory or a defeat, an oracle of the gods or the eloquence of a daring leader, was sufficient to impel the Gothic arms on the milder climate of the south. Besides the influence of a martial religion, the numbers and spirit of the Goths were equal to the most dangerous adventures. The use of round bucklers and short swords rendered them formidable in a close engagement; the manly obedience which they yielded to hereditary kings gave uncommon union and stability to their councils; and the renowned Amala, the hero of that age and the tenth ancestor of Theodoric, king of Italy, enforced, by the ascendancy of personal merit, the prerogative of his birth, which he derived from the *Anses*, or demigods of the Gothic nation.

"The fame of a great enterprise excited the bravest warriors from all the Vandalic States of Germany, many of whom are seen a few years afterwards combating under the common standard of the Goths. The first motions of the emigrants carried them to the banks of the Prypec, a river universally conceived by the ancients to be the southern branch of the Borysthenes [Dnieper]. The windings of that great stream through the plains of Poland and Russia, gave a direction to their line of march, and a constant supply of fresh water and pasturage to their numerous herds of cattle. They followed the unknown course of the river, confident in their valor, and careless of whatever power might oppose their progress. The Bastarne dwelt on the northern side of the Carpathian Mountains; the immense tract of land that separated the Bastarne from the savages of Finland was possessed, or rather wasted, by the Venedi. . . .

"As the Goths advanced near the Euxine [Black] Sea, they encountered a purer race of Sarmatians, the Jazyges, the Alani, and the Roxolani; and they were probably the first Germans who saw the mouths of the Borysthenes and of the Tanais [Don]. If we inquire into the characteristic marks of the people of Germany and of Sarmatia, we shall discover that those two great portions of human kind were principally distinguished by fixed huts or movable tents; by a close dress or flowing garments; by the marriage of one or of several wives; by a military force, consisting, for the most part, either of infantry or cavalry; and, above all, by the use of the Teutonic or of the Slavonian language—the last of which has been diffused by conquest [of Russia] from the confines of Italy to the neighborhood of Japan.

"The Goths were now in possession of the Ukraine, a country of considerable extent and uncommon fertility, intersected with navigable rivers which from either side discharge themselves into the Borysthenes, and interspersed with large and lofty forests of oak. The plenty of game and fish, the innumerable bee-hives, deposited in the hollows of old trees and in the cavities of rocks, and forming, even in that rude age, a valuable branch of commerce, the size of the cattle, the temperature of the air, the aptness of the soil for every species of grain, and the luxuriancy of the vegetation, all displayed the liberality of nature, and tempted the industry of man. But the Goths withstood all these temptations, and still adhered to a life of idleness, of poverty, and of rapine."—*Id.*, chap. 10, par. 3, 4, 8-11.

A. T. J.

(*To be continued.*)

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Isaiah 53:1-12. The Suffering Saviour" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 46 , pp. 726, 727.**

**DECEMBER 13. ISAIAH 53:1-12**

THIS prophecy really begins with verse 13 of the preceding chapter. Altogether, it is a most vivid description of the life, sufferings, and death of Christ the Saviour. The Lord showed by his prophets, not only that the Saviour should come, but the time when he should come, the place where he should be born, and here, by Isaiah, the leading particulars and characteristics of his career while in this world. In verse 14 of the preceding chapter we read of the effects upon him of his fast in the wilderness: "His visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men." Men may talk of men's fasting forty days, and count it as detracting from the merit of that fast of our Saviour; but the *fact* still remains that the condition to which our Saviour was reduced by his forty days' fast was lower than that which was ever reached by any man that was ever in this world, who lived after it. "His visage was so marred *more than any man*, and is form *more* than the sons of men."

"WHO hath believed our report?" Although the Lord had by his prophets foreshown the coming, and the manner of the coming, of

the Saviour, yet there were few, very few, to receive him at his coming. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not."

"With what profound and reverent interest should the elders of Israel have been studying the place, the time, the circumstances, of the greatest event in the world's history,—the coming of the Son of God to accomplish the redemption of man! Oh, why were not the people watching and waiting that they might be among the first to welcome the world's Re-

727

deemer! But lo, at Bethlehem two weary travelers from the hills of Nazareth traverse the whole length of the narrow street to the eastern extremity of the town, vainly seeking a place of rest and shelter for the night. No doors open to receive them. In a wretched hovel prepared for cattle, they at last find refuge, and there the Saviour of the world is born. . . .

"An angel visits the earth to see who are prepared to welcome Jesus. But he can discern no tokens of expectancy. He hears no voice of praise and triumph that the period of Messiah's coming is at hand. The angel hovers for a time over the chosen city and the temple where the divine presence was manifested for ages; but even here is the same indifference. The priests, in their pomp and pride, are offering polluted sacrifices in the temple. The Pharisees are with loud voices addressing the people, or making boastful prayers at the corners of the streets. There is no evidence that Christ is expected, and no preparation for the Prince of life.

"In amazement the celestial messenger is about to return to Heaven with the shameful tidings, when he discovers a group of shepherds who are watching their flocks by night, and, as they gaze into the starry heavens, are contemplating the prophecy of a Messiah to come to earth, and longing for the advent of the world's Redeemer. Here is a company that are prepared to receive the heavenly message. And suddenly the angel of the Lord appeared, declaring the good tidings of great joy. Celestial glory flooded all the plain, an innumerable company of angels was revealed, and as if the joy were too great for one messenger to bring from Heaven, a multitude of voices broke forth in the anthem which all the nations of the saved shall one day sing, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.'"—*Great Controversy, by Mrs. E. G. White, pp. 197, 198.*

WE shall not attempt any annotation on any of that part of the lesson from verse 2 to verse 10. In these verses Inspiration Himself, out of the depths of divine, pitying love, has described the sufferings, the afflictions, and the sorrows of the Holy One, who died for the children of men, and to attempt an "exposition" would be but to mar the beauty and the blessed symmetry of the description. We will, however, transcribe these verses, and whoever reads them, we ask him to read them over *slowly*, thoughtfully, three times.

"FOR he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."

"HE shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." That is, he shall see the fruits of his suffering, and shall be satisfied. Satisfied? Could he not be satisfied with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was? Could he not be satisfied with his place upon that throne "high and lifted up," where Isaiah saw him? Could he not be satisfied with the worshipful song of the seraphim crying, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory"? Was not all this enough to satisfy him? No, not while man was lost in this world of sin. "For the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross, despising the shame." And when he shall have gathered to himself all of the fruits of his sufferings, from "sacrificing Abel" to the last one, then he "shall be satisfied;" then his joy will be full; then will be fulfilled his saying, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." Heb. 2:12. And again: "The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy; he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing." Do you want to share that joy, as well as add to it? Gather souls to Christ. increase the fruits of his suffering by bringing souls to his salvation, and you will increase his joy; then it will be said to you, "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Oh, thou suffering, afflicted, sorrowing Saviour! If I can add one ray of gladness to that fair brow that was pierced with the cruel thorns, I shall be satisfied. If I can add one beam of satisfaction to that visage that was so marred more than any man, I shall be delighted. If I can add one thrill of joy to that great heart of love that was broken with the ingratitude of men, my joy shall be full.

"THEREFORE will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong." Satan is the strong one who has spoiled the human race. He brought sin into the world, and death by sin, and has shut up man in his prison-house—the grave. And Jesus, in talking of Satan and his house and his

power, said: "How can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." Matt. 12:29. Satan had the power of death (Heb. 2:14). Christ died and went into the grave, and came forth exclaiming: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore. Amen; and have the keys [the power] of hell [the grave] and of death." Rev. 1:18. Now he will bring forth all who have gone down to the grave trusting in him. And when he went into the land of the enemy, and returned a conqueror, he brought forth some spoils to grace his triumph, and soon will bring all.

"AND many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection." Matt. 27:52, 53. "And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." Col. 2:15. And, "When he ascended up on high, he led a multitude of captives." Eph. 4:8, margin. In this text, Col. 2:15, Paul uses the figure of a Roman triumph. When a Roman commander had gone into an enemy's country, and had seized the power, when he returned he brought captives and spoils to immense value to his capital city; and then he was awarded a triumph, wherein he should be exalted on high, and following in his train were all the captives and spoils which he had taken. So when Christ went into Satan's country, and, as we have seen, seized the power, when he returned he brought a multitude of captives, who graced his triumph as he returned to his glorious city. But that was only the beginning, that was but a foretaste; soon he comes to gather all his saints together unto him; then when the righteous dead arise, and the righteous living are changed, and caught up to meet him in the air; then when he returns with all his ransomed throng there will be a triumph indeed. And he deserves it. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; *because* he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

A. T. J.

**"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul Subversive of the Truth"**  
***The Signs of the Times 11, 46 , pp. 730, 731.***

THE doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is one of the oldest, one of the most widespread, and one of the most destructive doctrines that has ever been in this world. It was preached in the world before ever faith in Christ the Saviour was preached. In fact, if the doctrine had never been preached to man, there would never have been any need of a Saviour, and it was the belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul that first brought sin into the world "and all our woe." "The serpent said unto the woman, *Ye shall not surely die;*" and from that day to this that doctrine has been believed more, by the children of men, than has the truth of God. Indeed, in our day this doctrine of the immortality of the soul has gained such favor among even those who profess the word of God as their standard of belief, that to deny it is considered by the majority of them as tantamount to a denial of the word itself. Whereas, instead of such denial being

in any way a denial of the truth of revelation, the fact of the matter is that the truth of revelation can be logically and consistently held *only* by the total and unequivocal denial of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. This we now propose to show.

There is no truth more plainly taught, nor more diligently insisted upon in the Bible, than this: That the future existence of men depends absolutely upon either *a resurrection* of the dead or *a translation* without seeing death at all. Paul's hope for future existence was in the resurrection of the dead. In speaking of his efforts to "win Christ," he says: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" Phil. 3:10, 11. It "was of the hope and resurrection of the dead" that he was called in question by the council (Acts 23:6); and when he had afterward to make his defense before Felix, he declared that the resurrection of the dead was the sum of his hope, saying: "*And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*" Acts 24:15. Time and again Paul so expresses his hope of future life; in short, he expresses it in no other way.

Nor is Paul the only one of the writers of the Bible who teaches the same thing. The resurrection of the dead is that to which Job looked for the consummation of his hope (Job 14:14, 15; 17:13-15; 19:23-27). David says: "Thou which hast showed me great and sore troubles, shalt quicken [give life to] me again, and shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth." Ps. 71:20. And, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Ps. 17:15. And what shall we more say. For the time would fail us to tell of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, and Hosea, and Micah, and all the prophets and apostles, and of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for Jesus himself declared that it was the *resurrection of the dead* of which God spake when he said, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." More than this, Jesus pointed his disciples always to the resurrection of the dead, through which alone they could obtain the reward which he promised. In reading John 6:29-54 we find that no less than four times, the Saviour, in giving promise to those who believe in him, sets it forth as the consummation of that belief that, "I will raise him up at the last day." And in Luke 14:13, 14 we read: "When thou makest a feast, and the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou . . . shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just.*"

Paul, however, gives us, upon this subject, a straightforward, logical argument, which leaves the doctrine of the immortality of the soul not a particle of ground to rest upon. The 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians is devoted entirely to an argument in proof of the resurrection of the dead. The apostle first proves, by hundreds of living witnesses who had seen him after he was risen, that Christ arose from the dead. Still there were some who said: "There is no resurrection of the dead;" and in refutation of that idea, he introduces three points of argument, any one of which utterly excludes the doctrine of the immortality of the soul from any place whatever in Christian doctrine.

1. In verse 16, his promise is, "*If the dead rise not.*" The *first* conclusion from that is, "Then is not Christ raise;" then upon this conclusion follows the logical sequence, "Your faith is vain," and upon that another, "Ye are yet in your sins." From his premise—"If the dead rise not"—the *second* conclusion is, verse 18, "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished.*" Nothing can be plainer than that this statement and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as is held, it cannot perish, and therefore, so far as its existence is concerned, it is utterly independent of the dead. Is it not supposed by all those who believe the soul to be immortal, that all who have passed from this world in the faith of Christ, have gone to Heaven, and are now enjoying its bliss? It is assuredly. Then, if that be the truth, upon what imaginable principle can it be conceived that they "are perished," if there be no resurrection? What need have they of a resurrection? Have they not, *without a resurrection*, all that Heaven can afford? Upon that theory certainly so. Then it just as certainly appears that not one of them has perished, even though there never be a resurrection.

Over against this theory stands the word of God, that "If the dead rise not, then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." That word is the truth. Therefore it follows that if there be no resurrection of the dead, there is no hereafter for any who have ever died, or who shall ever die. But God has given assurance to all men that there shall be a hereafter, and that assurance lies in the fact "that he hath raised him [Christ] from the dead" (Heb. 9:27; Acts 17:31). The resurrection of Christ is the God-given pledge that there shall be a resurrection of all the dead: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And, "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Therefore it is by virtue of the resurrection of the dead, and *not* by the immortality of the soul, that there will be any hereafter for the dead, whether just or unjust.

2. The second point that the apostle makes in this connection is in verse 32: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." On this nothing can be better than to present Dr. Adam Clarke's comment upon this same passage. He says, and the italics are his:—

"I believe the common method of pointing this verse is erroneous; I propose to read it thus; 'If, after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it advantage me? If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.' What the apostle says here is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine that *there is no resurrection*; for if there be no *resurrection*, then there can be no *judgment*—no *future state of rewards and punishments*; why, therefore, should we bear *crosses*, and keep ourselves under continual discipline? Let us eat and drink, take all the

pleasure we can; for to-morrow we die, and there is an *end* of us forever."

That is sound exegesis, and a just comment upon the words of the apostle. As we have shown, that is the point of Paul's argument throughout, and it is the thought of the whole Bible upon this subject. But if the soul be immortal, neither Dr. Clarke's comment nor Paul's argument is sound. For if the soul be immortal, whensoever it may be that we die that is *not* the "end of us forever," resurrection or no resurrection. By this it is plain that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul nullifies the plainest propositions of Scripture, and is therefore false.

This view fully explains the query which Dr. Clarke propounds in his remarks at the close of his comments on 1 Cor. 15. He says:—

"One remark I cannot help making; the doctrine of the *resurrection* appears to have been thought of much more consequence among the primitive Christians than it is *now!* How is this? The apostles were continually insisting on it, and exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness through it. And their successors in the present day seldom mention it! . . . There is not a doctrine in the gospel on which more stress is laid; and there is not a doctrine in the present system of preaching which is treated with more neglect!"

From the Doctor's insertion of exclamation points and his query, "How is this?" It would appear that he was surprised that it should be so. It is indeed surprising that it should be so. But it is easily enough explained. The fact is that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has become so all-pervading "in the present system of preaching," that there is no room for the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true, then the doctrine of the resurrection is indeed of no consequence. If that doctrine be true, then there is destroyed all need of laying stress upon the gospel doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. And although "the apostles were continually insisting on" the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and although there is indeed "not a doctrine of the gospel upon which more stress is laid," yet through the insidious, deceptive influence of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul it is that the preachers of the present day "seldom mention it," and that in the present system of preaching there is indeed "not a doctrine that is treated with more neglect." And nothing is needed to show more plainly than does this, the irreconcilable antagonism between the truth of God and the mischievous doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

.3. The third point is in verse 36: "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." To quicken is "to make alive." What Paul says therefore is, "That which thou sowest is not made alive, except it die." That this is spoken directly of man and his resurrection, is plain by verses 42-44. "It is sown a natural body," etc. Now the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is, that the body properly has no life, living, sentient man; that it is that about man which alone possesses real life. In other words, the body is only the house in which the real man lives; *i.e.*, the real "I" dwells within the "me;" and death is simply the separation of the soul from the body. Death breaks down the house, and lets the real occupant free. According to this doctrine, there is no such thing as real death; because the body properly has no life, consequently it does not die; and the soul—the real man—is

immortal, and it cannot die; therefore there is in reality no such thing as death. If this be true, there is not only no such thing as death, but there is, likewise, no such thing as a resurrection of the dead. For, upon the apostle's premise that "That which thou sowest is not quickened [made alive] *except it die*," it follows that, as the body, having no life, does not die, it cannot be quickened (raised from the dead); and as the soul does not die, it cannot be raised from the dead; consequently there is no such thing as a resurrection of the dead.

Therefore it stands proved to a demonstration that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is utterly subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. But the resurrection of the dead is a Bible doctrine; it is the very truth of God. So then it is plain that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is *subversive of the truth of God*; and is therefore false, deceptive, and destructive.  
A. T. J.

**December 10, 1885**

**"The First Migrations of the Goths. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 47 , pp. 740, 741.**

(Continued.)

"THE Scythian hordes, which, towards the east, bordered on the new settlements of the Goths, presented nothing to their arms, except the doubtful chance of an unprofitable victory. But the prospect of the Roman territories was far more alluring; and the fields of Dacia were covered with rich harvests, sown by the hands of an industrious, and exposed to be gathered by those of a warlike, people. It is probable that the conquests of Trajan, maintained by his successors, less for any real advantage than for ideal dignity, had contributed to weaken the empire on that side. The new and unsettled province of Dacia was neither strong enough to resist, nor rich enough to satiate, the rapaciousness of the barbarians. As long as the remote banks of the Dniester were considered as the boundary of the Roman power, the fortifications of the Lower Danube were more carelessly guarded, and the inhabitants of Mesia lived in supine security, fondly conceiving themselves at an inaccessible distance from any barbarian invaders.

"The irruptions of the Goths, under the reign of Philip [A.D. 244-249], fatally convinced them of their mistake. The king, or leader, of that fierce nation, traversed with contempt the province of Dacia, and passed both the Dniester and the Danube without encountering any opposition capable of retarding his progress. The relaxed discipline of the Roman troops betrayed

the most important posts, where they were stationed, and the fear of deserved punishment induced great numbers of them to enlist under the Gothic standard. The various multitude of barbarians appeared, at length, under the walls of Marcianopolis, a city built by Trajan in honor of his sister, and at that time the capital of the second Mesia. The inhabitants consented to ransom their lives and property by the payment of a large sum of money, and the invaders retreated back into their deserts, animated, rather than satisfied, with the first success of their arms against an opulent but feeble country. Intelligence was soon transmitted to the emperor Decius, that Cniva, king of the Goths, had passed the Danube a second time, with more considerable forces; that his numerous detachments scattered devastation over the province of Mesia, whilst the main body of the army, consisting of seventy thousand Germans and Sarmatians, a force equal to the most daring achievements, required the presence of the Roman monarch, and the exertion of his military power.

"Decius found [A.D. 250] the Goths engaged before Nicopolis, one of the many monuments of Trajan's victories. On his approach they raised the siege, but with a design only of marching away to a conquest of greater importance,—the siege of Philippopolis, a city of Thrace, founded by the father of Alexander [the Great], near the foot of Mount Hemus. Decius followed them through a difficult country, and by forced marches; but when he imagined himself at a considerable distance from the rear of the Goths, Cniva turned with rapid fury on his pursuers. The camp of the Romans was surprised and pillaged, and, for the first time, their emperor fled in disorder before a troop of half-armed barbarians. After a long resistance, Philippopolis, destitute of succor, was taken by storm. A hundred thousand persons are reported to have been massacred in the sack of that great city. Many prisoners of consequence became a valuable accession to the spoil; and Priscus, a brother of the late emperor Philip, blushed not to assume the purple, under the protection of the barbarous enemies of Rome. The time, however, consumed in that tedious siege, enabled Decius to revive the courage, restore the discipline, and recruit the numbers of his troops. He intercepted several parties of Carpi, and other Germans, who were hastening to share the victory of their countrymen, intrusted the passes of the mountains to officers of approved valor and fidelity, repaired and strengthened the fortifications of the Danube, and exerted his utmost vigilance to oppose either the progress or the retreat of the Goths. Encouraged by the return of fortune, he anxiously waited for an opportunity to retrieve, by a great and decisive blow, his own glory, and that of the Roman arms."

"The Goths were now, on every side, surrounded and pursued by the Roman arms. The flower of their troops had perished in the long siege of Philippopolis, and the exhausted country could no longer afford subsistence for the remaining multitude of licentious barbarians. Reduced to this extremity, the Goths would gladly have purchased, by the surrender of all their booty and prisoners, the permission of an undisturbed retreat. But the emperor, confident of victory, and resolving, by the chastisement of these invaders, to strike a salutary terror into the nations of the North, refused to listen to any terms of accommodation. The high-spirited barbarians preferred death to slavery. An obscure town of Mesia, called Forum Terebronii, was the scene of the battle. The Gothic army was drawn up in three lines, and either from choice or accident, the front of the third line was covered by a morass. In the beginning of the action, the son of Decius, a youth of the fairest hopes, and already associated to the honors of the purple, was slain by an arrow, in the sight of his afflicted father; who, summoning all his fortitude, admonished the dismayed troops, that the loss of a single soldier was of little importance to the republic.

"The conflict was terrible; it was the combat of despair against grief and rage. The first line of the Goths at length gave way in disorder; the second, advancing to sustain it, shared its fate; and the third only remained entire, prepared to dispute the passage of the morass, which was imprudently attempted by the presumption of the enemy. 'Here the fortune of the day turned, and all things became adverse to the Romans; the place deep with ooze, sinking under those who stood, slippery to such as advanced; their armor heavy, the waters deep; nor could they wield, in that uneasy situation, their weighty javelins. The barbarians, on the contrary, were inured to encounter in the bogs, their persons tall, their spears long, such as could wound at a distance.' In this morass the Roman army, after an ineffectual struggle, was irrecoverably lost; nor could the body of the emperor ever be found."

"This fatal blow humbled, for a very little time, the insolence of the legions. They appeared to have patiently expected, and submissively obeyed, the decree of the senate which regulated the succession to the throne. From a just regard for the memory of Decius, the Imperial title was [A.D. 251, December] conferred on Hostilianus, his only surviving son; but an equal rank, with more effectual power, was granted to Gallus, whose experience and ability seemed equal to the great trust of guardian to the young prince and the distressed empire. The first care of the new emperor was to deliver the Illyrian provinces from the

intolerable weight of the victorious Goths. He [A.D. 252] consented to leave in their hands the rich fruits of their invasion, an immense booty, and what was still more disgraceful, a great number of prisoners of the highest merit and quality. He plentifully supplied their camp with every conveniency that could assuage their angry spirits or facilitate their so much wished-for departure; and he even promised to pay them annually a large sum of gold, on condition they should never afterwards infest the Roman territories by their incursions."

"But the Romans were irritated to a still higher degree, when they discovered that they had not even secured their repose, though at the expense of their honor. The dangerous secret of the wealth and weakness of the empire had been revealed to the world. New swarms of barbarians, encouraged [A.D. 253] by the success, and not conceiving themselves bound by the obligation of their brethren, spread devastation though the Illyrian provinces, and terror as far as the gates of Rome. The defense of the monarchy, which seemed abandoned by the pusillanimous emperor, was assumed by Emilianus, governor of Pannonia and Mesia; who rallied the scattered forces, and revived the fainting spirits of the troops. The barbarians were unexpectedly attacked, routed, chased, and pursued beyond the Danube. The victorious leader distributed as a donative the money collected for the tribute, and the acclamations of the soldiers proclaimed him emperor on the field of battle."

"We have already traced the emigration of the Goths from Scandinavia, or at least from Prussia, to the mouth of the Borysthenes, and have followed their victorious arms from the Borysthenes to the Danube. Under the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus [A.D. 253-268], the frontier of the last-mentioned river was perpetually infested by the inroads of Germans and Sarmatians; but it was defended by the Romans with more than usual firmness and success. . . . Though flying parties of the barbarians, who incessantly hovered on the banks of the Danube, penetrated sometimes to the confines of Italy and Macedonia, their progress was commonly checked, or their return intercepted, by the Imperial lieutenants. But the great stream of the Gothic hostilities was diverted into a very different channel. The Goths, in their new settlement of the Ukraine, soon became masters of the northern coast of the Euxine. To the south of that inland sea were situated the soft and wealthy provinces of Asia Minor, which possessed all that

could attract, and nothing that could resist, a barbarian conqueror.

"The banks of the Borysthenes are only sixty miles distant from the narrow entrance of the peninsula of Crim Tartary [the Crimea], known to the ancients under the name of Chersonesus Taurica. . . . The little kingdom of Bosphorus, whose capital was situated on the Straits, through which the Meotis communicates itself to the Euxine, was composed of degenerate Greeks and half-civilized barbarians. . . . Domestic factions, and the fears, or private interest,

of obscure usurpers, who seized on the vacant throne, admitted the Goths into the heart of Bosphorus. With the acquisition of a superfluous waste of fertile soil, the conquerors obtained the command of a naval force, sufficient to transport their armies to the coast of Asia.

"This ships used in the navigation of the Euxine were of a very singular construction. They were slight flat-bottomed barks framed of timber only, without the least mixture of iron, and occasionally covered with a shelving roof, on the appearance of a tempest. In these floating houses, the Goths carelessly trusted themselves to the mercy of an unknown sea, under the conduct of sailors pressed into the service, and whose skill and fidelity were equally suspicious.

But the hopes of plunder had banished every idea of danger, and a natural fearlessness of temper supplied in their minds the more rational confidence, which is the just result of knowledge and experience."

"The fleet of the Goths, leaving the coast of Circassia on the left hand, first appeared before Pityus, the utmost limits of the Roman provinces; a city provided with a convenient port, and fortified with a strong wall. Here they met with a resistance more obstinate than they had reason to expect from the feeble garrison of a distant fortress. They were repulsed; and their disappointment seemed to diminish the terror of the Gothic name. As long as Successianus, an officer of superior rank and merit, defended that frontier, all their efforts were in-

741

effectual; but as soon as he was removed by Valerian to a more honorable but less important station, they resumed the attack of Pityus; and by the destruction of that city, obliterated the memory of their former disgrace.

"Circling round the eastern extremity of the Euxine Sea, the navigation from Pityus to Trebizond is about three hundred miles. The course of the Goths carried them in sight of the country of Colchis, so famous by the expedition of the Argonauts; and they even attempted, though without success, to pillage a rich

temple at the mouth of the river Phasis. Trebizond . . . was large and populous; a double enclosure of walls seemed to defy the fury of the Goths, and the usual garrison had been strengthened by a re-enforcement of ten thousand men. But there are not any advantages capable of supplying the absence of discipline and vigilance. The numerous garrison of Trebizond, dissolved in riot and luxury, disdained to guard their impregnable fortifications. The Goths soon discovered the supine negligence of the besieged, erected a lofty pile of fascines, ascended the walls in the silence of the night, and entered the defenseless city sword in hand.

"A general massacre of the people ensued, whilst the affrighted soldiers escaped through the opposite gates of the town. The most holy temples, and the most splendid edifices, were involved in a common destruction. The booty that fell into the hands of the Goths was immense: the wealth of the adjacent countries had been deposited in Trebizond, as in a secure place of refuge. The number of captives was incredible, as the victorious barbarians ranged without

opposition through the extensive province of Pontus. The rich spoils of Trebizond filled a great fleet of ships that had been found in the port. The robust youth of the sea-coast were chained to the oar; and the Goths, satisfied with the success of their first naval expedition, returned in triumph to their new establishment in the kingdom of Bosphorus."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 10, par. 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20-33.*

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Isaiah 55:1-11. The Gracious Invitation" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 47 , p. 743.**

**DECEMBER 20. ISAIAH 55:1-11**

"HO, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." This is an invitation to the thirsty of all lands to come to the Fountain of living waters. And no one anywhere who thirsts for this water—no one who desires righteousness—will ever be turned away empty. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for *they shall be filled.*" Matt. 5:6. "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." John 4:14. Isaiah, too, gives the song that all these may sing: "And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortedst me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation. Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Isa. 12:1-3. This gracious invitation is to all

people,—“Ho, every one,”—“for the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.” Titus 2:11. “And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, come. *And whosoever will*, let him take the water of life freely.” Rev. 22:17.

“WITHOUT money and without price.” “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.” Rom. 3:24, 25. Abraham is the “father of the faithful,” and he received that title because he believed God. When God told Abraham to look toward heaven and “tell the stars” if he were able to number them, and that so many—innumerable—should his seed be, Abraham believed it. “And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.” Gen. 15:5, 6. “Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but *for us also*, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” Rom. 4:23-25. As the Lord said to Abraham, as the number of the stars “so shall thy seed be;” so he says to every man, of his sins, “Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” “Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.” And as Abraham believed God in that, so much we believe God in this. And as in that Abraham’s belief was counted to him for righteousness, so in this our belief is counted to us for righteousness. So Abraham became the father of the faithful. “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

“WHEREFORE do ye spend money for that which is not bread?” It may not be exactly the thought that was in the mind of the prophet; but we would take occasion to remark upon this, that multitudes of people, and those who suppose themselves Christian people too, not only spend their money for that which is not bread, but spend it for that which is worse than no bread, but spend it for that which is worse than no bread. Tobacco, for instance—why do you spend your money for that? It simply creates an appetite that destroys the will and makes an idolater of him that uses it. Why do you spend your money for fold and jewels, rings and ear-rings, and to keep pace with all the foibles and fashion and the ways of the world? It is simply to foster pride, and the desire to please the world rather than to please God. “Love *not* the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.” And it is “the god of this world,” which blinds the minds of them that believe not. Shall the Lord be your God! or shall the god of this world be your god?

WHY do you spend “your labor for that which satisfieth not?” “Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you.” Spend your money for that which will spread among men the love and glory of Christ. Labor to show forth the virtues of God, and for the graces of the Spirit of Christ. Labor to adorn the doctrine of God,

and not your own person. And then when He who searches the heart, shall reward every man "according to his ways, and according to the *fruit* of his doings," you will find that you have labored for "that meat which endureth unto everlasting life;" then it will be seen that you have labored for that upon which you can fee to all eternity, and for that which "satisfieth" indeed. "With long life will I satisfy him, and show him my salvation." Ps. 91:16.

"SEEK ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near." This plainly suggests a time when the Lord may not be found even though he be sought for, and when he will not be near even though he be called upon. Men may talk eloquently about the gospel continuing forever; about the world becoming converted; and all such imaginary things. But the angel of God "sware by him that liveth forever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein," that "the mystery of God *should be finished.*" Rev. 10:5-7. The mystery of God is the gospel of Christ; it is the work of Christ in this salvation of men. 1 Tim. 3:16. Christ declared repeatedly that this world will end, *and that it will end in wickedness*, such as was in the days of Noah, and which had to be swept from the earth by the furious flood. In all the Bible the end of the world is spoken of in no other way than as ending in wickedness. And the doctrine of the conversion of the world is only an invention of Satan to blind the eyes of the children of men, that they may not see the dangers and duties of the last days, as they are portrayed in the faithful word. There is to be a "day of vengeance of our God," and that day of vengeance begins when the "day of salvation," the "acceptable year of the Lord," ends.

IN the hand of the Lord is the "cup of salvation" (Ps. 116:13), "and he poureth out of the same" to all who will accept "the gracious invitation." But when the dregs of that cup are reached, then these are poured into the "cup of his indignation," and "all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." Ps. 75:8; Rev. 14:10; 15:1; 16:1-21; Jer. 25:15-33. All who will not willingly and freely drink of the "cup of salvation," will be compelled to drink deeply of the "cup of indignation." "And it shall be, if they refuse to take the cup at thine hand to drink, then shalt thou say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Ye shall certainly drink." Jer. 25:28. Then will be the time spoken of in Proverbs 1:24-33, when the Lord may not be found, neither will he hear: "Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon me, *but I will not answer*; they shall seek me early, *but they shall not find me*; for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord; they would none of my counsel: they despised all my reproof." "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near."

"LET the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure

in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?" Eze. 33:11. "For the Lord delighteth in mercy." The wicked man is to forsake his ways and learn the way of God. He is to forsake his thoughts, and learn the thoughts of God. These he must learn by the Spirit of God, which the Lord giveth to those who will forsake their sins, and ask him to guide them into the way of his thoughts; for his "thoughts are very deep." "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. 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. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2:10-15.

THERE is no way right but the Lord's way, and to find that way we must first forsake our own way. There are no right thoughts but the Lord's thoughts, and to find these thoughts we must first forsake our own thoughts. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

A. T. J.

### **"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul Subversive of the Truth.— No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 47 , p. 746.**

LAST week we showed conclusively that belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, is subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. There is another doctrine of the Bible which holds just as important a place in the divine scheme as does that of the resurrection, that is, *the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ*; and this likewise is subverted by a belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. The subversion of this truth is, in a measure, involved in that of the resurrection; because without the second coming of Christ there would be no resurrection; and anything that destroys belief in the resurrection of the dead, by that means destroys faith and hope in the second coming of the Lord.

That the event of the resurrection of the dead depends wholly upon the second coming of Christ, is easily shown by the Scripture, which, of course, in these things is the *only* authority. We have before shown that the righteous are rewarded only at the resurrection; and to plainly show the connection, we will repeat a verse which we before quoted: "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind. And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed of the just." Luke 14:13, 14. And of his own coming Jesus says: "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. The coming of the Lord, and the resurrection of the righteous dead, are directly connected by Paul thus: "*For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up*

together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. And again: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. 15:51-55.

"*Then* shall be brought to pass the saying." When? "At the last trump," certainly; "for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised." When is it that the trump shall sound? "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord. . . . The Lord himself shall descend from Heaven . . . with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise." "*Then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." *Then* it is, and *not till then*, that men shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" But through belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, it is now sought to be made to appear that this "saying" is "brought to pass" when men die! There can be no more direct perversion of the word of God than to represent this saying as being brought to pass when men die. But what does the doctrine of the immortality of the soul care about the perversion of the word of God? The first time that that doctrine was ever uttered, it was in direct contradiction of the express word of the Lord himself. The Lord said, in the event of man's disobedience, "Thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17); and the devil said, "Ye shall NOT surely die." Gen. 3:4; Rev. 20:2. And there is no shadow of reason to expect that the doctrine will, in reality, ever assume any other position.

It is not alone a perversion of Scripture to so apply the "saying" in question: it is alike a perversion of the plainest principles of reason and experience. For instance, here are death and a saint of God struggling for the mastery. Presently *death obtains* the mastery. The saint lies lifeless; death has the victory. When he is dead, is that a time to claim victory over death? When he is being lowered into the grave, is that a time to shout the victory over the grave? Nay, verily. But it is not to be always so. There is One who exclaims, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell [the grave] and of death." Rev. 1:18. And when that glorious one "shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God," and with power that bursts the bars of the cruel grave and destroys the strength of death; then the saint arises triumphant over death, and "THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory.*" *Then* the saint can shout exultingly, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" And, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" And thrice thanks, yea, "blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.*" 1 Peter 1:3.

However, it is not alone through the subversion of the doctrine of the resurrection, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul strikes against the coming of the Lord. The issue is directly joined. For by those who believe in the natural immortality of the soul, it is held that those who die in the Lord go straight to Heaven; that they go direct to the place where the Lord is; and so they sing,—

"Then persevere till death  
Shall bring thee to thy God;  
He'll bring thee, at thy parting breath,  
To his divine abode."—*Gospel Hymns, No. 112.*

And obituaries are actually written by them such as the following, which we read not long since in the *Christian Cynosure*: "Alvah Palmer went to Heaven from" a certain place in New York; and then the notice went on to tell when and of what he died, etc. And Dr. Talmage, in relating how a certain saintly woman was "emparadised," tells how the chariot of Elijah was outdone; for there it must have taken *some* little time to turn out the chariot and hitch up the horses; but here, in this instance, the transition was all made instantaneously, without waiting for either horses or chariot! And all this when a person died! These are only notable expressions of the common idea of those who believe in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul.

Now, if these things be true,—if it be true that death brings people to God; that men and women go direct to Heaven from their homes in this world, and this so instantaneously that there is no time to get ready the chariot of God, as was done when Elijah went *without dying at all*,—we say if these things be true, then there is literally no place left for the coming of the Lord. It would be simply the height of ridiculous absurdity to talk about the Lord's coming to this world after people who are not here at all, but are, and have been, for years and hundreds of years, in Heaven—in the very place which he leaves to come here! This is why the doctrine of the coming of the Lord is so neglected, so despised, in fact. Believing this, there is no need to believe in the coming of the Lord; indeed, it is a palpable inconsistency to believe in it. Believing this, there is no need to look, or wait, for the coming of the Lord; all there is for such to do is to wait till death shall come and take them, and so death—"the last enemy," "the king of terrors"—is given the place and the office of Him who is altogether lovely and the chiefest among ten thousand, of Him "that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

But this belief is not the "belief of the truth." There is no element of truth, in any form, in the idea of people going to God or to Heaven when they die. Christ himself said as plainly as tongue can speak, "*Whither I go, ye cannot come.*" John 18:33. Then when his disciples were troubled because of these words he told them, in words equally plain, of the event upon which they must place their only hope of being with him where he is, and that event is, "*I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.*" John 14:3. And that word "that" shows positively that that is the only way in which men may ever be with him where he is. Therefore the coming of the Lord is the Christian's hope. And the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in supplanting, as assuredly it does, the doctrine of the coming of the Lord, supplants the Christian's hope. Then when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul sends men to Heaven

before the end of the world, before the sounding of the last trump, before the time when the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven and raise the dead, before he appears in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and sends his angels to gather together his elect—we say when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul puts men into Heaven before the occurrence of these events, it does it in defiance of the word of Christ, which liveth and abideth forever. Therefore we say it stands proved, that the belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the doctrine of the second coming of Christ, and, in that, is subversive of the truth of God.

A. T. J.

**December 17, 1885**

**"The First Migrations of the Goths. (*Continued.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 48 , p. 756.**

"THE second expedition of the Goths was undertaken with greater powers of men and ships; but they steered a different course, and, disdainful of the exhausted provinces of Pontus, followed the western coast of the Euxine, passed before the wide mouths of the Borysthenes, the Dniester, and the Danube, and increasing their fleet by the capture of a great number of fishing barks, they approached the narrow outlet through which the Euxine Sea pours its waters into the Mediterranean, and divides the continents of Europe and Asia. The garrison of Chalcedon was encamped near the temple of Jupiter Urius, on a promontory that commanded the entrance of the Strait; and so inconsiderable were the dreaded invasions of the barbarians that this body of troops surpassed in number the Gothic army. But it was in numbers alone that they surpassed it. They deserted with precipitation their advantageous post, and abandoned the town of Chalcedon, most plentifully stored with arms and money, to the discretion of the conquerors.

"Whilst they hesitated whether they should prefer the sea or land Europe or Asia, for the scene of their hostilities, a perfidious fugitive pointed out Nicomedia [now Ismid, at the head of the Gulf of Ismid], once the capital of the kings of Bithynia, as a rich and easy

conquest. He guided the march which was only sixty miles from the camp of Chalcedon, directed the resistless attack, and partook of the booty; for the Goths had learned sufficient policy to reward the traitor whom they detested. Nice, Prusa, Apamea, Cius, cities that had sometimes rivaled, or imitated, the splendor of Nicomedia, were involved in the same calamity, which, in a few weeks, raged without control through the whole province

of Bithynia. . . . The ruin of Cyzicus was delayed by a fortunate accident. The season was rainy, and the Lake Apolloniates [Uballania], the reservoir of all the springs of Mount Olympus, rose to an uncommon height. The little river of Rhyndacus [Loupadi], which issues from the lake, swelled into a broad and rapid stream, and stopped the progress of the Goths. Their retreat to the maritime city of Heraclea [the northern point of Asia Minor], where the fleet had probably been stationed, was attended by a long train of wagons, laden with the spoils of Bithynia, and was marked by the flames of Nico and Nicomedia, which they wantonly burnt. Some obscure hints are mentioned of a doubtful combat that secured their retreat. But even a complete victory would have been of little moment, as the approach of the autumnal equinox summoned them to hasten their return.

"When we are informed that the third fleet, equipped by the Goths in the ports of Bosphorus, consisted of five hundred sails of ships, our ready imagination instantly computes and multiplies the formidable armament; but, as we are assured by the judicious Strabo, that the piratical vessels used by the barbarians of Pontus and the Lesser Scythia, were not capable of containing more than twenty-five or thirty men we may safely affirm, that fifteen thousand warriors, at the most, embarked in this great expedition. Impatient of the limits of the Euxine, they steered their destructive course from the Cimmerian to the Thracian Bosphorus. When they had almost gained the middle of the Straits, they were suddenly driven back to the entrance of them; till a favorable wind, springing up the next day, carried them in a few hours into the placid sea, or rather lake, of the Propontis [Marmora]. Their landing on the little island of Cyzicus was attended with the ruin of that ancient and noble city. From thence issuing again through the narrow passage of the Hellespont, they pursued their winding navigation amidst the numerous islands scattered over the Archipelago, or the Egean Sea. The assistance of captives and deserters must have been very necessary to pilot their vessels, and to direct their various incursions, as well on the coast of Greece as on that of Asia.

"At length the Gothic fleet anchored in the port of Pireus, five miles distant from Athens, which had attempted to make some preparations for a vigorous defense. Cleodamus, one of the engineers employed by the emperor's orders to fortify the maritime cities against the Goths, had already begun to repair the ancient walls, fallen to decay since the time of Scylla. The efforts of his skill were ineffectual, and the barbarians became masters of the native seat of the muses and the arts. But while the conquerors abandoned themselves to the license of plunder and intemperance, their fleet, that lay with a slender guard in the harbor of Pireus, was

unexpectedly attacked by the brave Dexippus, who, flying with the engineer Cleodamus from the sack of Athens, collected a hasty band of volunteers, peasants as well as soldiers, and in some measure avenged the calamities of his country.

"But this exploit, whatever luster it might shed on the declining age of Athens, served rather to irritate than to subdue the undaunted spirit of the northern invaders. A general conflagration blazed out at the same time in every district of Greece. Thebes and Argos, Corinth and Sparta, which had formerly waged such memorable wars against each other, were now unable to bring an army into the field, or even to defend their ruined fortifications. The rage of war, both by land and by sea, spread from the eastern point of Sunium to the western coast of Epirus. The Goths had already advanced within sight of Italy, when the approach of such imminent danger awakened the indolent Gallienus from his dream of pleasure. The emperor appeared in arms; and his presence seems to have checked the ardor, and to have divided the strength, of the enemy. Naulobatus, a chief of the Heruli, accepted an honorable capitulation, entered with a large body of his countrymen into the service of Rome, and was invested with the ornaments of the consular dignity, which had never before been profaned by the hands of a barbarian.

"Great numbers of the Goths, disgusted with the perils and hardships of a tedious voyage, broke into Mesia, with a design of forcing their way over the Danube to their settlements in the Ukraine. The wild attempt would have proved inevitable destruction, if the discord of the Roman generals had not opened to the barbarians the means of an escape. The small remainder of this destroying host returned on board their vessels; and measuring back their way through the Hellespont and the Bosphorus, ravaged in their passage the shores of Troy, whose fame, immortalized by Homer, will probably survive the memory of the Gothic conquests. As soon as they found themselves in safety within the basin of the Euxine, they landed at Anchialus in Thrace, near the foot of Mount Hemus [Balkan Mountains]; and, after all their toils, indulged themselves in the use of those pleasant and salutary hot baths. What remained of the voyage was a short and easy navigation.

"Such was the various fate of this third and greatest of their naval enterprises. It may seem difficult to conceive how the original body of fifteen thousand warriors could sustain the losses and divisions of so bold an adventure. But as their numbers were gradually wasted by the sword, by shipwrecks, and by the influence of a warm climate, they were perpetually renewed by troops of banditti and deserters, who flocked to the standard of plunder, and by a crowd of fugitive slaves, often of German or Sarmatian

extraction, who eagerly seized the glorious opportunity of freedom and revenge."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 10, par. 35, 37, 38.*

March 20, A.D. 268, Gallienus was assassinated, and was succeeded by Claudius as emperor. In his speech to the soldiers,—

"He painted in the most lively colors the exhausted state of the treasury, the desolation of the provinces, the disgrace of the Roman name, and the insolent triumph of rapacious barbarians. It was against those barbarians, he declared, that he intended to point the first effort of their arms. Tetricus might reign for a while over the West, and even Zenobia might preserve the dominion of the East. These usurpers were his personal adversaries; nor could he think of

indulging any private resentment till he had saved an empire, whose impending ruin would, unless it was timely prevented, crush both the army and the people.

"The various nations of Germany and Sarmatia, who fought under the Gothic standard, had already [A.D. 269] collected an armament more formidable than any which had yet issued from the Euxine. On the banks of the Dniester, one of the great rivers that discharge themselves into that sea, they constructed a fleet of two thousand, or even of six thousand vessels; numbers which, however incredible they may seem, would have been insufficient to transport their pretended army of three hundred and twenty thousand barbarians. Whatever might be the real strength of the Goths, the vigor and success of the expedition were not adequate to the greatness of the preparations. In their passage through the Bosphorus, the unskilful pilots were overpowered by the violence of the current; and while the multitude of their ships were crowded in a narrow channel, many were dashed against each other, or against the shore. The barbarians made several descents on the coasts both of Europe and Asia; but the open country was already plundered, and they were repulsed with shame and loss from the fortified cities which they assaulted.

"A spirit of discouragement and division arose in the fleet, and some of their chiefs sailed away towards the islands of Crete and Cyprus; but the main body, pursuing a more steady course, anchored at length near the foot of Mount Athos, and assaulted the city of Thessalonica, the wealthy capital of all the Macedonian provinces. Their attacks, in which they displayed a fierce but artless bravery, were soon interrupted by the rapid approach of Claudius, hastening to a scene of action that deserved the presence of a warlike prince at the head of the remaining powers of the empire. Impatient for battle, the Goths immediately broke up their camp, relinquished the siege of

Thessalonica, left their navy at the foot of Mount Athos, traversed

the hills of Macedonia, and pressed forwards to engage the last defense of Italy.

"We still possess an original letter addressed by Claudius to the senate and people on this memorable occasion. 'Conscript fathers,' says the emperor, 'know that three hundred and twenty thousand Goths have invaded the Roman territory. If I vanquish them, your gratitude will reward my services. Should I fall, remember that I am the successor of Gallienus.' . . . The event surpassed his own expectations and those of the world. By the most signal victories he delivered the empire from this host of barbarians, and was distinguished by posterity under the glorious appellation of the Gothic Claudius. The imperfect historians of an irregular war do not enable us to describe the order and circumstances of his exploits; but, if we could be indulged in the allusion, we might distribute into three acts

this memorable tragedy."—*Id.*, chap. 11, par. 7-9.

A. T. J.

(Concluded next week.)

### **"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul Subversive of the Truth.— No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 48 , p. 762.**

THE Judgment is one of the certainties of Bible doctrine. Time and again Jesus sets before us the awful scenes and the all-important decisions of the Judgment. "I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment." Matt. 12:36. "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them; for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the Judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." Luke 11:31, 32. In the parable of the wheat and tares, in the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Matt. 22:1-14), in the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30),—in fact, in all his teaching, the Judgment was made prominent. In Matt. 25:41-46, he sets before us a view of the very Judgment itself.

The Old Testament as well as the New tells of the Judgment. Solomon says: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. *For God shall bring every work into Judgment*, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12:13, 14. Daniel says: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood

before him; *the Judgment was set*, and the books were opened." Dan. 7:9, 10. Isaiah, David, Job, and other prophets speak of this as well as Solomon and Daniel. Even "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," prophesied of this, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, *to execute Judgment upon all.*" Jude 14, 15.

This is not a Judgment that is constantly going on during men's lives and completed at their death, so that *then* their reward is given whether for good or ill. "It is appointed unto me once to die, but *after this* the Judgment." Heb. 9:27. Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment *to come*" (Acts 24:25), not judgment *already* come, nor constantly going on. There is a time appointed for the Judgment. "Because *he hath appointed a day* in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:31. "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;" "*in that day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." Rom. 2:12, 16. And again: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10. It is not that alone that he has done in his direct personal acts for which he must account; he must answer for the *fruit* of his doings. "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and *according to the fruit of his doings.*" Jer. 17:10.

The *time* when men shall receive for that which they have done, whether it be good or bad, is at the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the end of the world. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. . . . And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, *and the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that *thou shouldest* give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Rev. 11:15, 18. Again we quote the words of Jude: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, *the Lord cometh* with ten thousands of his saints, *to execute judgment upon all*, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Jude 14, 15. With this agree exactly the words of Christ: "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give *every man* according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. And Paul in his charge to Timothy, and to all ministers of Christ, says: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*; preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2. Peter also says: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Peter 2:9.

It would be easy to multiply texts from all parts of the Bible on these points, but these must suffice for the present. From these evidences it is plain (1) that

there is a *time "appointed"* for the Judgment; (2) that this is after death; (3) that this is called the "*day of Judgment*;" (5) that it is at the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ; (6) that *then*, and not till then, it is that the righteous receive their reward; (7) and that the "unjust" are "reserved" until that time to be punished, that they are not punished before that great day of Judgment. Yet however plain all this may be, it is equally plain that there is not a single principle of it that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul does not tend to subvert. For if, at death, righteous men enter immediately into their reward, and the unrighteous go immediately to the place of punishment, then where is there any possible room for the Judgment? (unless perhaps the absurd idea be adopted, that men should spend hundreds of thousands of years in happiness or misery, and then be brought to the Judgment to see whether they be worthy of that which they have enjoyed or suffered!!)

For if at death men enter immediately into their reward or punishment, as the case may be, then it follows, if there be any Judgment at all, that instead of there being a *time "appointed"* "after this" for Judgment, there must necessarily be a judgment constantly going on in the life of each individual, and that that judgment closes at his death, and that he in consequence of *judgment passed* enters *then* upon his destiny, whether for good or for ill. It can be seen at a glance that such a view is utterly subversive of the Bible doctrine of the Judgment. If such be the truth, then there can be no such thing as a day of Judgment when the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon *all*, because all are judged as fast as they die; there can be no such thing as Christ judging the living *and the dead* at his appearing and his kingdom, because all the dead have been judged when they died; there can be no such thing as the "time of the dead that they should be judged" when the seventh angel sounds, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, for all the dead will have been judged before the seventh angel shall have sounded; and there can be no such thing as *reserving* "the unjust unto the day of Judgment to be punished," because by this theory they are sent to punishment as soon as they die; in short, if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be the truth, the Bible doctrine of the Judgment cannot be the truth. And the time has now come when a choice must be made between them. As for us we choose the Bible with all its doctrine, and with all that that choice involves.

That we do not misrepresent the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul when we say that it puts men into Heaven or hell at death, can be proved by any one who will consult the hymn books, or the papers of the religious denominations who believe that doctrine, or listen to the average funeral discourse or revival sermon.

But that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the Bible doctrine of the Judgment is not all. By virtue of that doctrine, men have usurped the seat of the Judge of all, and have arrogated to themselves the prerogative of reading into Heaven whomsoever *they* see fit. How often we read that such and such a person is in Heaven! But what right has any man to say who is worthy of a place in that bright world? Who knows the heart? None but God alone. He alone it is who pronounces upon the worthiness of men "to obtain that world and the

resurrection from the dead," and when men take upon themselves to read into Heaven this man or that man, they are simply usurping the awful prerogative of the Most High. And only for belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, no man would ever think of it. We repeat: It is God alone to whom belongs the right to pronounce that decision. He will pronounce it in every case, but it will be in the Judgment; not at death, but at the resurrection of the dead, and before the assembled universe, and by the voice of the glorious Son of God, who hath loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood; for he "hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." John 5:27-29. Any doctrine that will lead men to thus usurp the prerogative of the Judge of all the earth cannot be the truth. This is exactly what the doctrine of the immortality of the soul does, therefore it cannot be the truth; and as it is subversive of the Bible doctrine of the Judgment, it is not only not the truth, but it is subversive of the truth.

A. T. J.

**December 24, 1885**

**"The First Migrations of the Goths. (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 49 , p. 772.**

*(Concluded).*

"I. THE decisive battle was fought near Naissus, a city of Dardania [Nissa, in Servia]. The legions at first gave way, oppressed by numbers, and dismayed by misfortunes. Their ruin was inevitable, had not the abilities of their emperor prepared a seasonable relief. A large detachment, rising out of the secret and difficult passes of the mountains, which, by his order, they had occupied, suddenly assailed the rear of the victorious Goths. The favorable instant was improved by the activity of Claudius. He revived the courage of his troops, restored their ranks, and pressed the barbarians on every side. Fifty thousand men are reported to have been slain in the battle of Naissus. Several large bodies of barbarians, covering their retreat with a movable fortification of wagons, retired, or rather escaped, from the field of slaughter.

"II. We may presume that some insurmountable difficulty, the fatigue, perhaps, or the disobedience, of the conquerors, prevented Claudius from completing in one day the destruction of the Goths. The war was diffused over the province of Mesia, Thrace, and Macedonia, and its operations drawn out into a variety of marches, surprises, and tumultuary engagements, as well by sea as by land. When the Romans suffered any loss, it was commonly occasioned by their own cowardice or rashness; but the superior talents of the emperor, his perfect knowledge of the country, and his judicious

choice of measures as well as officers, assured on most occasions the success of his arms. The immense booty, the fruit of so many victories, consisted for the greater part of cattle and slaves. A select body of the Gothic youth was received among the Imperial troops; the remainder was sold into servitude; and so considerable was the number of female captives, that every soldier obtained to his share two or three women. A circumstance from which we may conclude, that the invaders entertained some designs of settlement as well as of plunder; since even in a naval expedition, they were accompanied by their families.

"III. The loss of their fleet, which was either taken or sunk, had intercepted the retreat of the Goths. A vast circle of Roman posts, distributed with skill, supported with firmness, and gradually closing towards a common centre, forced the barbarians into the most inaccessible parts of Mount Hemus, where they found a safe refuge, but a very scanty subsistence. During the course of a rigorous winter in which they were besieged by the emperor's troops, famine and pestilence, desertion and the sword, continually diminished the imprisoned multitude. On the return of spring, nothing appeared in arms except a hardy and desperate band, the remnant of that mighty host which had embarked at the mouth of the Dniester.

"The pestilence which swept away such numbers of the barbarians, at length proved fatal to their conqueror. After a short but glorious reign of two years, Claudius expired at Sirmium [near Murovic in S. E. Slavonia], amidst the tears and acclamations of his subjects. In his last illness, he convened the principal officers of the state and army, and in their presence recommended Aurelian, one of his generals, as the most deserving of the throne, and the best qualified to execute the great design which he himself had been permitted only to undertake.

"The death of Claudius had revived the fainting spirit of the Goths. The troops which guarded the passes of Mount Hemus, and the banks of the Danube, had been drawn away by the apprehension of a civil war; and it seems probable that the remaining body of the Gothic and Vandalic tribes embraced the favorable opportunity, abandoned their settlements of the Ukraine, traversed the rivers, and swelled with new multitudes the destroying host of their countrymen. Their united numbers were at length encountered by Aurelian, and the bloody and doubtful conflict ended only with the approach of night. Exhausted by so many calamities, which they had mutually endured and inflicted during a twenty years' war, the Goths and the Romans consented to a lasting and beneficial

treaty. It was earnestly solicited by the barbarians, and cheerfully ratified by the legions, to whose suffrage the prudence of Aurelian referred the decision of that important question. The Gothic nation engaged to supply the armies of Rome with a body of two thousand auxiliaries,

consisting entirely of cavalry, and stipulated in return an undisturbed retreat, with a regular market as far as the Danube, provided by the emperor's care, but at their own expense.

"The treaty was observed with such religious fidelity, that when a party of five hundred men straggled from the camp in quest of plunder, the king or general of the barbarians commanded that the guilty leader should be apprehended and shot to death with darts, as a victim devoted to the sanctity of their engagements. <sup>^\*</sup> It is, however, not unlikely, that the precaution of Aurelian, who had exacted as hostages the sons and daughters of the Gothic chiefs, contributed something to this pacific temper. The youths he trained in the exercise of arms, and near his own person: to the damsels he gave a liberal and Roman education, and by bestowing them in marriage on some of his principal officers, gradually introduced between the two nations the closest and most endearing connections. But the most important condition of peace was understood rather than expressed in the treaty. Aurelian withdrew the Roman forces from Dacia, and tacitly relinquished that great province to the Goths and Vandals."—*Dec. and Fall, chap. 11, par. 10, 11, 16.*

"The Goths, who in the time of Claudius and Aurelian had felt the weight of the Roman arms, respected the power of the empire, strength of that warlike nation was now restored by a peace of near fifty years; a new generation had arisen, who no longer remembered the misfortunes of ancient days; the Sarmatians of the Lake Meotis followed the Gothic standard either as subjects or as allies, and their united force was poured upon the countries of Illyricum. Campona, Margus, and Benonia, appear to have been the scenes of several memorable sieges and battles; and though Constantine encountered a very obstinate resistance, he prevailed at length in the contest, and the Goths were compelled to purchase an ignominious retreat, by restoring the booty and prisoners which they had taken. Nor was this advantage sufficient to satisfy the indignation of the emperor. He resolved to chastise as well as to repulse the insolent barbarians who had dared to invade the territories of Rome. At the head of his legions he passed the Danube after repairing the bridge which had been constructed by Trajan, penetrated into the strongest recesses of Dacia, and when he had inflicted a severe revenge, condescended to give peace to the suppliant Goths, on condition

that, as often as they were required, they should supply his armies with a body of forty thousand soldiers."—*Id.*, *Chap. 14, par. 35*.

The peace thus granted by Constantine to the Goths continued till A.D. 331. In the meantime the Goths, in the endeavor to extend their power to the North, were resisted by the Samaritans, and a bloody war among these barbarous nations was the result.

"After some experience of the superior strength and numbers of their adversaries, the Sarmatians implored the protection of the Roman monarch, who beheld with pleasure the discord of the nations, but who was justly alarmed by the progress of the Gothic arms. As soon [A.D. 331] as Constantine had declared himself in favor of the weaker party, the haughty Alaric, king of the Goths, instead of expecting the attack of the legions, boldly passed the Danube, and spread terror and devastation through the province of Mesia. To oppose the inroad of this destroying host, the aged emperor took the field in person; but on this occasion either his conduct or his fortune betrayed the glory which he had acquired in so many foreign and domestic wars. He had the mortification of seeing his troops fly before an inconsiderable detachment of the barbarians who pursued them to the edge of their fortified camp, and obliged him to consult his safety by a precipitate and ignominious retreat.

"The event of a second and more successful action [A.D. 332, April 20] retrieved the honor of the Roman name, and the powers of art and discipline prevailed, after an obstinate contest, over the efforts of irregular valor. The broken army of the Goths abandoned the field of battle, the wasted province into the mountains, where, in the course of a severe campaign, above one hundred thousand were computed to have perished by cold and hunger. Peace was at length granted to their humble supplications; the eldest son of Alaric was accepted as the most valuable hostage; and Constantine endeavored to convince their chiefs, by a liberal distribution of honors and rewards, how far the friendship of the Romans was preferable to their enmity."—*Id.*, *chap. 18, par. 13, 14*.

A. T. J.

**"Notes on the International Lesson. 2 Kings 22:1-13. Josiah and the Book of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 49 , p. 774.**

**JANUARY 3. 2 KINGS 22:1-13**

IN this lesson we return to the kings of Judah. After the good king Hezekiah died, his son Manasseh reigned. "And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, after the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel. For he built up again the high places which Hezekiah his father had destroyed; and he reared up altars for Baal, and made a grove, as did

Ahab king of Israel; and worshiped all the host of heaven, and served them. . . . And he made his son pass through the fire, and observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with familiar spirits and wizards; he wrought much wickedness in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger. . . . And Manasseh seduced them [the children of Judah] to do more evil than did the nations whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel. . . . Moreover Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another; beside his sin wherewith he made Judah to sin, in doing that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." 2 Kings 21:2, 3, 6, 9, 16.

THEN because of all this great evil, the Lord said by his prophets: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Behold, I am bringing such evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, that whosoever heareth of it, both his ears shall tingle. And I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab; and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down." Verses 12, 13. "And the Lord spake to Manasseh, and to his people; but they would not hearken. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria [Esarhaddon], which took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon." 2 Chron. 33:10, 11. He was released, however, after a while, and at his death his son Amon reigned. "And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, as his father Manasseh did. . . . And the servants of Amon conspired against him, and slew the king in his own house. And the people of the land slew all them that had conspired against king Amon; and the people of the land made Josiah his son king in his stead." 2 Kings 21:20, 23, 24.

THUS it was that young Josiah—only eight years of age—came to the throne. And he found the land full of iniquity and abominable idolatry; altars reared to Baal; images of Ashtoreth in the high places; places of worship for horrid Moloch; horses and chariots dedicated to the sun; priests of Baal, and of all the idols, burning incense to Baal, to the sun, to the moon, to the planets, and to all the host of heaven; the house of God shut up; the worship of the Lord forsaken, and the book of the law forgotten,—this had been the condition of affairs for nearly fifty years. In the eighth year of his reign he began actively the work of reformation—to break down the altars; to break in pieces the images; and to burn the chariots of the sun. Thus he did throughout all Judah. "And so did he in the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali, with their mauls round about." 2 Chron. 34:3-6. While these things were going on, the Levites were at the same time gathering money from all the people, "of the hand of Manasseh and Ephraim, and of all the remnant of Israel, and of all Judah and Benjamin; and they returned to Jerusalem. And they put it in the hand of the workmen that had the oversight of the house of the Lord, and they gave it to the workmen that wrought in the house of the Lord, to repair and amend the house."

"AND it came to pass in the eighteenth year of king Josiah, that the king sent Shaphan the son of Azaliah, the son of Meshullam, the scribe, to the house of the Lord, saying, Go up to Hilkiyah the high priest, that he may sum the silver which is brought into the house of the Lord, which the keepers of the door have gathered of the people." "And Hilkiyah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have

found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. And Hilkiyah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it. And Shaphan the scribe came to the king, and brought the king word again. . . . And Shaphan the scribe showed the king, saying, Hilkiyah the priest hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilkiyah the priest, and Ahikam the son of Shaphan, and Achbor the son of Michaiah, and Shaphan the scribe, and Asahiah a servant of the king's, saying, Go ye, inquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found; for great is the wrath of the LORD that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, to do according unto all that which is written concerning us."

THESE messengers went immediately to Huldah the prophetess, who "dwelt in Jerusalem in the college," and when Josiah received the answer from the Lord, he gathered all the people together, "small and great," and "read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord." And the king made a covenant before the Lord, to keep his commandments, with all their heart and with all their soul. And all the people stood to the covenant. 2 Kings 23:2, 3. "And like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him." 2 Kings 23:25.

JOSIAH did a grand work, and it is a grand commendation of the Lord that he received because of it. But this was not written for his sake alone. Those who tremble at the word of the Lord, and turn from their transgressions, as did King Josiah, the Lord will accept and commend as readily as he did him. This reformation by Josiah is only an illustration of the power of the word of God. When Luther found a Bible chained in the library of his monastery, its precious word touched his heart, and by it caused a revolution in all Europe. When Wesley began to obey that word "with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might," the power of the word could not be kept back, but it fairly turned England and America "upside down." So it will be ever. Only let a few men, or even a solitary man, walk in the way of the commandments of God, with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their might, and they can move nations. "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

THE work of reformation is not yet done. The noble duty of covenanting to walk after the Lord and to keep his commandments, did not cease with this act of Josiah, nor with Luther, nor with Wesley. Even now the Lord sends a message to all people, saying with a loud voice, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Even now iniquity and idolatry, prevail as really as in the days of Josiah, Luther, or Wesley. And now it is the duty of those who fear God to covenant to talk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments and testimonies and his statutes, with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their might, to perform the words of this covenant that are written in the book.

AS IT was in the days of Josiah, that the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth and the honor of the sun, had supplanted the worship and honor of Jehovah, even so now the worship of the beast (the papacy), and his image (the so-called National Reform), and the honor of the "venerable day of the sun" are fast supplanting the worship and honor of Jehovah. Even now, as of old, the Lord cries out, "If I be a Father, where is mine honor? if I be a Master, where is my fear?" Mal. 1:6. Men who make their boast of the law, through breaking the law are dishonoring God. "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God?" Rom. 2:23. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." Isa. 58:13. "Them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Sam. 2:30.

A. T. J.

**"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul Subversive of the Truth.—  
No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 49 , pp. 778, 779.**

GOD created man upon the earth, and gave him dominion over all upon it. He made him, not as the angels, but *lower* than they—inferior to the angels. Ps. 8:5; Heb. 2:7, margin. God made man upright, but through the deception of Satan he turned to crooked ways—he sinned. And although God had put all things in subjection under him, and "left nothing" that was not "put under him," yet now, says Paul, we see not all things put under him. Heb. 2:8. Through sin he has been deprived of his glory, and honor, and dominion, which God gave him, and which the Lord intended that he should forever enjoy. This sin was brought upon him by Satan, and, hard upon sin, death followed.

But when man had thus sold himself under sin, God gave by promise, and in the "fullness of time" he gave *in fact*, his only begotten Son, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." When man had so sold himself under sin, under the curse, God gave his dear Son to redeem him from sin, from the curse, and from all condemnation. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:1. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. 3:13. "He hath made him to be sin *for us*, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5:21. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, *condemned sin in the flesh*; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4.

To put away sin and plant righteousness in its stead, is the mission of Christ to this world. That he might accomplish this, he had to make the awful sacrifice of *himself*, the Creator of the universe. "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9:26. By the greatness

of the sacrifice we may judge of the enormity of sin, and how abhorrent it is in the sight of God, and also how widely contrary it is to every principle of the government of the King of Eternity. To deliver man from its thralldom he spared not his own Son. Rather than to see the blight and stain of sin upon the fair face of his universe, God gave up the "Son of his love" to die the cruel death of the accursed tree. John says: "He that committed sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. *For this purpose* the Son of God was manifested, *that he might destroy the works of the devil.*" 1 John 3:8. The work of the devil is sin; for he says, "He that committeth sin is of the devil." Therefore when it is said that the Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, it is simply expressing, in other words, that which we quoted from Paul, that Christ appeared to put away sin.

As therefore Christ's mission is to destroy the works of the devil—to put away sin—it follows that as long as there is a vestige of sin remaining, his mission is not accomplished. Whatever therefore tends to perpetuate sin, tends just so far to delay the accomplishment of the mission of Christ. And if by any means sin were made eternal, the inevitable result would be to nullify and subvert the mission of Christ. Now that is exactly what is done by the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. The very meaning of the word *immortal* being "not subject to death," it follows that if the soul be immortal, it must live eternally, whatever its condition may be; and from this again it follows that when the awful sentence is pronounced, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still," whatsoever soul it be that shall then be unjust must live so to all eternity; which is simply to make sin eternal, and so to subvert the mission of Christ.

That sin is to be eternal is strenuously maintained by those who believe that the soul is immortal. This is shown positively in the doctrine of the eternal torment of the wicked. In fact, the belief in the eternal torment of the wicked is simply the necessary consequence of the belief in the immortality of the soul. We know, for the word of God says it, that the wicked will be punished. We know likewise, by the same authority, that they will be punished as long as they live (*aion—a life-time*). Now if they live eternally, it is evident that they will be in pain eternally. But the word of God says just as plainly that the wicked shall die, as it says anything at all about them. "The wages of sin is *death*." Rom. 6:23. "The soul that sinneth, *it shall die*." Eze. 18:4. That word tells us of a time when, "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," shall be heard saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. 5:13. This scripture can never be fulfilled if the doctrine of eternal suffering be true, or, in other words, if the doctrine of immortality of the soul be true. Again, we read of a time when "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, *neither shall there be any more pain*;" for the former things are passed away." Rev. 21:4. If the doctrine of eternal suffering be the truth, it is literally impossible that there can ever come a time when there shall be "no more pain."

But there stands that faithful word, that there is coming a time when there shall be no more pain; there is coming a time when every voice in the universe

will ascribe "Honor, and glory, and power," "unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb *forever and ever*." This is the truth of God; he has given his only begotten Son that it might be accomplished; and we have seen that the mission of the Son is declared to be "to put away sin," to "destroy the works of the devil." And the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in making sin eternal, and in immortalizing the works of the devil, frustrates the purpose of God and subverts the mission of Christ.

Once more: The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul makes the body only worthless clay, formed into a prison that binds, and fetters, and clogs the free action of the soul; while death is the friendly messenger that bursts the prison bars, and sets free the aspiring soul to seek its native sphere. One of the most influential of American preachers said lately, of one who had *died*, that that person was living, and more thoroughly living, to-day than any of us who are clogged and hampered and chained down by earthly impediment." This is simply the expression of the common belief of those who hold to the idea that the soul is immortal. Embodied in metre so that it can be sung, it runs on this wise:—

"Why should we start and fear to die?  
What timorous worms we mortals are!  
Death is the gate to endless joy;  
And yet we dread to enter there."

Now we read in the word of God, as follows: "O death, I will be thy plagues." Hos. 13:14. And again we read that "death" "shall be destroyed." 1 Cor. 15:26. Can it be that God is going to visit with plagues, and destroy, the gate to endless joy? Is he so displeased to have his creatures entering into endless joy that he is determined to destroy the very means by which they enter that blissful state? If the words of this preacher and the language of this hymn, and the doctrine upon which these are founded, be the truth, then the Lord is going to do just the thing that is here pointed out, that is, he is going to visit with plagues, and destroy, the gate to endless joy.

But this is not all. We read further of Christ: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might *destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil*." Heb. 2:14. Granting the claim that death is the gate to endless joy, then from this scripture it follows just as absolutely as logic can demonstrate, that *the devil*, having the power of death, *is the gate-keeper*. And so the Lord is not only going to destroy this "gate to endless joy," but he is going to destroy him that keeps it. Nor yet is this all. Granting not only the claim, based upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, that death is the gate to endless joy, but also that the soul is clogged, and hampered, and imprisoned by its confinement in the body, and that it is released by death, it follows that if there had never been any death in the world no soul could have ever been set free, and there never would have been any gate to endless joy. And as it was the devil who brought death into the world, therefore, under that doctrine, to him must be accorded the honor of setting men free from this world, and of creating and opening to men the gate of endless joy. But this is the very thing that Christ says that he himself came to do. He says: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no

man cometh unto the Father *but by me.*" John 14:6. "*I am the door;* by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." John 10:9. Therefore when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul makes death the gate to endless joy, and the friendly messenger that releases men from this world, it supplants the Saviour of the world, and bestows upon Satan the honor that is due to Christ.

And by all this, we lay against the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul the legitimate and logical charge that it frustrates the purpose of God, that it nullifies the mission of Christ, and that it supplants the Saviour of the world. And if anything more is needed to show that between that doctrine and the truth of God, there is a difference wide as eternity, we promise to present it in our next issue.

A. T. J.

<sup>1</sup> The italics in these quotations are mine. A. T. J.

<sup>2</sup> A sermon delivered by Eld. A. T. Jones in Oakland, Cal., Sabbath, July 5, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> A sermon delivered by Eld. A. T. Jones in Oakland, Cal., Sabbath, July 5, 1884.

<sup>4</sup> Fourier's theory here referred to is "the spreading of heat in a solid tending to ultimate equalization of temperature throughout it, instead of the transference of heat from one body to another by conduction through the solid considered."

<sup>5</sup> According to Grote, it was not exactly unanimous. He says the *Lacedemonians* did not acquiesce in the vote.óChap. 91, par. 17.

<sup>6</sup> The text says *Samaritans*, but it certainly should be *Sarmatians*, we have therefore inserted Sarmatians. The justice of this will be seen by any one who will consult any map of the period, or read carefully the text itself; for the *Samaritans* were not *remote* at all.